

FP6-507728

EURON

European Robotics Network

Network of Excellence
Information Society Technologies

DR.4.1
Guidelines for evaluation

Due date of deliverable: 31/7/2004

Actual submission date: 31/7/2004

Start date of project: May 1st, 2004

Duration: 48 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:

KTH

Revision: V.1.

Dissemination Level: PU

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR EVALUATORS

Participating in evaluation of proposals for EURON
Call 1

Fixed deadline call for proposals

Call identifier: EURON/CALL 1

Version, 13 June 2004

Contents

1	EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION.....	3
2	THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS.....	4
2.1	INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS EVALUATORS.....	4
2.2	EURON STAFF.....	4
3	THE EVALUATION PROCESS.....	5
3.1	BEFORE THE EVALUATION.....	5
3.2	INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS	5
3.2.1	<i>Evaluation criteria and forms</i>	5
3.2.2	<i>Proposal marking</i>	6
3.2.3	<i>Practical guidelines for form completion</i>	6
3.2.4	<i>Conflicts of interest and confidentiality</i>	6
3.3	CONSENSUS	7
3.3.1	<i>Consensus meeting</i>	7
3.3.2	<i>Consensus meeting minute</i>	7
3.4	BOARD MEETING.....	7
3.4.1	<i>Review of consensus group results</i>	7
3.4.2	<i>Final board discussion for – PRPs, RAs, and TSs</i>	8
3.5	EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS	8
4	REPORTING.....	10
4.1	THE BOARD REPORT	10
5	FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION AND PROJECT SELECTION	10
6	ANNEXES.....	11
6.1	ANNEX I : PANEL REPORT FORMAT.....	11
6.2	ANNEX II : STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE REPORT FORMAT	14
6.3	ANNEX III : CONSENSUS MEETING MINUTE.....	17
6.4	ANNEX IV : ETHICAL ISSUES REPORT	19
6.5	ANNEX VII FORMS FOR PROSPECTIVE RESEARCH PROJECTS (PRP)	21
6.6	ANNEX VIII : FORMS FOR RESEARCH ATELIERS.....	29
6.7	ANNEX IX : FORMS FOR TOPICAL STUDIES	39

1 Evaluation documentation

The evaluation of proposals in the EURON is based entirely on the “**Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures**” that describe the general principles and the procedures which will be used in the evaluation of proposals.

These guidance notes do not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Sixth Framework Programme, the Call for proposals or the Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures.

These IST Guidance notes for evaluators are prepared on the basis of the above Guidelines. They describe the evaluation process in practical detail and they contain the evaluation forms needed to be completed at each step of the evaluation of proposals, and an indicative format for the panel report which each group of evaluators will prepare at the conclusion of their work.

For the evaluation, you will also need to consult the current **EURON Work Programme**. The Work Programme provides a detailed description of the content of the Strategic objectives and indicates which types of instruments may be used for each. The Work Programme also contains details on the eligibility and evaluation criteria which will be applied to proposals.

Three different types of instrument are available to fund activities in the EURON:

- Prospective Research Projects
- Research Ateliers
- Topical Studies

Evaluation criteria and evaluation forms differ according to the type of instrument. For each proposal which is evaluated, ONLY THE CRITERIA AND FORMS APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF INSTRUMENT MUST BE USED.

2 The roles and responsibilities of evaluation participants

2.1 Independent experts acting as evaluators

The evaluation and selection of proposals is carried out by EURON with the assistance of independent experts (evaluators).

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They must sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration prior to beginning their work. The confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

2.2 EURON Staff

EURON staff will organise a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the criteria applicable for this specific call, in full respect of the relevant procedures, rules and regulations. They will 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.

<p>EURON staff will not attempt to influence the opinion of the evaluators. Even if asked, they may not express any opinion to the evaluators on the merits or otherwise of any proposal. They may however provide additional information or assistance on request.</p>
--

3 The evaluation process

The evaluation of proposals for all instruments is carried out using the procedure described below.

Each evaluation session consists of a number of steps. Briefly, the steps are as follows:

- **Step 1: Individual evaluation of proposals**

Each proposal is evaluated against the applicable criteria by several evaluators independently, who fill in individual evaluation forms giving marks and providing comments.

