

Guidelines for Evaluators

for

Call for Proposals – Small Grants

under the

Norway Grants 2009-2014

Hungarian-Norwegian Research Programme

Further information:

telefon: +36-1-999 44 00 email: info@norvegalap.hu

<http://www.norvegalap.hu>

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Background - Objectives of the Programme	3
3. Evaluation process	3
3.1. Drawing up of the pool of independent experts and the appointment of experts	4
3.2. Eligibility check	4
3.3. Evaluation of the proposals	5
3.3.1. First stage – individual evaluation of proposals	5
3.3.2. Second stage – consensus assessment	5
3.3.3. Ranking lists	6
3.3.4. Finalisation of the evaluation	6
4. Confidentiality and conflict of interest	7
4.1. Confidentiality	7
4.2. Conflict of interest	7
5. Selection criteria	8
5.1. Selection criteria	8
5.1.1. Detailed description of the selection criteria - Reintegration grants	9
5.1.2. Detailed description of the selection criteria – Post-doctoral fellowships	10
5.1.3. Detailed description of the selection criteria – Young talents initiatives	11
5.2. Scoring of the proposal	12
6. Individual Evaluation Form / Consensus Report template	13
6.1. Reintegration Grants	13
6.2. Post-doctoral fellowships	19
6.3. Young talents initiatives	25

1. Introduction

This document specifies in detail how the general procedures on the evaluation of proposals set out in the Regulation on the implementation of the EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2009-14, and in particular, in its Annex 12 – Rules for the establishment and implementation of donor partnership programmes falling under the Programme Areas “Research within Priority sectors” and “Bilateral Research Cooperation” are implemented in the Hungarian-Norwegian Research Programme, call for bilateral research projects.

2. Background - Objectives of the Programme

The **overall objectives** of the Norway Grants are:

1. to contribute to the **reduction of economic and social disparities** in the European Economic Area, and
2. **to strengthen bilateral relations between Norway and Beneficiary States** through financial contributions in priority sectors, including research and scholarship

The overall objective of the “**bilateral research cooperation**” programme area is to enhance **research-based knowledge** development in Hungary through **enhanced research cooperation** between Norway and Hungary.

In accordance to the Memorandum of Understanding on the implementation of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism 2009-2014 between Hungary and the Kingdom of Norway, and the Programme Agreement between the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the National Focal Point for the Norway Grants in Hungary, the Hungarian-Norwegian Research Programme shall include a small grant scheme, which will focus on **attracting excellent researchers from outside Hungary to work at a Hungarian research organisations, supporting post-doctoral researchers carrying out research, and promoting the involvement of young talents in science.**

3. Evaluation process

An evaluation of proposals submitted in response to the call for proposals is conducted in order to identify those whose quality is sufficiently high for possible funding. The evaluation process complies with the following basic principles, as laid out in article 3.5 of Annex 12:

- i) **Excellence.** Projects selected for funding must demonstrate a high quality in the context of the topics and criteria set out in the calls.
- ii) **Transparency.** Funding decisions must be based on clearly described rules and procedures, and applicants should receive adequate feedback on the outcome of the evaluation of their proposals.
- iii) **Fairness and impartiality.** All proposals submitted to a call are treated equally. They are evaluated impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants.
- iv) **Confidentiality.** All proposals and related data, knowledge and documents communicated to the Programme Operator are treated in confidence.
- v) **Efficiency and speed.** Evaluation, award and contract preparation should be as rapid as possible, commensurate with maintaining the quality of the evaluation, and respecting the legal framework.
- vi) **Ethical and security considerations.** Any proposal which contravenes fundamental ethical principles may be excluded at any time from the process of evaluation, selection and award.

3.1. Drawing up of the pool of independent experts and the appointment of experts

To evaluate the proposals submitted in response to the call, the Programme Operator and the Implementing Agency shall draw up a list of appropriate international independent experts. The pool will be drawn up from two main sources:

- a) a procurement procedure conducted by the Implementing Agency
- b) experts from the database set up for the Commission's use in the evaluation of projects in the European Union Framework Programmes for Research, who submit pre-commitments to participate in the evaluation in accordance with article 3.5.1 of Annex 12.
- c) experts may be added at any time from outside this pool.

