

EVALUATION PROCEDURES FOR THE PROGRAMME
« CONFIRMING THE INTERNATIONAL ROLE OF COMMUNITY RESEARCH »

A.1. States in the Phase of Pre-Accession to the European Union :

and

A.2 NIS and CEECs not in the pre-accession phase :

1. The Evaluation process. Evaluation will follow standard procedures as described in the *Manual of Proposal Evaluation Procedures*.

1.1 **Pre-Registration** Option not exercised.

1.2 **Pre-proposal check.** Option not exercised.

1.3 **Remote or postal evaluation.** All evaluations will normally be performed within premises controlled by the Commission.

1.4 **Evaluation criteria.** The generic evaluation criteria will be applied within the context of the specific programme; interpretation of the criteria will consider the extended geographical cover of the countries addressed in the programme, the support of efforts to develop a pluralistic scientific and technological system, and the preservation and development of their research excellence by building on existing expertise in order to help them solve some of their major economic and societal problems.

1.5 **Evaluation procedure.** Evaluation will follow standard procedures as described in the *Manual of Proposal Evaluation Procedures*. Non anonymous evaluation is foreseen for the strategic action on training and excellence.

For conference participation support, threshold criteria will be used in the following way: where the raw score for any threshold criterion is not met, the evaluator will stop evaluation of the proposal and report to the evaluation panel. If the consensus mark attributed by the panel is less than the threshold, this will be marked on the Evaluation Summary Report and no further evaluation of other criteria will be made.

1.6 Specific procedure for evaluation of accompanying measures for A1 in the framework of the Strategic action on training and excellence.

The specificity of this activity relies on the 2 phases, training and the re-establishment with specific evaluation criteria to be applied. Moreover, within the re-establishment phase, different evaluation criteria are applied depending on the nature of the proposed re-establishment mechanism. The specific nature of the measures requires an adaptation of the general evaluation criteria taking into account the training aspects and the proposed re-establishment mechanisms, as described below:

A coherent and global proposal has to be provided including one or possibly several significant period(s) of training and re-establishment, providing the total duration does not exceed 24 months for the training phase and 12 months for the re-establishment phase.

Applicants must submit by the relevant deadline the workplan for the 2 phases. In the case of a scheme consisting of several significant periods of training and re-establishment, the workplan for the re-establishment phase must be fully detailed in the proposal. In the case of proposals with one period training phase and one period re-establishment phase, the workplan for the re-establishment phase might nevertheless be indicative. Should the case arise, the re-establishment award will be given only if at the latest 6 months before the end of the training phase the grant holder presents a specific detailed workplan for approval demonstrating his/her re-establishment capacity.

Pre-proposal checks and pre-registration do not apply to this measure.

Each proposal will be evaluated by at least three independent experts, selected according to the normal procedures described in this manual.

1.6.1. Evaluation criteria and thresholds

The evaluation criteria to be applied are detailed below.

Strategic action on training and excellence	<i>Score Range</i>
I. Training phase	
1. <i>Project</i> Scientific/technological quality; originality; innovation; methodological approach; feasibility; relevance and potential scientific impact of project.	0-25
2. <i>Host Institution</i> Research quality of host group; expertise in project field; research infrastructure to support project	0-25
3. <i>Applicant</i> Research experience/publications ; aptitude of applicant for carrying out the research work	0-50
II. Re-establishment phase	
II A. Re-establishment phase with host institution	
1. <i>Project</i> Scientific/technological quality; originality; innovation, methodological approach; feasibility; relevance and potential scientific impact of project for the grant holder and the development of the scientific potential of the host country.	0 – 50
2. <i>Host Institution (where applicable)</i> Research quality of host group; quality and volume of scientific/technological activities; research infrastructure to support the proposed work;	0 – 50
II.B. Re-establishment phase without host institution	
1. <i>Project/type of mechanism</i> Scientific/technological approach ; originality; Expected impacts and benefit of collaboration for parties involved; feasibility; relevance and potential scientific impact of project; budget and staff needs	0 – 100