- **Step 2: Evaluation consensus**

For each proposal a consensus report is prepared. The report faithfully reflects the views of the evaluators referred to in Step 1.

- **Step 3: Board evaluation**

A panel discussion is convened to examine and compare the consensus reports and marks in a given area and to make certain recommendations on a priority.

3.1 Before the evaluation

On receipt by EURON, proposals are opened, registered and acknowledged and their contents entered into a database to support the evaluation process.

Basic eligibility criteria for each proposal are also checked by EURON staff before the evaluation begins (timely arrival, minimum number of participants, completeness of proposal and scope), and proposals which do not fulfil these criteria will not be evaluated.

3.2 Individual evaluation of proposals

Each proposal will first be assessed by a minimum of three to five evaluators, chosen by EURON board from among the pool of evaluators taking part in this evaluation. Key aspects of this assessment are described below.

3.2.1 Evaluation criteria and forms

The proposal will be evaluated in terms of pre-determined blocks of evaluation criteria¹, as described in the Work Programme. The blocks of evaluation criteria list a number of detailed issues (sub-criteria or prompting questions) which the evaluator should consider during the assessment of that block. The sub-criteria or “prompts” comprising the blocks of criteria are not scored, the evaluator will only record observations on them on the form. They are to help support his/her eventual judgement on what score to assign to the criterion concerned, and also to remind him/her of issues to raise later during the discussions of the proposal.

When examining proposals, evaluators may *only* apply the evaluation criteria which are shown on the evaluation forms.

At this stage the evaluators are acting individually and independently; they do not discuss the proposal with each other, nor any third party. The evaluators record their individual opinions on special forms, the **Individual Assessment Report (IAR) form**, giving scores and comments on the evaluation criteria. These forms detail the criteria to be used.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of projects proposed, there are therefore different versions of the Form IAR for each project type. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the Form IAR for the proposal which they are evaluating.

There are as many IAR forms as there are evaluators of the proposal. Each evaluator will sign his/her own form. Signature on the IAR form closes this step of the evaluation. In signing the IAR, the

¹ “Block of criteria” refers to the main numbered headings in the work programme annex under which several evaluation issues are grouped.

evaluator also declares that he/she has to the best of their knowledge no direct or indirect conflict of interest in evaluating the proposal.

3.2.2 Proposal marking

Evaluators examine the individual issues comprising each block of evaluation criteria and mark the blocks on a six-point scale from 0 to 5. In this scheme, the scores indicate the following with respect to the block under examination:

0 -	<i>the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or can not be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information</i>
1 -	<i>poor</i>
2 -	<i>fair</i>
3 -	<i>good</i>
4 -	<i>very good</i>
5 -	<i>excellent</i>

Half marks may be given.

For all criteria a threshold score is applied, as well as a threshold on the overall score to be achieved. Proposals which fail to achieve one or more of the threshold scores will not be considered for support.

3.2.3 Practical guidelines for form completion

Assess and mark the proposal exactly as it is described and presented. Do not make any assumptions or interpretations about the project in addition to what the proposers themselves have written in their proposal.

- Make sure to use the correct form for the type of project involved.
- Keep to the evaluation criteria as stated in the forms.
- Give all required scores.
- Try to maintain consistency in your scoring throughout your work.
- Provide a brief but explicit justification of your scores. Be honest but correct, in particular when scores are low – you should use polite and correct language but do not hide the facts as your remarks may be used in the report which is sent to inform the proposers of your conclusions. It is often useful to quote short extracts from the proposal text.
- Give recommendations for modifications, if needed, particularly in the case of relatively high scoring proposals.
- Please write your forms clearly, so that they are readable by the staff.
- Remember to sign and date your forms.

3.2.4 Conflicts of interest and confidentiality

If during the evaluation itself an evaluator discovers 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 **immediately** to the EURON coordinator who will then take all necessary actions to remove the conflict of interest.

Under no circumstance may an evaluator attempt to contact a proposer on his own account, either during the evaluation session or afterwards.

It may be necessary, in exceptional cases, to seek some clarification from a proposer concerning the proposal received. Any evaluator requiring some clarification of a proposal should contact EURON staff, who will then take the necessary action.

