European Commission

THE FIFTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Fifth Framework Programme focuses on Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 1998 to 2002.

INFORMATION SOCIETY TECHNOLOGIES
IST PROGRAMME
(USER-FRIENDLY INFORMATION SOCIETY)

GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATORS

participating in the evaluation of proposals

of the IST Programme

3rd IST call 10 February 2000

Final Edition, April, 2000

2
<u>Contents</u>

1. Overview of the Evaluation Procedure

1.1 Introduction

This document defines the procedure applied to the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the 3rd IST Call for Proposals published on 10 February 2000. Any further information in addition to this document, e. g. scheduling for the evaluation, will be provided during the briefing of evaluators.

The activities for which proposals are invited are summed up in the IST Call announcement that was published in the Official Journal of the European Communities and documentation referred to in it. The activities themselves are described in the 2000 IST Workprogramme. The general procedure for evaluation of proposals for the IST Programme is described in the FP5 Manual of Evaluation Procedures. A specific annex to the general FP5 Manual of Evaluation Procedures supplements it with details of the evaluation procedures for the IST programme.

An overview of documents needed in the evaluation is given in table 1. Copies of all these documents are available to evaluators and should be studied before evaluation commences.

Based on these documents, these guidelines detail the procedure and provide specific supporting information to evaluators taking part in the evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the 3rd IST Call.

TABLE 1: **IST EVALUATION DOCUMENTS**

Publicly available, for proposers' use:

FP5 evaluation manual Includes: • Annex C — Experts terms of reference, code of conduct • Annex D — Experts conflict of interest declaration • Annex E — Role of Commission staff • Annex I — IST evaluation procedures **IST Workprogramme 2000** Gives the description of the action lines of the IST programme. **IST Call for proposals (10 February 2000)** Gives the rules, deadlines and the scope of the Call (the Action Lines open for submission). **IST Guide for Proposers part I** Gives FP5 introduction, IST programme description, evaluation process overview, information on 3rd country participation, contracts, IPR, proposal submission. **IST Guide for Proposers part II** Gives information on the specific types of actions called, submission forms, NCPs, etc. (6 versions: "Fixed deadline proposals": RTD (2A), Take-Up Actions (2B), Support measures (2C), "Continuous submission scheme": FET Open (2D), Support measures (2E) and "Grants applications" (2F))

For evaluators' use, but publicly available:

Evaluation guidelines Gives evaluation and post-evaluation procedure for evaluators' information Appendix 1 – Bursaries Appendix 2 - Evaluation forms Appendix 3 - Procedures for handling Grant Applications Appendix 4 - Panel Report Appendix 5 - Glossary

The remainder of this section (Section 1) provides an overview of the general procedure, some basic principles, and the role of the Commission staff supporting this evaluation.

Section 2 describes, for the information of the evaluators, the required structure of proposals.

Section 3 defines, step by step, how the evaluation is to be undertaken.

Section 4 outlines briefly subsequent stages in the process following completion of the evaluation.

Section 5 completes the picture by detailing the handling of the various forms, which are used in the evaluation, and the layout of reports to be completed.

1.2 Evaluation Operation

On receipt by the Commission, proposals will be registered and sorted, administrative eligibility will be checked by Commission staff and essential data will be entered into a database to support the evaluation process. During this period the Commission staff will make a tentative assignment of evaluators to proposals, taking into account the code of conduct applicable to Commission staff and to evaluators. *During the period preceding the evaluation no assessment of proposals is carried out*.

The actual evaluation will take place on secure premises in Brussels during the period stated in the schedule. Changes to this schedule may be communicated at the evaluators briefing, or if necessary at other times prior to completion of the evaluation process.

For certain specific measures, where commercial sensitivity is not an issue (e.g. proposals in the Future and Emerging Technologies Area, certain proposals for Accompanying measures and Networks), a procedure of remote evaluation may be carried out where some of the evaluators work in their own premises. In such cases a number of procedures described in this documents may not apply and participating staff and evaluators will be supplied with separate or supplementary instructions.

1.3 Organisation

The evaluation of proposals is undertaken by external independent evaluators, who assess each aspect of the proposal and provide advice to the Commission.

The main division of the programme is into four key actions (KAs) and special areas of future and emerging technologies (FET) and research networking (RN). In addition the programme is open for specific SME measures and training measures in co-ordination with the relevant Horizontal programmes.

KAs will be split into Research Areas (in short: Areas) which are well defined and coherent groups of Action Lines or parts of ALs. Proposals for an Area are evaluated and ranked together. A Commission official to be appointed by the relevant Director will act as an Area Co-ordinator, responsible for the evaluation in his/her Area. Areas could cover an organisational Unit and in this case the Head of Unit might then act as the Area Co-ordinator.

The Cross Programme Actions will be evaluated as Areas with independent Panels, although in close co-operation with the KA evaluations.

Received proposals will be grouped according to Areas. Evaluators will evaluate proposals in Areas which are appropriate to their technical expertise. For proposals covering more than one Area, either a single prime Area will be identified during the preparation phase and this prime Area will invite evaluators from other relevant Areas to participate in its discussion of such proposals (e.g. joint panel sessions may be held), or a special dedicated cross-programme panel of evaluators may be formed.

Each proposal will be assessed independently by at least three evaluators or "readers" chosen by the Commission staff under the responsibility of the Area Co-ordinator These readers will then come together under the moderation of a Commission Project Officer ("Moderating PO") as a consensus group to decide the proposal's scores.

Commission staff will also allocate a rapporteur to each proposal (normally from among the readers). He[1] would be responsible for recording the outcome of the discussion for that proposal.

If the forms filled in by the evaluators of a particular proposal indicate strong consensus, the Moderating PO might ask the rapporteur to prepare his report and obtain approval of the individual evaluators without a formal meeting.

Panels will be established for an Area, which consist of evaluators with the appropriate expertise. They will come together to discuss the relative importance of all the proposals for the Area as a whole. This discussion is moderated by the Area Co-ordinator. One of the panel members may act as panel rapporteur, to assist in the production of the panel's final report[2].

---

[1] Whenever a masculine form (e.g. "he") is used, the feminine form (e.g. "she") is meant as well. For easy reading however he/she is not used throughout

[2] For very wide-ranging areas, several panels may be involved. These would meet individually, and then their results may be consolidated in integration meetings under Commission moderation (see below) if their results are to be reported jointly.

1.4 Commission Support

The evaluation process is supported by a team of Commission personnel and also external support staff (the Commission has subcontracted operational support to an Evaluation Service provider, the ESP), whose responsibilities are to 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.

Evaluators must not directly interfere in the work of the ESP or ask tasks to be performed, but always act via the Area Co-ordinator or Moderating PO.

Commission staff do not involve themselves in the assessment of proposals, and even if asked may not express any opinion on the merits or otherwise of any proposal.

The evaluation may also be subject to observation from time to time by independent experts who have been brought in by the Commission to audit the fair working of the process and when appropriate to suggest improvements for inclusion at a later date. They will be identifiable by their badges. They will play a strictly observational role, and will not in any way participate in the evaluation of proposals or the management of the evaluation (the rules for observers are laid down in the Manual of Evaluation Procedures for FP5). Evaluators are obliged to inform their Area Co-ordinator if observers contact them directly about the evaluation results of any particular proposals.

1.5 Conflicts of Interest

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employers or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They should familiarise themselves with the Code of Conduct for Evaluators, (See Evaluation Manual), and should act in conformity with it.

Evaluators receive with their Task Contract a Confidentiality Declaration and Conflict of Interest declaration. The latter asks indication of any proposal with which they (or, as far as they know, their employer) are associated. They are required to complete and sign these forms, together with the contract, before they can start work. They will not participate in the evaluation process for proposals in which their employer participates (or proposals directly competing with these proposals, if any) and will be excluded from any panel discussions of such proposals.

If during the evaluation itself an evaluator finds he 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 to the Commission moderator or Area Co-ordinator, he will complete a further Conflict of Interest declaration, and the same rules will apply.

1.6 Confidentiality and Security

All evaluators and Commission staff directly involved in the evaluation will be issued with identification badges, which are to be worn at all times during the evaluation. All persons permitted entry to the premises on which the evaluation is taking place will wear a badge indicating their role.

Evaluators must neither discuss individual proposals nor aspects of their evaluation with other persons inside or outside the Commission during *or after* the evaluation period, except in the meetings specifically convened for that purpose by Commission staff.

Nothing may be photocopied by an evaluator without the express permission of the Moderating PO or the Area Co-ordinator. No documents or electronic data in whatever form may be transferred to a place outside the premises of the evaluation. Phone calls to/from the evaluators are strongly discouraged whilst the actual evaluation is taking place and are not allowed at all in the reading and meeting rooms in which the evaluators work.

> *Portable phones and computers should not normally be brought onto evaluation premises or, if it cannot be avoided, be given to the ESP or Area Co-ordinator for secure storage.*

The Commission undertakes to keep confidential any information which could identify which proposals have been read by individual evaluators, and the comments made by an individual evaluator

on any proposal. Evaluators undertake *never* to subsequently reveal the identity or opinion of his/her co-evaluators.

It may be necessary in exceptional cases to seek clarification from proposers regarding the proposals received. However, such contacts with proposers will only be carried out by the Moderating PO after approval of the Area Co-ordinator. Any evaluator requiring such clarification must report to the Moderating PO or Area Co-ordinator, who will then take the necessary action.

The evaluation procedure for shared cost RDT proposals is designed to ensure that the first stage of evaluation, which is of the proposal's scientific/technological quality and innovation aspects, is carried out with no knowledge of the identity of the proposers. If, in this initial anonymous evaluation stage, an evaluator is by chance able to identify the origin of a proposal by, for example, its technical approach and content, he is asked *not* to share this knowledge with other evaluators. He should immediately inform the Moderating PO, who will take the necessary actions to ensure the proposal is fairly treated.

2. The Proposals

Proposals are required to be structured in three sections:

2.1 Proposal Part A

This part comprises administrative and financial data. It is collected by the Commission mainly for administrative purposes, is not subject to evaluation and only the proposal abstract and/or summary and the estimated budget will be needed by the evaluators.

2.2 Proposal Part B

This part comprises the description of scientific and technological objectives, and the detailed project workplan. It consists of text plus supporting pictures, diagrams etc., under six predetermined headings:

> B.1. Title page
> B.2. Contents list
> B.3. Objectives
> B.4. Contribution to programme/key action objectives
> B.5 Innovation (for RTD proposals and Take up actions)
> B.5. Relations to programme (for Accompanying measures)
> B.5. Membership (for Concerted actions/Thematic networks)
> B.6. Project workplan

This is supported by three tables:

> Workpackage list
> Deliverables list
> Workpackage description (one table per workpackage)

Short proposals for work in the open domain of future and emerging technologies - "FET Open" - have an abbreviated form of Part B, consisting only of a title page and a free-form description of the project plan.

