



THE SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Sixth Framework Programme covers Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2002 to 2006

Integrating and Strengthening the European Research Area

NEST

New and Emerging Science and Technology

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR EVALUATORS

Participating in evaluation of proposals for

NEST Call B-2

Fixed deadline Call for Proposals

Call identifier: FP6-2003-NEST-B-2

March 2004

Contents

- 1 EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION3**
- 2 THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS4**
 - 2.1 INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS EVALUATORS4
 - 2.2 COMMISSION OFFICIALS4
 - 2.3 INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS OBSERVERS4
- 3 THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....5**
 - 3.1 BEFORE THE EVALUATION5
 - 3.2 BRIEFING OF THE EVALUATORS5
 - 3.3 INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS6
 - 3.4 CONSENSUS.....9
 - 3.5 PANEL MEETING9
 - 3.6 EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS (ESR)..... 10
 - 3.7 THE PANEL REPORT 11
 - 3.8 FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION AND PROJECT SELECTION 11
- ANNEXES12**

1 Evaluation documentation

The evaluation of proposals in NEST is based entirely on the “**Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures**”, that describe the general principles and the procedures which will be used in the evaluation of proposals.

These guidance notes do not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Sixth Framework Programme, the Call for proposals or the Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures.

These guidance notes are prepared on the basis of the above Guidelines. They describe the evaluation process in practical detail and contain the evaluation forms needed to be completed at each step of the evaluation of proposals and an indicative format for the panel report.

For the evaluation, you will also need to consult **the current NEST Work Programme** and the NEST reference documents for each action line. The Work Programme provides a detailed description of the content of the strategic objectives, and indicates which types of instruments may be used for each. The Work Programme also contains details on the eligibility and evaluation criteria which will be applied to proposals.

Additionally, it may be necessary to refer to **the NEST Guides for Proposers**. These Guides are used by the proposers in preparing their proposals. They describe in detail the contents which are required in proposals for this NEST Call, and tell proposers how their proposals should be prepared and submitted.

These documents may be found on the specific call page for NEST:

http://fp6.cordis.lu/next/call_details.cfm?CALL_ID=115

Two different types of instrument are available to fund activities in NEST-B-2:

- Co-ordination Actions (CA)
- Specific Support Actions (SSA)

Complete details of these instruments' characteristics and their application within FP6 can be found at:

<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/instruments.htm>.

Evaluation criteria and evaluation forms, and in some cases the evaluation procedures, differ according to the type of instrument. For each proposal which is evaluated, ONLY THE CRITERIA, FORMS AND PROCEDURES APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF INSTRUMENT MUST BE USED

2 The roles and responsibilities of evaluation participants

2.1 *Independent experts acting as evaluators*

The evaluation and selection of proposals is carried out by the Commission with the assistance of independent experts.

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They conform to the “Code of Conduct for independent experts appointed as evaluators” which is appended to the “Guidelines on proposal evaluation and project selection procedures” and must sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration prior to beginning their work. These must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

Experts may also be invited by the Commission to perform the roles of rapporteur or panel chairperson.

2.2 *Commission officials*

Commission staff will organise a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the criteria applicable for this specific call, in full respect of the relevant procedures, rules and regulations. They will ensure that the process runs smoothly and fairly, that access to the information pertaining to proposals is strictly controlled and that the most efficient use possible is made of the time of all concerned.

In consensus and panel meetings Commission staff may act as moderators, seeking consensus between the independent experts, without any prejudice for or against particular proposals or the organisations involved.

The work of an evaluator is under the supervision of the Commission officials organising the evaluation.

Commission staff will not attempt to influence the opinion of the independent experts. Even if asked, they may not express any opinion to the experts on the merits or otherwise of any proposal. They may however provide additional information or assistance on request.

In organising the evaluation, the Commission is assisted by contracted support staff from the Evaluation Service Provider (ESP). They play no formal part in the evaluation process, but provide logistical support.

