

20th Call for Transnational Collective Research Project Proposals

Project Acronym	<input type="text"/>	Reference No.	<input type="text"/>
Coordinating Association	<input type="text"/>	Country / Region	<input type="text"/>

Evaluator	<input type="text"/>	Country / Region	<input type="text"/>
-----------	----------------------	------------------	----------------------

Preliminary remarks

- a. Evaluators are required to declare any potential conflicts of interest. They are required to treat applications in the strictest confidence. They are engaged as individuals, not as representatives of their employer or any other entity. They are required to carry out the assessment or evaluation themselves and not ask someone to assess or evaluate the application in their place. They must not ask anyone to give another opinion of their work.
- b. The evaluation is performed completely anonymously. ID numbers are used to keep track of evaluations. The evaluation is performed in English, other languages are not accepted. Evaluators are required to e-mail the evaluation report to **[funding agency]** before **[date]**.
- c. Evaluators are required to assess project applications with reference to the 'Application Assessment Guidelines'. They rate the quality of the project application according to three main criteria:
 - Max. 30 points: Basic Assessment (setup, and management of the project)
 - Max. 30 points: Technology and Innovation
 - Max. 40 points: Market and Competitiveness

The importance of these three criteria is differentiated as indicated by the points. The score of each of the main criteria is calculated using the scores given to several sub-criteria in each category. The sub-criteria are of equal importance, the ranking system allows an allocation of a maximum of 10 points to each of the sub-criteria. For each sub-criteria score provided, the evaluator provides comments to support the conclusion and justifies the score given. The evaluator is given an opportunity to summarise the conclusions and provide any additional comments which will help to rank the projects ('Overall Impression').

In order to guarantee that only high quality CORNET project applications are eligible for funding, a quality threshold is defined. If a project scores less than 60 % on one or more of the main evaluation criteria or less than 60 % overall, the project application is not eligible for funding within the CORNET programme.

Essential Requirements for Collective Research Projects (relevant exclusion criteria)

- a. Do the expected project results have clearly **pre-competitive** character, serving the need of a wide grouping of companies, mostly small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs)? yes no
- b. Do the expected project results meet mainly the needs of SMEs? Are the results **usable by SMEs** without interim stage at major enterprises? yes no

*For funding within the CORNET programme, both of the above mentioned requirements have to be fulfilled. If you consider one of the above mentioned requirements is **not fulfilled** and have answered with 'no', please explain your concerns about the project briefly:*

running scale

insufficient ...

... excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
below threshold						above threshold				

I. Basic Assessment

B.1 Partnership Analysis

- Well-balanced partnership?
- Added value through co-operation
- Technological capacity of project partners, personnel structure
- Managerial capacity especially of coordinating project partner

Rate (max. 10 points):

B.2 Project Structure

- Methodology and planning approach
- Milestones and deliverables

- Cost and financing structure, appropriateness of:
 - Personnel expenditures
(quantity and qualification of staff, person-months, employment level)
 - Technical equipment (if requested)
 - Subcontracting (if requested; only services aside R&D activities)
 - Co-financing (e. g. budget supplied by industry)

Rate (max. 10 points):

Rate (max. 10 points):

TOTAL: Basic Assessment Rating

/30

Expert's opinion on BASIC ASSESSMENT:

running scale

insufficient ...

... excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
below threshold						above threshold				

II. Technology and Innovation

T.1 Technological Advance – Assessment of the technology itself

- Clarity of innovation objectives (according to state of the art?)
- Appropriateness of referred literature (international sources?)
- Scientific demand of the project

Rate (max. 10 points):

T.2 Innovation – Assessment of the application of the technology

- Relevance of intended technological achievements
- Degree of innovation

Rate (max. 10 points):

- Does the intended innovation result in new products, processes, services or systems or combinations?
- Does it lead to other significant improvements of the existing use of the technologies?

Rate (max. 10 points):

TOTAL: Technology and Innovation Rating

/30

Expert's opinion on TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION:

running scale

insufficient ...

... excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
below threshold						above threshold				

III. Market and Competition

M.1 Market and Profitability – Assessment of the market as such and of the potential of the project to help SMEs for improving their access to this market

- Representativeness of associations in the sector
- Representativeness of users committee in the sector

Rate (max. 10 points):

- Dissemination strategy
- Economic potential
- Potential impact on SMEs

Rate (max. 10 points):

M.2 Competitive Advantages – Assessment of the project's long term benefits and contribution to the long term competitive position of the participants

- Strategic importance of the project
- Valorisation strategy

Rate (max. 10 points):

- Trans-national added value

Rate (max. 10 points):

TOTAL: Market and Competition Rating

/40

Expert's opinion on MARKET AND COMPETITION:

running scale

insufficient ...

... excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
below threshold						above threshold				

Assessment Overview

Basic Assessment Rating	/ 30
Technology and Innovation Rating	/ 30
Market and Competition Rating	/ 40
SUM	/100

(above threshold \geq 60 points)

Overall Impression of the Project

Please summarise your overall impression and justify the score given. Provide any additional comments which you consider will help to rank the project. Line out why you recommend (or do not recommend) the project for funding.

Date of signature _____ Signature _____

running scale

insufficient ...

... excellent

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
below threshold						above threshold				