It should be noted that, for shared-cost RDT actions, Part B should not contain any indication of the identity of the proposers in the intended consortium, nor should it contain a direct indication of the costs in financial terms (it does however contain figures relating to the manpower involved in the proposed project). Proposals which clearly did not respect partly or fully and in a way which is judged to be deliberate, the requirement that proposers should not be named or recognisable in Part B will normally have been eliminated during the preliminary eligibility check carried out by Commission officials.

Proposals where there are occasional references in the text through apparently genuine error may be evaluated. Any such occurrences will be corrected in the proposal if that is judged appropriate (e.g. the identifying text could be blanked out from the copies of the proposal supplied to evaluators).

However it might be possible that not all violations of the anonymity rule have been detected beforehand, as some issues might only be discovered during evaluation by the evaluators themselves. Any violation that is detected during the process must be immediately notified to the Moderating PO. Where the inclusion appears to arise from genuine error rather than deliberate intent the Commission may re-assign the evaluation to new evaluators, after the necessary actions to ensure a fair evaluation have been taken.

2.3 Proposal Part C

This part comprises a description of the proposed project's contribution to EC policies and development, and participants' roles and qualifications. It consists of text plus supporting pictures, diagrams etc., under eight recommended headings:

> C.1. Title page
> C.2. Contents list
> C.3. Community added-value and contribution to EC policies
> C.4. Contribution to Community social objectives
> C.5. Project management
> C.6. Description of consortium
> C.7. Description of participants
> C.8. Economic development and scientific and technological prospects

Short proposals for work in the open domain of future and emerging technologies ("FET O") have an abbreviated form of Part C, consisting only a title page and the sections "Description of consortium" and "Description of participants".

Consortia offering a research, demonstration or a combined research and demonstration proposal or a concerted action proposal for any of the specific programmes in the Fifth Framework Programme may also include an application for an International Co-operation Training Bursary ("INCO bursary"). Applications for such bursaries consist only of part A and part B. There is a special procedure for the evaluation of these applications, which is described in an appendix to these guidelines (Appendix 4).

2.4 Combined research and demonstration projects

Proposals for Combined research and demonstration projects normally contain two Parts B and Parts C, treating the research and the demonstration aspects of the proposal separately. In this case both parts are evaluated separately, using the forms E.1 and E.2 which are designed for these parts.

If the research and demonstration is presented however as one integrated project, the proposal must be evaluated as a whole, using the specific E.1 and E.2 for this case.

Ranking of these proposals by Panels follows this choice. Hence if separated, the two proposals are ranked separately, if not, it is ranked as one proposal. Evaluators are invited to make recommendations as to the relevance of the demonstration proposal at this stage.

3. Evaluation Procedure

3.1 Evaluation criteria

Proposals are evaluated on the basis of a number of predetermined FP5-wide criteria. The forms used during the evaluation (described in fuller detail later in these guidelines) give these criteria explicitly and evaluators must be aware that these are the only criteria to be used. In the forms, detailed issues are also given that follow directly from the IST Specific Annex and other elements, which might be considered during this assessment of the given criteria.

The contents of Part B of the proposal allow evaluators to score the proposal on the first criterion of **Scientific/Technological quality and innovation**. (See Evaluation Manual for further description of the criterion).

Thus, evaluators first review Part B (the part of the proposal dealing with scientific and technological objectives and the project workplan) for the proposals, which have been assigned to them as readers. This is undertaken on an individual basis, working alone. Evaluators should not discuss the proposal assigned to them with other evaluators, except in the meetings designed for that. Evaluators will fill in and sign the Form E.1.

For certain types of proposal, a threshold score must be reached on this criterion. In these cases, the Moderating PO might ask for a consensus meeting or a report if a consensus seems clear from the written reports that the threshold will not be reached.

The contents of Part C of the proposal allow evaluators to score the proposal on the four further criteria, **Community added value and contribution to EC policies, Contribution to Community social objectives, Economic development and S&T prospects, Resources, Partnership and Management.** (See Evaluation Manual for further description of the criteria). Again, for certain types of action thresholds may apply to some of these criteria.

Thus, evaluators review Part C - the part of the proposal dealing with contribution to EC policies, economic development, project management and participants - for the proposals, which have been assigned to them as readers. This is again undertaken on an individual basis, working alone without contacts with other evaluators. In order to support the evaluators' judgement on the last criterion concerning Management and resources, the Commission will supply summary budget information from proposal Part A. The evaluators will fill in and sign the Form E.2.

3.2 Evaluation criteria scores

The scoring system used is as follows:

> 0 -   Unsatisfactory - the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information
> 1 -   Poor
> 2 -   Fair
> 3 -   Good
> 4 -   Very good
> 5 -   Excellent

To establish the weighted score for a proposal, so that an initial ranking of proposals can be made, the scores in each of the above five criteria are taken, and these are summed in a weighting scheme. This weighting scheme differs according to the type of action involved, as detailed in the IST Specific Annex to the FP5 Manual of Evaluation Procedures.

3.3 Eligibility criteria

Prior to the evaluation by external experts, Commission staff examined and eliminated from the evaluation any proposal which failed to meet a number of legal and administrative eligibility criteria (for example, that deadlines have been respected, that the proposing has the required minimum number of participants from EU or Associated States, etc.). There are however a number of more general

eligibility criteria which should normally be assessed by the evaluators following their detailed study of the proposal. The evaluation criteria are described in the Evaluation Manual.

On the basis of their knowledge of Part B and Part C, readers will also check the proposal against a list of eligibility criteria (see Form C.2 in Appendix 5). Proposals, which fail on any, one of the listed eligibility criteria will be not be evaluated further, and will automatically be subject to a "non-retained" recommendation by the panel.

Partially in-scope proposals: As mentioned above, one of the eligibility checks is whether the proposal is within the scope of the call. It is possible that, after reading by the evaluators, a proposal is found to be only partially, but not fully, within the scope of the Call. If the out-of-scope parts appear relevant to other key actions or programmes, evaluators from these other areas may be brought in, and the proposal will be evaluated in the same manner as any other cross-programme proposal. In the extreme case responsibility for evaluation may be transferred to another, more relevant, programme. If it is concluded that these out-of-scope parts are not relevant to other Commission actions, but in the judgement of the readers the parts in-scope to the IST programme are of sufficient merit, the evaluation of the proposal may continue, confined however only to those parts of the proposal which are in-scope without consideration of the remaining material.

> **If *at any point* in your reading you come to the opinion that the proposal may be ineligible, please alert your Area Co-ordinator or the Moderating PO for the proposal. After checking with the other readers, he may decide to launch the consensus group meeting. If it is there agreed that the proposal is ineligible, evaluation of the proposal will terminate.**

> **Evaluation and eligibility criteria**
> **When examining proposals, evaluators will *only* apply the evaluation and eligibility criteria set out in this document. No other factors will be taken into account.**

3.4 Overview of steps in the evaluation procedure

Step 1   Opening, registration and preparation
Following the closure of the Call for Proposals, all proposals will be opened, registered and be assigned a reference number if the proposer has not yet done so. The Commission staff will prepare evaluators' dossiers and set up the work schedule for the evaluation itself.

Step 2   Eligibility check by Commission, verification of proposal assignment
Proposals' conformity to the formal requirements of the Call will be checked. This includes the adherence to the deadline of submission, the correct signature, the eligibility of the consortium and the anonymity of part B. Proposals which fail the eligibility check will not go forward to evaluation. The Commission will at this stage also verify that each proposal is addresses to the most appropriate action line/programme, arranging a transfer of responsibility if necessary, and will also assign responsibility for proposals which are cross key action or cross programme in nature.

Step 3   Evaluator briefing
Evaluators will be registered on arrival at the evaluation offices, supplied with badges etc. and briefed on the evaluation procedure by their Area Co-ordinator or another senior Commission staff member. Evaluators will be informed how proposals for evaluation will be distributed, how they will receive the planning for evaluation, the list of the proposals to be evaluated, how proposal rapporteurs will be assigned, and the names of the Moderating POs in the Areas.

The Area Co-ordinator may also issue working schedules to evaluators, indicating which readings have to be completed by which time/date, so that evaluation operations can proceed in an efficient way.

Step 4   Individual evaluation of proposals and eligibility check
Evaluators review Part B and then Part C and perform their eligibility check.

Practical guidelines for evaluators completing evaluation forms

- **Read the FP5 Manual of Evaluation Procedures (in particular the section on proposal marking) before you start completing evaluation forms**
- **Read the Appendix on filling in the eligibility forms and E.1 and E.2 (see Appendix 5) for the type of action you are assessing before you start work.**
- **Give all required scores**
- **Note that the score per criterion expresses an overall assessment of the criterion relative to the focus and objectives of the proposed action; the sub-criteria expressed in the forms and the issues per type of action given in the Appendices should not be interpreted as having equal weights**
- **Provide a clear and brief justification of the scores and be honest but correct, in particular when scores are low**
- **Ensure consistency in your scoring throughout your work**
- **Be factual in the comments supporting the scores, with references to proposal text when useful**
- **Give recommendations for modifications, if any, in case of relatively highly scoring proposals**
- **Focus resource effectiveness on human resources and equipment. Labour rates will be checked during the negotiations if needed**
- **Please write your forms clearly, so that they are readable by the staff, or use a PC to fill them in.**
- **Always be succinct but clear**
- **Give details and references to the proposal text underpinning your conclusions**
- **Keep to the criteria stated in the forms**
- **Assess the proposal as described and presented. Do not assume interpretations**
- **Always use polite and correct language, but without hiding the facts; your remarks are used to draw up the E.3 and E.4 and they will be used in the ESR to inform the proposing consortia on details of your findings.**

Step 5   Consensus group meeting
Once their individual conclusions on all the criteria are recorded and signed, the readers then meet with their Moderating PO in a "consensus group", to achieve a consolidated view on a score for each criterion, from which then the weighted score for the proposal is calculated, and on the overall score. The Project Officer will moderate the discussion, ensuring it is fair and that all voices are heard, but of course he expresses no opinion on the evaluation of the proposal itself. The Forms E.3 and E.4 will be drafted and finalised by the rapporteur. The Evaluators will together complete the form C.2 in the consensus meeting. Each reader of a proposal will sign the final forms (C.2, E.3 and E.4).