1.6.2. Proposal marking

The assessment to be made by each expert is scored in a range from 0 to 100, as outlined in the table above. Due to the detailed nature of the information required to properly evaluate the applicant/host institution training and re-establishment phase (where appropriate), it is essential that the personal details of the parties involved (e.g. applicants, scientific supervisors) are known to the expert. It is therefore impractical to carry out the evaluation anonymously. The total score attributed to each proposal is interpreted as follows:

- Marks of 90 or more are reserved for proposals of exceptionally high quality;
- Marks of 80 or more indicate proposals of very high quality;
- Marks 70-79 indicate proposals of high quality;
- Marks 60-69 indicate proposals of medium quality;
- Marks lower than 60 indicate proposals with notable weaknesses.

1.6.3. Threshold for funding

Only proposals for which the average evaluation mark is at least 70 in each phase, training phase and re-establishment phase, may be funded.

2. Specific interpretation of evaluation criteria

The specific nature of the measures requires an adaptation of the general evaluation criteria in the following way:

Accompanying measures: Conference participation support	Scientific and Technological Excellence	Resources , Partnership and Management	Community Added value/ Comm. Policies	Contribution to Community Social Objectives	Economic Development and S&T prospect
A.1 Support for scientists from states in pre-accession , to take part in seminars, conferences, colloquiums and workshops taking place in the EU, and to organise such events in their country. The initiatives can also cover information days about the programmes of the EU Framework Programme.	Scientific/technological quality of the initiative, non-recurring nature of the event, novelty of the programme and role to be performed by the pre-accession states participants (papers, interventions, chairmanship of workshops etc.)	Appropriateness of the overall initiative, credibility of the organisers Technical and administrative organisation of the initiative, foreseen financial coverage. Diversity of the funding: the contribution of the Commission should not cover more than one third of the global costs.	Contribution to Community pre-accession strategy, and to the EU scientific, financial and technical co-operation programmes for these countries		
A.2 Support for scientists from CEECs not in pre-accession, the NIS and Mongolia to take part in seminars, conferences, colloquiums and workshops taking place in the EU, and to organise such events in their country.	Scientific/technological quality of the initiative, non-recurring nature of the event, novelty of the programme and role to be performed by the NIS / CEECs not in pre-accession scientists (papers, interventions, chairmanship of workshops etc.) Scientific relevance in relation to themes of interest to these countries: environment, health, sustainable use of natural resources	Appropriateness of the overall initiative, credibility of the organisers Technical and administrative organisation of the initiative, foreseen financial coverage. Diversity of the funding: the contribution of the Commission should not cover more than one third of the global costs.	Contribution to the EU scientific, financial and technical co-operation programmes for these countries		

3. Weighting of the evaluation criteria (scale to 10) and thresholds (scale to 5)

TYPE OF ACTION	TYPE OF PROJECT	SELECTION CRITERIA					
		Threshold Criterion		Non-Threshold Criteria			
		Scientific and technological excellence		Community Added value etc.	Contribution to Community Social objectives	Economic Development and S&T prospect	Resources, partnership and management
		Weight	Threshold	Weight	Weight	Weight	Weight
A.1 and A.2: Support to conferences	Accompanying Measures	5	3	2	0	0	3

A.3 Mediterranean Partner Countries

and

A.4 Research for Development

1. The evaluation process

Proposals (Shared-cost actions, concerted actions and thematic networks) will first be evaluated on scientific and technical grounds by subject-matter specialists (first step). Highly-rated proposals with a potential for support will then be submitted to regional evaluation panels consisting of experts from Mediterranean Partner/Developing Countries who will examine the relevance and usefulness of proposals to and possible impact of results in the regions concerned (second step).

Evaluation of accompanying measures will be undertaken under the responsibility of Commission staff using appropriate procedures.