2.3 *Independent experts acting as observers*

Independent experts may be appointed as observers to examine the evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The role of the observers is to give independent advice to the Commission on the conduct, fairness and equity of the evaluation sessions, ways in which the procedures could be improved, the evaluation criteria used in the sessions and the way in which the evaluators apply these criteria. They do not express views on the proposals under examination or the evaluators’ opinions on the proposals.

They conform to the “Code of Conduct for independent observers of the evaluation process” which is appended to the “Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures”.

3 The evaluation process

The evaluation of proposals in NEST for CA and SSA is carried out in a single stage procedure as described in the Guide for Proposers.

Each evaluation session consists of a number of steps, as described in the “*Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures*” (with an accompanying flow chart), independently of whether the process involves a single stage or a two-stage procedure. Briefly, the steps are as follows:

- **Step 1: Briefing of the evaluators**
All evaluators are briefed orally or in writing before the evaluation by representatives of the Commission’s service in charge of the call, in order to inform them of the general evaluation guidelines and the objectives of the research area under consideration.
- **Step 2: Individual evaluation of proposals**
Each proposal is evaluated against the applicable criteria independently by several evaluators who fill in Individual Assessment Reports (IARs) giving marks and providing comments. This part of the evaluation is carried out remotely by the evaluators at their place of work.
- **Step 3: Consensus**
For each proposal a Consensus Report (CR) is prepared. The report faithfully reflects the views of the evaluators referred to in Step 2.
- **Step 4: Panel evaluation**
A panel discussion will be convened, to examine and compare the “consensus reports” and marks in a given area, to review the proposals with respect to each other and to make recommendations on a priority order and/or on possible clustering or combination of proposals. The panel consists of a subset of the evaluators carrying out individual assessments. The panel prepares the Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs).

3.1 Before the evaluation

On receipt by the Commission, proposals are opened, registered and acknowledged and their contents entered into a database to support the evaluation process.

Basic eligibility criteria for each proposal are also checked by Commission staff before the evaluation begins and proposals which do not fulfil these criteria are excluded.

Depending upon the number of proposals received, the evaluation may be carried out by a single group of evaluators or in different groups or sub-groups, split according to subject and/ or instrument type. Evaluators will be informed about the precise breakdown of any groups.

In organising the evaluation, Commission staff assign the proposals to research areas, as appropriate, taking into account the number of proposals received. The assignment of evaluators to research areas and the allocation of proposals to evaluators will also have been carried out, taking account of the fields of expertise of the experts. If the subject matter of a particular proposal covers more than one research area, appropriate means to evaluate it fairly will be established. This may involve, for example, inviting evaluators from other groups to participate in the evaluation of the proposal or forming an ad-hoc cross-cutting group of evaluators.

No proposal will be supplied to evaluators until they have signed and returned the confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration.

3.2 Briefing of the evaluators

Evaluators will be provided with a briefing by Commission staff before the evaluation begins, covering the evaluation procedure, technical issues involved in the particular research objectives and the horizontal issues to be taken into consideration in the evaluation.

3.3 Individual evaluation of proposals

Each proposal will first be assessed by a minimum of three to five evaluators decided by the Commission services chosen from among the pool of evaluators taking part in this evaluation. At least one of the evaluators (the “rapporteur”) will be a member of the panel. Key aspects of the assessment are described below.

Evaluation criteria and forms

The proposal will be evaluated in terms of pre-determined blocks of evaluation criteria¹, as described in the Work Programme. The Work Programme and Calls for proposals also give any threshold marks which will be applied to each of the criteria.

The blocks of evaluation criteria list a number of detailed issues (sub-criteria or prompting questions) which the evaluator should consider during the assessment of that block.

When examining proposals, evaluators may *only* apply the evaluation criteria, which are set out in the Work Programme and shown on the evaluation forms.

At this stage the evaluators are acting individually and independently; they do not discuss the proposal with each other, nor any third party. The evaluators record their individual opinions on special forms, the Individual Assessment Report (IAR) form, giving scores and comments on the evaluation criteria, and addressing the horizontal issues as described in the Work Programme/ Call (see below). These forms detail the criteria to be used.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the Form IAR for each instrument. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the Form IAR for the proposal, which they are evaluating.

There are as many IAR forms as there are evaluators of the proposal. Each evaluator will sign his/ her own form. Signature on the IAR form closes this step of the evaluation. In signing the IAR, the evaluator also declares that he/she has no conflict of interest in evaluating the proposal.

Transfer of proposals between calls

Proposals can only be transferred where they are eligible under the receiving call (e.g. submitted before the call deadline) and the receiving call is in a position to evaluate (i.e. evaluations have not already been completed). In cases where programmes cannot agree to the transfer, the proposal remains with the original programme. Transfer of proposals between instruments is not possible.



Proposal transfer
form.xls

Scope of the call

If, prior to the evaluation, the Commission services suspect that a proposal may be out of the scope of the Call, the supervising Commission official will inform all the evaluators of that proposal and seek their views before proceeding with the evaluation.

It is also possible that, after reading by the evaluators, a proposal is found to be only partially, or indeed not at all, within the scope of the Call. It may in reality not address the research objectives which it claims to address, or it may not actually be constructed appropriately for the type of instrument it claims to be.

¹ “Block of criteria” refers to the main numbered headings in the work programme annex under which several evaluation issues are grouped.

If, during the reading of a proposal, an individual evaluator suspects that a proposal may be out of the scope of the Call, he must alert the supervising Commission official. The Commission official will inform all the evaluators of that proposal and seek their views before continuing with the evaluation.

If the consensus is that the proposal is out of scope (and hence “not relevant”), the evaluators will assign a zero/ below-threshold score to the evaluation criterion “Relevance”. The evaluation may then be stopped without addressing further criteria.

Based on the consensus of the evaluators, the Commission staff will determine whether or not to proceed with the evaluation of the proposal and make appropriate arrangements.

Proposal marking

Evaluators examine the individual issues comprising each block of evaluation criteria and mark the blocks on a six-point scale from 0 to 5. In this scheme, the scores indicate the following with respect to the block under examination:

0 -	<i>the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or can not be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information</i>
1 -	<i>poor</i>
2 -	<i>fair</i>
3 -	<i>good</i>
4 -	<i>very good</i>
5 -	<i>excellent</i>

Half marks may not be given.

The sub-criteria or “prompts” comprising the blocks of criteria are not scored. They are to help the evaluator support his/her eventual judgement on what score to assign to the criterion concerned when he/she has finished his/her reading, and also to remind him/her of issues he/she may wish to raise.

A feature of the procedure as described is to allow the evaluators to reflect on the individual issues comprising the blocks of criteria. By only taking the marks for the blocks of criteria into consideration in the final evaluation of the proposals, evaluators are encouraged to “look at the larger picture” and score the proposal against these important blocks of criteria as a whole, rather than applying a “mechanical” process of adding any marks given on individual issues.

Thresholds and weightings

For all criteria a threshold score is applied, as well as a threshold on the overall score to be achieved. Threshold scores are applied to certain criteria, as described in the Call, as well as a threshold on the overall score to be achieved. Proposals which fail to achieve one or more of the threshold scores will not be considered for support.

An overall score is calculated for each proposal. For proposals in NEST all criteria will carry an equal weight, so the overall score is calculated in this case by simple addition.

Horizontal issues to be addressed

In addition to the blocks of evaluation criteria to be evaluated, the following issues also need to be addressed during the evaluation, and recommendations made if appropriate:

- **Gender** – are there any gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal and, if so, have they been adequately taken into account?
- **Ethical** and/ or **safety** aspects – have they been identified and taken into account?
- Readiness to **engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole**, to spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider **societal implications** of the work.
- The synergies with **education** at all levels.
- The justification and integration of any **third country participation** in the proposal.