Threshold scores
The score resulting from the consensus meeting for a criterion must be at least equal to the threshold as given in the IST Specific Annex. Proposals which fail to achieve this score will not be retained for funding.

Weighted and overall score
The form E.4 includes two boxes for the scoring of the full proposal.

"Weighted score" will show a score calculated from the five individual criterion scores using the appropriate weighting scheme. This will be a figure between 0 and 5 expressed to one decimal place. This score will be used only to establish the initial ranking for this proposal versus the others, prior to the panel discussion.

"Overall score", will be a score of 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, based on an overall judgement made by the readers in the consensus group. This overall score will be supplied to the proposers in the Evaluation Summary Report, which is returned to them. Normally this overall score would be the weighted score rounded-up or rounded-down, depending on the judgement of the readers. An overall score that differed by more than one point from the weighted score would require agreement by the panel as a whole, and detailed written justification in the panel report.

In drafting the E.4, the rapporteur will especially give attention to:
- The scores given are fully and clearly justified (especially sub-threshold scores),
- Comments are factual, but not offensive,
- Reasons for rejection are clear and constructive, without suggesting that the decision made can be changed by rewriting parts of the proposal now (this can only be done via resubmission of the whole proposal to a later call)
- If recommendations for modifications are given for retained proposals, these are clearly explained,
- The identity of evaluators is not revealed.

Quality control of Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)

As the texts, scores per criterion and overall score from the E.4 forms will be sent back to proposers as the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), the Area Co-ordinator will in the background be assuring the quality of these forms against the criteria above.
The Area Co-ordinator will consult the rapporteur concerned on changes he makes. In all cases edits will be documented and filed.

Step 6   Panel review
The Area panel moderated by the Area Co-ordinator will then meet. The proposal with its' forms C.2, E.3 and E.4 will be made available before the panel meeting The panel might ask questions, discuss issues in depth and in *exceptional* cases suggest changes to the conclusions drawn up by the readers (however any such change must be explicitly justified and noted in the panel report).

If no changes are agreed to the E4 forms in the panel meeting, the E4 forms will with the change from decimal score to integer score be the ESR form to be communicated to the proposer. If changes are agreed in the panel meeting, these changes are introduced to the ESR for the project. The final set of ESR forms are signed by the panel rapporteur and the area co-ordinator.

Step 7   Panel ranking
A list is provided to the panel, of all the proposals which were eligible and reached all necessary thresholds within their Area, arithmetically ordered on the basis of their weighted scores expressed to one decimal place. The panel reviews this ordering by weighted scores in the light of their responsibility for the Area as a whole, e.g. their significance to the Area of the Workprogramme addressed by the panel or the programme as a whole. This will lead to the ranking, for which clear justifications are provided in the panel's final report.

All eligible, above threshold proposals will be ranked. The list of other proposals will be made available to the panel members.

If a proposal is presented with an R&D and Demonstration activity separately, both parts could be ranked separately following the E.4 of each. Combined R&D and Demonstration proposals have only one E.4 and are ranked as one proposal.

In the case of two similar proposals, the Panel should give a clear recommendation how to handle these in cases where both proposals are ranked high enough to deserve funding. It could be that in such cases the proposal scoring lowest should be placed on the reserve list, for negotiation only in the event that the superior proposal fails in negotiation.

Where the panel recommends clustering of proposals, either with other proposals submitted to the same call, or with existing projects in the programme, this should be duly justified, explicitly described and qualifications on ranking could be given dependent on the acceptance of the clustering by the consortium.

Where evaluators recommend the merging of two or more proposals, the ranked list should include each of the original proposals, and also the theoretical merged proposal. Panel members should realise that merging is an exceptional action that requires full consent of the consortia involved. Arguments for merging should be clearly given in the report.

> *"Integration of subpanel lists"*
> It may be necessary to consolidate and integrate the ranked lists of several subpanels in an Area together. This may happen where a particular evaluation area is so broad in scope or received so many proposals that it was necessary to handle it in several subpanels. In this case the Area Co-ordinators concerned will establish a representative selection of members of the

relevant subpanels, who will meet with them under Commission staff moderation and with one of the experts as rapporteur.

Step 8   Panel report and Priority list
The panel prepares a written report, following a pre-described format (See Appendix 4), on its deliberations, including the panel's conclusion concerning the priority ranking of proposals for its area. This panel report with the priority list will form part of the overall Evaluation Report that will be submitted by the Commission to the IST Committee. The panel report will not contain comments on the evaluation operations. Such comments can be reported separately to management.

Step 9   Information to proposers
The ESR as finalised and presented in the Evaluation Report will be sent to the proposers as soon as the ISTC has been informed on the evaluation results with a letter emphasising that such information does not constitute any commitment or decision on selection or rejection of the proposal by the Commission.

4. Post-evaluation Procedure

4.1 Commission Implementation Plan

The Commission (Programme management) will take the panels' reports and final ranked lists to establish a draft implementation plan, consisting of 5 groups of proposals:
1. proposals to be retained for negotiation in ranked order (incl. ex equo if convenient), with a budget indication taking into account the recommendations of the evaluators
2. proposals which should be kept in reserve, pending possible availability of funding, with an indication of the order in which they will be addressed if such funds would become available (also with a budget indication as under 1.)
3. proposals which (though eligible and above required thresholds) cannot be funded as their ranking is such that the available budget will not allow its funding
4. proposals which cannot be retained because of failure to meet an evaluation threshold
5. proposals received which are ineligible.

The implementation plan will normally follow the panels' rankings and recommendations, but important strategic and/or policy reasons may require further consideration in exceptional cases. The implementation plan will also need consultation with other Directorates General within the Commission which are responsible for policies which might be affected by the IST programme.

For these reasons, the Commission may exceptionally choose to change the ranking recommended by the panels. In this instance, due attention and written justifications will be given to the IST Committee in the report accompanying the implementation plan.

4.2 Contract preparation and finalisation

The proposers of proposals ranked highest and for which funding is available will be contacted in writing. They will receive the summary report of the evaluation of their proposal and a request for further administrative and - where required – technical information necessary for the preparation of a project contract. This extra information will include that information necessary for establishing the financial and legal viability of the contract participants and their availability of all the necessary resources to carry out the project.

Among the items to be dealt with in the contract preparation and finalisation phase will be an examination of the costs proposed in relation to the resources requested to achieve cost effectiveness, the detailed technical work to be carried out and, where relevant, third country participation. In discussing these items with proposers, the Commission staff will take account of the comments of the evaluators. In addition, any recommendations for possible clustering of projects (with the agreement of proposers) will be dealt with in this phase.

Once the details have been finalised and all the necessary financial and legal checks carried out, a draft selection decision will be prepared by the Commission services. This will be adopted by the Commission following normal internal procedures and the procedure adopted in the specific programme decision. Once the selection decision has been taken, contracts will be sent to the proposers for signature.

4.3 Proposals in reserve for negotiation

In estimating availability of funding, the Commission will start at the top of the priority list and allot funding until all currently available funds are attributed. Proposals below that point are nevertheless still retained proposals. It may be that funding will become available later (for example, by savings made in the negotiations with the higher-ranked projects during their contract preparation phase).

Therefore, the proposers of such proposals will receive the summary report on the evaluation of their proposal, noting that they are still retained, but indicating that negotiations cannot be started at this point and might not be started at all if no budget would become available. Such proposals will be retained on the reserve list. They may also choose to withdraw their proposal and, if the planned calls allow, improve it for submission at a later date.

When the budget for the particular call has been finally used up, any proposals remaining from the "reserve" which it has not been possible to fund will then be rejected by a decision of the Commission as set out above, and the proposers will be informed.

4.4 "Non retained proposals"

Proposals, which are not eligible, failed to meet one of the thresholds, or are fully evaluated but ranked such that funding cannot be expected on the basis of the available budget, will receive formal notification on this after the formal Commission decision is taken.

Proposers will be informed in writing of the Commission's decision.

4.5 The IST Committee

The IST Committee (ISTC) is the committee of Member State representatives (together with observers from the Associated States), that assist the Commission in the management of the programme.

The ISTC will be informed on the results of the evaluation before the first letters go to the consortia for opening negotiations. The ISTC will discuss these results and after negotiation be asked a formal opinion on those proposals which are planned to be contracted for amounts above €1.5 million, or include partners from third (non-associated) countries.

Conclusion of contracts is therefore subject to the positive opinion of the ISTC, as well as the final decision of the Commission on the negotiated project.

Appendix 1 - Bursaries

Evaluation of Bursary applications for young researchers from developing countries.

Consortia preparing a research, demonstration or a combined research and demonstration proposal or a concerted action proposal for any of the specific programmes in the Fifth Framework Programme 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.

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.

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.

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

Proposal marking

The score range is 0 to 100 as detailed above. In order for a bursary to be granted, a bursary application must reach a score of at least 60, of which at least 30 should be excellence of scientific and/or training objectives. A score of at least 5 must be reached for each of the other criteria. The evaluated applications will be ranked by each Programme according to their score.

Only if the whole project is selected for funding <u>and</u> the bursary application is adequately rated will the bursary be granted.

Evaluation Form for INCO Bursary applications

Bursary application associated with:

Proposal no.   _____

Proposal acronym   _____

Name of applicant   _____

EVALUATION CRITERIA
Insert for each criterion a score in the range shown (high score = good)
and calculate total

---

1. Excellence of the scientific and/or training objectives of the application

     score 0-50   _____

2. Potential value of the bursary to the applicant and to his/her home institute

     score 0-20   _____

3. Relevance of the proposed bursary to the project as a whole

     score 0-15   _____

4. Experience and professional training of the candidate

     score 0-15   _____

Total score   _____

Date

Signed (all readers)

COMMISSION USE ONLY

	Yes	*No*
Total score ≥ 60		
Scientific/training objectives score ≥ 30		
Other scores ≥ 5		
Candidate in eligible region		
Candidate ≤ 40 *years old*		
Candidate knowledge of host language		
Host in EU/Assoc. state		
Host in proposal consortium		

Appendix 2 – Evaluation Forms

2.A. *Standard Evaluation Forms*

E.1.   Evaluation of Criterion 1

E.2.   Evaluation of Criteria 2 – 5

E.3.   Consensus Meeting Notes

E.4.   Proposal Summary Form

ESR   Evaluation Summary Report

C.1.   Administrative Eligibility Checklist

C.2.   General Eligibility Checklist

E.1

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL – **PART B**

Proposal No.:		**Proposal Acronym:**			
Evaluator name:					
Signature:				Date:	

Scores: 0 Unsatisfactory   1 Poor   2 Fair   3 Good   4 Very good   5 Excellent

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation	☐

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

Comments:

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

Comments:

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

Comments:

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL – **PART C**

E.2

Proposal No.:		**Proposal Acronym:**	
Evaluator name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Scores:　0 Unsatisfactory　　1 Poor　　2 Fair　　3 Good　　4 Very good　　5 Excellent

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies	☐

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects

Comments:

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations.

