



National Research Council



Executive Agency for Higher Education,
Research, Development and Innovation Funding

THE NATIONAL PLAN FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND INNOVATION 2015-2020, PNIII

**Subprogramme 1.1 – Human Resources,
Research projects for stimulating
young independent teams 2021 Call for proposals**

Guidelines for Experts (Evaluators)

www.cncs-nrc.ro
www.uefiscdi.gov.ro

Content:

1. General Information of the call 3

2. Governance of the call 3

3. Conflict of Interest.....4

4. Contractual agreement4

5. Evaluation process 5

 5.1. General principles of evaluation (for individual/consensus/panel step)5

 5.2 Task of expert evaluators.....6

 5.3 Proposal evaluation stages 7

6. Transparency 13

7. References 13

Romanian National Research Council and its executive agency, UEFISCDI, welcome you as a scientific evaluator for the Research projects for stimulating young independent teams Call 2021 (TE - 2021). This document specifies in detail the evaluation process, its inputs and outputs, and defines the responsibilities of the participants in the process.

1. General Information of the call

The major goal of this call is to support young researchers with PhDs in order to create or consolidate their own research team and an independent research programme. The Call is addressed to young researchers from Romania and from abroad, with achievements demonstrated through the quality and the international recognition of their scientific results.

- ✓ The maximum funding granted for a project, with a maximum duration of 24 months, is 450.000 lei (about 93 K EUR).
- ✓ The budget allocated to this call for proposals, for the entire implementation period, is 70.000.000 lei (about 14.55 Million EUR).
- ✓ The estimated funding rate is 22.6%.

The selection of the project proposals for funding is based strictly on their merits, assessed through peer review evaluation performed by experts in the field, with excellence as the sole criterion.

2. Governance of the call

The National Research Council is an advisory body of Ministry of Research, Innovation and Digitization (MCID). The NRC consists of representatives of national RDI system (academia, national research institutes, Romanian Academy), having a scientific profile internationally recognized. The NRC is the scientific coordinator of the call and supervises the activity of UEFISCDI.

The Executive Agency for Higher Education, Research, Development and Innovation Funding, UEFISCDI, is a research funding agency. It organizes competitions and subsequently monitors the implementation of research projects accepted for funding. UEFISCDI manages approximately 22% of the public funds allocated to research, development and innovation.

The expert evaluators are internationally recognized independent experts who meet the selection criteria according to the call documents. They are responsible for the scientific evaluation of the submitted proposals according to the evaluation criteria.

The experts perform the work in a personal capacity and must not represent any organization. During the evaluation process an expert could receive the task of Rapporteur (may act as both evaluator and Rapporteur for a number of allocated projects).

The Scientific Officers (SOs) are representatives of the National Research Council (avoiding potential conflict of interest) whose role is to support and monitor the evaluation process, ensure that all steps and procedures are strictly followed. These SOs also check the quality of the Individual Evaluation Reports (IERs) and Consensus Reports (CRs) and the consistency between comments and scores, at any stage (i.e., both before and after submission). When necessary, they contact the Experts to ask for clarifications, to pinpoint potential conflicting statements or inappropriate/incorrect statements. All such communication will be carried out exclusively in the online evaluation platform. Under no circumstances the scientific officers (SOs) will be involved in the evaluation process, interfere with

the experts' assessment of the proposals or influence their decisions.

3. Conflict of Interest

Experts must declare that they can carry out the evaluation of a proposal with total confidentiality, impartiality and competence. They must not find themselves in situations where their impartiality might be questioned, or that could raise suspicion on their recommendations being affected by elements that lie outside the scope of the evaluation.

