

## **ANNEX I – EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The reviewers will evaluate the proposals in accordance with the scope and expected impact described in this Call Announcement (see Chapter (4)), and using the three equally weighted evaluation criteria described below.

### **I. Proposal evaluation criteria and scoring system**

#### **1. Scientific Excellence (Score 0-5)**

- Clarity and originality of the proposal's objectives and research questions, and the potential progress beyond state-of-the art;
- Soundness of the proposed concept, project design and methodology;
- Quality of open science practices, including the sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end-users where appropriate.

#### **2. Relevance and potential Impact (Score 0-5)**

- Extent to which the proposed work has potential to contribute to strategic societal impacts at the European and/or global level;
- Relevance to the scope and topic(s) of the call;
- Relevance and credibility of proposed inter- and transdisciplinary considerations, co-creation processes and other forms of stakeholder engagement;
- Suitability, quality and clarity of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in "expected results and impact" (pre-proposal) or the communication, dissemination and exploitation plan (full proposal).

#### **3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation (Score 0-5)**

- Project feasibility and quality, coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources (e.g., costs, staff, equipment);
- Effectiveness and suitability of the management structures and procedures, including risk management, data management, and, where relevant, consideration of ethics and regulatory issues, and innovation management;
- Relevance, competence, expertise and complementarity of the consortium participants (including balance in terms of gender and career stage) to address project goals, and the level of integration and collaboration between Partners involved in the proposal;
- Added value of transnational collaboration.

The evaluation threshold mark for individual criteria will be **3**. The overall threshold mark applying to the sum of the three individual scores will be **10**.

### **II. Evaluation scores for the evaluation**

Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the main criteria. Each criterion will be scored out of 5 (half scores are not allowed) and equally weighted. The 0-5 scoring system for each criterion indicates the following assessment:

- 0 -** *The proposal **fails** to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to incomplete information.*
- 1 -** ***Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.*
- 2 -** ***Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.*
- 3 -** ***Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.*
- 4 -** ***Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.*
- 5 -** ***Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor*