Based on the best assessment of proposals expected to arrive - supported by statistical information from the database of pre-notified proposals – a pool of experts adequate in number and expertise to carry out the evaluation of proposals within the small grant scheme of the Programme is drawn up. This initial selection provides a sufficiently broad pool to ensure that the final choice will conform to requirements of competence and balance etc. described below.

In accordance to Annex 12, experts are required to have skills and knowledge appropriate to the areas of activity in which they are asked to assist. They must also have a high level of professional experience in the public or private sector in one or more of the following areas or activities: research in the relevant scientific and technological fields; administration, management or evaluation of projects; use of the results of research and technological development projects; technology transfer and innovation; international cooperation in science and technology; development of human resources.

The pool of experts will be drawn up using the following selection criteria

- A high level of expertise;
- An appropriate range of competencies.

Each expert contracted for the evaluation subscribes to a *Code of conduct* and signs a *Confidentiality and conflict of interest* declaration.

The list of experts to be used for evaluation sessions is decided by the Programme Operator. The final list of experts to be invited for the evaluation of proposals is approved by the President of the Programme Operator.

The names of the experts assigned to individual proposals are not made public, however, in accordance with Annex 12, once a year the Programme Operator shall publish on the internet the list of experts used for the evaluation of Projects in the research Programme.

3.2. Eligibility check

A proposal will only be considered eligible if it meets all of the following conditions:

- It is received through the on-line submission system before the deadline given in the call text.
- The Project Promoter is eligible applicant and has its seat in Hungary
- All project partners are eligible applicants, and project partners applying for funding have their seat in Hungary
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)
- The application forms and the proposal description are written in English
- The content of the proposal relates to the focus areas and funding scheme

- The requested grant amount corresponds to the minimum and/or maximum amount of funding that can be awarded according to the Call for Proposals

After submission, the Implementing Agency shall verify compliance with the eligibility criteria of the application. If an application does not comply with the eligibility criteria, the Implementing Agency shall make a decision to reject the application.

3.3. Evaluation of the proposals

At the beginning of the evaluation process, the Programme Operator provides briefing material and documentation necessary for the evaluation process for the experts, including:

- the call for proposals, the content and expected impacts of activities to be financed under the small grant scheme as described in the Programme Proposal.
- the evaluation process and procedures as well as the evaluation criteria to be applied,
- the Code of conduct
- rights and responsibilities of independent experts, and particularly conflict of interest and confidentiality obligation
- Individual evaluation reports (IER) for performing the evaluation

The briefing of the evaluators emphasizes the principles for evaluation of proposals, that all proposals are treated equally on their own merit, that the evaluation concerns the proposal as presented and that it is evaluated only against the evaluation criteria set out in the Call for Proposals.

3.3.1. First stage – individual evaluation of proposals

Based on the pool of international independent experts the Programme Operator will assign each proposal to three experts who are asked to complete a remote reading and issue an individual evaluation of each proposal.

Each evaluator of a proposal reads it in detail and makes an individual assessment of the proposal without discussion with others. He/she records his/her conclusions on an IER form, which he/she submits to the Implementing Agency electronically.

The experts are asked to indicate, if the proposal falls entirely out of scope of the call for proposals. If the proposal is considered to be out of scope by all reviewers, it may be considered to be ineligible and may not be passed on to the second stage.

The experts are asked to indicate, if the proposal deals with sensitive ethical issues.

3.3.2. Second stage – consensus assessment

In the second stage (called '**consensus assessment**') the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment, representing the common views of the individual experts.

When the last IER for a particular proposal has been submitted, the comments on the set of IERs may be transmitted to the proposal Rapporteur to prepare (if the individual report are in reasonable concordance) a first draft Consensus report.

The individual experts may convene online to arrive to discuss and agree scores and an overall score for the proposal.

Their discussion of the proposal continues until a consensus is achieved (i.e. a conclusion with which all the experts agree) regarding the comments and the accompanying scores for each evaluation criterion.

In the case of multidisciplinary projects and/or persistent disagreement, the Programme Operator may bring in additional experts to examine the proposal.

In the case that it is impossible to reach a consensus within a reasonable time, the consensus report sets out the majority view of the independent experts but also records any dissenting views.

Scores and comments of this stage are set out in the consensus report. Comments are presented in a way to be suitable for feedback to the proposal Project Promoter.