Comments:

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

Comments:

<u>INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL – **PART C**</u>

E.2

Proposal No.:		**Proposal Acronym:**	
Evaluator name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Scores: **0 Unsatisfactory**   **1 Poor**   **2 Fair**   **3 Good**   **4 Very good**   **5 Excellent**

---

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

Comments:

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

Comments:

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

Comments:

<u>INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL – **PART C**</u>

| E.2 |

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Scores: 0 Unsatisfactory   1 Poor   2 Fair   3 Good   4 Very good   5 Excellent

4. Economic development and S&T prospects	☐

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

Comments:

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

Comments:

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

Comments:

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSAL – **PART C**

| E.2 |

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:			
Signature:		Date:	

Scores: **0 Unsatisfactory**   **1 Poor**   **2 Fair**   **3 Good**   **4 Very good**   **5 Excellent**

5. Resources, partnership and management   ☐
a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;
Comments:
b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners
Comments:
c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.
Comments:
If Applicable: Where a non-EU and non-Associated State participant is involved, is it in conformity with the interest of the Community, and is it of substantial added value for implementing all or part of the specific programme?
Comments:

<u>CONSENSUS MEETING NOTES - RTD ACTIONS PART B&C</u>

| E.3 |

Proposal No.:		**Proposal Acronym:**				
Area:					Date:	
Evaluator 1		Evaluator 2			Evaluator 3	
Signature		Signature			Signature	

Minutes of the consensus meeting *(Describe how the decisions regarding the evaluation results were reached. Always provide comments if the consolidated evaluation differs significantly from the individual scores on given criteria and/or if scores have moved above or below thresholds. Record any dissenting views):*

Proposal Number	E.4					
«ACRONYM»	**«Research Sector(Unit), Action line»**		**Type of action**			
«TITLE»						
PROPOSERS	**R**	**C**	**COST**	**%**	**FUNDING**	**%**
«SHORTNAME»	«ROLE»	«COUNTRY»	«C_SHAREC»		«C_SHAREF»**«NEXT RECORD»**	
Total Effort	**Total: (KEURO)**					

PROPOSAL ABSTRACT:
XXX

ELIGIBILITY: YES/NO

IF NO: Comments.

Marks achieved for evaluation criteria[*]:

1.   **Scientific/technological quality and innovation**   (T=.) ☐   **xW** ☐
Comments:

2.   **Community added value and contribution to EC policies** (T=.) ☐   **xW** ☐
Comments:

3.   **Contribution to Community social objectives**   (T=.) ☐   **xW** ☐
Comments:

4.   **Economic development and S&T prospects**   (T=.) ☐   **xW** ☐
Comments:

5.   **Resources, partnership and management**   (T=.) ☐   **xW** ☐
Comments:

Weighted score ☐

/10

Overall score ☐

General/overall comments (including proposals for modifications and possibilities for clustering/fusion with other proposals):

---

[*] Note that the thresholds and weightings for the specific type of actions need to be looked up in the IST Specific Evaluation Manual Annex (Appendix 3 of this Guide)

Proposal Number	Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)						
«ACRONYM»	**«Research Sector(Unit), Action line»**		**Type of action**				
«TITLE»							
PROPOSERS		**R**	**C**	**COST**	**%**	**FUNDING**	**%**
«SHORTNAME»		«ROLE»	«COUNTRY»	«C_SHAREC»		«C_SHAREF»**«NEXT RECORD»**	
Total Effort	**Total: (KEURO)**						

PROPOSAL ABSTRACT:
XXX

Marks achieved for evaluation criteria

1.   **Scientific/technological quality and innovation**   ☐
Comments:

2.   **Community added value and contribution to EC policies**   ☐
Comments:

3.   **Contribution to Community social objectives**   ☐
Comments:

4.   **Economic development and S&T prospects**   ☐
Comments:

5.   **Resources, partnership and management**   ☐
Comments:

Overall score   ☐

General/overall comments:

IST PROGRAMME – FOR OFFICIAL COMMISSION USE ONLY
ADMINISTRATIVE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST – STANDARD

C.1

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Commission Official:		DG/Unit:	
Signature:		Date:	

Eligibility criteria	YES	NO
1.1. Timely submission Electronic proposals:		
- ProTool sealing method and certification used		
- Validation file OR Proposal file before deadline		
- Validation file in time and proposal file within 48 hours and unique identifier matches		
If NO: Comments:		
1.2. Timely submission Hand delivered proposals		
- Registered as hand delivered before deadline by ESP		
If NO: Comments:		
1.3. Timely submission Public post or courier		
- sending date before the deadline		
- receipt date in Commission within 10 working days after deadline		
If NO: Comments:		
2. Paper proposal signature		
- A1 form signed by co-ordinator (Contact person) OR		
- All A3 forms signed by participants		
If NO: Comments:		
3. Electronic signature		
- Use of Class II certificate OR		
- Use of Class I certificate and receipt of signed A1 form (mail or fax) before deadline		
If NO: Comments:		
4. Completeness of proposal		
If NO: Comments:		
5. Eligibility of consortium		
If NO: Comments:		
6. Cost shared R&D proposal with anonymous part B		
If NO: Comments:		
7. Proposal is in scope of Call for KA		
If NO: Comments:		
8. Evaluation by KA accepted		
If NO: Comments:		
ELIGIBLE:		
If NO: Comments:		

ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST -

C.2

Proposal No.:			Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator:			Panel:	
Signature:			Date:	

Eligibility criteria	YES	NO
1. Does the proposal address the parts of the Workprogramme which are open for this Call?		
If NO: Comments:		
2. If the proposal is only partially in line with the Call, does it have sufficient merit to be considered in its entirety or in part?		
If NO: Comments:		
3. Have relevant ethical issues been adequately taken into account in the proposal; is the proposed research compliant with fundamental ethical principles, if relevant?		
If NO: Comments:		
4. Is participation of industrial entities in industrially-oriented shared cost actions appropriate to the nature and purpose of the activity		
If NO: Comments:		
5. Is the proposal in line with Community policies, if relevant		
If NO: Comments:		
6. Have appropriate safeguards/impact assessment regarding Community policies (e.g. environment) been taken into account, where necessary?		
If NO: Comments:		
7. Does the proposal follow the requirements for layout (e.g. requirements for anonymity)?		
If NO: Comments:		
OVERALL ELIGIBILITY:		
If NO: Comments:		

2.B   Information on Eligibility Forms – C.1, C.2

Form C.1 will be filled in by Commission staff. It concerns legal and administrative eligibility checks which relate to timely and correct submission.

Form C.2 relates to general eligibility criteria. Some assistance on interpreting the questions is given below.

- Scope (questions 1 and 2): Checking adherence to the scope of the Call will be done by Commission staff during the pre-screening stage. It might however appear after more detailed study by the evaluators that elements have been overlooked. It could be concluded that the proposal does not fit within the scope of the Call at all, or that it might fit better in another Area. If consensus is reached on this, the proposal evaluation in the Area concerned will be terminated and if no other Area would be appropriate the proposal will be deemed ineligible.
  In the case that important parts fit within the scope and other parts not, one might consider continuing evaluation and make remarks on the parts which are not within scope (are they necessary for the part in scope or could they be separated?).

- Ethical issues (question 3): This question should be answered "no" if evaluators are aware and have a strong opinion that the research might lead to applications or include demonstrations that run counter to generally accepted ethical principles in EU society. One example might relate to the use of Internet and the position taken by EC and European Parliament on this. Other examples might relate to the protection of privacy. Supporting information is given in Appendix 5I.

- Industrial participation (question 4): The IST programme is an industrially oriented programme, with much attention given to Evaluation Criterion 4 (Economic development and S&T prospects). The answer to this question should only be "no" if the proposal has clear industrial goals, aiming at exploitation of results in product or markets, but none of the partners comes from the industry that would be seen as the suppliers and/or users on that market.
  The case should be clear-cut. In case of doubts (rather than a clear "no") it would be more appropriate to express these in the criteria 4 (economic development) and 5 (consortium).

- Community policies (question 5 and 6): Again, the question should only be answered "no" if clear consensus exists on the fact that the proposal is not in line with a particular Community policy. It is acknowledged that evaluators cannot be experts in all Community policy fields and they should only judge if they feel competent to do so. The Moderating PO might consult policy DGs in the Commission Service, and these policy DGs are also invited to read proposals related to their field and comment on it. The Commission might in exceptional cases, even after the recommendation of the ranked lists by the panels, based on such advice, and duly justified in the reports, decide to withdraw the proposal from the ranked list.
  If Community policies are at stake, and no safeguards or impact assessment is foreseen in the proposal where this would be a pre-requisite to do the work, question 6 should be answered "no". Supporting information on Community policy is given in Appendix 5I.

- Completeness and anonymity): The layout for proposals are described in the Guide for Proposers.

  If Part B reveals the identity of partners, it should be judged whether this is an accidental mistake, and in general the consortium has tried to stick to the rule. If not, the answer to this question must be "no". If it is judged accidental, the Moderating PO will take the necessary measures to correct the proposal and assure a fair evaluation.
  Other elements on layout should be only considered serious if it hinders a fair evaluation due to missing information, incomprehensibility, etc. In case of missing minor administrative information (and only then) may the Moderating PO (following the rules laid down in the relevant manuals) ask the consortium to complete the information.

- Overall eligibility: The overall eligibility is "no" if one of the answers on the questions is "no".

