

Evaluation reporting form

The following templates can be used as basis for your own document

Example 1:

Proposal No.:

Reviewer:

Acronym:

Do you have any conflicts of interest?

No

Yes

1.	Relevance to the aim(s) of the joint transnational call
2.	Scientific quality of the proposal (innovation potential, methodology)
3.	Feasibility of the project (adequacy of the work plan, budgetary and other resources, time schedule)
4.	International competitiveness of participating research groups in the field(s) of the proposal (previous work in the field, expertise of the research groups)
5.	Quality of collaborative interaction between the groups, and added value, on both levels scientific and transnational, of the research consortium
6.	Potential of the expected results for future clinical and other health relevant applications

Overall score: ____

Please do not use other scores than 1, 2, 3, and 4

Scoring system:

1 = excellent (clear recommendation for funding)

2 = good (just below excellent, but room for feasible improvement of certain aspects)

3 = fair (major components should be reconsidered or at least adjusted)

4 = poor (clear recommendation for rejection, as at least one major aspect is missing or strongly underdeveloped)

Overall comment (mandatory):

Example 2:

Proposal No.:

Reviewer:

Acronym:

Do you have any conflicts of interest?

No

Yes

1. Excellence (max. 5.0 points)

1.1 Clarity and pertinence of the objectives (max. 1.5 points)

1.2 Credibility of the proposed approach and soundness of the concept (max. 2.0 points)

1.3 Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches (max. 1.5 points)

2. Impact (max. 5.0 points)

2.1 Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic (max. 2.5 points)

2.2 (max 1.0 point)

Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge;

Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets; and, where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets;

Any other environmental and socially important impacts (not already covered above);

2.3 Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project and to manage research data where relevant (max. 1.5 points)

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation (max. 5.0 points)

3.1 (max. 2.0 points)

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables;

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures;

3.2 Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants (max. 1.0 points)

3.3 Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) (max. 1.0 points)

3.4 Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and allocation and justification of the resources to fulfil that role (max. 1.0 points)

- **Ethical issues:** Full-Proposals include the H2020 „Ethical issues Table“. In case ethical issues apply (applicants mark respective issues in the table) M-ERA.NET recommends that the national/regional organisations observe these issues (e.g. post-evaluation review) for their respective funded projects.
- **Gender aspect** is not an evaluation criterion. It is only used for M-ERA.NET internal purpose.

SCORES

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination (definition of scores taken from the H2020 guidelines to applicants):

- **0** - The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
- **1 - Poor.** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- **2 - Fair.** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
- **3 - Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- **4 - Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- **5 - Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Overall comment (mandatory):