The individual assessment forms include space for the evaluators' comments on these issues.

If during their reading of a proposal evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, they must flag this by using the tick box provided on the Form IAR. The issue will then be further discussed at the level of the panel and, if necessary, Form EIR will be completed (see below)¹.

In general, while evaluating proposals, evaluators should bear in mind the extent of the participation in the consortium of the various actors and the balance of participation in the consortium.

Practical guidelines for form completion

- Assess and mark the proposal exactly as it is described and presented.
- Do not make any assumptions or interpretations about the project in addition to what the proposers themselves have written in their proposal.
- Make sure to use the correct form for the type of instrument involved.
- Keep to the evaluation criteria as stated in the forms.
- Give all required scores.
- Try to maintain consistency in your scoring throughout your work.
- Provide a brief but **explicit justification of your scores. Your comments should be concise and understandable for third persons.** Be honest but correct, in particular when scores are low – you should use polite and correct language but do not hide the facts as your remarks will be used in the report which is sent to inform the proposers of your conclusions. It is often useful to quote short extracts from the proposal text.
- Give recommendations for modifications, if needed. These recommendations may help the negotiations with successful proposals and provide useful feedback to improve less successful proposals for any future application.
- However it should be assured that each proposal is marked on its own merits (as the proposal has been written) and not based on the assumption that the modifications are being taken into account. Recommendations are clearly oriented towards the future.
- Please write your forms clearly, so that they are readable by the Commission staff, or use the IT application provided via a PC.
- Remember to sign (and date) your forms.
- At the start of the evaluation, it is recommended that evaluators examine a number of proposals before “signing off” their first individual assessment forms. This will help to calibrate your marking.

Conflicts of interest and confidentiality

If during the evaluation itself an evaluator discovers he or she is in some way connected with a proposal which he has been asked to evaluate, or has some other allegiance which impairs his impartiality, he must declare this **immediately** to the Commission official(s) supervising the evaluation, who will then take all necessary actions to remove the conflict of interest.

Nothing may be photocopied by an evaluator without specific permission from a Commission official. No documents or electronic data in any form may be taken off the evaluation premises. Phone calls to/from evaluators during the working day are strongly discouraged, and are not allowed at all in the reading and meeting rooms.

Laptops should not be brought onto the evaluation premises. An exception is made for evaluators who are working as rapporteurs, in which case the use of the PC is supervised by the Commission officials.

Under no circumstance may an evaluator attempt to contact a proposer on his own account, either during the evaluation session or afterwards.

It may be necessary, in exceptional cases, to seek some clarification from a proposer concerning the proposal received. Any evaluator requiring some clarification of a proposal should contact the Commission official supervising the evaluation of the proposal, who will then take the necessary action.

¹ Note that, according to the Guides for Proposers, every proposal should include a declaration on ethical issues.

The Commission may decide to arrange for the individual reading to be carried out away from Commission-controlled premises (i.e. remotely). When remote evaluation is used for the individual reading and evaluation of proposals by individual evaluators, copies of the proposals assigned to the individual evaluator are forwarded by post (paper copies) or made available electronically via a web-based application provided by the Evaluation Service Provider.

For the latter case each evaluator receives a user identification and password providing on-line access to the system. The evaluator has on-line access to the individual evaluation form and can download the proposals assigned. The individual reading and evaluation can thus take place independently of place, time and working rhythm of the individual evaluator. Once the evaluator has completed the individual evaluation form he signs off and submits the form electronically. Submission of the evaluation form closes the individual evaluation stage for that particular proposal. The evaluator will be informed about the deadlines for evaluating the proposals assigned.

Any conflict of interest discovered while reading the proposal has to be notified to the Commission, who will reassign the proposal to another evaluator. The Commission will maintain close contact with the remote evaluator to assist him on any query.

3.4 Consensus

A Consensus Report (Form CR) will be prepared, recording all the individual assessments of the evaluators of each proposal. Consensus scores for each block of criteria will be the average of each evaluator's individual score.