2.C.   *Specific issues for shared-cost R&D and Demonstration*

I.   Issues related to E.1 and E.2

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Contribution of proposal to the key scientific and technological issues of programme and Key Action*
> - *Overall assessment of quality of research proposed*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*
>
> - *In case of Demonstration actions, the emphasis lies on addressing the key technological issues for achievement of the objectives of the programme and/or Key Action*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Degree of originality and progress beyond state of the art; credibility of achieving results*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify the novelty of the proposed result, for example by including a comparison with the state of the art?*
> - *The level of risk and scientific and technical handling of these risks*
> - *Is there a reasonable balance between risks and potential benefits; note that risks may be acceptable in return for high benefits; warn for unacceptable risks*
> - *In case of demonstration the emphasis lies on awareness of the state of the art, and demonstration of results beyond it.*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan adequate and credible for achieving the planned results?*
> - *Are self-assessment procedures incorporated?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses*
> - *Does the proposal identify and describe interdependencies, if any, with other national or international activities?*
> - *Is there clear added value in carrying out the proposed action at European level (as opposed to national level)?*
> - *What are the problems addressed at European level?*
> - *What is the expected impact at European level?*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposers be able to undertake the activities needed at the European level?*
> - *Can the proposed research only be achieved at European level; for which reasons?*
>
> - *In case of demonstration, does it have a European wide effect?*

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *To which EU policies could to your knowledge the proposed action contribute?*
> - *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> - *Does the proposal address standardisation or regulation, and if so in a credible way?*
> - *Note that supporting information is given in Appendix 5I*
> - *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If a proposal is not relevant to these criteria, it should be given a score of 2 (fair).

In some cases, the Panel may decide that all proposals are of equal irrelevance to these objectives, in which case they should all be scored 2.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to growth and is it likely to have a wider economic impact – directly or indirectly?*

- *Will the action improve competitiveness or create market opportunities?*
- *Specify impact and assess its value for the EU economy if possible*
- *Are exploitation plans outlined for individual participants, for the consortium as a whole?*
- *Are they well planned, timely and likely to come through?*
- *Are they concrete, for example detailing user groups' involvement?*
- *Is the exploitation plan critically dependent on one or more partners; if so, which ones?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action for EU competitiveness?*
- *Will it help to improve competitiveness and/or create markets for products/services based on RTD results in the area of IST?*
- *Indicate these markets and products*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *What is the likely contribution to European scientific and technological progress?*
- *Are plans/tools to disseminate results foreseen?*
- *Are dissemination strategies explained, results and target groups identified?*

- *In case of Demonstration actions, the latter issue is the most relevant*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
- *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
- *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing international projects?*
- *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestones?*
- *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Are the proposer organisations appropriate for implementing the proposed action?*
- *Are there overlaps or gaps in expertise of partners?*
- *Do the partner(s) have the skills and experience needed?*
- *Is sufficient industrial expertise represented in the consortium?*
- *Are roles and functions clear (in case there are several partners)?*

- *Consortia in proposals for demonstration projects or combined (non-separable) projects must contain technology developers as well as technology users.*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
- *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation*
- *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
- *Is the personnel proposed having the required expertise and credibility?*
- *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed project?*

II. General comments

In case a proposal is a combined RTD and demonstration action, and both actions are well separated, with consortia and budgets clearly identified and workpackages distinguished for both activities, then evaluators must complete two E.1's and E.2's. If however, no proper distinction can be made it should be evaluated as one action, taking all aspects into account.

Part B of proposals for shared cost RTD and Demonstration must be presented without indication of partner names (anonymous). If this is not the case, evaluators must warn Commission staff.

In certain situations the IST programme may use a two-step evaluation procedure, with different issues and weights in each step. In the first Call however, no such procedures are implemented for normal shared cost RTD, except for FET (See Appendix 5.G)

III. Weights and threshold

The following weights and thresholds are relevant for shared cost RTD and Demonstration.

Criterion	RTD Weight	RTD Threshold/ Min.Score	Demonstration Weight	Demonstration Threshold/ Min.Score	Combined Weight	Combined Threshold/ Min.Score
1	4	3	3	3	4	3
2	1	2	2	2	1	2
3	1	-	1	-	1	-
4	2	3	2	3	2	3
5	2	2	2	2	2	2

2.D. Specific issues for Accompanying Measures[1]

I.   Issues related to E.1 and E.2

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Instead of addressing research quality as such, this criterion rather focuses on how the IST programme objectives/activities are supported by the accompanying measure proposal*
> - *Does the proposal demonstrate convincingly that it can play a valuable role in accompanying and supporting the Programme?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed measure contribute in stimulating the innovation potential – in market,, technology or other relevant terms - of European industry and/or the science and technology base?*
> - *Is the consortium aware of the state of the art of technology/current practice in their field?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan appropriate for pursuing the objectives of the proposed accompanying measure?*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to increasing public awareness of European technology in general, of specific achievements in particular, or of any key issues relevant to the IST Programme?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses?*
> - *Is there clear added value in carrying out the proposed action at European level (as opposed to national level)?*
> - *What is the expected impact at European level?*
> - *Will benefits be European wide?*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposers be able to undertake the activities needed at the European level?*
> - *Note that accompanying measure proposals may be submitted by a single organisation*

---

[1] See later sections of this Appendix for specific issues concerning Take-up Measures accompanying the Programme

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *To which EU policies could, to your knowledge, the proposed actions contribute?*
> - *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> - *Note that supporting information Community policy is given in Appendix J*
> - *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If a proposal is not relevant to these criteria, it should be given a score of 2 (fair).

In some cases, the Panel may decide that all proposals are of equal irrelevance to these objectives, in which case they should all be scored 2.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to growth and is it likely to have a wider economic impact – directly or indirectly?*
> - *Will it promote the exploitation of R&D results, the take-up of advanced technologies by the market, or the transfer of exploitable knowledge?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action?*
> - *Will it help to improve competitiveness and/or create markets for products/services based on RTD results in the area of IST?*

▪ *Indicate these markets and products*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> ▪ *What is the likely contribution to European scientific and technological progress?*
> ▪ *Are the dissemination activities adequate, well targeted and planned credibly?*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> ▪ *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
> ▪ *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
> ▪ *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing international projects?*
> ▪ *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestone?*
> ▪ *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*
> ▪ *If there is only one partner, will this partner be able to carry out the project at European level?*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> ▪ *Are the proposer organisations appropriate for implementing the proposed action?*
> ▪ *Are there overlaps or gaps in expertise of partners?*
> ▪ *Do the partner(s) have the skills and experience needed?*
> ▪ *Is sufficient industrial expertise represented in the consortium?*
> ▪ *Are roles and functions clear (in case there are several partners)?*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> ▪ *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
> ▪ *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation?*
> ▪ *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
> ▪ *Is the personnel proposed having the required expertise and credibility?*
> ▪ *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed projects the proposed action cost-effective?*

II.   *General comments*

Accompanying measures can be executed by one partner, but need to have a convincing European added value in its results.

Accompanying measures will not be evaluated with Part B necessarily anonymous.

Accompanying measures will generally be submissable continuously. Nevertheless, the programme management may decide to evaluate a batch concurrently with fixed deadline RTD proposals for reasons of convenience.

Accompanying measures may also include requests for contributions (grants, 'subventions') to conferences, seminars, exhibitions etc. to only a relatively modest percentage of the total budget.

III.   *Weights and thresholds*

The following weights and thresholds apply for Accompanying measures.

Criterion	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score
1	2	3
2	3	4
3	2	-
4	2	-
5	1	2

2.E. *Specific issues for Concerted Actions and Thematic Networks*

I. *Issues related to E.1 and E.2*

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Instead of addressing research quality as such, this criterion rather focuses on how the IST programme objectives/activities are supported by Concerted Action or Thematic Network*
> - *Does the proposal demonstrate convincingly that it can play a valuable role in supporting the Programme?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> -
> - *Will the proposed measure contribute in stimulating the innovation potential – in market,, technology or other relevant terms - of European industry and/or the science and technology base?*
> - *Is the consortium aware of the state of the art of technology/current practice in their field?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan appropriate for pursuing the objectives of the proposed accompanying measure?*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to concertation and/or networking of European technology research in general, of specific achievements in particular, or of any key issues relevant to the IST Programme?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses?*
> - *Is there clear added value in carrying out the proposed action at European level (as opposed to national level)?*
> - *What is the expected impact at European level?*
> - *Will benefits be European wide?*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> ***Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:***
> - *Will the action aim at real European wide concertation and/or networking?*
> - *Note that CA and TN can be submitted by a single organisation as the foreseen contractor and a (large) number of 'members' involved in the activities*
> - *Is the membership of the action sufficiently European wide?*

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *To which EU policies could to your knowledge the proposed actions contribute?*
> ▪ *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> ▪ *Note that supporting information on Community policy is given in Appendix 5I*
> ▪ *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact?*
> ▪ *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> ▪ *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> ▪ *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If a proposal is not relevant to these criteria, it should be given a score of 2 (fair).

In some cases, the Panel may decide that all proposals are of equal irrelevance to these objectives, in which case they should all be scored 2.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *Will the proposed action contribute to growth and is it likely to have a wider economic impact – directly or indirectly?*
> ▪ *Will it promote the co-ordination of exploitation of R&D results, the take-up of advanced technologies by the market, or the transfer of exploitable knowledge?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> ▪ *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action?*
> ▪ *Will it help to improve competitiveness and/or create markets for products/services based on RTD results in the area of IST?*
> ▪ *Indicate these markets and products*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *What is the likely contribution to European scientific and technological progress?*
> - *Are the co-ordination, awareness and dissemination activities adequate, well targeted and planned credibly?*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
> - *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
> - *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing international projects?*
> - *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestone?*
> - *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*
> - *If there is only one contractor foreseen, will this partner be able to carry out the project at European level?*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Are the proposer organisations appropriate for implementing the proposed action?*
> - *Are there overlaps or gaps in expertise of partners?*
> - *Do the partner(s) have the skills and experience needed?*
> - *Is sufficient industrial expertise represented in the consortium?*
> - *Are roles and functions clear (in case there are several partners)?*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
> - *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation*
> - *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
> - *Is the personnel proposed having the required expertise and credibility?*
> - *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed projects the proposed action cost-effective?*

II. *General comments*

Concerted Actions and thematic networks can be contracted to one or more partners, but need a clear European wide membership and a convincing European added value in its results.

CA/TNs will not be evaluated with Part B necessarily anonymous.

CA/TNs will generally be submissable continuously. Nevertheless, the programme management may decide to evaluate a batch concurrently with fixed deadline RTD proposals for reasons of convenience.