A disqualifying conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- was involved in the preparation of the project proposal;
- stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted;
- has a close family relationship with the applicant;
- works in the same institution as the applicant or was employed by the applicant's organization within the previous 3 years;
- is involved in a contract or research collaboration with the applicant or had been so in the previous 3 years;
- has co-authored a scientific publication with the applicant in the last 3 years;
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

Before starting the assessment of proposals allocated to them, the evaluators will need to login at the Submission and Evaluation platform, www.uefiscdi-direct.ro. Upon login, the evaluators get access to the Principal Investigator/Project Leader information and the proposal's summary of the respective allocated proposals. This will allow the experts to check their potential conflict of interest and directly announce the UEFISCDI staff if such conflicts are identified. Full access to the proposal is given after the expert has confirmed that there is no conflict of interest.

The expert evaluators must notify UEFISCDI, via email/in writing, at any moment during the evaluation process, if they become aware that either one of these conditions is not satisfied or that they are in conflict of interest. When a potential conflict of interest is reported by an expert or brought to the attention of UEFISCDI by other means, UEFISCDI will analyse the circumstances and decide on a case-by-case basis whether the conflict is real. In the latter case, the expert will be excluded from the evaluation of the respective proposal.

Once you have confirmed that you do not have a conflict of interest, you will be given full access to proposals.

4. Contractual agreement

The relationship between UEFISCDI and the expert evaluators is defined by a contractual agreement written and signed by both parties. By signing this agreement, the expert evaluators accept the conditions regarding the evaluation tasks, the confidentiality, the conflict of interest, and the use of personal data by UEFISCDI, according to the provisions of the Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR) and to the Law 190/2018 on the protection of natural persons with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data. More details are available at: <https://uefiscdi.ro/protectia-datelor-cu-caracter-personal>. UEFISCDI cannot allocate proposals to an expert who has not been officially appointed (i.e., the expert has signed the contractual agreement

and, in doing so, has agreed to the terms laid down in it, including, in particular, confidentiality and conflict of interest aspects).

The evaluators will be remunerated for their activities after the finalization of the evaluation process. The following expenses will be covered by the call:

- 55 € (49 € net amount) evaluation fee per one individual evaluation;
- 55 € (49 € net amount) additional fee per proposal assigned as Rapporteur;
- 275 € (247 € net amount) fee per day for participation in panel meeting.

The expert must sign the “Contractual Agreement” with all the appendixes and upload them to the evaluation platform (dedicated section).

Omission to upload the „Contractual Agreement” and its appendixes, in due time, to the dedicated section of the online evaluation platform, will lead to delay of payment for the activity as expert evaluator/Rapporteur!

5. Evaluation process

The evaluation process is described in the Call document, <https://uefiscdi.gov.ro/resource-825020-information-package-te-2021-english-version.pdf>.

The eligibility check is made by UEFISCDI staff. If, during or after completion of the evaluation phase, a non-compliance with any of eligibility criteria is found, the project proposal will be declared ineligible and will be excluded from the competition.

5.1. General principles of evaluation (for individual/consensus/panel step)

- ✓ The expert must assess the proposals by themselves – do not delegate this task to anybody else.
- ✓ The expert should evaluate the proposal as it is, not as it could be or as the expert would like it to be, and without giving any recommendations or suggestions.
- ✓ Each criterion/sub criterion must be addressed by a list of Strengths/Weaknesses of minimum 200 and maximum 2000 characters. Comments should be delivered as a bullet point list of strengths (+) and weaknesses (-), listed separately, under the titles “Strengths” and “Weaknesses”. General comments or comments that describe parts of the proposal are not acceptable.
- ✓ Each argument should be placed under the specific criterion, with great care of not mixing criteria (e.g., comments about the work plan will not be placed under “State of the art” or comments about the novelty of the project should not be placed under “Quality of the Principal Investigator”).
- ✓ All comments should be clear statements, based on facts presented in the proposal and not on opinions of the experts (e.g. comments as “I think that”, “My impression is”, “It seems that”, “The applicant should”, “It may be better”, etc. must be avoided).
- ✓ All facts that are considered relevant to the current proposal should be considered, regardless of the section of the proposal where these are to be found. E.g., if the proposal describes the work plan in the “Project Feasibility” section, it must be carefully assessed.
- ✓ Any comment referring to inexistent or irrelevant criteria for the present competition is considered a procedural mistake which may lead to a successful redress and justify a re-evaluation of the proposal. Never penalize a proposal based on information that the applicant

was not expected to provide (e.g., *do not assess the TRL since these are basic research projects, or do not assess socio economic impacts if these are not relevant for the domain/area or are not specifically required; please do not confuse socio economic impact with dissemination*).