2. Specific interpretation of evaluation criteria

Type of action	Scientific and Technological Excellence	Resources Partnership and Management	Community Added value/ Comm. Policies	Contribution to Community Social Objectives	Economic Development and S&T prospect
A.3 and A.4 shared-cost actions, concerted actions and thematic networks	Applied as in Manual (anonymous)	Applied as in Manual and especially considering significant and balanced partnership between European and Mediterranean Partner/Developing Country teams. This criterion will be applied both in the first step which will focus on the division of the tasks and the scientific capacity of the teams to execute them and in the second step, where the Mediterranean Partner/Developing Country experts will particularly consider the quality of local resources and manpower, and the balance in the partnership and the work load.	Applied as in Manual, except that the problems to be addressed will not be specifically European in nature but will be of relevance to Mediterranean Partner/Developing Countries as set out in the Work Programme. Community added value will apply to the European element of consortia. Euro-Mediterranean Partnership policy and EU Development policy will be of particular importance.	Since the targets are Mediterranean Partner Countries and Research for Development, this block of criteria will not be applied. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the individual criteria mentioned in the Manual are all related to the objectives of the Euro-Mediterranean partnership and are components of sustainable development which is the major objective of Research for Development.	Applied during regional evaluation as in Manual and including foreseeable impact on sustainable development as criterion and application to global or regional-scale problems (Research for Development) or socio-economic modernization in the Mediterranean Region.

A.3 and A.4 accompanying measures	Emphasizing quality of the action proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the programme, and adequacy of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives. (proposers identity revealed)	Applied as in Manual	Contribution to Community scientific, financial and technical co-operation programmes for the countries concerned.	as above	The strategic impact of the proposed project and its potential to support the objectives of the programme.
-----------------------------------	--	----------------------	--	----------	--

3. Weighting of evaluation criteria (scale to 10) and thresholds (scale to 5)

TYPE OF PROJECT	STEP	EVALUATION CRITERIA							
		Scientific and technological excellence		Community Added value etc.		Resources, partnership and management		Economic Development and S&T prospect	
		Weight	Threshold	Weight	Threshold	Weight	Threshold	Weight	Threshold
A.3 and A.4 Shared- cost, concerted actions and thematic networks	Step 1	3	4	1	Not applied	1.5	Not applied	-	-
	Step 2	-	-	-	-	1.5	4	3	4
A.3 and A.4 Accompanying measures		2	Not applied	2	Not applied	2	Not applied	4	Not applied

A.5 EMERGING ECONOMIES AND INDUSTRIALISED COUNTRIES

1. Evaluation criteria

Scientific/Technological quality

- Quality of the proposal and its contribution to achieving the objectives of the call for proposals
- Adequacy of the chosen approach, methodology, and work plan for achieving the objectives of the call of proposals.

Community added value and contribution to EU policies

- The international cooperation dimension
- The European added value for the Consortium
- The proposal's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of EU external policies.

Contribution to Community social objectives

- Not applied

Economic development and S+T prospects

- Not applied

Management and resources

- Quality of the management and proposal approached proposed
- Quality of partnership
- Appropriateness of the resources

2. Weighting (scale to 10) of evaluation criteria and thresholds

ACCOMPANYING MEASURES				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	Weight criterion	of Primary marks	Maximum marks	Threshold
Scientific & technological quality	5	5	25	18
Community added value and contribution to EU policies	2	5	10	None
Contribution to Community social objectives	-	0	0	None
Economic development and S&T prospects	-	0	0	None
Management and resources	3	5	15	10
TOTAL	10		50	28

3. Thresholds

Proposals must receive 18 or more marks for **Scientific/Technological quality and innovation** and 10 or more marks for **Management and resources** in order to be considered for funding.

B. TRAINING OF RESEARCHERS

B.1. BURSARIES FOR YOUNG RESEARCHERS FROM DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Consortia preparing a joint research proposal²² or a concerted action proposal for any of the specific programmes may include an application for an International Co-operation Training Bursary. If successful, the bursary will be funded from the budget of the specific programme "Confirming the International Role of Community Research". The following procedures apply to the evaluation of such bursaries under all specific programmes of the EC fifth framework programme.

1. Evaluation Experts

Bursary applications must be submitted together with a project proposal (concerted action or joint research project) for any programme. The bursary application will then be evaluated simultaneously with the project proposal, by the same experts.

