

ANNEX IV – EVALUATION FORM

Panel/Name of reviewer:

Name of the applicant (i.e. consortium coordinator)

Application number:

Title of proposed project:

Comments must be provided for each of following sub-criteria.

Numerical scores of the sub-criteria is made with scores ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding). Please do not use decimals (e.g. 3.5).

Rating for the three main criteria is an average of the sub-criteria (decimals not used). The final score of the project is the sum of the three main criteria. (up to 18).

Applications are scored using the scale below. There should be consistency between the numerical score and written comments.

6 = outstanding, stands out with exceptional novelty, innovativeness and renewal of science at global level

5 = excellent, extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved

4 = very good, contains some elements that could be improved

3 = good, contains elements that can be improved

2 = unsatisfactory, in need of substantial modification or improvement

1 = weak, severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

I Quality of the proposal (threshold: 5/6; rating = average of the sub-rates)

Rating (1–6)

I.1 Scientific/technological quality

Sub-rating (1–6):

Is the project scientifically/technologically significant? Does the project constitute breakthrough research and does it have potential for exceptionally significant outcomes? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, how does the collaboration contribute to this?

I.2 Novelty of the proposal

Sub-rating (1–6):

Is the project ambitious? Can the project generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices to stakeholders?

I.3 Relevance of the project to the call

Sub-rating (1–6):

How does the proposal contribute to tackle the challenge relevant to the Call?

1.4 Feasibility of the project, facilities available

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the research plan, objectives and hypotheses clearly presented and realistic? Do the applicants acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Are the research methods and materials appropriate for the project? Does the research environment (including appropriate research infrastructures) support this project and offer a wide base for researcher training?

2 Competence of applicants (threshold: 5/6; rating = average of the sub-rates)

Rating (1–6)

2.1 Competence and expertise of the applicant/consortium

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the merits and expertise of the applicants appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? Do the members of the Consortium bring complementary expertise to the project? What are the merits of the applicant to supervise doctoral/postdoctoral students (if applicable)?

2.2 Project management including budget

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the project management, resources and the division of labour and the proposed schedule appropriate and well planned? Is the budget realistic and does it support the proposed plan?

2.3 Added value of transnational Consortium and complementarity expertise

Sub-rating (1–6):

Is the combination of the research teams from all countries appropriate? Is the added value of the collaboration in terms of producing a better scientific result compared to the value that would emerge from research carried out at a national scale only, clearly demonstrated? What is the significance of the mobility plan?

3 Impact (threshold: 5/6; rating = average of the sub-rates)

Rating (1–6)

3.1 Societal impact and stakeholder engagement

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the policy application, importance of the research for solving pressing concerns/issues related to emerging contaminants in fresh water clearly demonstrated? Have the appropriate stakeholders been identified and engaged in the project?

3.2. Dissemination and exploitation of the results

Sub-rating (1–6):

What is the research plan's relevance to water RDI and are the results scientifically exploitable? Are realistic and appropriate plans in place for effective implementation, subsequent exploitation and dissemination of the outputs? Have IPR issues been adequately considered (if applicable)?

3.3 Potential outputs/results/policy relevance

Sub-rating (1–6):

What is the research plan's relevance to EU policy statements, legislative framework or management plans; standardization of methods; general increase of common knowledge in relation to the theme of the call, etc.

3.4 Ethical issues

Are ethical issues involved and if so, how are they taken into account?

Overall assessment

Final rate (3-18):

Threshold: 13/18

Main strengths and weaknesses of the project. Additional comments and suggestions.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final score of the project is the sum of the three main criteria.