- ✓ The comments should assess the quality of the described criterion under evaluation and not summarise it or suggest improvements.
- ✓ A weakness should be addressed only once so that double penalization does not occur. (E.g., *the methodology may be weak, which may reflect in evaluating both criteria 2.2 and 2.3. However, the expert must decide where to address the criticism and penalize the proposal only once. A too small number of citations may be referring to “research results” (1.1) and “visibility and impact” (1.2); however, they should be addressed only in criterion 1.2*);
- ✓ The IER must be carefully checked for conflicting statements, especially when these may pop up under different criteria. (E.g., *a weakness could be that the proposal has not sufficient novelty (C1) while a strength would be that the proposed methodology is novel (C2); these statements must be harmonized*); Remember that IERs are sent to the applicants and comments in IERs must be carefully prepared in order to contain clear weaknesses and strengths of the proposal.
- ✓ The expert must treat all proposals equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits. Comments that hint, indicate or refer to names, numbers, gender, institutions, nationality, and age are strictly forbidden.
- ✓ There is no scoring at the individual evaluation stage.
- ✓ Scores are proposed AFTER the Consensus Report is finalized and they must fully reflect the balance between Strengths and Weaknesses (and not vice versa). Scores must reflect the overall assessment of a criterion and the experts must use the full range of scores to appropriately highlight the quality of the proposal (E.g., *it is not correct to have a score of 4.5 for a criterion where only positive comments are listed, without any weaknesses; equally wrong is to find a major weakness, as, e.g.: The methodology does not support the proposed solution and scoring it with 4.0*);
- ✓ The panel members will analyse all proposals with no consensus reached or above the threshold (80 points) and will prepare the final report which will be sent to the Principal Investigator.
- ✓ The experts should keep in mind that they are evaluating a project proposal and not a research paper. The comments should assess the quality of the described criterion under evaluation and not summarise it or suggest improvements.

A personal touch to the experts: Please, **evaluate the proposal as you would like it to be evaluated if it were yours: be objective, dispassionate, unbiased, fair and polite.**

5.2 Task of expert evaluators

The expert evaluators are required to:

- read the “Call documents” and the “Guide for Experts”;
- inform UEFISCDI about a disqualifying or a potential conflict of interest;
- read and objectively evaluate the assigned project proposals;
- meet all deadlines of the evaluation process;

- fill in and submit the evaluation sheet for each assigned project proposal, providing comprehensive comments that evaluate the proposal in a critical way, addressing all the evaluation criteria for each point, avoiding summarizing and advising on improvements, clearly highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal as it was submitted by the applicant and not its potential;
- read the rebuttal (if any);
- actively participating in consensus discussions regarding all assigned project proposals, by using the "forum" type interface available on the online evaluation platform; comments at the consensus stage are compulsory;
- elaborate the consensus report (Rapporteurs only) based on the individual evaluations, the rebuttal (if any) and the discussions with the other evaluators and ultimately agree the scores for each evaluation criterion that fully reflects the agreed comments in the final evaluation report.
- not disclose the proposals assigned to third parties;
- communicate with the assigned Scientific Officer from the National Research Council and Technical Officer from UEFISCDI for any issue that might appear at any moment during the evaluation process;
- take part at the panel meeting (panel members are mainly Rapporteurs).