2. Eligibility criteria

In order for a bursary application to be eligible, it must satisfy the following requirements :

The Candidate

- Must be a national of, and established in one of the eligible regions.
- He/she should not be more than 40 years of age (at the time of application).
- He/she must have a good knowledge of a working language of the host institute.

The Host Institute

- Must be established in an EU Member State or in a State associated to the 5th Framework Programme.
- Must be a member of the consortium proposing the joint research project or concerted action.

3. Evaluation Criteria

Eligible bursary applications will be evaluated according to the following criteria :

	Criteria	Score range
1.	Excellence of the scientific and/or training objectives of the application	0-50
2.	Potential value of the bursary to the applicant and to his/her own home institute	0-20
3.	Relevance of the proposed bursary to the project as a whole	0-15
4.	Experience and professional training of the candidate	0-15

4. Proposal marking

The score range is 0 to 100 as detailed above.. No proposal will be funded, even if there are funds available, for which :

- the score for one criteria is marked less than 50% of the maximum score for this criteria;

or

- the total average score is less than 70.

The evaluated applications will be ranked by each Programme according to their score.

Note : Only if the whole project is selected for funding and the bursary application is highly rated will the bursary be granted.

²² RTD projects, Demonstration projects and Combined projects (see point 1.3.2a of the Guide to Proposers)

B.2 Fellowships for Community Researchers

The horizontal nature and common requirements of the system of Japan Fellowships mean that a number of the provisions detailed elsewhere in this manual do not apply to their evaluation. The major differences, grouped under the headings evaluation experts, evaluation criteria and proposal marking, are detailed below.

1. Evaluation experts

Each Japan Fellowship proposal will be evaluated by two independent experts, selected according to the procedures described earlier. Because of the scientific diversity of the Japan evaluation panel, the chairperson will be nominated by the Commission. The chairperson's role will be to coordinate the work of the panel and will not involve the evaluation of individual proposals.

2. Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria to be applied to the Japan Fellowships, together with an indication of their relative importance, are detailed below according to the scheme available:

Japan Fellowships	Score Range
1. Project Proposal Scientific/technological quality; methodological approach; scientific relevance of project to Europe	0 - 30
2. Japanese Host Institution Research quality of host group; research infrastructure to support project; quality of scientific contacts between the Japanese Host Institute and Europe	0 - 30
3. Applicant Research experience/academic records/publications; aptitude of candidate; impact and benefit to fellow;	0 - 40

3. Proposal marking

Because of the detailed and specific nature of the applications forms for Japan fellowships, the structure of proposals are in general relatively homogeneous. This allows a standardised assessment to be made by each expert, which is scored in a range from 0 to 100.

The total score attributed to each proposal is interpreted as follows :

- Marks of 90 or more should be reserved for proposals of exceptionally high quality;
- Marks of 80 or more indicate proposals of very high quality;
- Marks from 70-79 indicate proposals of high quality;
- Marks from 60-69 indicate proposals of medium quality;
- Marks lower than 60 indicate proposals with notable weaknesses.

No proposal will be funded, even if there are funds available, for which :

- the score for one criteria is marked less than 50% of the maximum score for this criteria;

or

- the total average score is less than 70.

Once all the experts have completed their individual assessments, the marks will be checked to ensure there are no significant discrepancies between them. Where there are such discrepancies, the experts can discuss the marks with each other, and may revise their marks if there is clear agreement between them. If there is a continuing discrepancy, a supplementary expert may be asked to mark the proposal.

The detailed scoring system used in fellowships will result in a ranked list of proposals to be funded. In the limited number of instances where two or more proposals have the same score, the plenary panel session described below will discuss and rank these proposals separately.

When the individual evaluations have been completed, a plenary panel session will take place in order to discuss and agree on issues relating to eligibility, specific evaluation criteria, marking discrepancies, or proposals which experts believe require further discussion. In case a supplementary expert has been used for a specific proposal, one of the experts may withdraw his/her mark. If this is not the case, one of the following courses of action will be agreed under the guidance of the Chairperson : the Panel may decide to keep the average mark; the Panel may decide to withdraw an obvious outlier mark; exceptionally, the Panel may decide to appoint a further supplementary expert.