



PEER REVIEW GUIDELINES CCS 2013 CALL

HANNA SROCZYŃSKA
Unit for Bilateral Programmes and EUREKA
National Centre for Research and Development

11 September 2013



ELIGIBILITY CHECK - NCBR

In order to be retained, the proposals must fulfil all of the following eligibility criteria:

- Proposals must be submitted by an entity eligible according to the Programme;
- Proposals must be submitted before the deadline;
- Proposals must meet the criterion concerning the number of participants: at least 1 entity from Poland and 1 from Norway eligible according to the Programme;
- Proposals must be complete (i.e. all of the requested components and forms must be included). Proposals must respect the requested format, be submitted in English to the online submission system;
- Proposals must be coherent with the call topic.



Peer Reviews

I stage – three independent international reviewers, chosen from the database of reviewers of NCBR and the EC, assess the proposal. The reviewers also indicate if the proposal:

- falls entirely out of scope of the call for proposals; and
- deals with sensitive ethical issues.

The reviewers complete the 'Review Form'.

If the proposal is considered to be out of scope by all reviewers, it may be considered to be ineligible and may not be passed on to the second stage.



Peer Reviews

- **II stage** - called '**consensus stage**' - the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment performed by the three reviewers.

Scores and comments of this stage are set out in the **evaluation summary report** approved by reviewers. Comments are presented in a way to be suitable for feedback to the proposal Project Promoter.



Outcome of the evaluation

The Programme Operator draws up **a ranking list** containing all the proposals after the evaluation process.

The PO takes into account any other recommendations of the independent experts.



Selection criteria:

Criteria	Description
1. Coherence with the call topic	Relevance in relation to the objectives and areas of the programme
2. Scientific and/or technical excellence	Innovativeness of idea
	Appropriateness of approach
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management	Competence and expertise of applicant team
	Feasibility and efficiency of project plan
4. Impact of the project	Contribution to capacity and competence building
	Intended short-term outcomes
	Intended long-term application of outcomes



Selection criteria – scientific and/or technical excellence

Innovativeness of the idea – originality of project idea, state-of-the-art knowledge of literature and references, ambition and challenge to address scientific or technical problems of current interest and their relevance to an international level of expertise

Appropriateness of approach – methods proposed have to be sound, rigorous, state-of-the-art and appropriate to the proposed investigation, proposed goals are achieved using the methodology/approach presenting the level of risk that is inherent to a challenging research project



Selection criteria – quality and efficiency of implementation and management

Competence and expertise of the applicant team – PI's knowledge and experience in the field of research and her/his general qualifications to lead the project; relevance and strengths of partners; quality of previous work, results of previous projects, etc.

Feasibility and efficiency of the project plan – schedule and milestones compatible with resources, appropriateness of human resources per partner, appropriateness of budget, etc.



Selection criteria – impact of the project

- **Contribution to capacity and competence building** – how the project will build the experience and competence of the applicant team/institutions involved, how the project will influence a long-term collaboration between partners, etc.
- **Intended short-term outcomes** – doctoral or post-doctoral training, actual research work and dissemination of results, foreseen number of publications, etc.
- **Intended long-term application of outcomes** – planned strategies for disseminating and using results during and after the project as well as description of how potential users can be involved in the project in view of exploitation of results i.e. exploitation of intellectual property generated, technical innovations, spin-offs; intended technical, economic, environmental and societal impacts



Scoring of the proposal

The reviewers examine the issues to be considered comprising each evaluation criterion, and score these on a scale from 0 to 5. Half points may be given. Explanations for each score value are given in the Guidelines.

Top scores should only be awarded to proposals of exceptionally high quality (high international calibre and major scientific impact).



Consensus report form – funding recommendation

Funding recommendation	Explanation
Not recommended for funding	<p>Project of too low calibre to warrant funding.</p> <p>Major and essential modifications need to be made to achieve an international standard of quality and efficiency of the proposal:</p> <p>Abolition of large portions of a (or entire) work package (unless project can be conducted well without said work package) or need to add important work packages.</p> <p>Substantial modification of the proposed methodology.</p> <p>Additional scientific/ technical expertise required for the project.</p>
Inclined not to fund	<p>Project of good to very good quality.</p> <p>Minor modifications to the project plan may improve the quality and efficiency of the proposal:</p>
Inclined to fund	<p>Budget cuts (and resources) necessary because of slight overestimation which do not jeopardise the successful completion of work packages and the project while achieving the full range of proposed results.</p> <p>Modifications of the work-packages which do not necessitate large changes to the project description.</p> <p>Minor alterations and considerations that should be accounted for on the level of the methodology.</p>
Recommended for funding	Project of excellent quality that should be funded as proposed.



Thresholds

The proposal can receive a total number of 25 points in the evaluation procedure. To be recommended for funding, the proposal must receive at least 15 points and pass all the thresholds according to the values presented in the table below.

Criteria	Thresholds	Weight
1. Coherence with the call topic	YES	Precondition
2. Scientific and/or technical excellence	3/5	x3
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management	3/5	x1
4. Impact of the project	3/5	x1



Programm Committee (PC) recommendation

PC receives:

- a ranking list,
- individual reviews and consensus reports,
- proposals.

PC while making its recommendation takes into account the overall quality of the evaluated proposals and indicative budget of the programme area.

The outcome of the discussion is the final ranking list approved by the PC, containing the proposals recommended for funding.



Funding decision by NCBR

After the final approval of the ranking list by the Programme Committee, the NCBR issues the funding decision for each proposal recommended for funding. The decisions are also issued for proposals rejected from financing.

After the decisions have been issued, the Programme Operator sends electronically a letter, together with an evaluation summary report, to the Project Promoter of each of the evaluated proposals.



**THANK YOU
FOR YOUR ATTENTION**

11 September 2013