5.3 Proposal evaluation stages

According to the Document Call, the Funding Application uses Times New Roman font type, 12 font size, 1.5 line spacing and 2 cm margins. Any modification to these parameters (excepting the tables, figures or their captions) is forbidden. **The pages exceeding the established limits will not be taken into consideration in the evaluation process.** The imposed number of pages (Section C – Funding application) does not contain the bibliographic reference; these will be written on additional pages. For each section, the text marking the information and the mandatory sections of the application will be maintained.

Observation: Unfortunately, the large numbers of proposals not respecting the template (more than 50%), imposed us to accept all these proposals as eligible. However, the experts will be specifically informed about the project proposals which are not complying with the template of the funding application, and they will need to pay special attention to these projects.

5.3.1. Individual Evaluation. Each eligible proposal is evaluated independently, online, by at least 3 experts, using the platform www.uefiscdi-direct.ro. The Individual Evaluation Report (IER) provides a list of strengths (grouped under “Strengths”) and weaknesses (“Weaknesses”) for each evaluation (sub) criterion, according to the evaluation sheet (*shown in section 5.3.6 of this Guide*).

- ✓ **No scores are awarded in the Individual Evaluation Report!**
- ✓ **Information found in pages that exceed the maximum limit for each section will be disregarded!**

To ensure a fair and homogeneous evaluation across a specific domain, the expert will have access to the statistical chart of all competing Principal Investigators/Project Leaders and as well as to the B2 section (*Visibility and impact of the scientific contribution of the project leader*).

When all IERs have been submitted, the experts will have access to each other’s comments and may adjust their own remarks during this phase. This is required especially when there are conflicting statements, which should be solved before the rebuttal.

5.3.2. Rebuttal. The IERs are sent to the applicants, with the invitation to submit a rebuttal on the comments expressed by the experts within five working days. The rebuttal is limited to 6.000 characters (including spaces) and consists in counterarguments strictly regarding the criticism formulated by evaluators. The applicant should not include in the rebuttal any supplementary information. *New facts or information that appear in the rebuttal but have not been described in the proposal shall be disregarded.* The experts should carefully read the responses of the applicant and assess whether, after checking with the proposal, they maintain their opinion. The answer of the applicant is not compulsory, and its absence will not affect the next stage of the evaluation process.

5.3.3. The Consensus Report (CR). After rebuttals are received from the applicants, the evaluation process enters the consensus phase, under the coordination of a Rapporteur, selected among the three initial experts. The task of the Rapporteur is to coordinate the consensus discussions through a “forum” type interface available on the online evaluation platform, taking into consideration the applicant’s rebuttal (if any). The Rapporteur will identify agreements as well as divergences in the IERs, will exchange views with the other experts and will propose comments acceptable to all the experts involved. Where the views are very different, the Rapporteur will engage the other two experts in a focused discussion on the major disagreements and will seek to clarify any difference of opinion and contradictions. All experts have to actively participate in the discussion and clearly express their opinion in a reasonable time (5 working days after the discussion started). Please **note** that the CR is NOT a collection of all statements from each IER, but comments that reflect the opinions of all experts regarding the evaluated criteria.

a) **Once the consensus is reached**, the Rapporteur will write the CR in the form of a bulleted list of Strengths and Weaknesses for each criterion. The comments in the final CR must be clearly formulated, reflecting opinions of all experts. In brief, the CR MUST NOT contain: i) any reference to the applicant’s name, gender, age, institutional affiliation or the other experts involved and their IERs; ii) copy-pasted parts of the proposal. Comments MUST be comprehensive, clear, refer to all sub criteria and not limited to one short sentence, explain weaknesses. Comments MUST NOT make suggestions for improvements.

The Rapporteur will propose scores for each criterion, AFTER reaching consensus on the comments and strictly in agreement with the balance between the final comments listed as Strengths and Weaknesses. Keep in mind that the CR gives the final agreed view of the proposal. Everyone’s voice must be heard and all must agree to the final scores and comments. **Both high and low scores must be supported by appropriate comments. Ensuring consistency between comments and scores is of paramount importance to guarantee a good quality CR.** The other two experts will then express their opinion on the CR and scores by voting “agree” or “disagree” on the same platform.

