
Harmonized
EVALUATION Guidelines
and Criteria

Date: May 2006

Preface

This document describes the rules for evaluating project proposals for transnational collective research in the framework of the CORNET programme.

All participating organisations (ministries and funding agencies) in CORNET will be commonly referred to as funding agency, or, shortly, agency in the following description. The agency in the same country/region where the Project Coordinator is from is the so called ASSIGNED AGENCY and has the leading role in the evaluation process.

Evaluation process, Criteria and Experts

All involved agencies have agreed on a CORNET-level coordinated evaluation process, which is interlaced with their own decision process.

The paper copy of the CORNET Submission Form handed in by the Project Coordinator at his funding agency is scanned in to PDF format and e-mailed to all involved agencies. This version of the proposal is the only official version for the evaluation process. Therefore the Project Coordinator has to make sure that the proposal contains all relevant information, since subsequent addenda will not be taken into account in the evaluation process.

In-house experts of the assigned agency check the compliance of the applications with the eligibility criteria (collective character of the project, composition of the consortium, eligibility of costs etc.).

The evaluation is based on the assessment of 3 external experts. The confidentiality of the experts is secured. External experts will be recruited only in Europe, and they are required to sign a confidentiality agreement/non-disclosure agreement. By the nature of collective research and the European scope of CORNET, it is not expected, that the selection of external experts should give rise to conflicts of interest. However, if concerns exist, the partners in the collective research project consortia have to inform their agency. The names of the experts will be known to the involved agencies, but they will not be disclosed to the project consortia.

Evaluation criteria

The evaluation of the projects will be done with respect to 4 groups of indicators with corresponding sub-indicators.

Indicators I and II refer to the managerial and economic side of the project (aiming at the assessment of the financial and organisational capabilities of the applicant and his/her ability to implement the project results and transfer results to the SME community) .

Indicators III and IV refer to the technical assessment of the project, its suitability into the context of the CORNET programme and the availability of the technical expertise by the research performers.

I. Aptitude of the Applicant

- 1.1 Financial commitment of stakeholders
- 1.2 Managerial capability of the consortium leader
- 1.3 Ability to disseminate project results

II. Capability of the consortium to implement R&D results

- 2.1. Added value to the enterprises – members of the associations
- 2.2 Economic effects of the project (jobs creation etc.)
- 2.3 (Sustainable) cooperation of the associations

III. Potential Impact and Quality of the Consortium

- 3.1. Main focus on SMEs (for instance degree of SME representation by associations)
- 3.2. Dissemination strategy
- 3.3. Expertise of the research performer
- 3.4. Adequacy of resourcing of the project w.r.t. the work plan

IV. Technical/Scientific Assessment

- 4.1. Innovation
- 4.2. Risk, scientific excellence
- 4.3. Expertise of the project partners, state of the art competence
- 4.4. Quality of the approach, methodology and work plan

External experts

The expert team comprises 3 members from different countries to be appointed from the expert pool created by CORNET and the involved agencies. Experts should be independent and have no working relation with any of the consortium partners. Preferably experts from countries not involved in the project proposal should be chosen.

The evaluation catalogue assessed by the external experts includes all indicators to get an overall picture of the external expert's opinion of the project.

External evaluators are experienced, technology-oriented experts within the relevant fields. Their practical experience is expected to be preferentially from an engagement in industry rather than from university only. In order to cover also the scientific part in the proposal experts should have industrial but also a scientific background. One of the experts in the team should come from a relevant university or a RTO with relevant R&D experience.

The assigned agency only interacts with the experts appointed to the relevant project proposal.

Experts are asked to use for their evaluation the template provided in the attachment:

Responsible organisation: FFG

Composed by: Jaeger/Spiegl

Attachment

Template for external Experts to evaluate proposals in CORNET

Evaluation Statement

Project number:

Name of the Evaluator:

1. Relevance of the Project for Collective Research

Please appraise if the project fits to the objectives of collective research. Are the objectives of the R&D pre-competitive? Estimate the qualification of the consortium and collaboration strategy in terms of collective research. Does the dissemination and technology transfer strategy comply with collective research?

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

2. Quality of proposed Solution

Is the problem clearly described and scoped? Is the proposed solution adequate and feasible? Please rate the degree of innovation and novelty in relation to the state of the art. Is it research according to the Frascati Manual? (<http://www1.oecd.org/publications/e-book/9202081E.PDF>)

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

3. Adequacy of Consortium

Evaluate the qualification of the consortium and the subcontractors as well as the quality of the cooperation. Will the project be realizable within this consortium? Are the tasks adequately split up between the partners?

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

4. Adequacy of Methodology

Is the methodology adequate according to the problem and does it comply it with the state of the art of science? Are the targets obtainable with other - more efficient - means?

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

5. Adequacy of Time Schedule and Costs

Is it possible to carry out the tasks within the planned time schedule? Please evaluate if the planned costs are plausible and adequate. Evaluate the necessity of purchased material infrastructure, if applicable. Are the costs adequately split up between the partners?

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

6. Market Relevance, Implementation, Economic Impact

Please evaluate the relevance of the project to the sector, the added value to the SMEs and the economic advantages as well as social aspects of the project. Please assess the implementation of the results in the future. Are the results usable and realisable?

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade:

Overall Impression of the Project

COMMENT OF EVALUATOR

Formal Assessment of the Project

1 - outstanding, 2 – very good, 3 - average, 4 – below average, 5 - insufficient

Grade: