

Net4M**o**bility⁺



Net4Mobility+

Network of the Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions National Contact Points for the mobile scientific and innovation community

Marie Skłodowska-Curie Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE) 2018 Evaluation Summary Reports Analysis

Task 3.1: MSCA Evolution Guide – Annex VI

Issued by: The Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey - TÜBİTAK

Issued date: 04 January 2019

Work Package Leader: Innovation Authority (IL)

Document status: CONFIDENTIAL. TO BE USED by NCPs ONLY.



Table of contents

1. Introduction
2. General Information on Evaluation Procedures
3. Evaluation Criteria for MSCA-RISE-2019 Call
4. Contact information of Net4Mobility+ Project
5. Comments of Evaluators to various proposals submitted to RISE-2018-Call

1. Introduction

This document has been prepared by Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions (MSCA) National Contact Points (NCPs) of Turkey, Belarus, Bulgaria, Greece and Israel working together under N4M+ project (which is receiving funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme) to show the MSCA Research and Innovation Staff Exchange (RISE)¹ applicants the crucial points noted by the evaluators on the "Evaluation Summary Reports (ESRs) of the 2018-call".

"Evaluation Summary Reports-ESRs" of the project proposals submitted to the H2020–MSCA–RISE–2018 call have been taken into account during the preparation of this document. 272 ESRs were available and NCPs chose 200 of them by creating a pool with different scores.

For the preparation of this analysis document, NCPs:

- copied and pasted "the strengths" and "the weaknesses" under different titles for each evaluation criteria (without changing the wording) of MSCA-RISE scheme which are:
1) Excellence; 2) Impact; 3) Implementation;
- created sub-sections under each criteria in order to facilitate the reading (since there are many sub-headings, none of the keywords were coloured/highlighted as it was the case in previously published ESR Analysis Documents);
- did not copy a comment if they have already copied a very similar one;
- deleted the very specific names or scientific topics and put 'xxx' instead;
- kept some of the field specific notes (such as a specific health, technology, science terms) in order to show the applicants the real comments of the evaluators, so that they might assume the same strengths and weaknesses could be similarly noted in their own research field as well;
- tried to note the most frequent comments of the evaluator; however, very specific ones have also been noted in order to show the applicants how important it is to provide the relevant and "to the point information" under each section.

Some of the "**strengths and weaknesses**" may have similar meanings but intentionally noted. This does not mean that they are more important than the others. This only means that they are written by different evaluators by using some other words with similar meanings.

¹ For further information about H2020 MSCA IF calls: <https://ec.europa.eu/research/mariecurieactions/>

With this document, NCPs wish to underline some hints that cannot be seen in the Evaluation Criteria given under the third title of this document. With those “**strengths and weaknesses**” NCPs aim at showing the applicants what the evaluators are really caring about during the evaluation process, of course according to the instructions given by the European Commission.

2. General Information on Evaluation Procedures

It is well noted in “**Guide for Applicants of H2020 – MSCA – RISE – 2019 call on page 29**”:

The evaluation of proposals is carried out by the **Research Executive Agency (REA)** with the assistance of independent evaluators which are experts on the field/topic related to the proposal/s assigned to them. **REA staff** ensures that the process is fair and in line with the principles contained in the European Commission's rules and the relevant sections of the MSCA Work Programme. **Experts** perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are required to be impartial and objective, and to behave throughout the evaluation process in a professional manner. In addition, **an independent observer** is appointed by the REA to observe and report on the evaluation process, on the conduct and fairness of the evaluation sessions, and on the way in which the experts apply the evaluation criteria. The observer does not express views on the proposals under examination or on the experts' opinions on the proposals. Proposals are submitted in a single stage and evaluated in one step by the experts against all evaluation criteria.

Conflicts of interest: under the terms of the "expert" contract, all experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest, and must immediately inform the responsible REA staff member should one become apparent during the course of the evaluation. The REA will take whatever action is necessary to remove any conflict of interest.

Confidentiality: the "expert" contract also requires experts to maintain strict confidentiality with respect to the whole evaluation process. They must follow any instruction given by the REA to ensure this. Under no circumstance may an expert attempt to contact an applicant on her/his own account, either during the evaluation or afterwards.

3. Evaluation Criteria for MSCA-RISE-2019 Call

Proposals will be evaluated on the basis of the following **award criteria**:

RISE - Marie Skłodowska-Curie Research and Innovation Staff Exchange		
Excellence	Impact	Quality and efficiency of the implementation
Quality and credibility of the research/innovation project; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects	Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the staff members	Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives.	Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels	Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management
Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations	Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results	Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure)
	Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences	Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the project
50%	30%	20%
Weighting		
1	2	3
Priority in case of <i>ex aequo</i>		

4. Contact information of Net4Mobility+ Project

Please do not hesitate to contact us for further information about this document via contact details of Turkey, Belarus, Bulgaria, Greece and Israel Marie Skłodowska Curie Actions (MSCA) National Contact Points which are available on <http://net4mobilityplus.eu>. Any question about the content of this document can also be directed to ncpmobility@tubitak.gov.tr

5. Comments of Evaluators to various proposals submitted to RISE:

Please find them below separately under “**strengths**” and “**weaknesses**” titles for each evaluation criterion and sub-criterion:

Criterion 1 – Excellence

Strengths:

Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects

- **Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action**

- The project demonstrates good scientific and technological quality, and includes clearly stated and well-focused objectives in the area of the targeted xxx topic.
- The research and innovation project presented is of good quality, outlining an approach that is credible overall and addressing an important medical problem by trying to develop a fully biocompatible nano-engineered cardiovascular stents.
- The project addresses relevant topics related to aquatic environments with possible health, environmental or industrial implications.
- The research aims are very relevant and timely in relation to crop improvement, climate change, sustainability and consumer needs.
- The research program is timely and relevant with industrial implications in the development of xxx topic.
- The idea of improving xxx research and boosting the internationalization of a key beneficiary is commendable.
- The planned research and innovation is of very good quality and organised around clear and logical objectives that are credible and novel.
- The aim of the project to developing new tools for an early diagnosis and better management of the xxx is timely and relevant, dealing with an emerging health issue.
- The project is very well designed and addresses an important topic. There is a strong technological objective to synergistically link several partners in a pan-European infrastructure with a large bioinformatics consortium in Latin America.
- The proposal, focusing on the development of a research and training activities in xxx, is innovative and credible as it builds upon another successful project and other consortia.
- The proposed research is hypothesis driven, its quality and credibility are good, and it brings a high level of novelty to the field of xxx against the current state of the art.
- The proposal is ambitious and credible.
- The proposed research is interesting and timely.
- The proposal is timely and innovative and addresses a topic that is extremely well suited for the RISE program.
- It demonstrates adequately how it will use a large network of academic and non-academic institutions, and specifies well how the theoretical framework will make the project credible.
- The proposed project is relevant in the era of xxx, and its credibility is sufficiently demonstrated.
- Some aspects in relation to methodology to achieve the research objectives such as photo voice diary are also innovative.
- The innovative character of the methodological approach is well presented and appropriate to achieve the core scientific objectives.
- The project is of good quality, addressing a topic in an area of relevance for health.
- The proposal seeks to combine research methods in innovative ways. Thus, this is a well-demonstrated effort to enhance our understandings of a properly defined topic.
- The proposal deals with the relevant domain of research of the sustainable mobility. The rationale to undertake the research is well articulated and convincing.
- The project is innovative facing a research activity under a holistic and integrated approach.

- The proposal deals with a topic of high societal relevance.
 - The credibility of the proposal is demonstrated, the research objectives are focused, and the project's rationale is convincingly explained.
 - The proposal presents a credible case for the need for technological innovation in xxx and aims to develop this new technology through inter-sectoral collaboration and exchange of knowledge.
 - The proposal corresponds well to the current EU and international initiatives relating to sustainable development and the conservation of ecosystem services, specifically within mountainous regions.
 - The proposal is highly important for society.
 - The quality and credibility of the planned research project is properly demonstrated and relevant against the current state of the art.
 - The level of project innovation is very good. The proposed work is credible and advances the current state of the art.
 - The research goals contain globally innovative and challenging aspects. Innovative aspects of the proposed research are addressed with sufficient details.
- **Level of novelty**
 - The level of novelty is considered good, as these wwww diveces can lead to new generation of xxx diveces.
 - The proposal is novel, ambitious and innovative in that it seeks to develop standards, knowledge and data sharing, in an important emerging field.
 - The novelty of the planned research is strong and relevant, supported by a well described methodology.
 - The tools to be developed during the project are inspiring and offer fresh and interesting perspectives. Also, the proposal is relevant and well placed to generate novelty and new insights with regard to the linkages between art, IT and museums.
 - The proposal topic is innovative, attempting to devise how to overcome the gap between accessibility planning and ICT.
 - The innovative thinking underpinning the project is clearly stated and the objectives closely linked to related actions. An innovative articulation of actions in specialised fields is also proposed for aspects of archaeology and knowledge sharing.
 - The novelty of the project is clearly pointed out and based on bringing together an international and intersectoral team of organisations dedicated to patient-driven approaches with research organisations and patient innovators.
 - The quality and novelty of the planned research focused on the importance of indigenous and community-managed rural areas where the socio-economies of the commons are central and on heritization as a means to ensure their conservation and sustainability is clearly demonstrated
 - The proposed project is very interesting and innovative underpinned by the relevant evidences from the literature. It might considerably contribute to xxx and its negative environmental consequences. Additionally, a number of other positive environmental and economic impacts can be expected.
 - The proposal offers an examination of timely and politically vital problems, clearly demonstrating its high quality and novelty.
 - There is a well-argued and good level of novelty based on identifying best practice in the area.
 - The theoretical framework is appropriate in its intention to understand the possibilities of managing 'competing memories' across borders of disputed territories.
 - The proposed research project is innovative because it attempts to enhance and enrich understanding of the Sharing Economy and the new consumption pattern in our societies. The context of the family business in the sharing economy is particularly novel and has potential to develop the state-of-art in this area.
 - The project novelty is relevant to the current state-of-the-art.
 - The novelty of the action is identified and justified and its relationship to the main objectives of the proposal is adequately demonstrated.
 - The quality and novelty of the planned research and innovation activities are very well defined and are relevant against the current state-ofthe-art.

- **State of art**
 - The state of art in xxx topic is well detailed, and the current limitations are well identified.
 - The research aims are of high quality and relevant against the current state of the art.
 - The relationship of the project objectives to the state of the art is credible and appropriate with sufficient background references and established and preliminary results/products from the participants.
 - Challenges facing xxx development and the state of the art are properly represented.
 - The objective to develop personalized medicine is innovative and the progress beyond the current state-of-the-art is well discussed in the proposal.
 - The novelty of the proposal regards well defined scientific, industry and policy objectives, and the state of the art supports these R & I objectives.
 - The proposed perspective and the theoretical framework of the project are very well presented and innovative against the meticulously presented state of the art in the field.
 - The literature review is carefully prepared and provides convincing evidence of a research gap that will be filled through the project.
 - The research project correctly identifies the key issue in present-day debates on its subject, asks proper research questions and formulates suitable research goals that would produce innovative results.
 - The state-of-the-art with respect to the research aims is discussed with convincing arguments that correctly demonstrate its relevance.
 - The state-of-the-art is discussed with convincing arguments with respect to the research objectives.
 - The advancement beyond the state of the art is thoroughly explained in adequate detail. The proposal presents innovative, and high in demand, strategies for securing and monitoring xxx.
 - The state-of-the-art is described in good detail. The current literature review is well addressed in the scientific area of interest.
 - The proposed research goes beyond current state-of-the-art and is strongly justified.
 - The innovation and improvement beyond the state-of-the-art in each of the different areas of investigation are convincingly identified.
 - The project novelty is relevant to the current state-of-the-art.
 - The state of the art is very well presented and the novelty of the planned research activities is clearly identified.
 - The state of the art and the anticipated innovative progress to be achieved are satisfactorily described.
- **Specific objectives and the relevance of the research and innovation action**
 - The technological and societal objectives of the project are logical and are properly designed in order to develop new strategies for sequencing and analysis of xxx from diverse environments, including both natural and human-made.
 - The scientific and technological objectives are defined and supported by a detailed description. The research to be performed is well described.
 - The clearly defined objectives are precisely outlined against the state of the art. The innovative aspect of some elements, for example, xxx, is convincingly demonstrated.
 - The objectives are very well defined on both scientific and organizational levels. For example, the clear goal of creating a xxx tool significantly addresses the social challenge of healthy ageing.
 - The project's rationale is well explained with a list of relevant research objectives.
 - Some aspects of the research, such as xxx, are sufficiently innovative.
 - The proposed objectives are meaningful and pertinent to the scope of the call.
 - The primary and secondary objectives are well defined and linked, and well supported by concise description of the work packages.
 - Scientific objectives are very well defined.
 - A positive aspect of the proposal is the aim to make use of classical philosophy relevant for solving problems of our time.
 - The relevance of the project is convincing; the conceptual framework is very attractive from the academic point of view.
 - The periodisation is convincingly explained and fits the aims of the specific scientific goals; moreover,

- the proposal clearly outlines the research material to be studied: manuscripts, printed materials, iconography and objects.
- The project objectives are clear and integrate different dimensions of the xxx domain as defined in relevant literature in the field.
 - The remaining parts of the proposal (methodology, transfer of knowledge, dissemination etc.) are clearly linked to the scientific objectives described.
 - The rationale for the proposed activities is clearly stated, and draws on connections to the Sustainable Development Goals as underpinning and explaining the significance of the work to be attempted.
 - The research objectives of the project are clearly presented and well focused.
 - The proposal clearly defines its research aims and articulates a number of important specific objectives.
 - The proposal's objective of developing inter-sectoral approaches in the selected research topic is clearly specified.
 - The objectives are well formulated and structured for research, transfer of knowledge and industry categories.
 - The aims and specific objectives of the planned research clearly demonstrate its timeliness and relevance against the state-of-the-art.
 - The main objective of the proposal is clearly set out in terms of scope. The research programme effectively integrates in a clear way four research objectives on the role of digital technologies and platform in enabling the connectivity and collaboration among different relevant actors. Research gaps and relative questions are clearly specified.
 - Scientific, technical and business oriented objectives, as well as training and mobility objectives are well defined.
 - The general and scientific objectives are precisely specified, realistic and achievable. The remaining parts of the proposal are clearly linked to the described scientific objectives.
 - The proposal focuses on current relevant research aimed to improve relevant and timely societal problems.
 - The project aims are clearly and pertinently defined in the light of xxx research field.
 - The proposal presents a highly credible project addressing a very relevant topic and a clear and detailed description of the project objectives.
 - The project is firmly based on an effective discussion about theoretical and conceptual topic related to the objectives of the research.
 - The proposed objectives are novel, clear, specific and achievable within the funding period.
- **Methodology**
 - The methodology is clear, credible and relevant to the objectives of the project. The inter/multidisciplinary methodology and intersectoral aspects proposed demonstrate good consideration of how to link together different technical domains.
 - The research methodology is clearly explained in sufficient detail and is novel.
 - Some research methodologies are adequately defined and include multidisciplinary aspects that are innovative.
 - The methodology to be used in chemistry is sound and credible.
 - The research methodology related to the design and construction of new xxx is adequate.
 - The methods used to achieve the scientific objectives are not new, however, advanced, appropriate and represent the state-of-the-art.
 - Chosen methodology is mostly efficient and appropriate to achieve the goals for the development of biologics.
 - The methodology which applies a wide array of state-of-the-art technologies is adequate.
 - The research methodologies are very well defined, including multidisciplinary aspects and are suitable for undertaking the proposed activities.
 - The proposal brings together a wide variety of approaches on the development of new nano-particles like vectors opening new perspectives on xxx.
 - The proposed methodology is advanced, credible, and appropriate to achieve the scientific objectives.
 - The multidisciplinary methodological approach is of good quality and is linked to the planned scientific

objectives.

- The described methodology is appropriately linked to the thematic focus stated and to the objectives set out in the proposal.
 - The methodology demonstrates a throughout understanding of the topic
 - The methodological approach is coherent and supports the credibility of the project
 - The extensive elaboration on the research methodology is very satisfactory, and together with the appropriate presentation of undertakings planned to conduct the transfer of knowledge and dissemination clearly linked to the scientific objectives of the proposal
 - The proposed interdisciplinary and comparative methodology, the long-term and transnational perspective is innovative, very well articulated and clearly appropriate for achieving the scientific objectives.
 - The proposal presents good methods and models of action.
 - This is a well presented proposal which is expected to merge traditional and innovative methods of xxx and xxx to create interdisciplinary protocols which will improve the quality of xxx data.
 - The research methodology scheme is appropriate to the proposal objectives and clearly described.
 - The methodology of the project is appropriate and credible and it is linked to the envisioned scholarly objectives.
 - The proposed methodologies are precisely specified combining multiple approaches in relation to the different scientific objectives described.
 - The proposal outlines a relevant context for developing methodologies and practices in an interdisciplinary dimension.
 - The methodology is credible and appropriate to achieve the defined objectives. Overall, the proposed methodology, transfer of knowledge, dissemination and communication activities are well linked to the project's scientific objectives.
 - The methodology is clearly specified and contains a good mix between theoretical, empirical and experimental approaches and it is clearly linked to the scientific objectives described.
 - The methodology is credible and consistent across each of the four application areas and for all of the research and innovation objectives.
 - There are useful features in the project methodology such as the development of potential think tank for sustainability.
 - The scientific and methodological approach is valid because it considers specific aspects of the challenges of the research field although the proposal is sector-specific.
 - The proposed methodology for knowledge sharing and knowledge transfer is generally appropriate which will directly contribute to achieving the aims of the research and innovation activities.
 - The methodology is credibly outlined and relevantly focused on limitations affecting several industrial applications.
 - The multidisciplinary research methodology is sufficient to achieve the project objectives.
 - The very well-designed research methodology includes dedicated innovation aspects.
 - The defined methodology is very comprehensive and very credible.
 - The selection of geographical areas of case studies is consistent with the project objectives.
- **Transfer of knowledge**
 - Knowledge transfer mechanisms and strategy are very good, and it is shown how this will directly contribute to achieving the aims of then research and innovation activities. For example, development of a guide for knowledge sharing activities is an innovative approach.
 - Knowledge exchange builds on the complementarity of research activities of the participating organisations and the described approach supports a continuous and widespread distribution of knowledge.
 - The knowledge exchange through training activities and other means is multidisciplinary and well justified in relation to the scientific objectives.
 - The sound and robust approach to maximize the transfer of knowledge is clearly linked to the scientific objectives of the project.
 - The knowledge to be shared between the participants is very well described with respect to wide-ranging complementary expertise, methodology and the use of state of the art equipment.

- Meaningful activities such as seminars and short courses are conceived to ensure appropriate transfer of knowledge back to the sending institution.
- The proposal envisions various actions for knowledge sharing.
- The organisation of the research process and cooperation between the project's participants definitely ensure the effective knowledge sharing between them and it is appropriate in the light of the project goals
- Concerning the knowledge sharing, various activities are properly described and appropriate to achieve the clearly identified scholarly objectives
- A substantial input from non-academic partners offers potential for knowledge transfer between sectors.
- The proposal offers a good diagrammatic indication of the way that knowledge sharing is going to take place.
- The approach to ensuring knowledge sharing between participants is well explained and pertinent, through the proposed two-way transfer of knowledge during the secondments, with seminars / workshops, etc.
- The approach to ensure knowledge sharing among participants is pertinent and adequately related to the different phases of the project. The knowledge transfer plan is solid, and the proposal provides sound justifications for how the plan contributes to realizing the aims of the research activities.
- The quality of knowledge sharing is high due to the capacities and complementarities between the project partners.
- The knowledge transfer is well-formulated contributing to in-depth understandings of the research topic.
- The transfer of knowledge is adequately presented: various appropriate actions (visits, secondments, workshops, trainings, etc.) are envisioned and outlined in the proposal.
- The activities of the projects are well designed to achieve a good level of transfer of knowledge between participating organisations. They are very well illustrated and pertinent to the aim of the project. The proposal provides for effective and valuable transnational, transdisciplinary and trans-sectoral knowledge sharing.
- The proposed methodology for the transfer of knowledge is pertinent to the objectives and strengthened by well-planned inter-sectoral exchanges.
- The knowledge sharing between the participants is ensured, pertinent and of high quality. The proposed technology transfer will contribute to achieving the aims of the research and innovation activities.
- The plan for knowledge sharing clearly contributes to the achievement of the project research and innovation objectives, as it has been structured based on the expertise and the skills of the consortium members.
- The proposed approach for knowledge sharing is pertinent and appropriately covers transfer of knowledge at the partner and secondment levels at the different stages of the project development. How knowledge will be shared between the academic and industrial partners in order to bring out commercially viable market solutions has been appropriately explained.

- **Secondments**

- Secondments for xxx are of good length and will support meaningful transfer of knowledge linking very well to research activities and a reintegration plan.
- Parallel secondments are well associated and systematically linked to the research objectives to be implemented. The workflow is well supported by separately funded activities and existing collaborations.
- The knowledge to be shared and the objectives of secondments are well described. Procedures are in place to ensure sharing of the newly acquired knowledge upon return to the sending institution.
- The inter-sectoral exchange leading to a credible advancement of the research capacity of the consortium members is clearly elaborated, particularly for the Third Country partners.
- The number of planned secondments is generally suitable to support an inter-continental academic

research network leading to knowledge sharing between participants.

- The secondments are clearly described, well justified and convincingly integrated in the overall project plan.
- The number of secondments facilitates in a suitable way the exchange to support research and training activities ensuring knowledge sharing between participants which are explained in excellent detail.
- Secondments and exchanges are well described related to the research programme.
- The substantial intersectoral secondments will provide good quality training and transfer of knowledge between the partners.
- The proposed knowledge sharing approach is comprehensive and includes the planned research and secondment activities to support the attainment of the research goals.
- The interaction between the participants is well addressed through the description of all secondments and the expected activities therein.
- The planned interactions are necessary to achieve the project objectives.
- The plan for mentoring during secondments, workshops and international conferences is well established.
- Focused on effectively integrating research and secondment activities, distinct contributions are described to emphasize the high quality of interactions between participating organisations.
- The secondments are well explained, and their duration is appropriate.
- There is a fair description of the planned secondments and their relevance is well underlined.
- The planned secondments for research activities are necessary to implement the described activities, and their duration is appropriate.

- **Training**

- The proposal indicates pertinent joint activities: in particular, the good articulation of training actions facilitates the exchange in specialised aspects of knowledge sharing and transfer of knowledge.
- There is a good focus on training ESR with the involvement of non-academic partners.
- Adequate forms of training activities are envisioned.
- Training activities are well justified in light of the objective of the proposed research.
- The proposed seminars and workshops are effective for sharing knowledge between participants.
- New areas of expertise and learning during the secondments are clearly formulated and precisely identified. This will contribute in a very good way to achieve the aims of the innovation.
- The contribution of the participating organisations to the exchange and training programme is well described. A variety of activities is well thought out to leverage networking opportunities such as summer school, Masterclasses etc. The role of the partners is adequately explained in terms of supervision of the staff members under the Open Innovation methodologies.
- Field trips and on-site training comprise valuable aspects of the training objectives.
- There is appropriate involvement of the stakeholders in the training and research activities.
- A good combination of workshops and network-wide training activities, which will provide transfer of scientific and technical knowledge, is presented.
- The good involvement of the non-academic sector in the training will provide to ESRs/ERs with industry related knowledge.
- The training program for scientific and transferable skills is well structured. The state-of-the-art review has been carefully prepared and provides sound guidance for the definition of the research and training objectives.

- **Dissemination and Work Plan**

- The international cooperation with a third country contributes to research exchange and public appeal, including exhibitions.
- The dissemination activities are very precisely described and planned.
- Very good interaction and synergies between the participating organisations are foreseen through the secondments and network-wide activities. The individual roles and distinct contributions of the participating organisations are well identified.
- The proposal clearly explains how the protocol makes for a convincing, transferable and usable model,

and coherently presents the activities that will contribute to knowledge sharing, for example field trips, labs, seminars, workshops, etc.

- The target audiences are clearly specified and the timetable of events demonstrates a well-justified chronological approach.
 - The conceptual framework is fully satisfactory.
 - The descriptions of participants' roles, their interactions and envisioned innovation activities are comprehensive.
 - The proposal offers a detailed list of research and training objectives. These objectives are well supported by the planned tasks.
- **Inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral aspects:**
 - The project proposal demonstrates diversity from academic and non-academic sectors, all providing good expertise.
 - The proposed project, aiming to implement xxx technologies to identify xxx of human disease, is ambitious and multidisciplinary.
 - The proposal includes a clear inter-sectoral involvement of partners with complementary wide-ranging expertise.
 - The combination of European and third country participants is well suited to the proposed multidisciplinary approach.
 - The expected multidisciplinary and intersectoral synergies are well matched to the objectives providing essential elements in the whole research and innovation process.
 - The proposal brings together multidisciplinary partners from academia and industry with complementary knowledge and methodological expertise. The contribution of each consortium participant is well described.
 - The international and intersectoral network that has been assembled adopts an integrated multidisciplinary approach.
 - Inter- and intrasectoral interactions are fostered through additional network-wide training events and workshops. The contributions of most of the partners to the specific objectives, their related expertise and the expected benefits, are well described and convincing.
 - The project is multidisciplinary covering a wide range of disciplines ranging from chemistry to structural biology, biochemistry and molecular/cell biology.
 - The proposal is intrinsically multidisciplinary and intersectoral involving different scientific/technical disciplines which are clearly described, credible, and relevant to the objectives of the project.
 - There is a high degree of intersectorality and multidisciplinary ranging from clinics to engineering and hardware development, which is advantageous for knowledge exchange.
 - The project is multidisciplinary in nature and brings together parties with very good expertise in relevant diverse fields.
 - The research approach is intersectoral and multidisciplinary, taking into consideration the technical challenges, the analysis and management of big data, as well as the education of health professionals and the ethical-social issues.
 - The project is multidisciplinary in nature and a necessary requirement for its success. There is an evident synergy between clinicians, epidemiologists, geneticists, laboratory and public awareness personnel involved.
 - The proposed research approach assumed by the selected inter-sectorial transfer of knowledge research groups is interdisciplinary, addressing art, museology, technology, history and art history, management and marketing art institutions.
 - The inter/multidisciplinary of the proposal is clearly connected with different theoretical approaches and justified. It is also supported by the research profiles and publications of the participants in the team.
 - The proposal convincingly argues that its inter-sectionality is expected to contribute to the achievement of its goals.
 - The project interdisciplinary approach is justified by the involvement in the work of experts on

different fields of work. The collaboration between industry and academia is a key aspect in the project.

- The proposal is well-structured and follows a multidisciplinary approach.
- The multidisciplinary dimension of the project is clearly developed with special reference to archaeology and new technologies.
- The proposal is clearly multidisciplinary and inter-sectoral with a well-balanced number of academic and industrial partners.
- The project draws upon knowledge from multiple disciplines and integrates these convincingly in the design.
- The interdisciplinary and intersectoral aspects are comprehensively explained and justified.
- The scientific approach is valid in interdisciplinary terms..
- The project implements multidisciplinary technologies including good experimental designs.
- The proposal demonstrates clearly the multidisciplinary aspect of the project, based on a multi-level analysis.
- The project clearly considers the multidisciplinary aspects, spanning from medicine to psychology, education and technology/IT.
- The inter/multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal are convincingly demonstrated and so are the inter-sectoral dimensions.
- The project is clearly multidisciplinary and intersectoral, the quality of interaction between partners is fully described.
- The intersectoral dimension described in the proposal is appropriate and highly relevant.
- The inter-sectoral character of the project is in general well argued, pertinent and focused on relevant issues related to Social Art Practice.
- The planned inter-sectoral exchange leads to a credible advance of research capacity in the project.
- The project has a good focus on academic and industry collaboration in development of new targeted therapy of xxx combined with lifestyle changes to improve patients' mobility and QOL
- The proposal indicates the involvement of relevant non-academic researchers and participants, presenting a research team and staff with a good track record.
- The Research Programme considers multiple approaches and the multidisciplinary knowledge described in the proposal is clearly linked to the project objectives in each of the four application areas.
- The supradisciplinary aspects required for the project success are clearly presented.
- The proposal has multi- and inter-disciplinary dimensions involving a relatively high number of non-academic institutions.
- The proposal clearly demonstrates its multi-disciplinary aspects. Moreover the followed multi-proxy approach is important for reaching the goals of the action.
- The research is highly integrated, interdisciplinary, international and intersectoral.
- The proposers have clearly demonstrated their multidisciplinary knowledge and how it will be deployed for achieving the proposed innovation and future potential business objectives of the industrial partners.
- This is a highly multidisciplinary project, combining a diverse range of approaches to study xxx, well justified as a relevant and important topic.

- **Gender aspects**

- The gender dimension has been adequately considered in respect to the cohorts of patients and animals for xxx models.
- The gender dimension regarding the use of human tissues in the research is well addressed.
- Gender aspects are comprehensively covered both at the scientific and managerial levels.
- Gender aspects have been well considered both at the research level and the consortium level.
- Gender patterns in xxx topic are well described.
- The gender dimension relevant to the proposed xxx research is well addressed.
- Gender aspects have been carefully addressed/ well thought out/ coherently taken into account/ very pertinent.
- The gender dimension has been well integrated into the knowledge sharing strategy.
- Gender dimensions, which are particularly important due to its relevance to the proposed subject, are

well integrated into the research design/awareness of gender aspects is well incorporated in the project.

- Promising and innovative ways to tackle gender based violence against migrant women have been provided.
- The gender aspects regarding the research content are adequately introduced.
- The gender aspects of the research are emphasized and taken into consideration.
- Awareness of gender aspects is sufficiently incorporated in the project.
- An active consideration of embedding gender issues into various parts of the project is taken into consideration.
- The gender aspects in terms of the research programme, and of the diseases being studied has been adequately and fully considered.
- The proposal offers strong consideration of the gender dimension, both in the content of the research, the project management, and in the work package activities. The gender aspects are clearly developed in terms of proposed secondments and in terms of involvement in proposed research themes.
- The proposed research considers and promotes gender equality in both the industrial and academic sectors.

Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives

- **Approach and methodology used for knowledge sharing (secondments, workshops/trainings/conferences, etc.).**
 - Plans are included to promote transfer of knowledge following each secondment, ensuring that researchers share their acquired knowledge and results to different colleagues.
 - Knowledge sharing activities through secondments are well planned, focused and well suited to support the project implementation.
 - Additional supportive workshops and two international conferences focused on xxx and xxx technology are correctly arranged as a part of knowledge sharing actions and are convincingly integrated with the project work plan.
 - The plans for knowledge sharing are credible. They cover a reasonable number of secondments and well planned annual and TC meetings, including proven innovative methods of learning. The different training and tasks for different levels of experience is a strength. Additionally, knowledge sharing at task handover is well thought through and clearly articulated.
 - The added value of the research in sense of the knowledge sharing is well described. The proposal provides a detailed list of secondments, with named people associated with a clear description of tasks to be accomplished.
 - The exclusive and cutting-edge technologies that form part of the research programme, represent an asset for the quality of knowledge sharing among participating organisations.
 - Transfer of knowledge activities are well planned, for example, regular events and training activities, including periodic workshops.
 - The knowledge sharing program is wide-ranging and well-structured (networking activities, research and training activities, workshops and innovation activities) to ensure exchange of cross-sectoral knowledge among all participants. The use of a consultant in the training is a strength.
 - The knowledge sharing among participants is relevant to the objectives. The secondment plan, the annual consortium meetings, the dissemination training schools and the integration with existing international consortia will facilitate an effective knowledge sharing.
 - The activities for knowledge sharing among the participants, planned at the individual level, WP level and network level, are well described and are strategically planned to achieve the scientific objectives.
 - The specific competencies, skills and cross-disciplinary knowledge that are to be shared during the secondments are well articulated within the project.
 - The plan for knowledge sharing is comprehensive and relevant. How the knowledge transferred will benefit each participant is appropriately described with specific examples.

- Directions of knowledge sharing in the area of establishment of new techniques and technology is comprehensive and well defined. Knowledge sharing is pertinent for achieving the goals.
- A clear strategy for knowledge sharing has been described, including details of secondments and their purpose.
- The activities for sharing both technical and non-technical knowledge among partners are very well planned and are adequate.
- All the seminars, workshops and conferences will be open to researchers from outside the network to maximise the quality of the project.
- The proposal describes fully and appropriately how the knowledge will be shared between participating organisations through secondments, training and networking activities.
- The knowledge sharing among participant institutions is well addressed and there is a clear presentation also of training aims and networking activity among the participants. Furthermore, the strategy of combining collective and individual secondments is well formulated and conducive to knowledge sharing.
- It is clearly described how the knowledge transfer between the consortium participants is expected to directly contribute to achieving the aims of the research activities.
- The joint activities such as workshops and training are very well foreseen and include various levels of participation and engagement which are promising to achieve the objectives of the project.
- The proposal presents a large and relevant variety of knowledge sharing academic activities, with a specifically orientated open access for academics, students, policy makers or professionals. The role of the extensive range of mobilities in promoting knowledge-sharing is mapped out in a satisfactory way in the proposal, with a range of potential inputs being signalled.
- The approach to ensure knowledge sharing among the participants based on a “twin approach” involving secondments is properly explained and clearly pertinent.
- The proposal successfully shows how European partners' expertise will be crucial to the project and therefore why specific knowledge sharing will support the project's objective.
- The envisaged approach to ensure knowledge sharing between participants, together with the detailed and innovative articulation of actions in specialised fields, is plainly explained and adequate to the project ambitions. It clearly contributes to the understanding of the research aims.
- The integration of expertise and the knowledge sharing between the large group of the selected participants fit well with the research objectives and these are appropriately defined.
- The knowledge sharing approach describes adequately specific tools to be developed as well as defined secondments.
- A detailed articulation of training events is proposed for the aspects of knowledge sharing and transfer of knowledge.
- The knowledge sharing is very focused on the individual researcher and is fully explored and planned in the light of the research objectives.
- The knowledge sharing related to the different secondments is very well described both for the methodological and theoretical aspects of the research.
- The quality of the knowledge sharing is appropriately demonstrated and is in line with the research project.
- A detailed articulation of training actions in specialized fields is proposed for the aspects of knowledge sharing and transfer of knowledge.
- The knowledge sharing mechanisms through extensive workshops, practical skills training and participation at network conferences are appropriate.
- The knowledge sharing between participants is well explained and pertinent. Network and training activities are well presented.
- The proposal builds on existing relationships between participants and will develop frameworks which will ensure clarity and quality of knowledge sharing. The consortium demonstrates its experience in knowledge transfer.
- The approach ensuring knowledge sharing among participants is well explained and coherent with the proposed scope. Partners' experience, capacities and skills are adequately detailed.
- Knowledge sharing through research, training, secondments and knowledge transfer activities are well

explained and appropriately incorporated into a framework through which the research related work packages are organised.

- The proposal presents methods and models for knowledge sharing logically linked with the objectives of the project, demonstrating the involvement and interaction of the participating partners.
- The proposed knowledge exchange in workshops, conferences and training also takes a full advantage of the multi-disciplinary nature of the proposal.
- The contribution of knowledge sharing activities towards the stated research and innovation aims and objectives is very promising. These activities, including jointly scheduled training and summer schools, are appropriate for sharing the potential results among participating organisations.
- The well-balanced contribution of all participating organisations to the research and knowledge sharing is sufficiently presented.
- The approach to knowledge sharing is precisely described and incorporates efficient practices that include e-learning, workshops, and secondments. The description of secondments is very well articulated in and the quality of the knowledge to be shared is very good.
- The approach to sharing knowledge between participants is very well explained and pertinent. The proposal very clearly describes how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute towards achieving the aims of the research and innovation activities.

Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations

- **Contribution of each participating organisation in the activities planned and expertise provided to reach the action's objectives**
 - The interactions between beneficiaries and partner organizations are relevant and organized to support optimal networking and mentoring within the consortium. For example, clear complementary contributions will be made by all participants.
 - The proposed interaction can strengthen links between European and South American research groups.
 - The proposed interactions are highly credible and well described. These are expected to foster cross-sectional interactions between EU/ACs and TCs, where multiple partnerships already exist with a record of successful collaborations in research and training.
 - There is evidence for previous successful interaction among at least some of the involved parties, which increases overall credibility that positive interactions will be developed.
 - The quality of interactions proposed in the project is good and described with sufficient detail to provide clear understanding of which tasks the different organisations will cooperate on during the secondments.
 - The presented interactions between the participants are relevant to the project. For example, experience from EU-funded collaborations increases the possibilities for efficient interactions and exchange of staff.
 - The interaction between the participants is well described, appropriately intersectoral, and relevant and necessary to achieve the objectives of the project. Each partner will actively develop a dedicated research endeavour.
 - Interactions between participating organisations with their specific contributions in xxx are well explained with objectives and justification for these activities. For example, network training activities are well planned with a clear vision of the type of skills that will be developed.
 - The interaction among participants is well described. Each partner will actively develop a dedicated research that contributes to complementary expertise, initially through all-consortium events and secondments, and later imported to the home institution.
 - Some participants have worked together previously in xxx research projects, which is a good foundation to the project.
 - The strengths, needs and roles of each participant in the project are clearly identified and the interaction among them is very good.
 - The credibility of the proposed work is well supported by some of the participants' previous fruitful

collaborations as well as the availability of resources.

- The quality of proposed interaction between project participant institutions is very good and necessary to achieve project goals.
- Participants are drawn from the key sectors, with each bringing specific and complementary expertise, in positive interactions.
- The interaction between the participants is of high quality and well described by listing complementarities and synergies which are required to achieve the goals of the project. The contribution to the consortium of each planned interaction is precisely explained.
- The interaction between the consortia members has been well described and convincingly demonstrated as being necessary and relevant to the project.
- The contribution of each participating organisation in the activities planned is clearly demonstrated / and explicitly linked to the project's scientific objectives.
- The key academic skills and professional characteristics of the named individuals are listed, and relate to several of the themes highlighted in the project's topic; partners will input to the project based upon their profile characteristics.
- The research teams and staff present a track record that highlights its ability to develop innovative research.
- The interaction between the participants is consistent with the proposed research objectives/ is well planned.
- The proposed work fits well with the different participating organizations clear focus on the scientific and expertise fields of the proposal – ICT and mobility.
- The participants have a history of working together, which is adequately explained and will be strengthened through the project.
- The participating organisations demonstrate experience in the broad field of analysis described by the proposal.
- The subject-orientation of the partners, both academic and non-academic is integrally linked to the stated objectives and provides a good basis for interaction.
- The range of transferable, work-based skills is impressive and indicative of the potential for a highly beneficial series of interactions.
- Each participant institution concretely demonstrates a useful contribution to the project. /Each participant has a well established scientific portfolio as well as collaboration with policy/practice agents, experience and track record in international cooperation in the field between Europe and Latin America.
- The planned sessions to formalise interaction each has an explicit focus, linked to the overall objectives.
- The credibility of the network is convincingly demonstrated since it involves different well known institutions (Academic and Non-Academic) with a very relevant knowledge on the topic of the research project.
- The credibility of the network is good as it involves different institutions with a very relevant knowledge on the topic of the Research Programme.
- The quality of the proposed interaction between the involved partners is fully documented with an appropriate description of the main networking activities.
- The interaction between the participants, such as research, training and engagement, is realistic, including particular activities for dissemination of results and sustainability which fully underpin this project. Linguistic and communication channels facilitating the consortium joint tasks are well considered.
- The interaction between the partners are expected to be supported by the benefit drawn from previous collaborations.
- Regular conferences and networking activities combined with monthly meetings and ongoing training promises solid interaction between the participating organizations. In this the creation of 'cohorts' for training delivery and mentorship provide a strong foundation for consistent interaction.
- The contribution of each participating organisation to the project and their complementarity is well demonstrated.
- The participating organisations demonstrate competences and well distinguished expertise with respect to the research objectives.
- The proposal presents a very detailed and clear description for each participating institutions. The "general" responsibility of each participant and their involvement in the project is clearly presented. The individual expertise of each consortium member is highly relevant as the main pillar for the

research and innovation objectives. There is a clear coherence in it.

- The proposal provides very useful details about the partners' expertise and successfully demonstrates how they are highly qualified to meet and deliver sounds results and reach the stated objectives.
 - The project successfully demonstrates how the interaction among partners is based on previous work and therefore on already tested successful interaction.
 - The amount of contribution to specific activities by each beneficiary (through secondments outgoing/incoming) sufficiently clear.
 - The proposal adequately shows how participants have been involved in high quality research on xxx topic.
 - The proposal provides for structured interaction between the participating organisations. These interactions are appropriately arranged around the delivery of the scientific objectives.
 - The interaction between participants is properly described.
 - The relevance of the interaction of consortium members to the achievement of project objectives is very clear. (ENV) (3.00)
 - Key contribution to the project for all participants is demonstrated. All participants have good expertise in the scope of proposed research and innovation programme.
 - The interactions are adequately demonstrated, and the research is expected to be led by a very experienced project co-ordinator.
 - The interaction between the participating organisations is very well presented and therefore its relevance for the achievement of the objectives of the project is convincingly confirmed.
 - The integration of expertise between the participants is coherent with the research objectives and adequately discussed with special reference to xxx sector.
 - Interactions between participating organisations are very good since each participant has a relevant curriculum on the field.
 - The presence of the non-academic sector is well balanced and adequately-outlined.
- **Justification of the main networking activities**
 - The diverse networking activities and interactions are clearly described and well detailed.
 - The main networking activities (i.e.. kick off meeting, winter/summer schools, training events, conferences, online platform) are well justified.
 - The interactions among participants of the academic and non-academic sector, particularly between EU and non-EU anti-Violence Centres are relevant to achieve the research objectives.
 - The proposal convincingly argues that the proposed thematic conferences, secondments and various envisioned publications secure extended collaboration at all levels of research and training.
 - The extent to which the participating organizations will concretely benefit from the research through the proposed actions and secondments is properly argued.
 - The specific innovation activities are adequately described for each participating organization and with respect to the identified objectives providing further visual and geographical mapping and summary of the links between knowledge and beneficiaries.
 - The approach based on comprehensive, logically interlinked and justified activities, including network training events, that engage all members/partners, guarantees its efficiency.
 - The quality of the proposed interaction between the involved partners is fully documented with an appropriate description of the main networking and outreach activities.
 - The proposed interaction between organisations and how they will benefit is well presented and described in areas such as research and training and stakeholder engagement, including particular activities for the dissemination of results and sustainability and the overall mobility strategy.
 - The interaction between the participants is well described and is arranged mainly by a serious of workshops and training skills activities; secondly the amount of "long term" secondments between academia and non-academia are credibly considered promising interaction modes.

Weaknesses:

Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action; level of novelty and appropriate consideration of inter/multidisciplinary, intersectoral and gender aspects

• **Quality and credibility of the research/innovation action**

- The scientific hypothesis and the rationale is not clearly presented.
- There are some oversights in proposed experimental strategies.
- Some research aspects of the proposal are not convincingly justified. For instance, the proposed games/tailored guiding products and the choice of focus on specific art content and time frames in the history of art. Equally important, the limitations of these choices, taking into account the complex history of past experiments between art/IT/tourism are not fully explored. The degree of success of IT and Art integration in the museum environment is not fully explored.
- The value of visiting exhibitions is underestimated since the proposal takes as given the loss of public in museums. The relation between audiences and museums and the ways in which that relationship might influence setting and fulfilling objectives is not sufficiently developed.
- The selection of case studies and the reasons for including them in the proposal are insufficiently explained.
- There is little justification for the project focus on disadvantaged/low SES individuals - this is evidenced by only a single mono-cultural example.
- The proposal lacks substantial theoretical contributions.
- Although the state-of-the-art is discussed mostly for the overall issues regarding the Digital Agenda, information modeling and 3D database, there are insufficient details on the specific innovative aspects of 3D modeling, surveys techniques, archive methods and scientific classification issues.
- There is insufficient information regarding the level to which language teachers will be trained and the type of certification to be developed.
- While the topic looks very attractive, reducing the negative impact of xxx with the use of smart technologies, the proposal fails to show any innovative solutions compared to what exists until now.
- The study does not convincingly demonstrate the innovative character of the research.
- There is little recognition given to the major differences/experiences of xxx within countries limiting the overall credibility of the research proposal.
- The innovation of the planned research is not evident, namely due to the fact that this project benefits from the findings of a previous project in the same theme.
- The proposal lacks quantifiable scientific/technical performance indices to measure the quality of the research.
- The innovative aspects of the proposed action are not sufficiently justified. Measurable indicators to assess the degree and extent of the innovations are not fully provided.
- Some aspects related to the degree of innovation, often claimed in the proposal, such as cost-effectiveness in terms of time, resources and waste are insufficiently quantified.

• **Level of novelty**

- The novelty of the project is not convincingly demonstrated.
- The level of originality of the research proposed by the consortium is low. For example, the innovation potential is poor as there are already similar products on the international market.
- A key element pertaining to the novelty of the project, the proposed diagnostic device, is not described in sufficient detail.
- The novelty of this approach is not well addressed relative to the state of the art of biomarkers and ultrasound devices.
- The novelty of the planned research in terms of medical implications is not very well demonstrated. The relevance of the project in terms of possible medical improvements is limited.
- The quality and novelty of the planned research / innovation activities are not clearly demonstrated. Its

relevance against the current state-of-the-art is not adequately detailed.

- The innovative character of the proposed activities and the novelty of the project with respect to relevant research techniques is not convincingly demonstrated
 - The innovative aspects of the content of the knowledge that will be shared are not sufficiently justified. This concerns especially the workshops, lectures and seminars on xxx of philosophy, theoretical and political philosophy to be held in both xxx and Europe: how they differ from the traditional xxx research is unclear.
 - It is not clear from the proposal how the project will contribute to the academic debates raised in the vast literature on xxx in general and political xxx in particular.
 - From a scientific point of view the essential issues of urban-rural divide (e.g. power relations and domination of urban space over the rural one) are not clearly elaborated as well as the innovativeness of the research topic.
 - The innovative focus is emphasized by the notion of a xxx, which is described in detail and its purpose clearly defined. However, the practicality of establishing the xxx is not really clear. Issues around transferability of a research environment from an advantaged research sphere in the north towards a disadvantaged research sphere in the south are not fairly explained in its practicality and how/if this contributes to the knowledge sharing.
 - The project does not properly justify how it will bring new knowledge in the field.
 - The connection between the selected principal disciplinary themes of project is insufficiently evidenced.
 - There is insufficient demonstration of the innovative xxx to be introduced through the use of technology.
 - The provided list of references is insufficiently detailed to convince about the innovativeness of the project.
 - The novelty of the project is not clearly demonstrated with respect to the selected research objectives.
 - Limited comparative information is provided to fully justify how the proposal differentiates itself from past or ongoing research with the same research objects.
 - It is unclear how the proposed project is novel bearing in mind that there is vast body of literature covering other regions.
 - Whilst a wide framework is presented in the field of Open Innovation the specific novelty of the project is not fully clear. Specifically, the project presents reasoned but repetitive concept on the potential and advantages of the Open Innovation.
 - Although a general framework is given, the claims about current state-of-the-art are not sufficiently evidenced, and the innovative nature of the planned research is not fully convincing.
 - The overall novelty of the planned research and innovation activities are inadequately demonstrated against the current state-of-the-art.
 - The scientific innovation of the proposal is insufficiently addressed in relation to the main research objectives.
 - Innovative aspects of this proposal are not convincingly outlined.
 - The novelty aspects are not fully evident in the light of current solutions in the field.
- **State of art**
 - The relevant background and state of the art are not described in a manner that highlights the originality of the proposed research.
 - The innovative elements of the research approach in relation to the state of the art are not convincingly demonstrated.
 - The proposal only partially presents the state of the art in its description of the current bottleneck and scientific hurdles in fast analysis in the food sector. Current solutions already available in the market for food analysis, and the novelty of the proposed approach is thus not well demonstrated.
 - The state of the art regarding the analysis and comparison of xxx mechanisms of organisms from multiple kingdoms is not sufficiently elaborated.
 - The development of the techniques and methodologies is not sufficiently explained compared to the state of the art.
 - The state of the art is not explained or appropriately referenced, therefore innovation potential is poor.

- The technological state of the art is inaccurately appraised. For example, given the number of companies in the xxx market, the proposition that a high quality device can be produced at such a cheap price is not well justified. Most mass-market devices do not compare well against gold standard devices in their estimates of key parameters.
- The project lacks novelty as it is not clearly presented how the proposed work goes beyond the state of the art.
- The research on socio-economic effects is insufficiently outlined against the state-of-the-art. The quality and credibility of the activities are thus not convincingly demonstrated and the relevance to the overall project is not evident.
- Some aspects of the state of the art are overlooked or poorly documented, for example, the background information on the currently available xxx to be used.
- The state of the art with respect to xxx using nanoparticles is not adequately described and the innovative aspects of the project are not convincingly presented.
- The state of the art, for example, regarding limitations of the potential use of xxx in a clinical setting has not been properly considered.
- The project theoretical framework does not sufficiently demonstrate the capacity to produce results that may significantly develop the state-of-the-art through knowledge sharing and collaboration, namely in edutainment and applied knowledge for xxx studies.
- The state of the art in the research field is not sufficiently elaborated thus leaving the proposal's claims for novelty not fully justified. How the project goes beyond the research and innovation done by the already existing scholarly networks is not clearly demonstrated/ it is not completely clear which are the new subjects to be studied during the course of the project and how are they related to the work already done.
- The state-of-the art is not fully / only partially presented and not completely addressed. The contribution of the proposal to the state-of-the-art is unclear / the proposed interdisciplinary research is not fully argued against the state of the art.
- The project's relevance against the current state of the art is not sufficiently evidenced. The conceptual framework and empirical descriptions do not clearly position the project vis-à-vis the academic literature and theory pertaining to the topic of xxx.
- The concept is not clearly defined in the proposal and the state-of-the-art is not appropriately described.
- The theoretical framework does not sufficiently demonstrate the capacity to obtain results that may significantly develop the state-of-the-art through the proposed knowledge sharing and collaboration.
- The state of the art is not adequately analysed to justify fully some of the assumptions made on the proposed approach in management sciences to big data analytics use in businesses.
- The current state of the art is not very well presented for some elements of the proposal.
- The argument of different health care system being investigated is not sufficiently elaborated in particular it remains unclear how the specificities of each countries health care system may be addressed through the research.
- Current state-of-the-art is not described in significant details in particular regarding social aspects.
- Although a general framework is given, the claims about current state-of-the-art are not sufficiently evidenced, and the innovative nature of the planned research is not fully convincing.
- The current state-of-the-art lacks important details related to main research topic.
- The state-of-the-art is insufficiently described, missing significant current contributions to the field.
- The state of the art is not fully described and the proposal does not clearly establish the coherence and credibility of the research methodology.
- The current state-of-the-art and its progress are not fully and credibly supported in the proposal.
- The state of the art and the progress beyond this is not very well presented in relation to existing and other similar technologies.
- The state-of-art is insufficiently addressed to support the added-value claimed. The discussion on the innovation potential in the field is not sufficiently articulated.

- **Specific objectives and the relevance of the research and innovation action**

- The research objectives and planned research and innovation activities do not take sufficient account of the potential drawbacks and challenges related to the use of xxx.
- The main objectives are too diffuse, with insufficient explanation of why the particular xxx are being considered together. Not enough effort is focused on one research area to be effective.
- The scientific objectives are very broadly defined and do not target a specific type of cancer or type of infection.
- Research objectives target too many scientific fields, which significantly detracts from the focus of the research and questions the overall feasibility.
- The research objectives are not fully focused or explained in relation to the state of the art.
- Research and innovation objectives are insufficiently focused. For example, the first objective is too vague.
- The wide breadth of diseases targets under study is not sufficiently discussed, making the proposal quite unfocused and overambitious in the proposed timelines.
- The project comprises too many objectives, each of which has significant complexity; whilst these are interlinked, it is doubtful that the research programme envisaged is viable.
- The proposal specific objectives are not fully described and are not systematically linked to the planned research methodology and project phases. Also, how the data will be collected and how these data will be systematized according to clearly defined criteria is not consistently described.
- The scientific objectives are not specific enough, the scope of the research subject is too broad and the methodology is not adequately explained.
- The proposal fails to show an appreciation of the political and social specificities of the current migrant/refugee crisis and how these are being challenged at present.
- The proposal is largely built around a new term it introduces but the rationale for introducing this term and its meaning are not adequately described.
- The discussion on the curriculum of xxx is not sufficiently developed.
- Technology Enabled Solutions as part of the methodology are insufficiently presented raising concerns about the focused objectives in the research proposal.
- The proposed research questions are a string of questions rather than a question with an explanation. This diminishes the clarity with which the objective of the proposal is formulated. Moreover, there is a lack of convincing details to explain the limitation of the research question in relation to the expected outputs of the project.
- The specific objectives are insufficiently specified.
- The scientific objectives are very broad in the light of the identified challenges and the complex process interactions in the research field.
- The breadth of scientific objectives is not fully justified in the proposal.
- Research objectives are inappropriately defined. There is insufficient detail given on the research activities because of a disproportionate focus on networking and training.
- The research objectives do not go beyond the state of the art to address specific clinical subtypes.
- The research objectives are not convincingly presented. The way in which disadvantaged, disengaged and low-income, non-specialist individuals will be recruited and concretely involved into highly specialised actions is not sufficiently explained.
- The objectives of the project are not formulated in sufficient terms. For example, the research goals are presented as “examples” rather than through a list of the specific targets to be achieved through the project.

- **Methodology**

- Insufficient methodological details are included. In addition, data integration is not addressed appropriately and it is unclear if samples and cohorts are new or existing, and if access to these is already established.
- There is inadequate explanation of methods to be used for reaching the scientific objective, with insufficient explanation of how objectives will be achieved.

- Some specific methodological approaches are too generally explained to evaluate the feasibility of the project.
- The methodology contains insufficient detail on the protocols that will be tested/compared in the pilot phase. Additionally, the proposal does not specify the number of xxx planned for each sample.
- Some aspects of the methodological approach are unclear. For example, the composition of the dataset is not clearly described or how this can be ultimately integrated into the project.
- There is not enough justification of the proposed methodological approach using the xxx device, compared to other more direct methods.
- It is unclear whether the proposed methodology is sufficient to achieve the scientific objectives, lessening the credibility of the project.
- The methodological approach in xxx is not sound. In addition, the proposed xxx strategy is underdeveloped and lacks important details, such as controls to be used as benchmarks.
- The usefulness of the techniques and methodologies applied in the project are not sufficiently explained against the technological state of the art or scientific requirements.
- There are numerous methodological shortcomings. For example, the proposal does not clearly describe which criteria will be considered in the enrolment of the children. In addition, insufficient evidence is given of xxx's willingness or ability to act as wellness coaches. Benchmarks for successful outcomes, e.g. % increase in moderate-to-vigorous activity, are not clearly defined.
- There are some methodological shortcomings. For example, the proposal does not contain enough information on how the performance of the device will be assessed. In addition, the proposal does not illustrate convincingly how the methods related to xxx will be effectively coupled to a low-cost device.
- The methodology is not convincing in terms of innovation. In addition, the description of the methodological section is too general.
- There are some methodological oversights. The proposal does not contain sufficient details on the procedure, samples and performance indicators that will be used to determine the effectiveness of the xxx model that will be created during the project.
- The methodology to be used in some work packages is not explained in sufficient detail. For example, WP1 lists the use of minimal data sets for building models but no explanation or reference is given on how to achieve this goal or what is implied.
- The proposed methodology is not fully appropriate to reach some of the project goals.
- The description of the methodologies is unclear and do not sufficiently demonstrate innovative features. Five different operations aiming to implement the research are planned but without sufficiently detailed description of their content.
- The methodology is not clearly elaborated: the explanation of the methodological aspects mixes research strategy with the research techniques; the real research methods are mentioned only occasionally and remain insufficiently explained. Similarly, the multidisciplinary of the research process is mixed with the multidisciplinary range of participants.
- Given the sensitivity of the research topic, it's not convincingly explained how the consortium will achieve the objectives through the methodologies described in the proposal.
- The three methodological approaches to be applied in phase 1 (grounded theory, action research and case study methods) are very different in terms of ontological and epistemological assumptions, and the proposal does not adequately outline a strategy for integrating them.
- The proposal does not provide sufficiently specific information on the purpose(s) of the primary data collection and the method(s) to be used.
- The proposal does not consider sufficiently the diversity of methodologies to be utilised, and the impacts of cultural understandings on them.
- The research methodology is generically presented and not properly linked to the project objectives.
- The methodological approach is not clearly specified; the description of the research programme is mainly referred to surveying. Moreover, the first phase of the project will be devoted to developing a common methodology but, the proposal itself does not give a direction of which kind of methodology will be followed.
- The project's methodological approach is inadequate because it does not incorporate sufficiently

historical and cultural perspectives.

- The proposal does not explain adequately how will the problems of accessing the relevant material be dealt with.
 - The proposed methodology to achieve the scientific objectives in relation to the xxx aspects are less developed. This is a significant shortcoming.
 - Not enough information is provided about the methodology, raising questions about its credibility and appropriateness to achieve the desired objectives.
 - The research methodology is not fully clear in defining the methods selected to carry out the project.
 - Even clear, the methodologies to be employed are only partially linked to some of the specific research questions and objectives.
 - Whilst the description of the methodology is formulated, the proposal does not provide adequate detail as to how these methods would involve expertise and organization to ensure the goals of the project.
 - There is no clear presentation nor discussion of the quality of the adopted methodology, making difficult the assessment of its credibility and appropriateness to achieve the scientific objectives.
 - The description of the methodology is too generic.
 - The proposal is limited to standardized methods and tools. The methodology of the proposal is not clearly explained.
 - The research methodology is not cohesively developed.
 - The scientific approach and methodology is not rigorously defined.
 - Methodology is broadly focused on technologies that are too generically described.
- **Transfer of knowledge**
 - How the proposed knowledge transfer will contribute to achieving the project's aims is only broadly described.
 - The importance of knowledge transfer to the TC participants is not adequately demonstrated.
 - The knowledge sharing is not linked to the specific scientific objectives and is poorly linked to the innovative activities in the project.
 - The nature of the knowledge transfer, such as the exact technology, skills or expertise to be shared is only broadly described.
 - Knowledge sharing is not well explained. e.g. proposed activities to improve complementary skills are too vague to demonstrate their quality/relevance to the project, and there is insufficient detail to demonstrate the quality of the knowledge-sharing lectures and workshops proposed.
 - The effectiveness of the knowledge sharing is not clearly outlined within the timeline of the proposal, given the very wide range in potential training areas.
 - Even though the contents of the sharing activities is clear in terms of xxx development, the overall strategy of knowledge transfer inside the consortium is not convincingly presented. For instance, the project provides information on how the given knowledge will be useful for a given phase but there is limited explanation as to what and how specific knowledge will be transferred.
 - Some knowledge transfer activities, in particular the conferences, are not described in sufficient detail.
 - The proposal doesn't present in sufficient detail the transfer of knowledge objectives aiming at the improvement of research knowledge as well as general skills of the teams.
 - Since the description of knowledge sharing is concentrated more on procedures than outcomes, its direct contribution to the aims of the research and innovation activities is not satisfactorily explained.
 - The knowledge sharing is presented at a very broad level and it is expected to provide breadth but not depth of knowledge among the participants. For instance, it is not clearly enough how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute to achieving the aims of the research and innovation activities since concrete measures are not sufficiently explained and the topics of the workshops, training and conferences are not specifically identified.
 - The proposal does not fully describe the links between the participating institutions and the case studies in order to reach the proposed objectives in transfer of knowledge.
 - The quality of knowledge sharing is not sufficiently justified.
 - The pertinence of knowledge sharing between participants is not sufficiently justified.
 - The proposal does not clearly demonstrate how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute to

achieving the aims of the research and innovation activities.