If all experts agree on the CR, the consensus is reached. The proposals above the threshold of 80 points will enter in the evaluation panel meeting step.

For the proposals below threshold of 80 points, the CR containing the agreed scores becomes the final report which is transmitted to the applicant.

b) **If the consensus is not reached**, the expert(s) who has (have) voted “disagree” will be asked to detail(s) the reasons for disagreeing with the CR for any particular criterion. The scores and comments provided by the disagreeing expert for the criterion or criteria in question will be part of the overall Consensus Report. Following the Individual Evaluation, the CR will be available to all Panel

members during the Panel Evaluation.

5.3.4 Evaluation Panel Meeting

Proposals for which no consensus has been reached and those above the threshold of 80 points awarded in Consensus Report will be analysed/discussed in the expert panels, which will establish the final hierarchy of the projects.

Each panel member, prior to the panel meeting, will have access to the project proposals, the comments of the expert evaluators, CRs and the rebuttals (if any) for all projects allocated to the panel. In addition to the Rapporteur initially assigned to a project, for each project another panel member will be assigned, who will have the task of carefully reading all the information related to a particular project.

The panel will analyse the projects for which consensus has not been reached and will establish, the score for each non-consensual criterion. Then, to establish the final hierarchy of research projects, the projects are discussed based on the evaluation criteria. Based on the comments in the CR, the panel may decide that scores must be adjusted if this is deemed necessary by the majority of panel members, to ensure the homogeneity of the evaluation within each domain.

The decisions of the panel can be made only with the approval vote of at least 2/3 of the panel members. If such a majority does not exist the final score of the project is calculated as the average of the scores proposed at the panel level. The decision will be motivated by a report from the panel. This report is sent to the Principal Investigator/Project Leader at the end of the evaluation.

The panel meetings are coordinated by a *chair* and a *co-chair*, members of the National Research Council, whose areas of scientific expertise are different from the domain of the panel. They will moderate the panel discussions without interfering in decision making.

5.3.5. Quality check of the reports (IER /CR/Panel Report)

The evaluation process will be monitored during both individual and consensus steps by the **Scientific Officers**. They will assist the funding agency, UEFISCDI, with evaluation management and monitoring. The Scientific Officers will not read the proposals and will not assess the scientific content of the IERs or CRs. They will merely point out issues that decrease the quality of the IER or CR (see above), such as:

- putative conflicts between perceived strengths and weaknesses (e.g., the same aspect of the proposal is identified both as a strength and as a weakness);
- inadequate comments as, e.g., comments placed under the wrong criterion or comments about irrelevant issues which are not required by the call;
- mismatches between comments and scores in the CR (e.g., a score of 4.5 in the absence of any identified weakness);
- names, age, gender, numbers etc. (see above);
- other issues that may decrease the quality of the report.

5.3.6 Evaluation Sheet

Make your judgment against the official evaluation criteria, as stated in the Evaluation Sheet, and nothing else. Please deliver your comments as a clear bullet point list of comments listed as

Strengths (+) and Weaknesses (-). When no weakness is identified, the Report should state: “Weaknesses. No major weakness identified.”

1. Principal investigator (40% of the total score)

The expert should assess to what extent the past achievements of the researcher (enumerated in sections B1, B2, B3, B4) guarantee and/or contribute to the success of the current proposal.

Criterion 1.1 Quality of the PI’s research output - 40% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See sections B1 and B4 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extent the PI’s research has led to progress in their field of expertise, in general (i.e. not only in the narrow field/theme of the project). Comment on the importance of the PI’s scientific discoveries, as reflected in their track record or other achievements.

Criterion 1.2 Visibility and impact of the PI’s research output - 30% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See section B2 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extent the PI’s scientific output is internationally recognized. Comment on the international visibility of the PI’s scientific output as reflected, for example, in citation in top journals, citation number, H-index and/or ranking (Q1-Q4) of their published work.

