

Evaluation Sheet

Criterion 1: Scientific excellence and / or innovative nature for technological research - 40%

To what extent:

- 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 / scientific bottlenecks properly addressed?
- Is the project proposal innovative in terms of scientific or technological innovation or prospects of innovation, and ambitious?

Criterion 2: Quality of the project's structure and feasibility – 40%

To what extent:

- Is the Romanian and French teams' expertise and previous achievements sound and suitably related to the project topic? How well qualified is the Romanian PI to conduct the project towards its stated objectives?
- Is the partner teams' structure correlated with the tasks, within the framework of the technical or scientific objectives? Do the enterprises involved play an active role in the project (if applicable only for French part)?
- Is it clear why the project proposal must be developed cooperatively between participating countries/institutions? Is there added value created through this collaboration? Are there synergies and complementarities between the partners?
- 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 partners' expertise and previous achievements?
- Does the task schedule comply with the assumed objectives and deliverables? Is the schedule realistic?
- Only for the Romanian team: Are the manpower (person-months) resources well justified? In particular, is the involvement of Romanian PI significant and sufficient for a proper implementation of the project? Are the requested equipment purchases well justified and relevant? Is financial part well justified and adequate?

Criterion 3: Overall impact of the project – 20%

To what extent:

- How the project builds the experience and competence of the researchers/ organization involved?
- How the project influences a long-term collaboration among the partners concerned?
- Are the dissemination and exploitation of the expected results clearly stated and realistic?
- How well the project is positioned in the industrial strategy of the project partner enterprises? (if applicable)
- Is there a strategy for further valorization of the project results? (if applicable)

Scoring:

Experts examine the issues to be considered comprising each evaluation criterion and score these on a scale from 0 to 5. Half point scores may be given. For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments:

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

Note: The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each of the three criteria weighed by the corresponding percentage and multiplying by 20 (final score range between 0 and 100 points).