3.3 Consensus

3.3.1 Consensus meeting

When all the evaluators of a particular proposal have completed their individual report forms (IAR), a consensus meeting is organised to discuss and agree scores for the proposal. A rapporteur will be allocated to each proposal, who will be responsible for recording the outcome of this discussion using the appropriate form(s). The discussion of the proposal will continue until a consensus is achieved i.e. a conclusion with which all agree regarding the marks for each criterion and the accompanying comments. In the event of persistent disagreement, the official supervising the evaluation of that proposal may bring in up to 3 additional evaluators to examine the proposal.

A Consensus Report (Form CR) will be prepared for each proposal as a result of consensus discussions. If consensus has not been reached, the report sets out the majority view of the members, but also records any dissenting views.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of instrument proposed, there are therefore different versions of the Form CR. Rapporteurs should ensure they are using the correct version of the Form CR for the proposal that is being evaluated.

From the consensus scores for each criterion given on the form CR, an overall score for the proposal is calculated by simple addition.

For all criteria a threshold score is applied. A threshold also applies to the overall score to be achieved. Proposals which fail to achieve one or more of the threshold scores will not be considered for support.

There is one CR form per proposal. It will be signed by all members of the consensus group

3.3.2 Consensus meeting minute

In addition to the CR form, there is a form for taking fuller notes of the consensus meeting; this is the Consensus meeting minute form CMM. While the CR form reports only the conclusions of the meeting, the form CMM will show how this conclusion developed, and on what considerations it was finally based.

There is one CMM form per proposal. It as a minimum be signed by the moderator and rapporteur or another independent expert.

3.4 Board meeting

After the consensus groups for all the proposals are completed, a EURON board meeting is called.

3.4.1 Review of consensus group results

The board will first make an overall review of the scores and opinions on each proposal given by the consensus groups.. The board may propose to revise the scores or comments which were given. While the contents of the CR forms remain unchanged, as a record of the consensus group discussion, these revised scores and comments are given on the Evaluation Summary Reports sent to the proposers (see below). The board will also justify changes in its Panel report (see below).

Proposals which have fallen below one or more of the evaluation thresholds will now no longer continue in evaluation. For each of these below-threshold proposals the board will generate an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), on the basis of the consensus report (CR), which will subsequently send to the proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal.

Proposals which have passed all evaluation thresholds continue in discussion.

3.4.2 Final board discussion for – PRPs, RAs, and TSs

For proposals for which have passed all of the thresholds, the board continues directly with the final discussion.

The EURON Staff will prepare lists in order of the overall score of each proposal. There will be a separate list per project type. These lists will be reviewed by the board, addressing specifically the question of the ordering of any proposals, which have tied scores.

The board will then prepare the ESRs for these above-threshold proposals, which the EURON staff will send out to each proposal co-ordinator, giving the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal. The ESR should not contain dissenting views – the board should resolve those cases where full consensus was not achieved at the previous step.

3.5 Evaluation Summary Reports

The Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) is the document which is returned to the proposal co-ordinator to give an account of the outcome of the evaluators' assessment of the proposal.

An ESR is sent for all proposals evaluated. Co-ordinators of proposals which failed one or more eligibility criteria, and which were therefore not evaluated, may receive a letter from EURON informing them of the reasons for exclusion on eligibility grounds rather than an ESR.

As the evaluation criteria differ according to the type of project proposed, there are therefore different versions of the ESR. Evaluators should ensure they are using the correct version of the ESR for each proposal.

The ESR is based on the scores and conclusions initially reached in the consensus report (Form CR), supported by any relevant information from the form CMM, and the EIR if used, and then reviewed and discussed by the whole board. Thus the scores and conclusions expressed on the ESR represent the combined wisdom of all the evaluators in the area concerned.

The ESR should not contain dissenting views – the board should resolve those cases where full consensus was not achieved at the previous steps.

For proposals which failed one or more of the eligibility criteria, and which were therefore not evaluated, the ESR if used will consist only of a remark in the overall comment identifying the eligibility criterion/criteria which the proposal failed. (Such proposers may receive a letter informing them of the reasons for exclusion on eligibility grounds, instead of an ESR).

For proposals which failed to reach the threshold on one or more of the evaluation criteria, the ESR will nevertheless contain scores and comments for all of the criteria, to clarify for the proposers the reason or reasons for the proposal's failure, so that if possible in a later call they may submit an improved proposal. It will contain an overall score, and the overall comment will consist only of a remark identifying the evaluation criterion/criteria on which the proposal failed to reach the threshold.

For proposals which passed the thresholds on the evaluation criteria but failed the threshold on the overall score, the ESR will contain scores and comments for all of the criteria, and an overall score. The overall comment will consist only of a remark indicating that the proposal failed to reach the required threshold on overall score.

For above-threshold proposals, evaluators should ensure that the comments contain any recommendations, which they wish to have taken into account during any possible contract negotiations. These recommendations should be as clear and specific as possible.

There is one ESR per proposal. It forms part of the Board Report and is signed off as part of that document.

4 Reporting

4.1 The Board report

Each board-review meeting will conclude its work by preparing a Board report, written to a pre-determined structure, which will summarise its activities and conclusions. The report represents the final decision of the Board. The panel report format is shown as an annex to this document.

The report will be signed, as a minimum, by three Board members,. The ESRs for all of the proposals considered by the Board will be appended to the report.

5 Finalisation of the evaluation and project selection

At this stage, the EURON staff reviews the results from the evaluators and prepare the implementation.

6 Annexes

6.1 Annex I : Panel report format

**1st call of the EURON : Call EURON/Call X
REPORT OF COMMITTEE XXX**

1. Introduction and methodology

This report covers the following aspects XXX within the 1st call of the EURON.....

The following table gives an overview of proposals dealt with by the panel:

Total proposals in panel	Ineligible	Failed threshold(s)	Proposals above threshold
100%	%	%	%

Every committee must follow the procedures given in the Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures, therefore the methods of the panel need not be described in detail unless some specific elements of the standard procedure have had a significant on the outcome of the meeting

2. Analysis of received proposals

Overview of the issues covered by the received proposals, proposal quality, important omissions or areas not covered.....

The total grant requested by all received proposals is €XXX

3. Proposal priority

The Panel recommends that the decision of EURON on funding of proposals will be based on the priority as given in the following table(s). The total grant requested by all prioritised proposals is €XXX

(Separate tables and comments per instrument type)

Prior-ity	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed (K€)	Grant requested (K€)	Other countries involved*
1						
2						
3						
4						

*(*Countries outside of the EU and Associated States)*

Individual short comments per prioritised proposal, explaining their relevance and any considerations of the panel leading to the priority list given above.

- *Pay particular attention to the reasons for the choice of priority given here to proposals which have tied scores.*
- *Highlight proposals which were evaluated as “cross-objective”*
- *For proposals involving organisations from “other countries”, comment on the significance of their participation to the project*
- *Highlight any issues of SME participation, if relevant*
- *Identify proposals requiring special attention due to either the importance of ethical issues raised or the inadequacy of the way ethical issues are addressed, if relevant*

4. Key issues

a) Clustering/merging/overlapping of prioritised proposals.

Any suggestions of proposals to be work together as a cluster; to be negotiated together as a merged project; which overlap in activity and where therefore one is first choice and one is “backup”

b) Comments on coverage of prioritised proposals

Comments concerning the relevance/coverage of the proposals which have reached the prioritised list, in terms of the technical area to be covered by this committee.

c) Recommendations for future calls

Recommendations/corrective action in future calls e.g. future need to target particular technical issues, instrument types, types of organisation, SMEs, countries....

5. Below threshold/ineligible proposals

The following table provides the list of proposals which have not been prioritised due to ineligibility or the score of at least one of the criteria falling below threshold, or the proposal falling below the overall threshold.

(E = eligibility failure; T1, T2 etc = individual criterion failure; TO = failure on overall threshold; TS = failure on multiple criteria.)

(Separate tables per instrument type)

Proposal no.	Acronym	Failing

6.2 Annex II : Strategic objective report format

1st call of the EURON: Call identifier EURON/CALL1
EVALUATION REPORT OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE XXX

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents a general analysis of the response to the call for this Strategic objective, as well as general conclusions that could be drawn. There then follows the individual reports of the various panels which participated in the evaluation of proposals for this Strategic objective.

2. RESPONSE TO THE CALL

A total of XXX proposals were received for this Strategic objective, requesting a total grant of €XXX. They were evaluated in a number of panels. The panels were defined in terms of *(describe how panels defined)*.

The proposals were distributed to these panels as follows:

Panel name	No. of proposals

Overall, a total of XXX of the received proposals (XXX%) were excluded from evaluation for various reasons (late submissions, ineligible consortium, incomplete proposals and being out of scope of the Call). Following evaluation by the external experts, XXX proposals (XXX%) were eligible and achieved scores on all criteria above thresholds. These proposals were listed in priority order by each panel. The total grant requested by all prioritised proposals in this Strategic objective is €XXX.

3. REMARKS ON THE PRIORITISATION OF PROPOSALS

Proposals for each type of instrument were evaluated in separate panels, therefore the priority lists given in each Panel report represents the final outcome of the evaluation process.

(or)

Proposals for *(name instrument type)* were evaluated in more than one panel, however each panel represented a distinct technical area to be treated separately within the Strategic objective, therefore the priority lists for *(name instrument type)* from each panel are not merged, the lists given in the individual Panel reports represent the final outcome of the evaluation process

(or)

Due to the number of proposals received, proposals for *(name instrument type)* were evaluated in more than one committee. Following the prioritisation process within each of these committees, the following merged priority list has been generated.

In addition it should be noted that....

If priority lists in different instrument panels now generate an overlap, provide recommendations for handling.

4. COMMENTS ON COVERAGE OF PRIORITISED PROPOSALS

Highlight main issues raised in reports section 4b) "Comments on coverage of prioritised proposals"

5. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CALLS

Highlight main issues raised in reports section 4c) "Recommendations for future calls"

6. PANEL REPORTS – EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORTS

The reports of the individual committees responsible for the different aspects of the Strategic objective now follow. This report concludes with the Evaluation Summary Reports for all of the proposals evaluated within the Strategic objective, arranged in alphabetical order by acronym.

6.3 Annex III : Consensus Meeting Minute

EURON**CMM**

Consensus Meeting Minute
All project types

Proposal number

Proposal acronym

Type of instrument

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 or if scores have moved above or below thresholds. Record dissenting views, if any.

The information on this form is retained in the proposal archive as a record of the evaluation decision

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

6.4 Annex IV : Ethical Issues Report

EURON**EIR**

Ethical Issues Report
All project types

To be completed only if the proposal is flagged by the Consensus group as containing ethical issues

Proposal number:

Proposal acronym:

Type of instrument:

Ethical issues – List the ethical issues found in this proposal and record any relevant comment

If this proposal passes all evaluation thresholds, it will be subject to a separate ethical review. The report of the ethical review will be appended to the ESR sent to the proposal coordinator

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

6.5 Annex VII Forms for Prospective Research Projects (PRP)

Individual Assessment Report for a PRP

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
<p>1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme 	Mark:
<p>2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the proposed project is likely to have an impact on reinforcing competitiveness or on solving societal problems • exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results • the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka) 	Mark:
<p>3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project has clearly defined and well focused objectives • the objectives represent clear progress beyond the current state-of-the-art • the proposed S&T approach is likely to enable the project to achieve its objectives in research and innovation 	Mark:
<p>4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality • the participants are well-suited and committed to the tasks assigned to them • there is good complementarity between participants • the real involvement of SMEs has been adequately addressed 	Mark:

<p>5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project management is demonstrably of high quality • there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities 	<p>Mark:</p>
<p>6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the project foresees the resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) necessary for success • the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project • the overall financial plan for the project is adequate 	<p>Mark:</p>
<p>Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)</p>	<p>Total score:</p>

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable)

- If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
- If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

EURON**CR****Consensus Report for a PRP**

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(If yes, complete EIR form)

NO YES

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

EURON**ESR****Evaluation Summary Report for a PRP**

Proposal number	Proposal name
Proposal acronym	Strategic objective

Participant name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
Total			100%		100%

Proposal abstract

1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:

4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

6.6 Annex VIII : Forms for Research Ateliers

EURON IAR

Individual Assessment Report for a Research Ateliers

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
<p>1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme 	Mark:
<p>2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposal demonstrates a clear added value in carrying out the work at European level and takes account of research activities at national level and under European initiatives (e.g. Eureka) the Community support would have a real impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome the project mobilises a critical mass of resources in Europe the exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the project 	Mark:
<p>3. Quality of the coordination (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are of demonstrably high quality the coordination mechanisms proposed are sufficiently robust for ensuring the goals of the action 	Mark:
<p>4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality the participants are well suited to the tasks assigned to them the project combines the complementary expertise of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes 	Mark:

<p>5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project management is demonstrably of high quality there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge, of intellectual property and of other innovation-related activities 	<p>Mark:</p>
<p>6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial ...) necessary for success the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project the overall financial plan for the project is adequate 	<p>Mark:</p>
<p>Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)</p>	<p>Total score:</p>

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable)

- If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
- If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

EURON CR

Consensus Report for a Research Ateliers

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the coordination (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(If yes, complete EIR form)

NO

YES

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

EURON ESR

Evaluation Summary Report for a Research Ateliers

Proposal number	Proposal name
Proposal acronym	Strategic objective

Participant name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
Total			100%		100%

Proposal abstract

1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the coordination (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:

--	--

4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 21/30</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

6.7 Annex IX : Forms for Topical Studies

EURON IAR

Individual Assessment Report for a Topical Study

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed project addresses the objectives of the work programme 	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the proposed work can only be achieved if carried out at European level the Community support would have a substantial impact on the action and its scale, ambition and outcome the exploitation and/or dissemination plans adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the project 	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed objectives are sound and the proposed approach, methodology and work plan are sufficiently high quality for achieving the objectives the applicant(s) represent(s) a high level of competence in terms of personal qualifications and/or experience the proposed activities innovative and original (<i>if applicable</i>) 	Mark:
4. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the management structure is credible in terms of professional qualifications, experience, track record and capacity to deliver 	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>) The extent to which <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project provides for the resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) necessary for success the overall financial plan for the project is adequate 	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 17.5/25</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable)

- If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
- If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

EURON CR

Consensus Report for a Topical Study

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 17.5/25</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(If yes, complete EIR form)

NO

YES

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

	Evaluator	Evaluator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

EURON**ESR****Evaluation Summary Report for a Topical Study**

Proposal number	Proposal name
Proposal acronym	Strategic objective

Participant name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
Total			100%		100%

Proposal abstract

1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:

4. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 1</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 17.5/25</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

EURON First Call for Proposals
Deadline 15 October 2004 @ 12.00 MET
DRAFT v 2004-06-13

1 Introduction

Under the European Research Network – EURON contract (FP6-NOE-507728), sponsored by the CEC-IST Future and Emerging Technologies unit, a call for proposals is hereby issued.

As part of its research coordination the network invites applications for support in terms of:

- Prospective Research Projects (PRP)
- Research Ateliers (RA) and
- Topical Research Studies (TRS)

2 Prospective Research Projects

A Prospective Research Project is a focussed effort to investigate a well-defined problem. Projects are expected to provide support to research within the subject area of the Beyond Robotics initiative and be of an exploratory nature, or test rapidly the credibility of new research ideas and concepts. They complement the research undertaken by the integrated projects, bridge the gaps, consolidating the initiative and its position at the forefront of research. A successful project is expected to generate critical input to one of the on-going IP projects in the area of “Beyond Robotics”. It may also be followed by a submission of a proposal for a regular EU project (STREP). The project proposals will be evaluated through a peer-review process, supervised by the “Network Board”. In this call it is anticipated that at most 2 Prospective Research Projects can be sponsored at an average level of funding of 100 K Euro per project and with a maximum duration of one year.

Prospective Research Projects must have a clear value to the “Beyond Robotics” programme and, as such, address one of the focal areas of:

- Hybrid bionic systems
- Cognitive Companion
- Robot ecologies

The proposed research can be related directly to one of the focal areas, be cross-cutting, or related to entirely new ideas – related to “Beyond Robotics”.

3 Research Ateliers

A Research Atelier is a focussed effort on a well-defined topic taking place at a single venue, with participation of researchers from a number of different institutions and/or companies over a limited period of time. The duration of an atelier can be from a few days to a month. The aim of an atelier is cross-institution and/or cross-discipline integration. The result of an atelier can be a roadmap or a focussed study of a particular topic. It is in particular recommended that such studies are carried out in close cooperation with the launched integrated projects. There is, however, no requirement to have direct participation from the launched IP projects.

It is expected that at most one research atelier can be sponsored at a level of 100 KEuro as part of this call.