The Implementing Agency will take the necessary steps to assure the quality of the consensus reports, with particular attention given to clarity, consistency, and an appropriate level of detail. If important changes are necessary, the reports will be referred back to the experts concerned. The signing of the consensus report completes the consensus step.

3.3.3. Ranking lists

Based on the outcomes of the consensus stage the Programme Operator draws up the ranking lists.

Particular requirements for prioritisation of proposals with the same score:

The procedure for prioritising proposals which have been awarded the same score (*ex aequo*) within a ranked list is described below. It will be applied successively for every group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

- (i) The proposals will be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion (2) scientific and/or technical excellence.
- (ii) When these scores are equal, priority will be based on the scores for the criterion (4) impact.
- (iii) When these scores are equal, priority will be based on the scores for the criterion (3) quality and efficiency of the implementation of management.
- (iv) When these scores are equal, proposals that address topics not otherwise covered by more highly-rated proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.

If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on other appropriate characteristics, related to the contribution of the proposal to the overall aims of the Hungarian-Norwegian Research Programme and the Norwegian Financial Mechanism.

3.3.4. Finalisation of the evaluation

Based on the scores that are the outcomes of the consensus stage and the ranking performed according to the scores and procedures for handling proposals that have been awarded the same scores, the Programme Operator draws up and presents to the Programme Committee for approval:

An evaluation report:

- An evaluation summary report (ESR) for each proposal, including comments and scores. Where relevant, any ethical issues and any security considerations are reported;
- Three ranking lists corresponding to the small grant focus areas of the call (1. Re-integration grants; 2. Post-doctoral fellowships; 3. Young talents initiatives) including all ranked proposals after the evaluation process. The lists contain the proposals which have passed all threshold (with a final score). Where proposals on the list achieve the same score the rules for ranking tied proposals will be applied.
- A list of those proposals which have failed one or more thresholds
- A list of those proposals which having been found ineligible during the evaluation process.

- A summary of any other recommendations of the independent experts.

A draft implementation plan:

- A list of proposals it intends to select for funding, taking into account the available budget, the strategic objectives of the programme, as well as the overall balance of proposals to be funded. A suggested grant amount is determined for each of these proposals.
- A list of proposals for a reserve list, which allows for eventualities such as the failure of negotiations on projects, the withdrawal of proposals, budget savings agreed during negotiation, or the availability of additional budget from other sources.

If the budget of the proposals recommended for funding for the focus areas of the small grants does not fill out the indicative budget, the amount remaining in the budget may be rearranged between the three focus areas.

After the final approval of the evaluation report and the implementation plan by the Programme Committee, the Programme Operator issues the funding decision for each proposal recommended for funding.

After the funding decision has been issued, the Implementing Agency sends electronically a letter, together with an evaluation summary report, to the Project Promoter of each of the evaluated proposals.

4. Confidentiality and conflict of interest

4.1. Confidentiality

No proposal material is sent to an expert until he has completed and returned the Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality declaration.

All proposals (including abstracts, forms and full proposals) and evaluation documents are confidential documents that should be handled with care and treated as confidential before, during and after the evaluation process.

Experts and Programme Committee members must not disclose any information concerning proposals or evaluation to outsiders, nor should they use confidential information to their own or any other party's benefit or disadvantage. In addition, experts may not reveal to outsiders that they are assessing the work plan of a particular researcher.

Experts and Programme Committee members must not communicate with applicants.

The experts will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent, and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files upon completing the evaluation as instructed. Experts and Programme Committee members may not show the contents of proposals or information on applicants to third parties.

4.2. Conflict of interest

All persons involved in the review process are required to declare any conflict of interests according to the following criteria.

A disqualifying conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- was involved in the preparation of the proposal;
- stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted or rejected;
- has a close family relationship with any person representing an applicant organisation in the proposal;
- is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organisation;

- is employed by one of the applicant organisations
- is a member of one of the groups advising the Programme, including the Programme Planning Committee and the Programme Committee;
- is in close research collaboration with an applicant(s), or had been so in the previous three years (eg. has common projects, or has co-authored and published an article with the applicant during the past three years;
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially.