III.   Weights and thresholds

The following weights and thresholds apply for Concerted actions and Thematic networks

Criterion	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score
1	2	-
2	3	-
3	1	-
4	2	-
5	2	2

2.F.   Specific issues for Assessment Actions

I.   Issues related to E.1 and E.2

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Contribution of proposal to the key scientific and technological issues of programme and Key Action*
> - *Overall assessment of quality of work proposed*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute in stimulating the innovation potential – in market or technology terms - of European industry and/or the science and technology base?*
> - *Is the consortium aware of the state of the art of technology in their field?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*
> - *For Assessment projects, a description of the initial status of the equipment or materials should be included*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan appropriate for pursuing the objectives of the proposed action?*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to increasing take-up of European technology in general, of specific achievements in particular, or to any key issues relevant to the IST Programme?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*
> - *For Assessment projects, target specifications should be included; a competitive and market analysis should be given*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses?*
> - *Is there clear added value in carrying out the proposed action at European level (as opposed to national level)?*
> - *What is the expected impact at European level?*
> - *Will benefits be European wide?*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposers be able to undertake the activities needed at the European level?*
> - *Note that proposals for Assessment actions may be submitted by a single organisation, but need to have a convincing European added value in its results*
> - *For Assessment actions, partners should be ready to cluster projects to ensure that other than directly involved users may benefit*

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *To which EU policies could, to your knowledge, the proposed actions contribute?*
> - *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> - *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If a proposal is not relevant to these criteria, it should be given a score of 2 (fair).

In some cases, the Panel may decide that all proposals are of equal irrelevance to these objectives, in which case they should all be scored 2.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to growth and is it likely to have a wider economic impact – directly or indirectly?*
> - *Will it promote the exploitation of R&D results, the take-up of advanced technologies by the market, or the transfer of exploitable knowledge?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action?*
> - *Will it help to improve competitiveness and/or create markets for products/services based on RTD results in the area of IST?*
> - *Indicate these markets and products*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *What is the likely contribution to European scientific and technological progress?*
- *Are the dissemination activities adequate, well targeted and planned credibly?*
- *For SEA Assessment actions it is intended to carry out dissemination at project level and at the level of clustered projects and beyond.*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
- *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
- *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing international projects?*
- *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestones?*
- *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*
- *If there is only one partner, will this partner be able to carry out the project at European level?*
- *Effective management of clustering in Assessment projects should be foreseen*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Are the proposer organisations appropriate for implementing the proposed action?*
- *Are there overlaps or gaps in expertise of partners?*
- *Do the partner(s) have the skills and experience needed?*
- *Is sufficient industrial expertise represented in the consortium?*
- *Are roles and functions clear (in case there are several partners)?*
- *In Assessment actions, user-supplier co-operation is necessary. The consortium must contain at least industrial user for alpha type equipment tests, at least two for more mature prototypes.*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
- *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation*
- *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
- *Do the personnel proposed have the required expertise and credibility?*
- *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed projects the proposed action cost-effective?*
- *For Assessment actions, no financial contribution will be made to cost categories Durable equipment, Computing, IPR costs and Overheads. Costs for prototypes in close to production conditions are reimbursable.*

II.   *General comments*

These actions will not be evaluated with Part B necessarily anonymous. When applying the general evaluation criteria given above due consideration should be given to the following points.

For <u>Assessment actions</u> the proposal should include a description of the initial status of the equipment or material based on which a factory acceptance test would be carried out. The users should indicate target specifications for a site acceptance test as well as final target specifications.

Assessment projects will be co-ordinated to maximise the complementarily of the offers, to broaden the user communities and to stimulate exchange of knowledge and expertise.

III.   *Weights and thresholds*

The following weights and thresholds apply for Assessment actions

Criterion	Weight	Threshold Min.Score
1	4	-
2	1	2
3	1	-
4	2	-
5	2	4

2.G.   *Specific issues for Best Practice Actions*

I.   *Issues related to E.1 and E.2*

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Are business/service objectives specified? Is it specified how they will be measured?*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to increasing take-up of European technology, of specific achievements in particular, or of any key issues relevant to the IST Programme?*
> -
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed measure contribute in stimulating the innovation potential – in market or technology terms - of European industry and/or the science and technology base?*
> - *Does the proposal contain a thorough description of the state of the art of the current practices, processes and/or operations?*
> - *Does the proposal identify the degree of improvement of these practices, processes or operations for the user organisation by well-founded, mature and established but insufficiently deployed methods and technologies including specific targets to be achieved?*
> - *Is an overview of the status of the technology to be transferred given?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan appropriate for pursuing the objectives of the proposed action?*
> - *Is the proposed project based on an identified baseline project within the user organisation?*
> - *Are the business objectives/ administrative needs identified and measurable and are they addressed by the objectives?*
> - *Is the proposed project based on an identified baseline project within the user organisation?*
> - *Are the business objectives/ administrative needs identified and measurable and are they addressed by the objectives? Is there a clear element of "Measurement and evaluation of results"?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses?*
> - *Is there a clear description of the European dimension of the action, indicating that there is a wider community (and not merely the participants themselves) which will benefit*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*

- *Will the proposers be able to undertake the activities needed at the European level?*
- *Note that accompanying measure proposals may be submitted by a single organisation*

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *To which EU policies could, to your knowledge, the proposed actions contribute?*
> - *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> - *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion (if applicable):*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the action particularly focus on improving employment prospects in Europe?*
> - *To what extent does it contribute to the use and development of skills in Europe*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion (if applicable):*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If criterion 3a and 3c has no relevance to the project, the criterion should be scored on criterion 3b only.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal describe in detail the business/service relevance and potential commercial impact for the user(s)?*
> - *Does the proposal describe how the anticipated results will be exploited and deployed internally within this (these) organisation(s)?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action?*
> - *Does the proposal identify the business/service communities who will benefit from the results?*
> - *Indicate the markets and products*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Are the dissemination activities adequate, well targeted and planned credibly?*
> - *Does the proposer commit to disseminate the experience and to allow its transfer to other parties?*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
> - *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
> - *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing projects?*
> - *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestone?*
> - *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the consortium led by the user(s)?*
> - *Are the technical competencies and expertise, the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners/subcontractors identified and appropriate?*
> - *Is professional support from technology, know-how, training or consultancy providers included?*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
> - *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation?*
> - *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
> - *Is the personnel proposed having the required expertise and credibility?*
> - *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed projects the proposed action cost-effective?*

II.   General comments

Take-up Actions can be executed by one contractor, but need to have a convincing European added value in its results. and will not be evaluated with Part B anonymous.

For "Best Practice" actions the individual experiment/punctual action steps must be described in the context of the real business case. A separate description of this underlying baseline project/target application - in terms of technical and business parameters - must be included. Choice and justification for each of the new practices including the supporting technologies (with comparison of not chosen options) should be given (e.g. new methodologies, technologies, hardware and/or software tools, subcontracted experts, etc. -whatever is applicable for the experiment).

III. *Weights and thresholds*

The following weights and thresholds apply for Best Practise actions.

Criterion	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score
1	2	3
2	1	2
3	2	-
4	3	3
5	2	3

2.H. Specific issues for Trials

I. Issues related to E.1 and E.2

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation

a) The **quality** of the research proposed and its contribution to addressing the key scientific and technological issues for achieving the objectives of the **programme and/or key action**;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed action contribute to increasing take-up of European technology, of specific achievements in particular, or of any key issues relevant to the IST Programme?*
> - *Are specific technical and business/administrative targets to be achieved clearly identified?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

b) The originality, **degree of innovation** and progress beyond the state of the art, taking into account the level of risk associated with the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposed measure contribute in stimulating the innovation potential – in market or technology terms - of European industry and/or the science and technology base?*
> - *Is the consortium aware of the state of the art of technology/current practice in their field?*
> - *Does the proposal describe the technology being the object of the trial, together with its degree of innovation?*
> - *Is the technology promising, but not yet fully established?*
> - *Does the proposal explain the originality, degree of innovative use and progress beyond the state of the art including specific targets to be achieved?*
> - *Is there an overview of the business/service case for this action?*
> - *Indicate the strengths and weaknesses*

c) The **adequacy** of the chosen approach, methodology and work plan for achieving the scientific and technological objectives.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Is the approach, methodology and work plan appropriate for pursuing the objectives of the proposed action?*
> - *Is there a clear element of "Measurement and evaluation of results"?*
> - *Does the proposal identify a real case that drives the trial and is the choice appropriate to drive future exploitation by the suppliers?*
> - *Indicate strengths and weaknesses*

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies

a) The **European dimension of the problem**. The extent to which the project would contribute to solving problems at the European level and that the expected impact of carrying out the work at European level would be greater than the sum of the impacts of national projects;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal clearly identify what European-level issues it addresses?*
> - *Is there a clear description of the European dimension of the action, indicating that there is a wider community (and not merely the participants themselves) which will benefit*

b) The **European added value of the consortium** - the need to establish a critical mass in human and financial terms and the combination of complementary expertise and resources available Europe-wide in different organisations;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Will the proposers be able to undertake the activities needed at the European level?*
> - *Note that accompanying measure proposals may be submitted by a single organisation*

c) The project's contribution to the implementation or the evolution of one or more **EU policies** (including "horizontal" policies, such as towards SMEs, etc.) or addressing problems connected with standardisation and regulation.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *To which EU policies could, to your knowledge, the proposed actions contribute?*
> - *Are you aware of certain EU policies with which the objectives of the proposal are not in line?*
> - *Note that supporting information on Community policy is given in Appendix J*
> - *Note that social objectives are addressed in the next criterion*

3. Contribution to Community social objectives

a) The contribution of the project to improving the **quality of life and health and safety** (including working conditions);

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion (if applicable):*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

b) The contribution of the project to improving **employment** prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the action particularly focus on improving employment prospects in Europe?*
> - *To what extent does it contribute to the use and development of skills in Europe*

c) The contribution of the project to **preserving and/or enhancing the environment** and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources.

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion (if applicable):*
> - *Do you expect a direct or indirect impact on this aspect from the proposed work?*
> - *Which impact, and is it to be considered positive or negative?*

If criterion 3a and 3c has no relevance to the project, the criterion should be scored on criterion 3b only.