In the case of the Humanities, please take into account the relevance and impact of the journals and publishers for the professional sub-field of the PI, as well as the presence of specific publications in the online catalogues of major international libraries.

In the field of Mathematics, while the use of numerical indicators in evaluating the PI is permitted, it is not particularly encouraged. The evaluation of this criterion should not be based exclusively on such indicators, and should vastly include the evaluator’s objective assessment of the intrinsic value of the PI’s scientific contributions and its actual impact on advancing the state-of-the-art in the specific mathematical field.

For 1.2, please see statistical charts of H-index, citations and Q1/Q2 articles of all competing PIs, for use if relevant.

For 1.1.-1.2, please take into account the scientific output in relation to the current career stage of the PI.

Criterion 1.3 Match between the PI’s previous research output and proposed topic - 30% of the total score of Criterion 1

(See section B3 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate to what extent the PI’s research output is relevant for the present project. Comment on how the previously published work or previous projects of the PI relates to the proposed research.

Specific guidance for Criterion 1: The comments in this section must reflect the overall excellence of the PI, taking into account each sub-criterion and the CV of the researcher (1.1, 1.2, and 1.3). E.g., the track record, visibility and prestige are excellent, but awards or doctoral committees abroad may be missing; this does not necessarily mean that the score should be reduced, unless this is considered essential for the proposal implementation. While bibliometric measures of the excellence (e.g., the Hirsch index, number of papers or citations) are important, these should be used in a judicious manner. These should not be the main and only reason for penalizing the applicant. E.g., simply stating that “*the applicant has an H-index = x*” without any other explanation should not be considered sufficient for a low score; experts should evaluate the quality of PI against all

achievements described in the proposal and how they are related to and indicative for the current proposal. In assessing the publication/patent record of an applicant (criterion 1.1), experts are advised to pay a special attention to the quality of PI's publications as main author in the field of the current proposal. In section B2 of the application form the PI's were asked to list the most significant scientific contributions (articles or books), maximum 10 items in total. The CV in section B4 should be evaluated in relation to each of the three criteria. The achievements and overall excellence should be assessed in relation to the proposed research. Numbers, in general, are important, however *these are not the only or best indicator of the researcher's excellence*. In addition, more emphasis should be placed on the quality of the publications, as opposed to their quantity. A small number of high-impact publications may be of higher value, compared to a large number of papers in low impact journals.

2. Research Project (60% of the total score)

The expert should assess to what extent the goals, proposed solution, motivation, novelty, methodology, implementation, described in sections C1 – C5, guarantee and/or contribute to the success of the current proposal.

Criterion 2.1 State-of-the-art and originality/innovation - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C1 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate whether the problem addressed by the project is clearly identified in relation to the state-of-the-art in the field. Comment on the originality and novelty of the proposed solution. If previous projects of the applicant addressing a similar topic are mentioned, comment on the novel aspects investigated in the present project.

Criterion 2.2 Research objectives, methodology and work plan - 30% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C2 of the Funding Application)

Evaluate the clarity and coherence of the scientific objectives. To what extent is the proposed methodological approach suitable for reaching these objectives? How effective is the work plan (timelines, milestones, deliverables) in terms of achieving the proposed objectives? Comment on the coherence of the approach in terms of activities and time scales.

Criterion 2.3 Feasibility (resources and research team) - 20% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C3 of the Funding Application)

To what extent the infrastructural support and human resource (research team) available at the host institution will ensure successful implementation of the project?

Criterion 2.4 Risks and contingency plans - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C4 of the Funding Application)

To what extent the risk analysis correctly identifies potential pitfalls? Also comment on the effectiveness of the alternative solutions proposed.