From the consensus scores for each criterion given on the form CR, an overall score for the proposal will be calculated by Commission services.

A rapporteur will be allocated to each proposal.

If one or more evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, this will be discussed by the subsequent panel to decide whether or not the issues require further attention. The relevant box on Form ESR will be ticked and an Ethical Issues Form (Form EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues. The Commission will decide whether to conduct an ethical review of the proposal by a specialist panel at a later date, as described in the "Guidelines on proposal evaluation and project selection procedures".

If the EIR form is used, it will be signed by all the evaluators of the proposal in the consensus group, or, as a minimum, by the moderator and rapporteur or another independent expert.

Signature of the CR, and, if needed, the EIR form(s) closes this step of the evaluation.

3.5 Panel meeting

The panel's discussions will be moderated by a Commission official and may additionally be chaired by an expert appointed by the Commission and assisted by a Panel Rapporteur.

The panel will first make an overall review of the scores and opinions on each proposal given by the individual evaluators. This serves both to bring the weight of the whole panel's experience and expertise to the review of each proposal, and also to ensure that the same standard of scoring is applied to each. The panel, working within the parameters established by the individual evaluators, may propose to revise scores or comments given. Any proposed changes in scoring or additional or revised comments from those originally given in the CR forms will be discussed.

Proposals which have fallen below one or more of the evaluation thresholds will no longer continue in evaluation. For each of these below-threshold proposals panel will prepare an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), on the basis of the consensus report (CR), which the Commission services will

subsequently send to the proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. These will form part of the Panel Report (see below). The ESR reflects both the consensus view agreed by the panel as well as the comments of the individual evaluators. The panel takes a clear decision on any divergent views between the individual evaluators and will provide clear comments, where necessary.

Proposals which have passed all evaluation thresholds continue in discussion.

Conclusion of panel discussion for CAs, and SSAs

The Commission services will prepare lists in order of the overall score of each proposal. There will be a separate list per instrument type. These lists will be reviewed by the panel, particularly addressing the question of the ordering of any proposals which have tied scores. They will thus propose priority lists to the Commission services to consider when deciding which of the proposals to implement as projects.

The panel will then prepare the ESRs for these above-threshold proposals, which the Commission services will send out to each proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. The ESR reflects both the consensus view agreed by the panel as well as the comments of the individual evaluators. The panel takes a clear decision on any divergent views between the individual evaluators and will provide clear comments, where necessary.

Any agreed changes in scoring or additional or revised comments from those originally given in the CR forms by the consensus groups will be reflected in the Evaluation Summary Reports (see below).

3.6 Evaluation Summary Reports (ESR)

The Evaluation Summary Report is the document which is returned to the proposal co-ordinator to give an account of the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. This represents the advice of the evaluators to the Commission, which the Commission will take into account in the final selection of projects for negotiation.

An ESR is sent for all proposals evaluated. Co-ordinators of proposals which failed one or more eligibility criteria, and which were therefore not evaluated, receive a letter from the Commission informing them of the reasons for exclusion on eligibility grounds, rather than an ESR.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the ESR. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the ESR for each proposal.

The ESR is based on the scores and conclusions initially reached in the Consensus Report (CR), supported by any relevant information from the Forms EIR, and then reviewed and discussed by the whole panel. Thus, the scores and conclusions expressed on the ESR represent the combined wisdom of all evaluators. If no amendments are made, the content of the ESR will be the same as that of the Consensus Report (CR). The panel will come to a clear conclusion which can be conveyed to the proposers in the ESR.

For proposals which failed to reach the threshold on one or more of the evaluation criteria, the ESR will contain scores and comments only for those criteria fully evaluated, to clarify for the proposers the reason or reasons for the proposal's failure, so that if possible in a later call they may submit an improved proposal. It will only contain an overall score and overall comment if the evaluation was not stopped due to a threshold failure.

