



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	Research in Enterprises
CALL IDENTIFIER	ENTERPRISES/0618



GUIDELINES AND GENERAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATORS

1. The Proposal, which the Evaluator is called upon to evaluate, was submitted under the **“Research in Enterprises” 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, and
 - Annex II – Call-specific Information (where applicable).
4. According to the Evaluation Procedure, each Proposal should be evaluated by **two (2) independent Evaluators**. Each Evaluator fills his / her own 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. The **Final Evaluation Score** for each Proposal will be equal to the **average** of the Evaluation Scores assigned by the two independent Evaluators. In case the difference between the scores of the two evaluations is **3,00 marks or more**, then the Proposal will be sent for evaluation to a third Evaluator and the Final Evaluation Score will be determined as the average of the two closest evaluation scores.
10. Proposals are deemed eligible for funding if they secure a **Final Evaluation Score of at least 11,00/15,00**.
11. Comments provided by the Evaluators 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.**
12. Please note that Proposal Part B – Technical Annex has a max page limit of **50 pages**. Any excess pages must be disregarded and not taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation.
13. 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.
14. 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. Finally, the reply to the third question will be taken into account as one of the **ranking factors** for Proposals eligible for funding that have achieved equal Evaluation Scores, when budget restrictions apply.
15. 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 (basic research, applied research etc.) 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 (20%)

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

- *Quality of Project Objectives.*
- *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 new or significantly improved product / service / production method.*
- *The proposed new or significantly improved product / service / production method compared to already existing solutions and identification of the current or future market gap and opportunity it addresses.*
- *Relevance of the proposed research activities (industrial research and experimental development) with the Project’s and Program’s objectives.*

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

2. ADDED VALUE AND BENEFIT (40%)

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

- Scientific, technological, economic and social impact deriving from the development of the new or significantly improved new product / service / production method for each of the Consortium members separately and the consortium as a whole (e.g. expected increase in job positions, future prospects of the technological application, exploitation of patents, etc.).
- Effectiveness of the proposed measures for the exploitation (including management of Intellectual Property Rights) and dissemination of results for achieving maximum Project visibility.
- Completeness, quality, and achievability of the business plan, and include at the very least a description of: (a) the market, (b) the competition, (c) the market rollout plan including a risk analysis and mitigation plan, (d) the competitive advantage of the new or significantly improved product / service / production method in relation to existing or future competition, and (e) the fundamental economic forecasts in relation to the growth and future exploitation of the new or significantly improved product / service / production method.

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

3. IMPLEMENTATION (40%)

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

- Completeness and appropriateness of the Work Packages’ content, the allocation of the various activities, the timetable and the budget*.
- Effectiveness of the proposed methodology for the implementation of the deliverables.
- Completeness, quality and capacity of the Consortium for the implementation of the Project (at the level of Organisations and/or individuals) and achievement of the proposed objectives.
- Suitability and adequacy of the proposed coordination and management activities, including identification and handling of potential risks.
- Completeness and reliability of the Contingency Plan within the framework of the Project implementation.

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”.