A potential conflict of interest may exist, even in cases not covered by the clear disqualifying conflicts indicated above, if an expert:

- was employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal within the previous three years;
- is involved in a contract or research collaboration with an applicant organisation, or has been so in the previous three years
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could

The experts and the Implementing Agency will endeavour to avoid any conflict of interest prior to the start of the evaluation. It may be however, that a conflict of interest is discovered at some later stage during the evaluation procedure. An expert must declare to the Implementing Agency staff a discovered conflict of interest at any time during the process. In this case he will be removed as reader/rapporteur of that particular proposal. At any later point in the evaluation, allegations of conflict of interest regarding an expert must be reported immediately to the Implementing Agency.

5. Selection criteria

5.1. Selection criteria

Selection criteria	Thresholds	Weight
1. Relevant for the focus areas of the call (Chapter 2)	YES	Precondition
2. Scientific and/or technical excellence	3/5	x1
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation	3/5	x1
4. Potential impact in terms of the objectives identified under Chapter 2	3/5	x1

A project proposal must reach an overall threshold of 10/15 to be considered for funding and be ranked.

5.1.1. Detailed description of the selection criteria - Reintegration grants

The following detailed criteria will be applied for proposals applying for reintegration grants specified as focus area (1) in Chapter 2 of the *Call for Proposal – Small Grants*

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme

- 1.1. This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the small grant focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”.

If the answer is “no”, the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer “no” should be given only in clear-cut cases.

2. Scientific and/or technical excellence

- 2.1. Innovativeness of proposed research - originality of project idea, state-of-the-art knowledge of literature and references, ambition and challenge to address scientific or technological problems of current interest and their relevance to an international level of expertise.
- 2.2. Appropriateness of approach - methods proposed have to be sound, rigorous, state-of-the-art and appropriate to the proposed investigation, proposed goals are achieved using a methodology/approach presenting the level of risk that is inherent to a challenging research project.

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management

- 3.1. Competence, expertise, international experience of the researcher(s) to be reintegrated; competence and expertise of the host institution; gender balance of the team at the host institution. Reintegrated researcher’s knowledge and experience in the field of research and his/her general qualifications to lead the project, relevance and strengths of host institution (including resources and infrastructure), quality of previous work of the researchers involved, level of integration of the reintegrated researcher(s).
- 3.2. Feasibility and efficiency of the project plan - schedule and milestones, compatible with resources, either available or requested, appropriateness of human resources (number of personnel and their qualifications) per partner, appropriateness of budget with respect to planned work.

4. Potential impact of the project

- 4.1. Contribution to capacity and competence building - how the project will build the experience and competence of the researchers/ organisations involved.
- 4.2. Intended short-term outcomes, for example - doctoral or post-doc training, ambition and balance of acquisition of expertise, actual research work and dissemination of results, dissemination of the research results among the wider public.
- 4.3. Intended long-term outcomes - planned strategies for long term integration of experienced researcher(s), for future capacity and competence building of the team, for disseminating and using results during and after the project, exploitation of intellectual property generated, technical innovations, spin-offs, raising of scientific awareness, improvement of quality of life; intended technical, economic, environmental and societal impacts.

5.1.2. Detailed description of the selection criteria – Post-doctoral fellowships

The following detailed criteria will be applied for proposals applying for post-doctoral fellowships specified as focus area (1) in Chapter 2 of the *Call for Proposal – Small Grants*

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme

- 1.1. This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the small grant focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”.

If the answer is “no”, the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer “no” should be given only in clear-cut cases.

2. Scientific and/or technical excellence

- 2.1. Innovativeness of proposed research - originality of project idea, state-of-the-art knowledge of literature and references, ambition and challenge to address scientific or technological problems of current interest and their relevance to an international level of expertise.
- 2.2. Appropriateness of approach - methods proposed have to be sound, rigorous, state-of-the-art and appropriate to the proposed investigation, proposed goals are achieved using a methodology/approach presenting the level of risk that is inherent to a challenging research project.

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management

- 3.1. Competence and expertise of the researcher(s) and the host institution; gender balance of the team at the host institution. Researcher’s knowledge and experience in the field of research and his/her general qualifications to lead the project, relevance and strengths of host institution (including resources and infrastructure), quality of previous work of the researchers involved, level of integration of the researcher(s) conducting post-doctoral research.
- 3.2. Feasibility and efficiency of the project plan - schedule and milestones, compatible with resources, either available or requested, appropriateness of human resources (number of personnel and their qualifications) per partner, appropriateness of budget with respect to planned work.