4. Economic development and S&T prospects

a) The possible contribution to growth, in particular the **usefulness and range of applications** and quality of the **exploitation plans**, including the credibility of the partners to carry out the exploitation activities for the RTD results arising from the proposed project and/or the wider economic impact of the project;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *Does the proposal describe in detail the business/service relevance and potential commercial impact for the user and supplier organisations?*
> - *Does the proposal describe how the anticipated results will be exploited and deployed respectively by these organisations?*

b) The **strategic impact** of the proposed project and its potential to improve competitiveness and the development of applications markets for the partners and the users of the RTD results;

> *Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:*
> - *What is the potential strategic impact of the proposed action?*
> - *Does the proposal identify the wider community who will benefit from the results?*
> - *Does the proposal include a plan for the supplier organisations to target these communities?*

c) The contribution to European technological progress and in particular the **dissemination strategies** for the expected results, choice of target groups, etc.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Do the supplier partners provide credible plans to carry out exploitation activities?*
- *Do the user organisations commit to further use if the experience gained?*
- *Are the dissemination activities adequate, well targeted and planned credibly?*

5. Resources, partnership and management

a) The **quality of the management and project approach** proposed, in particular the appropriateness, clarity, consistency, efficiency and completeness of the proposed tasks, the scheduling arrangements (with milestones) and the management structure. In addition, the tools to be used for monitoring project progress, including the quality of specified indicators of impact and performance, and ensuring good communication within the project consortium;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is an appropriate management structure proposed?*
- *Are conflict resolution procedures foreseen?*
- *Has the co-ordinator sufficient expertise in managing projects?*
- *Is the workplan clear, well designed with clear and achievable milestone?*
- *Are adequate tools foreseen for the management?*

b) The **quality of the partnership** and involvement of users and/or other actors in the field when appropriate; in particular, the scientific/technical competence and expertise and the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners;

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is there a strong involvement of users and user/supplier co-operation including joint evaluation of the results?*
- *Are the technical competencies and expertise, the roles and functions within the consortium and the complementarity of the partners/subcontractors identified and appropriate?*

c) The **appropriateness of the resources** - the manpower effort for each partner and task, the quality and/or level and/or type of manpower allocated, durables, consumables, travel and any other resources to be used. In addition, the resources not reflected in the budget (e.g. facilities to carry out the research and the expertise of key personnel). For this criterion, comments may be given rather than marks.

Issues to be considered in view of this criterion:
- *Is the proposed action cost-effective in general?*
- *Is the manpower proposed seen to be adequate; if not give an estimate of over/under estimation?*
- *Is the equipment, travel etc. reasonable for the size and type of project proposed?*
- *Is the personnel proposed having the required expertise and credibility?*
- *Are all partners expected to have or to be able to create the necessary resources for carrying out the proposed projects the proposed action cost-effective?*

II. General comments

Take-up Actions can be executed by one partner, but need to have a convincing European added value in its results. and will not be evaluated with Part B anonymous.

For "Trials", the status of technology, which is trialed, should be specified, together with its degree of innovation, and a description of current practice should be provided along with the new solution to be introduced. There must also be a separate description of the user business case(s)/ administrative needs, which is driving the Trial - in terms of technical and business parameters. The text should clearly specify where the innovation lies, keeping in mind that innovation can be in the form of novel technologies or novel applications of technology (e.g. new solutions, new operational practices etc.).

III.   Weights and thresholds

The following weights and thresholds apply for Trials.

Criterion	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score
1	3	
2	1	2
3	1	-
4	3	3
5	2	3

2.I.   Specific issues for FET actions

The FET programme is implemented in two parts: the **open domain** and **proactive initiatives**.

The **open domain** follows a 2-step process for proposal submission and evaluation which is described in separate Evaluation Guidelines, developed specifically for FET-Open.

Proactive initiatives consist of clusters of closely interacting projects that form as much as possible a coherent whole. Each individual project or research task is seen as part of a broader effort for advancing towards the long-term visions and objectives of the initiative.

The evaluation of proposals to proactive initiative calls follows the general principles and procedures described in the present Evaluation Guidelines but with some adjustments to account for the integrated and long-term nature of the project clusters:

First, evaluation by mail (i.e. by experts working in their own premises) is used in FET-Proactive – as well as in FET-Open – in order to ensure that all the expertise needed to assess any given proposal can be obtained.

Second, after the individual evaluation by 3 or more experts (E1/E2 forms) there is a single panel for each proactive initiative where all discussions take place. There are no separate "consensus meetings" but consensus is developed within the panel itself. The panel is also instructed to see each individual proposal as a potential part of a broader effort for advancing towards the long-term objectives of the proactive initiative. Therefore, the panel establishes its proposal ranking by considering both the individual merit of proposals as well as their inter-relations and synergies.

Furthermore, in FET-Proactive, the following specific issues are also considered when assessing proposals in relation to the <u>first</u> evaluation criterion (scientific/technological quality and innovation):

- *Contribution of proposal to advancing towards the long-term visions / objectives of the proactive initiative*
- *Whether the proposal addresses the key scientific and technological challenges of the proactive initiative*
- *Whether the proposal identifies potential cross-project activities and mechanisms to co-ordinate research and to maintain adequate interaction and information exchange with other projects in the same proactive initiative*

Weights and thresholds

The following weights and thresholds apply to FET actions:

Criterion	FET Open step 1		FET Open step 2		FET Pro-active	
	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score	Weight	Threshold/ Min.Score
1	5	3	4	3	4	3
2	1	-	1	3	1	1
3	1	-	1	-	1	-
4	2	-	2	-	2	-
5	1	-	2	2	2	2

Appendix 3 - Grant Applications

General Instruction for form completion

> *The evaluation of a Grant Application in the IST Programme conforms to the weighting and thresholds of an Accompanying Measure*

E4

The responsible Commission official will complete the first four eligibility criteria (presence of the three parts of the application and receipt at the ESP at least five months in advance[1]) on the E4 before issuing it to the evaluators. Applications failing on these criteria are not issued to evaluators; the Commission official directly completes the ESR as "Eligible - No" with an explanatory comment.

A photocopy of the E4 form is issued to two independent evaluators. After reading the grant application they should complete their copy individually, confirming or otherwise the last eligibility criterion (trans-national objective) and scoring on each of the assessment criteria; then signing and dating the form.

The responsible PO receives both forms and will draft an E4 consensus form, or if convenient the evaluators will do this jointly.[2] In the case where the differences in the results of the two evaluators are significant, the PO will consult the evaluators on their arguments and if necessary bring them in contact to reach consensus. (Should it not be possible for the two evaluators to reach a consensus, a third evaluator may be brought in, to establish either a consensus or a majority view on the points at issue).

The evaluators should sign a consensus E4 for the grant application, showing the calculated weighted score, and an appropriate integer score between 0-5.

ESR

Using the individual E4s, the responsible PO will draft the ESR, using the scores and comments of the evaluators on each of the criteria and showing the overall integer score. Where an application has failed because of eligibility criteria or one of the thresholds, this must be stated explicitly on the form, in the sections "Eligibility" or "General/overall comments" as appropriate.

The ESR should be approved and signed by the evaluators. A copy without signatures is returned to the applicants.

---

[1] Evidently, a day or two short is not significant; a month short would be. The PO must make a reasonable judgement of whether or not the applicants have tried to respect the notice period.

[2] or, if convenient, the evaluators may do this jointly

GRANT APPLICATIONS

Issues to be considered

Evaluation is based on the five FP5 criteria. Possible scores for each are:

0 -   Unsatisfactory (the application fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information)
1 -   Poor
2 -   Fair
3 -   Good
4 -   Very good
5 -   Excellent

Short comments should explain the score given. Any suggestions for modifications should be clearly explained.

Eligibility - Trans national objective: The conference/workshop/seminar/exhibition for which the grant is requested should further co-operation between actors from different Member States, or even more broadly. It should address issues of more than merely national relevance.

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation (Threshold - 3)
Does the event feature scientific and technical work of high quality? Does its main subject relate to the key scientific and technological issues of the programme and/or key action? Does it complement and support the programme's objectives? Are invited participants leading edge?

2. Community added-value and contribution to EU policies (Threshold - 4)
Is the event addressing issues at the European level and/or will it attract a Europe-wide audience? Is the expected impact of carrying out the event at European level greater than the sum of the impacts of national events? Will EU funding enhance the international aspects? Will the event contribute to the implementation or the evolution of one or more EU policies (including "horizontal" policies, such as those towards SMEs, etc.)? Does it involve issues connected with standardisation and regulation?

3. Contribution to Community social objectives
Does the event relate to:
- improving the quality of life and health and safety (including working conditions);
- improving employment prospects and the use and development of skills in Europe;
- preserving and/or enhancing the environment and the minimum use/conservation of natural resources?

4. Economic development and S&T prospects
Does the event contribute to European technological progress and in particular the dissemination of RTD results? Does the event stimulate support of economic growth? Is there a possible strategic impact, improving European competitiveness and the development of equipment or applications markets?

5. Resources, partnership and management (Threshold - 2)
Are the applicants capable of carrying out the activity? Are resources used efficiently? Is the budget appropriate to the activity (adequate in size, no profit or unnecessary expense)? Is the event adequately planned, will it be adequately publicised to the appropriate target audience? Is the approach appropriate, clear, consistent, efficient, complete?

Overall
Any general/ overall comments not given elsewhere, including any proposals for modifications (quantified if possible)

GRANT APPLICATION
E4 FORM

INDIVIDUAL

Application No. _____ Title: _____

ELIGIBILITY:

Application complete:	
Section 1.1 (organisation details)	YES / NO
Section 1.2 (description and budget)	YES / NO
Section 1.3 (supporting documentation)	YES / NO
Application submitted five months in advance	YES / NO
Trans-national objective	YES / NO

1. Scientific/technological quality and innovation (T=3) ☐ **x2** ☐
   Comments:

2. Community added value and contribution to EC policies (T=4) ☐ **x3** ☐
   Comments:

3. Contribution to Community social objectives ☐ **x2** ☐
   Comments:

4. Economic development and S&T prospects ☐ **x2** ☐
   Comments:

5. Resources, partnership and management (T=2) ☐ **x1** ☐
   Comments:

Weighted score ☐

Overall score ☐
General/overall comments:

Signed: date:

GRANT APPLICATION
E4 FORM

CONSENSUS

Application No. _____ Title: _____

ELIGIBILITY:

Application complete:	
Section 1.1 (organisation details)	YES / NO
Section 1.2 (description and budget)	YES / NO
Section 1.3 (supporting documentation)	YES / NO
Application submitted five months in advance	YES / NO
Trans-national objective	YES / NO

1.   Scientific/technological quality and innovation (T=3) ☐ **x2** ☐
Comments:

2.   Community added value and contribution to EC policies (T=4) ☐ **x3** ☐
Comments:

3.   Contribution to Community social objectives ☐ **x2** ☐
Comments:

4.   Economic development and S&T prospects ☐ **x2** ☐
Comments:

5.   Resources, partnership and management (T=2) ☐ **x1** ☐
Comments:

Weighted score ☐

Overall score ☐
General/overall comments:

Signed: date:

**GRANT APPLICATION
EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT**

Application No. _____ Title: _____

ELIGIBILITY: YES / NO

IF NO*: Comments.

