

## Fișă de evaluare (*Evaluation Sheet*)

### 1. Principal Investigator (60%)

**1.1 (45%)** Please assess the **quality of the PI's research results**, as demonstrated by the list of publications and patents. **Please comment** on the originality of the PI's results, on their impact on the state of the art, and on their relevance for the present project.

**1.2 (15%)** Please assess the **PI's capacity to autonomously manage scientific activities** as a researcher and/or research group leader, as well as **the visibility and prestige** in her/his international peer group. Please comment on the PI's publication record, her/his leadership abilities, the ability to attract funds, and his/her level of international recognition. **Please take into account** only those facts that you consider relevant for the current proposal.

### 2. Proposal (40%)

**2.1 (20%)** Please assess the **overall solution** described in the proposal in the context of the current state-of-the-art and its potential future impact (see section *C1*, *C2*, *C3*). **Please comment** on the following aspects: (1) significance and the difficulty of the problem being addressed; (2) the originality of the proposed solution and the appropriateness of the objectives; (3) the potential to advance knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thought and activity.

**2.2 (20%)** Please assess the **method and work plan** as defined by the proposal as a concrete approach to reach the envisioned solution (see section *C4*). **Please comment** on how well selected are the methods, design and investigation tools and on the effectiveness of the work-plan within the proposed timescale and resources. Have potential problem areas been appropriately discussed, and have alternative approaches been mentioned?

**1.3** Please assess the adequacy of the **proposed budget** and suggest possible corrections (see sections *C5* and *C4*). Please comment on the match between the work-plan and the budget, as well as on the appropriateness of the mobility (conferences, work-visits) and infrastructure acquisitions included in the budget.

*(There will be no score associated with this item, but the expert opinion will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the precise financial award.)*

**Recommendations for evaluators:**

1. Choose a score **only after** you wrote the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e. address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

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

2. When scoring use the full scale! **Half marks may be given.**

3. If scores **3** or **4** are used (improvements are necessary/possible) make sure the required improvements are described! If score **1** or **2** are used make sure the inherent/significant weaknesses are described in concrete terms!

**Note:** The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each of the seven subcriteria weighed by the corresponding percentage and multiplying by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);