

# Evaluation Criteria for Joint Applied Research Projects

PN-II-PT-PCCA-2012-4

## Criterion 1: Technical and scientific quality of the project proposal

(40%)

To what extent:

- *Is the project proposal well suited to the thematic of the call? Is the project topic answering a well defined problem/question with practical relevance?*
- *Is the project proposal positioning well described with respect to the state of the art or to technological innovation? Does the project proposal contribute to a significant (clearly identified) progress beyond the state of the art?*
- *Are the objectives of the project proposal appropriate? Are the technological bottlenecks properly addressed?*
- *Is the project proposal innovative in terms of technological innovation or prospects of innovation, and ambitious?*
- *Does the project proposal display and prove inter-, multi-, or trans- disciplinary character?*

## Criterion 2: Impact and dissemination of the project results

(20%)

To what extent:

- *Are the dissemination and exploitation of the expected results clearly stated and realistic?*
- *Are the project outcomes original and aim for direct applications with market potential? How well positioned are the project outcomes for further commercialization on national/international markets?*
- *Are the project outcomes leading toward a distinct improvement of the quality of life, performance and/or efficiency of products, technologies and/or services?*
- *How well the project is positioned in the industrial strategy of the project partner companies? Is there a strategy for further valorisation of the project results?*
- *Is there a proper distribution as well as an efficient protection of any intellectual property arising from the accomplishment of this joint project?*

## Criterion 3: Quality of the consortium

(20 %)

To what extent:

- *Is the project director expertise and previous achievements sound and suitably related to the project topic? How well qualified is the project director to conduct the project towards its stated objectives?*
- *Are the partner research team leaders well qualified (with respect to their expertise and previous achievements) to conduct the corresponding activities within the project and fulfil the associated tasks?*
- *Are the partnership and the partner team structure correlated with the tasks, within the framework of the technical and scientific objectives? Do/Does the companies/company involved play an active role in the project?*
- *Are there synergies and complementarities between the partners?*
- *Is the consortium size (number of partners) correlated with the complexity of the project outcomes?*

**Criterion 4: Project management, methodology, work plan, milestones, budget (20 %)**

*To what extent:*

- *Is the work plan structured with clearly identified and adequate milestones and deliverables? Are the project tasks adequately defined and assigned to partners? Is the partners load well balanced with respect to partner's expertise and previous achievements?*
- *Is the coordination plan adequate? Does the task schedule comply with the assumed objectives and deliverables? Is the schedule realistic?*
- *Are the resources adequate to the project (existing research infrastructure and requested upgrade/development of the research infrastructure)? Are the requested equipment purchases well justified and relevant?*
- *Are the manpower (person-months) resources well justified? Are the non permanent manpower resources (PhD students, postdoctoral research associates, junior researches) well justified?*
- *Is the financial part (travel budget, subcontracting, consumables...) well justified and adequate?*

**Quantitative assessment of each criterion**

- Please give a score for each criterion: 0 – absent, 1 – very poor, 2 – poor, 3 – fair, 4 – good, 5 – very good; the score can have decimal points.*
- The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each criterion weighed by the corresponding percentage and multiplying by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);*
- Please add comments in support of your evaluation, for each criterion. The comments must clearly state the strong and weak points according to the indicators within each criterion.*