*(ineligible applications are not subject to evaluation)

1.   Scientific/technological quality and innovation   ☐
     Comments:

2.   Community added value and contribution to EC policies   ☐
     Comments:

3.   Contribution to Community social objectives   ☐
     Comments:

4.   Economic development and S&T prospects   ☐
     Comments:

5.   Resources, partnership and management   ☐
     Comments:

Overall score   ☐

General/overall comments:

Appendix 4 - Panel Report

Panel report

Before a panel meeting held under Commission moderation and reported by the Panel Rapporteur, the panel members will receive the C.2, E.3, E.4 and A.2 of the proposals under discussion. They can request the Area Co-ordinator to have access to the proposal and additional evaluation material (e.g. E.1s or E.2s). After being informed on all the proposals, with further oral presentations if needed, the panel will proceed to rank all of the proposals for the Area. In exceptional cases, which must be clearly documented in the panel's report, they may decide to adapt the E.4 of one or more proposals as presented by the consensus meeting.

The panel will present its conclusions and a complete account of their deliberations in the panel report in the format shown below.

Panel report layout

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This Panel report covers the following Action Lines of the IST WP 2000
-
-

<<Reference to a general description in the overall area report, including description of which types of actions (RTD, Take-Up actions, Support measures) were covered by the panel. Only deviations from the general description should be mentioned here. >>

2. ANALYSIS OF RECEIVED PROPOSALS

<<The panel should address at least the following points: >>
- Description of the coverage of the area.
- Important problems encountered which are relevant to the evaluation and ranking process.

3. PROPOSAL RANKING

The Panel recommends that a decision of the Commission on funding of proposals will follow the ranking as given in table(s) 3.1 (- 3.3).

<<Short comments per proposal explaining the relevance and any considerations of the panel leading to the ranking. >>

XXXXX-ACRO: <<some comments on the proposal[1]>>
…….
XXXXX-ACRO: <<some comments on the proposal>>

<<For all lists. The list of proposal comments is a single list and ordered by number. >>

Table 3.1: Ranked Proposals (RTD)

Panel rank-ing	Proposal No	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed by consortium	Funding requested by consortium	3rd country*
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6 etc.						

*(*name third countries involved, if any)*

---

[1] These comments should include any issues on how to handle proposals addressing similar research in the ranking, for example clearly identify priorities between such proposals.

Table 3.2: Ranked Proposals (Take-U Actions)

Panel rank-ing	Proposal No	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed by consortium	Funding requested by consortium	3rd country*
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6 etc.						

*(*name third countries involved, if any)*

Table 3.3: Ranked Proposals (Support Measures)

Panel rank-ing	Proposal No	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed by consortium	Funding requested by consortium	3rd country*
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6 etc.						

*(*name third countries involved, if any)*

4. CLUSTERING OF RANKED PROPOSALS

<<Any suggestions if appropriate>>

5. THIRD COUNTRY PARTICIPATION AND BURSARIES IN RANKED PROPOSALS

<<Comments on mutual benefits and relevance of 3rd country participant>>
<<List of Bursaries related to ranked proposals if applicable>>

6. NON RANKED PROPOSALS

In table(s) 6.1 (- 6.3) the list of proposals which are ineligible or have failed to reach one of the thresholds are given with a short explanation in case of ineligibility.

Table 6.1: Non ranked proposals (RTD)

Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Failing		Remarks
		Eligibility: C1/C2	Threshold: Crit x	

Table 6.2: Non ranked proposals (Take-Up Actions)

Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Failing		Remarks
		Eligibility: C1/C2	Threshold: Crit x	

Table 6.3: Non ranked proposals (Support measures)

Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Failing		Remarks
		Eligibility: C1/C2	Threshold: Crit x	

The final panel report, with the ESR's annexed, will be signed by the Panel Rapporteur and the Area Co-ordinator on behalf of the panel.

Appendix 5 - Glossary

Accompanying measures	A type of RTD action, defined as such in Annex IV of the decision on FP5, contributing to the implementation of a programme or the preparation of future activities
Action line	The detailed elements of an individual Key Action
Area (Research Area)	A well-defined and coherent group of Action Lines or parts of Action Lines, to which a group of proposals are directed, and where they are subsequently evaluated and ranked in order of merit
Area Co-ordinator	Senior Commission official who supervises a Research Area, managing the allocation of proposals, the evaluation process and the panel discussion for the Area
Assistant contractor	A partner associated with a principal contractor in a Community action. An assistant contractor will sign the Contract, but works in a limited part of the RTD action and will have limited rights and liabilities
Associated States	Non-EU countries, which contribute to the funding of the framework programme, thereby entitling project partners from those countries to receive funding from the EU on the same basis as Member States
Cluster	A group of RTD actions working on a common theme or working towards common objectives in an area of interest
Concerted actions	Actions that co-ordinate RTD projects already funded
Consensus group	The readers/evaluators of a particular proposal, who meet together under Commission moderation to assess and score that proposal
Continuous submission proposals	Proposals for actions where the Commission accepts submission at any time over a long period of time
Co-ordinator (Co-ordinating contractor)	Lead contractor in a Community action, delegated by the consortium for the role of co-ordination with the Commission
CRAFT	Co-operative Research Action for Technology. A special measure designed to encourage the participation of SMEs in European research projects. It enables at least three mutually independent SMEs from at least two Member States to jointly commission research carried out by a third party
Deliverables	Reports or other practical outcomes of a project's work
Demonstration projects	Projects designed to prove the viability of new technologies which offer a potential economic advantage but which cannot be commercialised directly
Direct RTD actions	Actions carried out for the Commission by its own Joint Research Centre. A "JRC" component may also be included in work carried out by external contractors
Eligibility criteria	A number of criteria which a proposal must satisfy before it can be allowed to proceed to technical evaluation

ESP (Evaluation Service Provider)	An external contractor hired by the Commission to carry out a number of administrative and logistical support tasks during evaluations
Evaluation criteria	Five specific criteria fixed by Commission decision for the evaluation of proposals within the Fifth Framework Programme
FET	Future and Emerging Technologies, a component of the research carried out within the IST Programme
Fixed deadline proposals	Proposals received for actions where the Commission imposed a fixed deadline for receipt of proposals
Framework Programme (FP)	The multi-annual (normally five-year) programme of EC RTD Policy defining broad priorities and the overall sums of money to be allocated. It is implemented through specific programmes making up the four activities mandated by the Maastricht Treaty
Horizontal Programme	A specific programme of the framework programme covering an aspect of research applicable to all research domains, such as international co-operation, innovation, and training. The Framework Programme's first activity is comprised of several thematic programmes, whereas its second, third, and fourth activities are horizontal programmes
INCO	A specific programme within the Fifth Framework Programme "Confirming the international role of community research", which offers bursaries to young researchers from developing countries
Indirect RTD actions	Actions carried out for the Commission by external contractors following evaluation and negotiation of their proposals
IST Programme	User-friendly Information Society specific programme – Information Society Technologies Programme
JRC	Joint Research Centre of the European Commission
Key Action (KA)	Key actions, an innovation of the Fifth Framework Programme, are clusters of research projects, both small and large, which bring together activities - ranging from basic research, through applied and generic research, to development and demonstration - in a coherent whole, in order to target them strategically on a common European challenge or problem
Member	A type of participant in a Concerted action/thematic network
Model contracts	Standard forms of contract offered by the Commission
Moderating PO	Commission project officer who moderates a consensus group meeting (and also provides general support to the Area Co-ordinator)
Panel	A group of evaluators who have collectively read all the proposals in a particular Area (or sub-area), and after discussion rank them in order of merit for the Area (sub-area)
Panel rapporteur	An evaluator selected to prepare the panel report for his Area (with the support of other panel members)

Panel report	A summary report for a research Area, indicating the recommended ranking of proposals in the Area and the reasons for reaching these conclusions
PIM	Programme Integration and Management – a post evaluation strategic review
Principal contractor	Participant in a Community action with whom a contract is signed
Programme Committee	Committee of representatives from Member States and Associated States assisting in the management of a specific programme
Proposal rapporteur	The reader of a proposal who is nominated to complete the evaluation forms for it, and present the conclusions to the Area panel
Reader	An external expert (evaluator) assigned to study a particular proposal in detail
Research Area	See Area
RN	Research Networking, a component of the research carried out within the IST Programme
RTD Actions	Any action admissible under one of the Community RTD programmes in FP5 (see Annex IV of FP5 decision and IST Workprogramme)
RTD (or R&D) projects	Shared cost projects in FP5 for research, technological development and demonstrations whose goal is to obtain new knowledge in order to develop or improve products, process or services and/or meet the needs of Community policies.
SME	Small and Medium-sized Enterprises. For the Fifth Framework Programme, the common definition used throughout the Commission is being applied. This means a maximum of 250 employees, a turnover of less than €40 million or a balance sheet of less than €27 million, and less than 25% owned by one, or more, non-SMEs - except an investment or venture capital company not exercising control
SME Co-operative research projects	See CRAFT
SME Exploratory awards	Support, lasting no longer than 12 months, for preparation and exploration of an RTD proposal in one of the Specific programmes of FP5
Specific programmes	Detailed RTD programmes that implement FP5. They set out objectives for action in RTD areas or horizontal activities to be supported and the sums of money available for such support
Support measures	Activities in IST which run in parallel with RTD projects and are employed to prepare, support and facilitate the rapid take-up and transfer of technologies, experiences and know-how gained in the execution of RTD. This category includes Take-up measures, Concerted Actions and Thematic Networks, Accompanying Measures, SME support and training fellowships.

Technology Implementation Plan (TIP)	Report associated with an action indicating how the knowledge gained will be used
Thematic Programme	A specific programme in FP5 covering a particular, though broad, research area such as the life sciences or information society. The Fifth Framework Programme's first activity is comprised of several thematic programmes, whereas its second, third, and fourth activities are horizontal programmes
Third country	A country other than an EU state or Associated State
Threshold	A minimum score which must be achieved for a proposal to remain in evaluation. These are given in the IST Annex to the FP5 Manual of Evaluation Operations
Weighting	A process whereby individual evaluation criteria are assigned more or less significance, according to the nature of the action concerned. Weightings are dependent of the type of action considered and defined in the IST Annex to the FP5 manual of evaluation procedures
Work programme	A detailed description of the Action Lines and themes required to achieve the objectives of a Thematic Programme