

---

# RO-14 Research within priority sectors

## Guide for Evaluators

*Mircea Segarceanu*  
*(UEFISCDI - Implementing Agency)*

# The Evaluation Process

1. Eligibility check
2. Peer-Review Process
  - a. Individual Evaluation
  - b. Consensus Report
3. Thresholds and ranking list

# Eligibility Check

## Eligibility criteria:

- receipt of proposal by the IA before the deadline date and time established in the call
- minimum conditions (such as number of participants, eligible beneficiaries), as referred to in the call for proposals
- completeness of the proposal
- it is forbidden to submit a proposal which seeks to fund activities which had already obtained funding from the other sources
- proposals need to be submitted in English using the online submission system: [www.uefiscdi-direct.ro](http://www.uefiscdi-direct.ro)

# Eligibility Check

- The lists consisting of the approved and rejected projects proposals will be published on IA/PO websites
- Appeals may be submitted within 3 workdays. The list of received appeals will be published on IA/PO websites
- Final decision about registered appeals - within 5 working days.

# Peer-Review Process

## Reviewers

- Independent, international experts (researchers) with a good international visibility in a specific research area
- Recruited from EU Commission Database of Experts and national database of international experts

## Contract

- Experts sign a contract with clauses regarding confidentiality, conflict of interest and use of personal data by the IA

# Peer-Review Process

A disqualifying conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- Was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- Stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted
- Has a close family relationship with the applicant
- Is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organization
- Is employed by one of the applicant organizations in a proposal
- Is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially
- Was employed by one of the applicant organizations in a proposal within the previous 3 years
- Is involved in a contract or research collaboration with one of the applicant organizations, or had been so in the previous 3 years
- Is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party

# Individual Evaluation

- Each eligible proposal is evaluated independently, online, by evaluators (at least three individual reviews)
- The Evaluation Form (details in Guide for Evaluators):
  - **Criterion 0:** Coherence with the call topic (it is considered an elimination criterion)
  - **Criterion 1:** Scientific and/or technical excellence - 40%
  - **Criterion 2:** Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management – 40%
  - **Criterion 3:** Impact and dissemination of the project results – 20%
- Experts score these on a scale from 0 to 5; half point scores may be given;
- 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).

# Individual Evaluation

## Scoring

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



# Consensus Report

- After the individual stage, the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment, representing the common views of the evaluators
- Each evaluator will have access to the scores and comments of the other evaluators. If they consider it necessary, reviewers may adjust their initial scores
- One of the experts is randomly appointed as rapporteur. He coordinates the consensus discussion and writes the consensus report, with direct involvement of all reviewers
- If experts do not reach consensus, additional experts may be asked to examine the proposal
- All discussions are done via the evaluation platform

# Consensus Report

- Consensus Report Form (details in the Guide for Evaluators)
  - I. Introduction (including ethical considerations)
  - II. Evaluation Criteria
  - III. General Opinion
- Reviewers must provide an overall opinion to reflect their assessment of the likelihood for the project to exert a sustained, powerful influence on the research field(s) involved (thematic area). Also, they must provide recommendations and advice for improvement (if it is the case)

# Consensus Report

- Reviewers select one of the following funding recommendations:

Funding Recommendation	Explanation
Strongly Recommended for funding	Project Proposal is addressing a problem of high importance/interest in the thematic area. May have some or no weaknesses.
Medium Recommended for funding	Project proposal may be addressing a problem of high importance in the thematic area, but weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to medium.  or  Project proposal may be addressing a problem of moderate importance, with some or no weaknesses.
Not recommended for funding	Project proposal may be addressing a problem of moderate / high importance in the thematic area, but weaknesses in the criteria reduce the overall impact to low. or  Applications may be addressing a problem of low or no importance in the field, with some or no weaknesses.

## Thresholds and ranking list

- In order to be recommended for funding, a proposal must receive 75 points and pass all the following thresholds:

Criterion	Thresholds	Weight
Coherence with the call topic	YES	Precondition
Scientific and/or technical excellence	3/5 – 24 points/40 points	40% - 40 points
Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management	3/5 - 24 points/40 points	40% - 40 points
Impact and dissemination of the project results	3/5 - 12 points/20 points	20% - 20 points

# Thresholds and ranking list

- The results are 4 ranking lists (one for each thematic area of the Programme) to be discussed by the Programme Committee.
- These are split out into 3 sections:
  - proposals strongly recommended for funding
  - proposals medium recommended for funding (reserve list)
  - proposals not recommended for funding

# Thresholds and ranking list

- The Programme Committee takes into consideration the overall quality of the proposals (ranking lists), a similar success rate for each thematic area and the total earmarked budget to the call with the following conditionality:
  - at least EUR 4.337.000 shall be earmarked for projects under the area of research “Social sciences and humanities” including research on the bilateral relations between the Donor states and Romania;
  - up to EUR 3.000.000 shall be allocated to projects in the area of renewable energy;
  - at least EUR 2.353.000 shall target research contributing to the improvement of the situation of the Roma population, across all thematic areas.

## Thresholds and ranking list

- The final ranking list is approved by the Programme Committee
- In case two or more projects receive the same score in the same thematic area, the following criteria will be applied to determine the ranking:
  - Score on the criterion of scientific excellence;
  - Relevance to the overall objectives of the Programme;
  - Involvement of young researchers;
  - Gender-balance in the research teams.

Thank you for your attention

Good luck!