4 Topical Research Studies

In addition to the Prospective Research Projects and Research Ateliers, a number of Topical Research Studies may be initiated, providing a very reactive and flexible funding scheme to support the investigation of innovative ideas. The aim is to generate input to the research roadmap or explore research issues of relevance to the integrated projects or the community in general. Such studies are expected to be highly focussed, with well-defined deliverables, in emerging disciplines such as cooperative systems or human-robot interaction. A topical study has a maximum duration of one year. In the present call an anticipated volume of 1-2 such studies with a budget of 30–70 KEuro is foreseen.

The projects will be organised as “direct contracts with third parties” (according to article 17 of the rules for participation) to execute a small project or a special study under the auspices of EURON.

5 Proposal structure

A proposal must be prepared according to the recommended “proposal structure”. Proposals that are too long will not be considered.

To be eligible for support independent legal entities from at least two EU member states or associated states must be involved in the effort. These partners are jointly liable, technically and financially to execute the project or study and to deliver its results. The eligibility of a legal entity to participate and receive funding complies with the general principles laid down in the Articles 4 – 8 of the Rules of Participation in EU projects. Participants must also be members of EURON.

Proposals must be submitted in hard-copy (and electronically – PDF format – on a standard ISO9660 CDROM) by the closing date (12:00 noon (MET) 15 October 2004). An ASCII version of a proposal abstract (1/2 page) is to be included on the CDROM. Proposals received too late will be returned unopened.

Inappropriately formatted or partial proposals will be disregarded. Proposals submitted by fax or email will not be considered.

6 Evaluation Procedure

A list of received proposals with key data (proposer, institution, title of study, amount of resources requested) will be circulated to the EURON Board and the Commission. Any member of the Board who has a potential conflict of interest must announce it to the co-ordinator within 1 week of the publication of the list.

A set of three international experts (the “Evaluators”) are selected for the evaluation of the proposal. The evaluators will be selected according to scientific qualifications to judge the proposal, but at the same time in a manner to ensure a balanced and fair evaluation. Thus evaluators will be selected such that they:

- represent at least two different nationalities.
- have no conflict of interest
- excellent qualifications in the area of the proposal

The reviews are carried out under a confidentiality agreement with EURON.

Electronic copies are forwarded to the evaluators (within two weeks of the deadline of the call). Evaluations are to be completed within two weeks. Special evaluation forms are provided – they are adapted versions of the evaluation forms used by the CEC for STREPs. The evaluators will be asked to adhere to the guidelines for evaluation normally used by the CEC for STREPs, CAs and SSAs as appropriate. Copies of the guidelines will be forwarded to the evaluators together with the proposals. All evaluators will be required to sign a non-disclosure form and a non-conflict form to insure against publication of confidential information, and to avoid conflicts of interest.

The received evaluation forms will be collected and made available to the EURON Board, the EURON Strategic Advisory Committee and the Commission.

The Network Board is expected to meet 5 weeks after the deadline of the call to make a final decision on the received proposals. An EU officer will be invited to the meeting as an observer. In the selection of the proposals for support the Board will adhere to the guidelines for evaluation used by the CEC as applicable. For the discussion of each proposal, board members who have earlier notified a conflict of interest will be required to leave the room while the case is being discussed. Such members are *not* allowed to express any opinion about the proposal at any time during the meeting. Within one week of the board meeting, proposers receive a written decision regarding their proposal. The decision will include an evaluation decision and a summary of the evaluations received from the international evaluators. In addition, successful proposals will be advertised through the EURON WWW facility.

7 Contract preparation

The EURON co-ordinator concludes a written agreement with the project consortium. This agreement determines the conditions for implementing the project and the respective rights and obligations of EURON and the project consortium. The agreement has to be in conformity with the EURON contract. The agreement is an adapted version of the EU FP5 contracts for "Assessment Projects". Activities are expected to start by January 1, 2005.

8 Submission of proposals

Proposals are to be submitted to

EURON Call for Proposals
C/O Centre for Autonomous Systems
Numerical Analysis and Computer Science
Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan
Teknikringen 14
SE-114 28 Stockholm, Sweden

A notification of receipt will be returned to the proposers within one week of arrival (by fax)

9 Documents: (URLs to be filled in)

- EURON Workplan (general information on EURON and scope of projects)
- Evaluation Guidelines for Projects (a draft will be made available shortly)
- Structure of a proposal
- Model Contract (TBC)

General information about EURON can be obtained from the network web facility (<http://www.euron.org>)