4. Potential impact of the project

- 4.1. Contribution to capacity and competence building - how the project will build the experience and competence of the researchers/ organisations involved.
- 4.2. Intended short-term outcomes, for example - post-doc training, ambition and balance of acquisition of expertise, actual research work and dissemination of results, dissemination of the research results among the wider public.
- 4.3. Intended long-term outcomes - planned strategies for long term integration of post-doctoral researcher(s), for future capacity and competence building of the team, for disseminating and using results during and after the project, exploitation of intellectual property generated, technical innovations, spin-offs, raising of scientific awareness, improvement of quality of life; intended technical, economic, environmental and societal impacts.

5.1.3. Detailed description of the selection criteria – Young talents initiatives

The following detailed criteria will be applied for proposals applying for young talent initiatives specified as focus area (1) in Chapter 2 of the *Call for Proposal – Small Grants*

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme

- 1.1.** This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the small grant focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”.

If the answer is “no”, the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer “no” should be given only in clear-cut cases.

2. Scientific and/or technical excellence

- 2.1.** Innovativeness and appropriateness of proposed approach - originality of project idea, ambition to support young talents in addressing scientific or technological problems.

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management

- 3.1.** Competence, expertise of the project promoter’s and project partners’ (if applicable) project team; gender balance of the teams. Project promoter’s knowledge and experience in the field of science, technology, and research and his/her general qualifications to lead the project, relevance and strengths of partner organisation(s) (including resources and infrastructure), quality of previous work in supporting youth talents at partner organisation(s), depth of cooperation of project partners with research organisations (if applicable).
- 3.2.** Feasibility and efficiency of the project plan - schedule and milestones, compatible with resources, either available or requested, appropriateness of human resources (number of personnel and their qualifications) per partner, appropriateness of budget with respect to planned work.

4. Potential impact of the project

- 4.1.** Contribution to capacity and competence building - how the project will build interest, capacity and competence of young talents in science and technology.
- 4.2.** Intended long-term application of outcomes - planned strategies for further nurturing of young talents beyond the project.

5.2. Scoring of the proposal

Experts examine the issues to be considered comprising each evaluation criterion, and score these on a scale from 0 to 5. Half points may be given. For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments:

Score	Explanation
0	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
1 (poor)	The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2 (fair)	While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
3 (good)	The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
4 (very good)	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.
5 (excellent)	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Top scores should only be awarded to proposals of exceptionally high quality (high international calibre and major scientific impact). Comments on every score to justify the opinion should be given in the IER in sufficient detail to form a basis for the preparation of consensus reports, and in the consensus report as feedback to the applicants.

6. Individual Evaluation Form / Consensus Report template

6.1. Reintegration Grants

Project identification number	
Project acronym	
Project title	
Reviewer Code	

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme	
<p>1.1. This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the thematic focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the "Call for Proposals – Small Grants".</p> <p>If the answer is "no", the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer "no" should be given only in clear-cut cases.</p>	<p>Please indicate</p> <p>Yes / No</p>
<p><i>Please note that there is no need to further evaluate the proposal if it is not coherent with the focus areas of the Programme identified in Chapter 2 of the "Call for Proposals – Small Grants"</i></p>	



<p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p><u>Justification of scores:</u></p> <p>2. Appropriateness of approach - methods proposed have to be sound, rigorous, state-of-the-art and appropriate to the proposed investigation, proposed goals are achieved using a methodology/approach presenting the level of risk that is inherent to a challenging research project.</p> <p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p><u>Justification of scores:</u></p>	
---	--

1 (poor) The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 (fair) While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 (good) The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4 (very good) The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5 (excellent) The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Page 15 of 30

Page 16 of 30

<p>4.3. Intended long-term outcomes - planned strategies for for long term integration of experienced researcher(s), for future capacity and competence building of the team, disseminating and using results during and after the project, exploitation of intellectual property generated, technical innovations, spin-offs, raising of scientific awareness, improvement of quality of life; intended technical, economic, environmental and societal impacts.</p>	
<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p><u>Justification of scores:</u></p>	

<p>In case of multi-disciplinary projects, do you agree with the declaration of the applicant that the major focus of the proposal is the thematic focus area indicated by the applicant?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>No</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Don't Know</p> <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Remarks:</u></p> 			