For proposals which passed the thresholds on the evaluation criteria, but failed the threshold on the overall score (if one was applied), the ESR will contain scores and comments for all of the criteria, and an

overall score. The overall comment will consist only of a remark indicating that the proposal failed to reach the required threshold on overall score.

For proposals which have passed the evaluation thresholds, all sections of the ESR will be completed. Evaluators should ensure that the comments contain any recommendations which they wish to have taken into account during any possible contract negotiations, or second stage proposals. These recommendations should be as clear and specific as possible.

There is one ESR per proposal. They form part of the Panel Report and are signed off at the same time as that document.

3.7 The Panel report

Each panel will conclude its work by preparing a panel report, written to a pre-determined structure, which will summarise their activities and conclusions. An indicative panel report format is shown as an annex to this document. The precise format of the report to be drafted for this Call will be notified to the experts at the appropriate time. The report will be signed, as a minimum, by three persons, which may be the Panel rapporteur, the Panel chairperson or other panel members. The ESRs for all of the proposals considered by the panel will be appended to the report.

3.8 Finalisation of the evaluation and project selection

At this stage, the Commission services review the results from the evaluation, make their assessment of the proposals based on the advice from the evaluators and prepare the final evaluation results according to the provisions described in the “Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures”.

Annexes

Annex I: Indicative content of a panel report

Annex II: Form Ethical Issues Report EIR

Annex III: Evaluation Forms for Coordination actions (CA)

- Individual assessment form IAR – Coordination actions
- Consensus form CR - Coordination actions
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Coordination actions

Annex IV: Evaluation Forms for Specific support actions (SSA)

- Individual assessment form IAR – Specific support actions
- Consensus form CR - Specific support actions
- Evaluation summary report ESR - Specific support actions

Annex I:
Indicative content of
a panel report

March 2004

Indicative panel report format

Report of evaluation panel
2nd call of NEST

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This panel report covers the following aspects of ADVENTURE, INSIGHT and NEST Support Actions of this call of NEST.

Every panel must follow the official procedures given in the Guidelines for proposal evaluation and project selection procedures, therefore the methods of the panel need not be described in detail, unless some specific elements of the standard procedure have had a significant effect on the outcome of the Panel.

The following table gives an overview of proposals dealt with by the panel.

Total proposals in panel	Ineligible	Failed threshold(s)	Proposals above threshold

2. ANALYSIS OF RECEIVED PROPOSALS

Overview of the issues covered by the received proposals, proposal quality, important omissions or areas not covered.....

3. PROPOSAL PRIORITY

The Panel recommends that a decision of the Commission on funding of proposals be based on the priority as given in the following table(s):

(Separate tables and comments per instrument type)

Priority	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed (K€)	Grant requested (K€)	Other countries involved*	Ethical Issues Identified (Y/N)
1							
2							
3							

*(*Countries outside of the EU and Associated States)*

Individual short comments per prioritised proposal, explaining their relevance and any considerations of the panel leading to the priority list given above.

- *Pay particular attention to the reasons for the choice of priority given here to proposals which have tied scores.*
- *For proposals involving organisations from “other countries”, comment on the significance of their participation to the project.*
- *Identify proposals requiring special attention due to either the importance of ethical issues raised or the inadequacy of the way ethical issues are addressed.*

4. KEY ISSUES

a) Clustering/merging/overlapping of priority proposals

Any suggestions concerning proposals to be implemented together as a cluster; to be negotiated together as a merged project; which overlap in activity and where therefore one is first choice and one is “backup”

b) Comments on coverage

0= Fails or missing/ incomplete information; 1= Poor; 2= Fair; 3= Good; 4= Very good; 5= Excellent

Comments concerning the relevance/coverage of the proposals which have reached the prioritised list, in terms of the technical area to be covered by this panel.

c) Recommendations for future calls

Recommendations/corrective action in future calls e.g. future need to target particular technical areas, instrument types, types of organisation, SMEs, countries....