Criterion 2.5 Expected impact and dissemination plan - 10% of the total score of Criterion 2

(See section C5 of the Funding Application)

To what extent is the expected scientific output of the proposed work realistically described and how likely is it to lead to significant progress in the field? How will the proposed research impact (the visibility of) the host institution, PI and research team? Also, comment on the quality of the proposed measures to disseminate the scientific output of the proposal. Social, economic, or cultural impact should be considered only if relevant for the proposed research.

Criterion 3 – no individual score, no contribution to the other scores

Budget; this section will not be scored

(See section C6 of the Funding Application)

Please provide an overall assessment of the research budget requested and evaluate to what extent it is justified by the proposed research activities. There will be no score associated with this criterion, but the assessment will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the final financial award.

NOTES:

1. The final score will be automatically calculated as a weighted sum of the scores for each sub criterion multiplied by 20 (final score between 0 and 100), when introduced into the online platform.

Final grade = $20 * [(s_{1.1} * 40/100 + s_{1.2} * 30/100 + s_{1.3} * 30/100) * 40/100 + (s_{2.1} * 30/100 + s_{2.2} * 30/100 + s_{2.3} * 20/100 + s_{2.4} * 10/100 + s_{2.5} * 10/100) * 60/100]$, where $s_{i.j}$ is the score for criterion $i.j$.

2. Experts should make sure that their comments on each criterion are:

- *Concrete* i.e., they are explicitly referring to the information in the proposal
- *Complete* i.e., they address all the facets specified by the criterion
- *Consistent* i.e., they match the score, according to the scoring table and are not contradictory
- *Inoffensive* i.e., they do not contain discriminatory, offensive statements or adjectives
- *Explanatory* i.e., it is clear what makes a comment a weakness or a strength. Examples of poor comments: “The methodology is described” - is it enough? insufficient? excellent? new? obsolete? or “The novelty is not good” (why? what is missing?) or “The team is not appropriate” (what competency is missing?), etc.

5.3.7 Assessment against the Evaluation Criteria

The Rapporteurs propose a score **only after** consensus has been reached on the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e., address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

| | | |
|----------|-----------------------|---|
| 0 | ABSENT | The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i> |
| 1 | UNSATISFACTORY | The criterion is addressed in an <i>inadequate manner</i> , or there are <i>serious inherent weaknesses</i> |
| 2 | SATISFACTORY | While the proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, there are <i>significant weaknesses</i> |
| 3 | GOOD | The proposal addresses the criterion <i>well</i> , although <i>improvements would be necessary</i> . A number of <i>weaknesses/shortcomings</i> are present. |
| 4 | VERY GOOD | The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>certain improvements are still possible</i> . A <i>small number of weaknesses/shortcomings</i> are present. |
| 5 | EXCELLENT | The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. <i>Any shortcomings are minor</i> |

Scores of 0, 0.5, 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, ..., 4.0, 4.5, 5.0 (i.e., **half scale**) should be given for each of the eight evaluation criteria.

The scores must reflect the strengths and weaknesses and they must be in line with the comments. **Scores below 5 (i.e., also 4 or 4.5) must fully reflect the identified shortcomings/weaknesses, which should be clearly indicated** in the Consensus Report.

6. Transparency

The list of the expert evaluators who participated in the evaluation process will be published on the UEFISCDI's website, after the end of the competition. The list will not identify the expert evaluators assigned for each project proposal.

7. References:

In creating this guide, we adopted several guidelines and principles from the following sources:

1. H2020-MSCA, EJD Manual for experts, 2019
2. ESF - *European Peer Review Guide. Integrating Policies and Practices into Coherent Procedures*, 2011: <http://www.esf.org/activities/mo-fora/publications.html>
3. ERC - *ERC Grant Schemes Guide for Peer Reviewers*, 2011: http://erc.europa.eu/sites/default/files/document/file/GuideForERCPeerReviewers_2012%2020092011.pdf
4. http://ec.europa.eu/research/pdf/workshop_igb/rtd_evaluation_process.pdf

NOTE: Remember that nobody knows everything, and other peoples' point of view is as valid as your own. And there is no shame in learning and changing your mind!