


*EURIZON FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME:*

*“Remote Research Grants for Ukrainian Researchers”*

External Evaluators

Guide



## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

This evaluation guidance serves as the basis for attributing the proper score to the applications.

It is necessary to consider each of the three sub-criteria of the **SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE** and each of the three sub-criteria of the **POTENTIAL IMPACT**.

The **criterion of scientific excellence** is assessing the **general** scientific and technical soundness of the proposal, the innovation potential, the capacity of the team and the technical feasibility of the research project.

The **criterion of potential impact** is more **specific** to the EURIZON Call for Fellowship as the call is meant to prioritize those Ukrainian research teams whose projects show close collaborations with European scientists and/or are targeting the reconstruction and/or the support to the operations of Ukrainian RIs, and their future integration into the European Research Area (ERA).

The report from the external experts should mention, per each criterion, the items which seem to be met and those which do not.

1. **SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE**

The goal of the evaluation of the Scientific excellence of the research proposalis to assess the relevant aspects along the three sub-categories:

* 1.1 The **scientific excellence** and the **technical feasibility** of the research programme;
* 1.2 The **capacity and organisation of the team**, and the relevance of the team members

participation;

* 1.3 The PI´s and team members profiles, their scientific/technical **merits and professional**

**experience**.

The following table contains the **relevant aspects** that apply on the three sub-category of the SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE criterion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. **SCIENTIFIC EXCELLENCE** | |
| **ITEMS** | **RELEVANT ASPECTS** |
| 1.1The scientific excellence and the technical feasibility of the research programme | * Clarity and pertinence of the project’s objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is relevant according to the field and the context of the proposal; * Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is reflecting the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches), according to the available conditions of the researchers; * Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, scientific approaches; * Suitability and effectiveness of the measures to maximize expected outcomes, as set out in the dissemination plan, including communication activities where appropriate; * The research objectives are realistically achievable within the expected time frame and with the mentioned resources; |
| 1.1 The capacity and organisation of the team, and the relevance of the team members participation | * The role and contribution of each team member is clearly explained; * All participants have a meaningful role and allocation; * The research objectives are realistically achievable with the mentioned team resources and approach; * Appropriateness of the coordination structures and of the team roles; |
| 1.3 The PI´s and team members profiles, scientific/technical merits and professional experience | * The PI and the team seem to have the relevant profiles, background, expertise and experience to effectively develop the research as proposed; * The team expertise and experience are in line with the research plan description and goals; |

### **IMPACT**

The goal of the evaluation of the **POTENTIAL IMPACT** of the research proposalsis to assess the relevant aspects along three sub-categories:

* 2.1 The level of cooperation and synergy foreseen with the European partner;
* 2.2 The potential of boosting the future integration of Ukrainian RIs with the European

Research Area (ERA) beyond EURIZON

* 2.3 The potential of the proposed project of contributing to the capacity building and to

restoring the operations of the Ukrainian RIs.

**Priority will be given to research projects directly showing close collaborations with European scientists and/or targeting the reconstruction and/or the support to the operations of Ukrainian RIs, and their future integration into the European Research Area (ERA).**

The following table contains the **relevant aspects** that apply to the three items of the IMPACT CRITERION:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2.IMPACT** | |
| **ITEMS** | **RELEVANT ASPECTS** |
| 2.1 The level of cooperation and synergy foreseen with the European partner | * Links to relevant EU research infrastructures/institutions is identified; * The cooperation with the EU partner(s) is meaningful and substantial; * The collaboration with the EU partner adds significant value to the research project; * The cooperation is clearly planned and described; * Possible in-kind contributions or any other extra support (e.g. transnational remote or virtual access offered to facilities and labs) from the EU partner(s) is well detailed; * Extra consideration: the UA and European teams have already collaborated in the past or can show a case for a strong partnership; |
| 2.2 The potential of boosting the future integration of Ukrainian RIs with the European Research Area (ERA) beyond EURIZON | * The potential of boosting the integration of the research topic into the European research ecosystem is clearly planned and described; * The potential capacity of the proposal to expand the collaboration with the European scientists beyond EURIZON; * Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge between UA and the European Research systems; |
| 2.3 The potential of the proposed project of contributing to the capacity building and to restoring the operations of the Ukrainian RIs. | * The case for capacity building/restoring the operation of the research infrastructures in Ukraine is clearly explained and detailed (e.g., services to the scientific community, etc.); * Sound conditions for implementation are explained (e.g., viable organization for operation, availability of scientific human resources proven, etc.); * Strengthening the growth of the Ukrainian research system by developing innovations; * Meeting the values of the European research area and, where relevant, by transferring/sharing such values to the Ukrainian system; |

## **SCORING**

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination (definition of scores taken from the Horizon Europe guidelines to applicants):

* **5- Very High**, i.e. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.
* **4-High**, i.e. The proposal addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
* **3-Good**, i.e. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.
* **2-Fair**, i.e. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.
* **1-Poor**, i.e. The criterion is not addressed in an adequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
* **0-Fail**, i.e. The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

## **Definition of scores description.**

## A ‘**shortcoming are minor**’ is an issue that relates only to a marginal aspect of the proposal with respect to the criterion and/or can easily be rectified (it will not impact the scoring).

## A ‘**improvements would be necessary**’ is a problem that relates to an important aspect of the proposal. It impacts the scoring but does not render the proposal inappropriate for funding, i.e. the proposal is still expected to lead to useful results with positive impact.

## A ‘**significant weakness**’ means that the proposal addresses the criterion in a limited and/or not sufficiently effective way.