5. BELOW THRESHOLD/INELIGIBLE PROPOSALS

The following table provides the list of proposals which have not been prioritised due to exclusion on eligibility grounds or the score of at least one of the criteria falling below threshold, or the proposal falling below the overall threshold..)

(Separate tables per instrument type)

Proposal no.	Acronym	Failing

ANNEX 1 – Sub-Panel reports

Reports of any sub- panel associated with the evaluation.

ANNEX 2 – Evaluation Summary Reports

Attach proposal Evaluation Summary Reports for the Strategic objective in alphabetical order by acronym.

Annex II:
Form Ethical Issues Report EIR

March 2004

NEST priority

EIR

Ethical Issues Report

All instrument types

Proposal number:

Proposal acronym:

Type of instrument:

Ethical issues – *(List the ethical issues and comment)*

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator's signature Date

Rapporteur's signature

Annex III:
Evaluation Forms
for
Coordination Actions

March 2004

Individual Assessment Report for a Co-ordination action

Proposal Number :

Instrument :

Acronym :

Activity :

Expert First Name :

Expert Last Name :

Relevance to the objectives of the programme **MARK** (The threshold is 3) ...

The extent to which the proposed project **addresses the objectives** of the work programme for ADVENTURE, INSIGHT or SUPPORT.

Comment:

Quality of the co-ordination **MARK** (The threshold is 4) ...

The extent to which:

- the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of **demonstrably high quality**.
- the **coordination mechanisms** proposed are sufficiently **robust** for ensuring the goals of the action.

Comment:

Potential impact **MARK** (The threshold is 3) ...

The extent to which:

- the proposal demonstrates a clear **added value** in carrying out the work at the European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka).
- the Community support would have a real impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome.
- the project mobilises a critical mass of resources in Europe
- exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure **optimal use of the project results**, where possible beyond the participants in the project.

Comment:

Quality of the consortium **MARK** (The threshold is 3) ...

The extent to which:

- the participants collectively constitute a **consortium of high quality**.
- the participants are **well-suited to the tasks** assigned to them

The project combines the **complementary expertise** of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes.

Comment:

Quality of the management **MARK** (The threshold is 3) ...

The extent to which:

- the **project management** is demonstrably of high quality.
- there is a satisfactory plan for the **management of knowledge**, of intellectual property and other innovation-related activities.

Comment:

Mobilisation of resources **MARK** (The threshold is 3) ...

The extent to which:

- the project provides for the **resources** (personnel, equipment, financial;);) necessary for the success.
- the **resources** are **convincingly integrated** to form a coherent project
- the overall **financial plan** for the project is **adequate**.

Comment:

Overall comment

Highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for proposers

Comment:

Does the proposal raise ethical issues that need further attention?

If YES, please comment

Comment:

...

Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal?

If so, please comment on whether these have been adequately taken into account

Comment:

Engagement with actors beyond the research community

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?

Comment:

Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?

Comment:

If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated with the activities?

Comment:

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

I declare that I will submit the electronic and signed paper versions of this form with identical content.

SIGNATURE (Paper version only)

Consensus Report for a Co-ordination action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
Activity :	
1. Relevance	
2. Quality of the co-ordination	
3. Potential impact	
4. Quality of the consortium	
5. Quality of the management	
6. Mobilisation of the resources	
Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education and including recommended levels of resources, if relevant</i>).	

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? If yes, fill in Form EIR Yes No

Recommended for consideration

NO

YES

Evaluator names	Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total Score
	(Threshold)	(3)	(4)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Marks (out of 5)						
Date :	Initial averages:							
	Consensus marks*:							
Moderator signature :								
Rapporteur signature :								

* Consensus marks for each block of criteria will be for NEST the average of each evaluator's individual scores.

