



THE RESEARCH PROMOTION FOUNDATION

PROGRAMMES

FOR RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND

INNOVATION

“RESTART 2016 – 2020”

GUIDE FOR EVALUATORS

(Single-stage Evaluation)

PROPOSAL DETAILS	
PILLAR	I. SMART GROWTH
PROGRAMME	Proof of Concept for Technology / Knowhow Applications
CALL IDENTIFIER	CONCEPT/0618



Ευρωπαϊκή Ένωση
Ευρωπαϊκό Ταμείο
Περιφερειακής Ανάπτυξης



Κυπριακή Δημοκρατία



Διαρθρωτικά Ταμεία
της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης στην Κύπρο

GUIDELINES AND GENERAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATORS

1. The Proposal, which the Evaluator is called upon to evaluate, was submitted under the **“Proof of Concept for Technology / Knowhow Applications” Programme** of the Research Promotion Foundation **Programmes for Research, Technological Development and Innovation “RESTART 2016-2020”**.
2. The objectives of the abovementioned Programme and all necessary definitions and procedures are described in:
 - the relevant **Call for Proposals**, and
 - the **Work Programme (relevant Programme description in Section II/Pillar I)**.
3. Before producing the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are expected to study the relevant Proposal thoroughly. This consists of:
 - Proposal Part A – General Information & Budget,
 - Proposal Part B – Technical Annex,
 - Annex I – Curricula Vitae.
4. According to the Evaluation Procedure, each Proposal should be evaluated by **one (1) independent Evaluator**. The Evaluator fills his / her Evaluation Report Form, which consists of 3 Parts.
5. In Part I, the Evaluator should provide:
 - a. A fully justified assessment on whether the Proposal is **compatible with the objectives** of:
 - (i) the selected Programme,
 - (ii) the specific Call of Proposals, and
 - (iii) the selected priority area(s)/topic(s) (**where applicable**).
 - b. A score on each of the **3 evaluation criteria (assigning marks between 0,00 and 5,00 with an accuracy of 0,25 marks)** as well as relevant comments and detailed justification. It is noted that each criterion carries a **different weight**, as shown on the respective part of the Evaluation Report Form.

The Evaluator will not proceed with the scientific evaluation of the 3 criteria should a Proposal fail the compatibility assessment.
6. The evaluation criteria on which the scientific evaluation will be based are:
 - Excellence,
 - Added Value and Benefit, and
 - Implementation.

7. The **Evaluation Score** will be automatically calculated (in the relevant Table in Part III) by adding the scores assigned to each of the three criteria following the application of the relevant weights.
8. The table below provides an interpretation of the scores and should be applied for the evaluation of all Proposals:

Score	Evaluation Interpretation
0	The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
< 0,99	The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
1,00 – 1,99	The proposal addresses the criterion to a limited degree and there are significant weaknesses.
2,00 – 2,99	The proposal addresses the criterion partly and a number of shortcomings/weaknesses are observed.
3,00 – 3,99	The proposal addresses the criterion quite sufficiently but a small number of shortcomings/weaknesses are observed.
4,00 – 5,00	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

9. Proposals are deemed eligible for funding if they secure an **Evaluation Score of at least 11,00/15,00**.
10. Comments provided by the Evaluator should be written in a manner that would justify and explain the specific score provided for each criterion. **Proposals should be judged on merit and scored as they were submitted**, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. If significant shortcomings are identified (including in budget issues such as size, structure, allocation, aid intensity etc.), this must be reflected by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned. **No recommendations for improving Proposals should be provided**.
11. Please note that Proposal Part B – Technical Annex has a max page limit of **30 pages**. Any excess pages must be disregarded and not taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation.
12. In Part II of the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are asked to provide supplementary comments (but no scores) with regards to:
 - the need for an Ethics Review for the Proposal under evaluation,
 - any potential negative impacts and/or risks to the environment stemming from the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the Project's expected results/products, and
 - the degree to which the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced.
13. A positive reply to the first question would mean that the Proposal should **undergo an Ethics Review** before a funding decision can be reached, whereas a positive reply to the

second question should be **mirrored in the comments and scores** provided for individual criteria, if applicable.

14. Information relevant to both the evaluation criteria and the issues for which supplementary comments are requested can be found throughout the Proposal and, thus, Evaluators are advised to study it thoroughly before starting their work. However, the most relevant Sections of the Proposal for each criterion/supplementary issue are designated below.

PART I – EVALUATION

COMPATIBILITY WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- *Compatibility with the Objectives of the Programme.*
- *Compatibility with the Objectives of the Call for Proposals.*
- *Compatibility of the proposed type(s)* of research activities with those allowed by the Programme/Call for Proposals.*

The relevant information can be found in:

1. *[Section “General Profile of the Project Proposal”](#) and [“Aid Intensity” Table](#) in [“Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”](#), and*
2. *[Sections B1 and B4](#) in [“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”](#).*

**As [selected](#) in [“Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”](#) and [analysed](#) in [“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”](#).*

1. EXCELLENCE (40%)

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- *Quality of Project Objectives. Clarity, completeness, scientific / technical documentation.*
- *Degree of Project Innovation and Originality in relation to the existing knowledge (state-of-the-art) at international level.*
- *Soundness, credibility and feasibility of the proposed idea.*
- *Relevance with the Programme’s objectives including the objective for the implementation of industrial research which falls within Technology Readiness Levels 3-4 (TRL 3 - experimental proof of concept, TRL 4 - technology validated in lab).*

The relevant information can be found in [Sections B1 and B2](#) in [“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”](#).

2. ADDED VALUE AND BENEFIT (30%)

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- *Industrial application potential of the technology / knowhow, potential scientific/technological, social and/or economic benefit and prospects for the exploitation of the project results by the Host Organisation.*
- *Effectiveness of the proposed measures for the exploitation (including management of Intellectual Property Rights) and dissemination of results.*
- *Justification of the proposed Project's selected objectives in consistency with the business strategy of the Host Organisation.*

The relevant information can be found in [Section B3](#) in "Proposal Part B – Technical Annex".

3. IMPLEMENTATION (30%)

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- *Completeness and appropriateness of the Work Packages' content, the allocation of various activities, the timetable and the budget.*
- *Effectiveness of the proposed methodology for the implementation of deliverables.*
- *Completeness, quality and capacity of the Host Organisation for the implementation of the Project (at the level of Organisation and/or individuals) and achievement of the proposed objectives.*
- *Suitability and adequacy of the proposed management activities, including identification and handling of potential risks.*

The relevant information can be found in:

1. *["Project Budget Overview"](#) and ["Aid Intensity" Tables](#) in "Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget",*
2. *[Sections B4-6](#) in "Proposal Part B – Technical Annex", and*
3. *[Annex I – Curricula Vitae](#).*

**Including a validation of the selected distribution (%) of proposed type(s) of research activities per Partner, available in "Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget".*

PART II - SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS**QUESTION**

Do you believe that any part of the Proposal under evaluation (e.g. methodology, Work Packages and activities, expected results, products etc.) requires to undergo an Ethics Review (e.g. a bioethical assessment by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee)?

The relevant information can be found in [Sections B4](#) and [B7](#) in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.

Do you believe that the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the expected results/products could have any potential negative impacts and/or pose risks to the environment?

The relevant information can be found in [Sections B4](#) and [B7](#) in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.

Do you believe that the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced, both in terms of its research content as well as the key research personnel to be involved in its implementation?

The relevant information can be found in [Sections B4](#) and [B5](#) in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.