<p>Total score</p>	<p>Overall Score (overall threshold 10/15)</p>
<p><u>Overall remarks:</u></p> 	

Does the project give rise to any ethical issues?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
IF YES: Have they been sufficiently addressed or do they need to be addressed more specifically?			
<u>Remarks:</u> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 100px; opacity: 0.1; transform: rotate(-30deg); pointer-events: none;">DRAFT</div>			

6.2. Post-doctoral fellowships

Project identification number	
Project acronym	
Project title	
Reviewer Code	

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme	
<p>1.1. This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the thematic focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”.</p> <p>If the answer is “no”, the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer “no” should be given only in clear-cut cases.</p>	<p>Please indicate</p> <p>Yes / No</p>
<p><i>Please note that there is no need to further evaluate the proposal if it is not coherent with the focus areas of the Programme identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”</i></p>	



2 0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (poor) The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 (fair) While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 (good) The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4 (very good) The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5 (excellent) The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Page 21 of 30

Page 22 of 30



<p>4.3. Intended long-term outcomes - planned strategies for long term integration of post-doctoral researcher(s), for future capacity and competence building of the team, for disseminating and using results during and after the project, exploitation of intellectual property generated, technical innovations, spin-offs, raising of scientific awareness, improvement of quality of life; intended technical, economic, environmental and societal impacts.</p>	
<p><u>Strengths:</u></p> <p><u>Weaknesses:</u></p> <p><u>Justification of scores:</u></p>	

<p>In case of multi-disciplinary projects, do you agree with the declaration of the applicant that the major focus of the proposal is the thematic focus area indicated by the applicant?</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Don't Know</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p><u>Remarks:</u></p>			

Total score	Overall Score (overall threshold 10/05)
<u>Overall remarks:</u>	

Does the project give rise to any ethical issues?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
IF YES: Have they been sufficiently addressed or do they need to be addressed more specifically?			
<u>Remarks:</u> <div style="text-align: center; font-size: 4em; opacity: 0.1; transform: rotate(-30deg); pointer-events: none;">DRAFT</div>			

6.3. Young talents initiatives

Project identification number	
Project acronym	
Project title	
Reviewer Code	

1. Relevance in relation to the objectives and prioritised areas of the Programme	
<p>1.1. This criterion is considered an elimination criterion. The project proposal should be assessed if it fits the thematic focus areas identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”.</p> <p>If the answer is “no”, the project is rejected and there is no need for further evaluation. Please note that the answer “no” should be given only in clear-cut cases.</p>	<p>Please indicate Yes / No</p>
<p><i>Please note that there is no need to further evaluate the proposal if it is not coherent with the focus areas of the Programme identified in Chapter 2 of the “Call for Proposals – Small Grants”</i></p>	



3 0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (poor) The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 (fair) While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 (good) The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4 (very good) The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5 (excellent) The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Page 27 of 30

4. Potential impact of the project		Score: (Threshold 3/5)
4.1. Contribution to capacity and competence building - how the project will build interest, capacity and competence of young talents in science and technology.		
<u>Strengths:</u> <u>Weaknesses:</u> <u>Justification of scores:</u>		
4.2. Intended long-term application of outcomes - planned strategies for further nurturing of young talents beyond the project.		
<u>Strengths:</u> <u>Weaknesses:</u> <u>Justification of scores:</u>		

In case of multi-disciplinary projects, do you agree with the declaration of the applicant that the major focus of the proposal is the thematic focus area indicated by the applicant?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Remarks:</u>			

Total score	Overall Score (overall threshold 10/15)
<u>Overall remarks:</u>	

Does the project give rise to any ethical issues?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Don't Know <input type="checkbox"/>
IF YES: Have they been sufficiently addressed or do they need to be addressed more specifically?			
<u>Remarks:</u>			

Declaration – Individual Evaluation Form

By completing and returning this form, I confirm the following:

	I am not aware of any circumstances that would disqualify me from evaluating this application.
	I have read and understood the criteria I have been asked to use for evaluating the application as well as the description of the scoring scales.
	I understand and accept the guidelines for evaluating applications for the call for proposals for the Bilateral Research Projects under the Hungarian – Norwegian Research Programme.
	I am qualified to conduct this assessment.

Name	
Signature	
Date	