Evaluation Summary Report for a Coordination action

Proposal No:	
Call reference:	
Instrument :	
Activity:	
Acronym:	
Title:	

PANEL MARKS AND COMMENTS

Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme. 	Threshold 3	
Quality of the co-ordination The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of demonstrably high quality. the coordination mechanisms proposed are sufficiently robust for ensuring the goals of the action. 	Threshold 4	
Potential impact The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka). the Community support would have a real impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome. the project mobilises a critical mass of resources in Europe exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the project. 	Threshold 3	
Quality of the consortium The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality. the participants are well-suited to the tasks assigned to them. the project combines the complementary expertise of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes. 	Threshold 3	
Quality of the management The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project management is demonstrably of high quality. there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities. 	Threshold 3	
Mobilisation of resources The extent to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success. the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project. the overall financial plan for the project is adequate. 	Threshold 3	
Total mark	Threshold 21	
Has the proposal passed all thresholds?		

Panel comment

--

Does the proposal raise ethical issues that need further attention?	

REFEREES COMMENTS**REFEREE 1**

Relevance
Quality of the co-ordination
Potential impact
Quality of the consortium
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 2

Relevance
Quality of the co-ordination
Potential impact
Quality of the consortium
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 3

Relevance
Quality of the co-ordination
Potential impact
Quality of the consortium
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 4

Relevance
Quality of the co-ordination
Potential impact
Quality of the consortium
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

Annex IV:
Evaluation Forms
for
Specific support actions

March 2004

Are there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal?

If so, please comment on whether these have been adequately taken into account

Comment:

Engagement with actors beyond the research community

To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?

Comment:

Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?

Comment:

If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated with the activities?

Comment:

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest.

I declare that I will submit the electronic and signed paper versions of this form with identical content.

SIGNATURE (Paper version only)

Consensus Report for a Specific support action

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
Activity :	Specific area(s):

1. Relevance
2. Quality of support action
3. Potential impact
4. Quality of the management
5. Mobilisation of the resources
Overall remarks (<i>highlighting strengths and weaknesses and providing recommendations for project negotiation, i.e. gender, safety, public outreach, education, and including recommended levels of resources, if relevant</i>):

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention? If yes, fill in Form EIR Yes No

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?

NO

YES

Evaluator names	Criteria (Threshold)	1	2	3	4	5	Total Score
		(4)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	
	Evaluator signatures	Marks (out of 5)					
Date :	Initial averages:						
	Consensus marks*:						
Moderator signature :							
Rapporteur signature :							

* Consensus marks for each block of criteria will be for NEST the average of each evaluator's individual scores.

Evaluation Summary Report for a Specific support action

Proposal No:	
Call reference:	
Instrument :	
Activity:	
Acronym:	
Title:	

PANEL MARKS AND COMMENTS

Relevance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent to which the proposal addresses key issues to achieve or support the objectives defined in the workprogramme/calls, specific programmes or ERA, as appropriate.. 	Threshold 4	
Quality of the support action The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed objectives are sound and the proposed approach, methodology and workplan are of a sufficiently high quality for achieving these objectives. the applicant(s) represent(s) a high level of competence in terms of professional qualifications and/or experience. the proposed activities are innovative and original (if applicable). 	Threshold 3	
Potential impact The extend to which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the proposed work can only be achieved if carried out at European level. the Community support would have a substantial impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome. exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the project. 	Threshold 3	
Quality of the management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extend to which the management structure is credible in terms of professional qualifications, experience, track record and capacity to deliver. 	Threshold 3	
Mobilisation of resources The extent to which : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary for success. the overall financial plan for the project is adequate. 	Threshold 3	
Total mark	Threshold 17.5	
Has the proposal passed all thresholds?		

Panel comment

--

Does the proposal raise ethical issues that need further attention?	

REFEREES COMMENTS**REFEREE 1**

Relevance
Quality of the support action
Potential impact
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 2

Relevance
Quality of the support action
Potential impact
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 3

Relevance
Quality of the support action
Potential impact
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources

REFEREE 4

Relevance
Quality of the support action
Potential impact
Quality of the management
Mobilisation of resources