- The proposal does not describe how the transfer of knowledge will be done between academic and non-academic partners. Creating a network for exchanging expertise is not sufficient (no patents, joint venture).
 - The rationale for selecting the specific non-academic institutions is not clearly addressed in order to demonstrate the intersectoral aspects of the project.
 - An active involvement of non-academic partners is established in principle, but the way in which this is expected to be ensured is not explained in sufficient detail.
 - The proposal does not provide a clear explanation of the inter-connectivities between the various knowledge-sharing mechanisms it describes.
 - The transfer of knowledge is not clearly linked to the scientific objectives described.
 - Explanation of the functioning of the exchange of knowledge mechanism does not highlight the ways how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute to achieving the objectives of the research. Information about the concrete knowledge to be transferred between the project participants during the secondments is not described in sufficient detail.
 - The mechanism of transfer of knowledge is limited to secondments without a clear description of the benefit of these secondments in terms of share of knowledge.
 - The proposal is not clear enough in explaining the process of knowledge transfer and how it would contribute to achieving the aims of the research activities. For example, there is reference to training in soft skills but no clear specification of the envisaged skills nor how and when they will be acquired.
 - It is not clearly explained how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute to achieving the aims of the research activities.
 - The proposal does not present adequately how the knowledge transferred will help achieve the research objectives.
 - The plan of collaborations and staff exchanges to offer a comprehensive transfer of knowledge and training environment for the researcher, and between the participating organizations, is not sufficiently presented.
 - Some elements of the knowledge-sharing methodology like e.g. workshops and online seminars are not clearly linked with the research.
 - The interactions between the participating organisations in the planned activities do not clearly identify the link between knowledge transfer and the achievement of the project objectives.
- **Secondments**
 - The appropriateness and effectiveness of the relatively short secondments is not properly demonstrated in relation to the research objectives.
 - There is insufficient detail on the type of knowledge to be shared between organizations during secondments, and how it will contribute to reaching the scientific and medical objectives.
 - The proposal lists secondments, training courses, conferences, publications without giving the necessary detail about their content.
 - The secondments are not clear in terms of activities to be performed, transfer of knowledge and hosting organisations.
 - The secondments unbalanced number between partners is not sufficiently justified.
 - It is not sufficiently well-explained how the secondments relate to the project objectives.
 - The description of secondments is not sufficiently detailed to ensure that they will adequately contribute to achieving the research and innovation goals of the project.
 - Details of the proposed secondments are not fully presented.
 - Activities related to knowledge transfer through secondments are not appropriately addressed.
 - The description of secondments is not sufficiently detailed.
 - **Training**
 - The training of researchers is not well aligned to all the research objectives.
 - The presented joint activities, such as workshops and training, are not thoroughly defined and lack

adequate elaboration of the levels of participation and engagement.

- ESR and ER training are not clearly detailed, in particular regarding inter-disciplinary research training.
- The proposal does not provide sufficient detail on how to measure the performances of training activities.
- The advancements in the non-academic skills of the researchers are not convincingly demonstrated.
- The content of the network-wide training programme is not elaborated clearly enough.
- The proposal neither satisfactorily outlines the skills that will be developed nor the enhancement of career perspectives for participating researchers.

- **Dissemination and Work Plan**

- Specific dissemination actions are not convincingly elaborated.
- The exploitation strategy is not credibly described in the proposal.
- The development work packages lack sample sizes and there is a lack of information on xxx options in related packages.
- The proposal fails to show clear operational objectives related to the more general objective (i.e. developing a toolkit facilitating crossdisciplinary research by collaboration and co-creation).

- **Inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral aspects:**

- The intersectoral dimension of the proposed networking activities is severely limited / is not sufficiently discussed.
- The intersectoral exposure of the participants is not well developed in the application.
- Since this is a very broad inter-disciplinary and multi-disciplinary network, there is lack of focus on how meaningful interactions will be developed.
- The inter/multidisciplinary dimension of the project is not fully developed/ not demonstrated in sufficient detail.
- There is insufficient evidence that what is proposed will assist in developing multi-sectoral thinking or activity, given the absence of any non-academic partners.
- It is not clear how the project will take advantage of the complementarity of the fields of research represented by the partners.
- The relevance of the inter-sectoral research and innovation exchange, that involves some partners from Third Countries, has not been fully elaborated with respect to the outlined research objectives.
- The multidisciplinary activities cover only some areas within the proposal's research field, and the multidisciplinaryity is mainly related to exchange of participants.
- It is not sufficiently explained how the different disciplinary approaches will be used and interconnected.
- The multidisciplinary dimension is not fully developed with special reference to the aspect related to 'new trans-disciplinary xxx', 'database creation', etc.
- The notion of interdisciplinarity, which is very relevant to the research field and the xxx evaluation method, is not consistently defined throughout the proposal.
- The project does not adequately justify the links between the different fields of study considered in the research activity as well as the selection of the case study countries to be representatives of the xxx region.
- The proposal does not provide a satisfactory presentation of the contribution of the multidisciplinary disciplines involved in the proposed programme.
- Multidisciplinary activities described in "state-of-the-art" only covers some areas of the research field.
- Whilst the project is multidisciplinary by nature, it is not fully clear how this multidisciplinary would be channelled to foster the respective skills in the planned research.
- The multidisciplinary aspects of the research are not fully elaborated. For example, there is no clear reference to specific knowledge in the statistical and econometric fields, nor in some relevant for the theme social sciences, such as law and sociology.
- Multidisciplinary aspects of the programme although mentioned in the proposal are not presented in sufficient detail and therefore it is hard to expect that the posed scientific objectives would be achieved.

- **Gender aspects**

- The gender dimension in the research is not addressed appropriately, for example, in relation to the recruitment of subjects or the analysis of existing datasets.
- The gender considerations in xxx related disorders have not been addressed appropriately.
- The gender dimension of the research and innovation topic, even though relevant, is not sufficiently addressed.
- The gender dimension in such a medical domain is highly relevant but this aspect is not properly addressed in the scientific plan.
- Gender-specific risk factors in terms of xxx disease are not sufficiently taken into account.
- The gender aspects in terms of working with experimental models have not been properly addressed.
- Considering that the project will utilize data from human subjects, how the gender dimension may or may not relate to physical activity has not been well addressed.
- The gender dimension in research and innovation, even though relevant for this proposal, was not addressed appropriately.
- Given that xxx disease affects both genders, there is insufficient discussion about possible gender-related differences.
- The gender dimension is only marginally addressed - this has important implications for work in the topic.
- The gender dimension in research and innovation content is not properly addressed in view of the proposed research objectives.
- The gender perspective, particularly power relations (north-south, academic-non-academic) and cultural issues, specifically in respect of research ethics have not been addressed in sufficient detail.
- Gender, while highly relevant to the research topic, is not integrated into the conceptual discussion and research design.
- The gender aspects regarding xxx affecting both male and female equally is inaccurate and contested.
- The proposal addresses vulnerable groups but does not address adequately the gender perspective in the research proposal.
- The gender aspects are not sufficiently elaborated, especially in relation to the scientific side of the research.
- The approach for the relevant gender aspects in the research field is not convincingly articulated.
- The gender aspects are not appropriately considered in terms of the research and innovation content.

Quality and appropriateness of knowledge sharing among the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives

- **Approach and methodology used for knowledge sharing (secondments, workshops/trainings/conferences, etc.).**

- The proposal does not describe in sufficient detail the approach and methodology for sharing the knowledge among the partners.
- The description of the knowledge sharing activities is very brief and their added value for the participants is not well demonstrated.
- Whereas the activities in knowledge sharing among the project partners are credible, the content, i.e. the knowledge to be shared is insufficiently described.
- It is not clear how the proposed exchange of knowledge can practically extend through the consortium, given that secondments have been described in insufficient detail. For example, the way in which datasets will be shared amongst participants is not properly described.
- The contribution of the private sector to the knowledge sharing is not clearly described, which is incoherent with the research objectives.
- The knowledge sharing is not appropriately linked to specific scientific activities. The objectives of the secondments are described in a very generic manner.
- Concrete actions related to knowledge transfer are poorly addressed. In particular, description of knowledge sharing required for the secondment tasks is insufficient.

- The proposal does not sufficiently describe the topics of the annual workshops and lectures, as well as the contribution of each participant in the organization of the training events.
- While some parts of the knowledge sharing are well described, the modalities of knowledge sharing are not detailed with respect to the objectives.
- Other than secondments, the proposal does not clearly describe networking activities for sharing of knowledge among all the participating organisations.
- Sufficient details are not provided regarding some transfer of knowledge activities. For example, the duration of the training and the expected number of participants are not sufficiently justified.
- The proposed transfer of knowledge does not fully match the described objectives, e.g. seminars, workshops and training sessions are not properly elaborated to suit the proposals objectives, and the potential interactions are not adequately developed./There is not enough information on the interaction and knowledge exchange between participants, except for having them in the same place.
- The synergies/continuities between the various knowledge-sharing approaches are unclear, as is the intended purpose. The project does not fully acknowledge the different levels in which the researchers might be operating, and how this will impact on their capacity to share knowledge./ There is an inadequate presentation of aspects of duty of care for the research participants, many of whom might be highly vulnerable.
- The knowledge sharing does not adequately describe how those exchanges contribute that knowledge is actually shared and the operational aspect of the interactions
- The proposal tends not to be specific in presenting the purpose of particular knowledge-sharing actions. It is unclear as to how the consortium is expected to ensure that the end-product is able to be measured in respect of its efficacy in engaging with multiple audiences in order to promote effective knowledge.
- There is insufficient mention of how some aspects of knowledge transfer and sharing will be addressed such as the linguistic and cultural issues in dealing with xxx organisations and the advanced technological training in a short time.
- The knowledge transfer activities specifically supporting the development of the evaluation method is not adequately defined.
- The link between the knowledge transfer and the project aims is not completely demonstrated.
- The proposal does not clearly identify the partners with the type of knowledge to be transferred.
- The knowledge sharing activities are outlined but insufficiently detailed in the proposal. For example, it is not clear how the knowledge transfer will directly contribute to achieve the aims of the research and innovation activities.
- The explanation of the knowledge sharing and mechanism is underdeveloped. Several standard means are put forward but they are not sufficiently justified in terms of the knowledge exchange to be produced.
- The knowledge sharing between the participants is not sufficiently elaborated. The activities planned are described only in a generic way.
- The direct link between the knowledge sharing activities and the innovation activities is insufficiently described.
- The clarity and quality of knowledge sharing in light of the research objectives are vaguely described and there is insufficient information about the synergy between the proposed research and training activities.
- The importance of the contribution of the knowledge transfer among the participating organisations in order to realize the aims of the research and innovation activities is not convincingly identified. The involvement of the participants in the secondments, tasks, training etc is presented in generic terms.
- The geographic selection of the consortium countries is too narrow and might limit the expected knowledge-sharing of the project.

Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations

- **Contribution of each participating organisation in the activities planned and expertise provided to reach the action's objectives**
 - The proposal is not clear about the relevant competences of the partners and the knowledge sharing that will be achieved. In particular, the expertise and experience of the xxx partner relating to the research field is not adequately demonstrated.
 - Interactions between participating organizations are described with only generic statements.
 - The exact interactions that are to take place between the consortium members are only generally explained. For example, the description of specific resources that will facilitate internal communication is inadequate.
 - The participants' expertise to be shared during and after secondments is not described in sufficient detail. For instance, the description of the training courses and the skills to be acquired are not specific or detailed.
 - The quality of the interactions between the participating organisations is not adequately demonstrated. In addition, the relevance of some of the interactions proposed is not well justified.
 - The project does not elaborate sufficiently on interactions between all participating organisations, particularly between those from different disciplines.
 - The specific type of knowledge needed from each partner is not clearly described. For example, there is a high degree of overlapping expertise to be given to some partners.
 - The contribution of the non-academic participants and the TC organizations in transfer of knowledge and networking is not sufficiently presented.
 - The proposed interactions between partners are unspecific. For example, potential areas of synergy are not clearly identified and the added value of intersectoral aspects is not convincingly explained.
 - The interactions between participants and their networking are not described in sufficient detail in the proposal.
 - The involvement of local partners is mentioned as key to the project aspect, but it remains unclear how exactly such involvement will be ensured.
 - The interaction between the participants is not sufficiently described in order to explicitly demonstrate the relevance of choosing all these universities, some of them having almost similar competencies and roles.
 - The link between the beneficiaries' role in the project and the topics addressed is not explained in sufficient detail.
 - The interaction between partners has not been sufficiently outlined. Specifically the explanation of the involvement of non-academic sector and industry in the project activities is not fully convincing./ The role of NGO sector in research and innovation is not clearly delineated and presented
 - The proposal only offers a brief list of each institution's expertise and proposes regular meetings and workshops without a proper focus on the interaction relevance.
 - The interaction between the participant organizations is not sufficiently specified and effective.
 - The proposal contains a description of the activities of the partners but there is not a clear scheme of proposed interactions between partners.
 - The potential for the academic partners to receive knowledge on xxx from the non-academic partners is not sufficiently considered.
 - There is insufficient evidence that the proposed interaction between the participants is well-tailored and necessary to achieve the specific objectives of the project.
 - The involvement of third country partner is not clearly justified.
 - It is not clearly demonstrated how secondment activities will promote participants interaction in the delivery of the project's objectives.
 - The contribution of non-academic participants to achieving objectives is not sufficiently detailed.
 - The specific role to be played by the Third Countries is not well described.
 - Statements concerning the sustainable cooperation of participants are too general and lack specification.

- **Justification of the main networking activities**

- The overall presentation of the proposed interactions between the organisations is not sufficiently consistent and only generically described.
- Justification of the networking activities is not sufficiently detailed.
- Justification for the main networking activities for knowledge-sharing is generic and lacks sufficient project-specific detail.
- The integration between participant organizations is not uniformly well designed. For instance, one of the main methodological actions is based on one-to-one knowledge transfer by joint exchange of personnel, which conflicts with the listed training objective of group synergy/shared collective experience as a strength./ The proposal doesn't properly justify networking activities for the productive integration of the teams
- The proposed interaction between the participating organisations is not well presented and joint activities - such as workshops and training - are presented in an insufficient way
- The proposal provides limited explicit information on the quality of the interaction but rather focuses of the quality of the partners.
- The planned communication events are not sufficiently detailed in order to clearly demonstrate the focus of each of them and to link them to the core research objectives initially listed.
- The proposal does not fully clarify the interaction between the participating institutions in terms of the role of the staff to be exchanged.
- The project aims on expanding the network of participating organisations but there is not a definite strategy on how this will be achieved.
- Apart from the secondments, limited information is provided on the interaction activities among the partners.
- The networking activities and mechanisms for interaction among the participants lack details, including specific actions and planning.

Criterion 2 – Impact

Strengths:

Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the staff members

- **How the action contributes to realising the potential of individuals and provides new skills, enhances their knowledge and career perspectives**
 - The project has the potential to improve research skills of the involved staff.
 - Research-specific secondments adequately consider meaningful skills development for ER and ESRs.
 - The skills training in scientific areas is fair.
 - The networking capacity of the project can improve the career perspectives of the staff, especially the ESRs.
 - Mathematical modelling of biological systems is expected to grow, as a consequence of the continued improvement of high throughput data quantity, so secondees are likely to have enhanced career opportunities in the field.
 - There is a good plan for future exchange of staff and Ph.D. students, and for future collaborative research projects and grant submissions, as a result of the current application.
 - The research activities, together with the training events, will provide ERs and ESRs with multiple opportunities to gain new skills and acquire relevant practice in state-of-the-art techniques.
 - There is a high potential to substantially enhance the career perspectives of the staff members through the experience of international collaboration with several world-class scientists. The personal development plans envisaged for each of the secondees is commendable.
 - The secondments will allow staff to acquire valuable skills in xxx and xxx.
 - Researchers will acquire key skills in research, communication, personal development, and IPR awareness. In addition, the programme will focus on entrepreneurial skills allowing researchers to exploit their knowledge and develop the commercial potential of their work.
 - Description of skills and knowledge to be obtained by individual researchers during secondments is good. For example, the staff will be exposed to different cultures and environments through their academic-industrial collaborations that will improve their entrepreneurial skills with a positive and increased effect on their research.
 - Staff members will acquire a multidisciplinary knowledge of the xxx, will be directly involved in consortium management to improve entrepreneurial skills and be exposed to a wide range of research careers, all of which will provide personal benefits for future career perspectives.
 - Diversity of non-research training and skills development is strong, clearly demonstrating how skills and knowledge will be obtained on every secondment with secondment length supportive of meaningful skills acquisition.
 - The project will contribute to raising the attractiveness of a research career in the xxx sector.
 - The staff members will have the opportunity to gain useful technical expertise in standard practices for xxx and for clinical research, and also gain experience in the management of international projects.
 - The diverse plant models studied (where results emerging from one model have the potential to rapidly be applied to the other) should benefit staff members in terms of career enhancement, in particular early career researchers and technicians.
 - The opportunity for individuals to gain new research skills during secondments is well demonstrated. For example, integrating scientific and technological skills will have a synergistic effect.

- The project takes full advantage of the consortium to offer positive intersectoral experiences to seconded staff. The training of the researchers includes scientific and technical knowledge and soft and translational skills.
- The staff involved in the project will acquire interdisciplinary skills in advanced scientific methodologies that will improve their professional profiles.
- The high number of detailed planned intersectoral exchanges is commendable and will contribute to enhancing the career perspectives for all seconded staff profiles going beyond research and innovation.
- The different work settings of basic research labs and business-oriented research will help the seconded staff define their preferred career paths.
- The relatively large number of partners in the project will enhance exposure to new career perspectives as well as helping to realise the potential contributions of many ESRs to the subject field. This international dimension will offer new experiences for them to work in culturally diverse research contexts.
- The proposal logically presents/adequately demonstrates, in the short and long term, the general aim of improving seconded staff career prospects, based on knowledge and new technical skills acquisition.
- The acquisition of new skills is adequately demonstrated with respect to the Third Country researchers.
- The new skills gained during the secondments will be useful for future career prospects for the envisaged staff members due to their well thought organisational scheme and high quality of the participating institutions. In particular, the future career perspectives will be improved mainly through the scientific outputs of the research and through the new scientific international networks in a very crucial field.
- The proposal describes convincingly the potential benefits for researchers and staff, in particular with respect to the enhancing of their future career perspectives/ Some skills to be obtained by individuals through the project are adequately described in the proposal.
- The proposal demonstrates a good fit between some of the project's actions and recognised EU policy orientations, especially those linked to knowledge transfer and employment.
- A clear and convincing explanation is provided of what new skills will be developed and how such skills acquisition will enhance the future career perspectives of the academic researchers.
- A gap in the provision of suitably trained personnel in the field of enquiry of the project is appropriately scoped, evidenced by reference to credible evidence.
- The project's impact on the scientific career development and employability for the most part of ESRs and ERs is well demonstrated. The international and intersectoral mobility is expected to provide researchers with a diversified background/ There is a strong orientation to intersectoral partnerships and knowledge sharing; this is supported by some credible exemplification.
- The new skills and knowledge to be obtained by the individuals seconded based on "two-channel mechanism" are well presented, and the skills to be attained by the individuals seconded are clearly articulated.
- In the proposal it is very well identified what skills/knowledge obtained are expected to improve the potential and the careers perspectives of different professionals' profiles. These prospects seem realistic.
- The intention to use new technologies within the project will provide the participants with sets of transferable skills.
- It is convincingly described that the project will enhance their career prospects, for example through access through potential employers.
- The potential impact of the research and training on the staff's career and future employability is comprehensively explained.
- The proposal adequately explains whose career prospects will be enhanced (ER, ESR, and SMEs). It also convincingly provides information on what knowledge will lead to enhanced career prospects.
- The opportunities for the EU and non-EU researchers to acquire competencies and skills

enhancing their profile as researchers are well addressed.

- The proposal provides a convincing explanation of what new skills will be developed and how such skills acquisition is expected to enhance the future career perspectives of the academic researchers involved.
- The proposal offers a convincing explanation about the benefits of the proposed training objectives for the career prospects of the academic participants, in particular, it demonstrates convincingly how publications and networking events (conferences and seminars) will further enhance their career.
- There is a good potential on enhancing the future career prospects of the academic staff, mainly based on the proposed xxx exposure within the secondments.
- The knowledge exchange supports an in-depth understanding and the achievement of new skills for the staff members and hence a higher professional profile that leads to better career options.
- The benefits of the inter-sectoral exchange for career development will have an impact especially for the staff members as a result of the project.
- The impact on career prospects is well articulated with a general set of ambitions for each category of staff, and the benefits of inter-sectoral exchange for career development are good and relevant, especially in relation to policy-related research.
- The expected impact of the project is adequately discussed: a very good outline of skills / trainings and how they will be provided is described, and the project adequately outlines the potential for staff members to advance in their respective careers in the xxx sector.
- Potential impact of the research and training on the staff's' careers is clearly demonstrated together with the potential for their overall skills development, and their future employability. All participants will improve their capacity from a very interdisciplinary approach and consider very relevant aspects of the research to the market.
- The Programme provides many different tools to enhance research related human resources and offers a high level of detail on knowledge transfer to be achieved from secondments between the partners. It provides a comprehensive listing of the specific knowledge sharing to be achieved.
- The Programme contains a clear description of actions helping the development of new career paths. The new skills and knowledge to be achieved in the secondments are clearly set out and are appropriate to the level of seconded staff profiles and aligned to career development requirements.
- The skills to be gained and their benefits are clearly described, and also to some extent, differentiation between the staff profiles and their respective benefits is given.
- The proposal clearly demonstrates positive short-term and long-term impacts on the future career prospects and career development of the staff involved.
- The enhancement of career prospects is sufficiently addressed in respect to key scientific knowledge obtained through the project. Different networking activities have the potential to enhance the scientific profile of the participating staff members.
- A plan to enhance future career prospects for young scientists and also for non-seconded team associates is presented.
- The proposal demonstrates well the enhancing of the future career prospects of the staff members by increasing their expertise in multiple sub-disciplines and gaining the experience in working in an international team.
- The early stage researchers will be exposed to the supervision of outstanding scientists in the consortium.
- The contribution to the development of the fellows' scientific writing skills is extremely relevant.
- The composition of the consortium and the transfer of knowledge programme clearly contribute to the enhancement of the careers for the researchers through their secondments at the industrial participants.
- The proposal identifies an appropriate mix of important skills to be acquired by the secondees, including transferable skills, which contribute to an improvement in career prospects.

- Realizing the potential of the individuals is carefully addressed. The skills that will be transferred are described in detail. New skills and knowledge will add positively to the career perspectives of the participating staff.

Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels

- **Development and sustainability of new and lasting research collaborations resulting from the intersectoral and/or international secondments and the networking activities implemented**
 - The proposal has the potential to extend the successful collaboration already established between some of the academic partners during an accomplished COST action.
 - The project can develop new collaborative research between different organisations, within Europe and globally.
 - The project builds on established collaborations between the consortium participants. The very diverse network forms a good basis to encourage long-lasting collaboration.
 - The project can strengthen already established collaborations via a relevant range of national and international measures.
 - The cross-sectoral exchange between the wet-labs and the bioinformatics SME are strengths with the potential to enhance the future career prospects of the secondees involved.
 - The project is likely to establish new research collaborations, as well as strengthen the ones that have already been formed between some of the consortium partners. The potential to extend the collaboration beyond the timeline of the project is well demonstrated.
 - Active measures are proposed to promote the longevity of the collaborations.
 - Sustainability of the project is well demonstrated at various levels, such as within consortium members, between consortium members and external partners, including continued financing beyond the RISE funding scheme.
 - Current collaborations have been identified and it is specifically addressed how they will be sustained beyond the end of this project.
 - The proposal will strengthen the existing collaborations between the participants and will establish future collaborations with the industrial partners.
 - The sustainability of the project is adequately described at all stages, including how the secondments and resulting activities will strengthen the future collaborations and knowledge transfer.
 - The project will reinforce existing partnerships and build new international and intersectoral partnerships with common objectives. Plans for the longer-term sustainability of the partnership are well focused on the development of xxx devices. Connections with other important networks are advantageous.
 - The proposed knowledge transfer will likely forge new collaborations that are relevant to tackling current gaps in diagnosing and treating symptoms associated with xxx disease.
 - A number of beneficiaries benefit from already having collaborations and demonstrate clear commitment to developing stronger ties between themselves and partner countries.
 - The continuation of lasting research collaborations is clearly demonstrated in the proposal by the former H2020 projects developed with the contribution of relevant institutions from this consortium.
 - The proposal clearly shows that the international secondments and resulting activities will be able to develop sustainable collaborations between the involved team members thanks to the fact that it widens and enhances the academic ties built up through already existing (ongoing) projects between Third Country and European academic institutions/The project is expected to support the development of sustainable collaborations among the participating EU organisations and the Third Country partners. It foresees appropriately furthering existing platforms of cooperation.

- The proposal clearly argues that thanks to the already established collaborations and additional funding from the university laboratories and institutions it will secure the self-sustainability of the partnership after the end of the project.
- The proposal convincingly elaborates on the strengthening and developing of lasting research collaborations.
- The self sustainability of the program after the completion of the project is very well argued for/The approach for ensuring the sustainability of the collaboration between participants is carefully prepared and sound.
- The proposal rigorously presents large series of effective and credible solutions for developing the new and lasting academic collaborations within the project consortium. The idea of establishing a 'competition' for research and innovation in the field is a novel one.
- The consortium has the potential to establish lasting and sustainable academic/non-academic contacts, and cooperations to be built also through the development of shared IT based platforms.
- The proposal clearly shows how the secondments and resulting activities have the potential to develop sustainable collaborations between the participants (not least because they already have long lasting collaborations on various scholarly projects).
- The proposal envisages several properly justified and interlined steps for ensuring the sustainability of the collaboration, including linking it to existing collaborative project and designing an online diploma program that will outlast the project.
- The choice of the consortium partners is well justified given the need to develop new and potentially lasting research collaborations.
- The project will lead to new and lasting research collaborations between universities.
- The transfer of knowledge is convincingly demonstrated allowing new and lasting research collaborations within Europe.
- The proposal clearly shows how the consortium is based on already existing collaborations and how those ties will be strengthened through secondments, joint seminars and events.
- The proposal lists a number of grant applications that they planned to write after this project, thus demonstrating successfully how this project will further lasting collaborations between members.
- The consortium presents in clear detail the existing academic contacts and demonstrates the sustainable cooperation opportunities. It builds on already existing collaborations with the addition of new members to deepen and extend research in this field of expertise.
- The consortium has the potential to establish rich and lasting academic/non-academic contacts and sustainable cooperations.
- It also convincingly demonstrate how the inter and transcontinental collaboration is expected to foster new cooperation models, enhancing networking and supporting new and lasting collaborations. In particular, the proposal demonstrates how the new consortium includes two important networks and thus consolidates each one of them while providing opportunities to bring in more projects on xxx studies.
- The consortium has good potential to establish rich and lasting academic/non-academic contacts and sustainable cooperation.
- The content for the potential lasting research collaborations is well addressed.
- The development of research collaboration and the establishment of networks is convincingly presented.
- The proposed project reinforces an existing network of collaboration with the introduction of new partners to the network. The network development opportunities are strongest for the ESRs involved in the secondments.
- The proposal foresees future collaborations between the consortium partners and the associated researchers. The credibility of this claim is confirmed by previous collaborations.
- The proposal clearly sets out ambitions to develop sustainable collaborations between the partners. Specific actions are tailored to facilitate and promote the project to different environments. This is supportive of longer term research collaboration.

- There is clear and pertinent information about the network activities that are crucial to build the consortium's partnership as well as about the measures to secure the continuation of ties and cooperation beyond the lifetime of the project.
 - The proposal very well explains how the project will enhance the sustainability of scientific interactions between the involved organisations.
 - The activities planned in the proposal are likely to positively influence on the collaboration between the participating organisations.
 - The participants have a good track record of experience and collaborations in EU grants which can establish a ground for future collaboration.
 - Collaboration among the participants is very well demonstrated. Ways for the research collaborations and transfer of knowledge are identified and they are coherent with project objectives.
 - The establishment and sustainability of new and lasting research collaborations are evident from the statements provided, realistically assessed and well formulated. Specifically, planned secondments will greatly enhance competency building.
 - The development of the new and lasting research collaborations between participating organisations is credibly described and supported in the proposal.
 - The proposal clearly demonstrates how the secondments and resulting activities will develop sustainable collaborations between the participants.
- **Contribution of the action to the improvement of the research and innovation potential within Europe and/or worldwide**
 - Evidence for the potential impact of the proposal on research and innovation capacity at the Global and European levels are evident. For example, a strong component of the proposed research involves protocol standardisation for generating good quality data which will then be deposited in global databases allowing the entire scientific community access. This will also create a valuable reference dataset which will be of value both at a European and international level.
 - The project is likely to increase competitiveness of European research and strengthen the innovation capacity in the area of xxx.
 - This project has the potential to impact research and innovation in a significant way at both the European and global level.
 - The expected outcomes are well oriented to have an eventual positive effect on European and global health.
 - How realization of the project's goals could improve research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is sufficiently explained.
 - The project has very good likelihood to impact R&I at a global level by developing new xxx compounds. In addition, the project can have impact outside its current scope, as the compounds developed during project might have other xxx uses.
 - The contribution to R&I potential at global level is foreseen to be high due to high profile of partners included in the consortium, and because this project addresses relatively new xxx field associated with strong medical needs.
 - The transfer of knowledge among participants has the potential to improve the research and innovation potential at both the European and global level leading to relevant progress in societal challenges.
 - The impact of the project on both academic and industry sectors, and on scientific disciplines ranging from healthcare to computer engineering, is potentially very significant at both European and global level.
 - The project has the potential to enhance research and innovation potential at both European and global levels as xxx is a research priority.
 - The project will have a large impact on the research/innovation capacity in the TC partner countries.
 - Third Country participants will enhance transfer of knowledge towards European participants.

- The positive impact of the consortium's objectives and research activity on European policy is adequately demonstrated. The cultural sector in Europe is a major employer and there is real potential to improve innovation through the transfer of results to the sector at large.
- The proposal sufficiently discusses the intention to address the “Agenda for New Skills and Jobs” of the European Commission.
- The project proposed is likely to impact the research / innovation capacity at the European level since the consortium is going to bring about novel approach to health care in Europe taking into account patients' active role in sustaining their own quality of life.
- The proposal presents a well-formulated plan for impacting research capacity at the European level.
- The contribution to the innovation potential is evident, and so is the expected global impact, / especially at the European level it is clearly justified through the list of relevant policy documents.
- The intentions of the consortium are in line with the European and global orientations to promote research collaboration - this is supported by concrete illustrations of the alignment of the partnership to key international programmes (such as the Millennium Development Goals).
- The proposal argues, for the most part convincingly, that researchers to be trained will obtain relevant knowledge on xxx, and therefore may be able to contribute to an improvement of research and innovation potential at European and global level.
- The researcher secondments will provide a range of inter-cultural opportunities beyond EU countries, useful especially for early stage researchers to encounter new methodologies and opportunities to develop inter-cultural understandings.
- The proposal demonstrates well how secondments and resulting activities of this proposal are likely to develop sustainable collaborations between the participants involved, including the development of a pan-European scientific agenda on xxx and a transnational social work master program.
- The impact of the program on both the research and the innovation capacity at the European and even global level is well argued.
- The proposal has a clear ambition to create protocols which can be used at a wider European level and which can foster innovation in the xxx sector, including SMEs.
- The proposal to sign collaborative partnerships between several organizations has potential for developing new research initiatives.
- The project has good potential to contribute to the improvement of research potential in Europe and international.
- Thanks to its high scientific quality and the planned measures the project is expected certainly to impact the research and innovation capacity at both the European and global level.
- The proposed project convincingly demonstrates the potential for social and cultural impact at a European level. The project is indeed timely in redressing the imbalance with regards to knowledge sharing about xxx.
- Contribution of the project's programme for the improvement of the research and innovation potential within Europe is sufficiently formulated.
- The research topic aligns with EU priorities, offering some scope for the consortium to improve the research potential at European and global levels.
- Outcomes of the proposal would provide appreciable contribution to the improvement of research and innovation potential alt the EU level and world-wide.
- The important contribution to the improvement of research and innovation potential in the EU and worldwide has been detailed and convincingly illustrated.
- The consortium demonstrates its potential contribution towards improving research and innovation potential at the European level.
- The development of the new collaborations and reinforcement of existing collaborations is well justified and supported by networking activities.

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results

- **Dissemination strategy about the results**

- The strategy for dissemination of results targeting the scientific peers is convincing.
- The dissemination strategy is mostly well described taking into account the type of information, target audiences, channels, timelines and monitoring.
- The proposal contains a very good strategy for dissemination of the potential results. The consortium clearly articulates the appropriate premarket stimulation activities. For example, the use of social media is innovative (in particular pre-market simulation activities) and well conceived, and should contribute to the communication of the activities of the project to many stakeholder groups.
- A comprehensive dissemination plan, including open sources for software dissemination is outlined. The researchers provide adequate examples of how their models could be used from a commercial and clinical perspective.
- Appropriate channels and relevant target groups are identified for dissemination and exploitation. For example, some project results, like the software to be developed, are highly relevant for a target commercialization partner.
- The proposed dissemination strategy of the project results is very well presented. The content, quality and added value of the activities are clearly stated, and partners will develop tailor made sub-strategies. The strategy includes multiple dissemination channels and will target diverse audiences. There are concrete and specific activities describing how scientific and non-scientific audiences will be reached with various means, including social media, school targeted events, a web site, television and radio programs and newspaper articles. In addition, the role of staff members in the outreach activities is well specified.
- The strategy to disseminate and maximise the impact of the results is clear and consistent, and described in detail with targets in mind at all stages. The use of different multimedia types can effectively reach stakeholders from different sectors, including trade fairs and end-users.
- The dissemination strategy is very well elaborated and includes publications, scientific meetings and workshops.
- The dissemination plan includes full accessibility to results (open-access) and actively seeks industry involvement.
- The proposal contains a very good strategy for scientific dissemination of the potential results obtained. Routes and opportunities to maximize academic interest in the project are very well explored within the proposal.
- Dissemination and educational actions to reach the scientific community are clear and consistent toward the goal of maximizing the impact of the project results.
- The proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results are very well identified and pertinent with activities which include publications in peer-review journals, participation in international conferences and national initiatives.
- The proposal has a well developed dissemination strategy addressing diverse actors (academia, governments, organizations/private sector and citizens).
- The proposal describes different audience groups, shows a relevant and appropriate dissemination strategy with number of public dissemination channels.
- An effective use of social media is foreseen as a key instrument in the dissemination approach to be adopted.
- The proposal's choice of journals for publishing of scientific papers highlights the importance of Open Access publication in the dissemination strategy.
- The outlined dissemination measures and target groups are relevant and refer to concrete goals underlining research excellence. They are very well detailed with a clear table containing the different events, audiences, objectives and key messages. It has been proved that they are directed both to the academic and non-academic audience.
- The proposal offers a well articulated dissemination strategy to widely spread results among the academic people. There is suitable commitment by the consortium to produce a number of scholarly reports, conferences and joint publications.

- The presented strategy to disseminate the project's results is clear, multi-layer and consistent. In particular, good measures to impact the scientific community are present, for spreading the results through peer-reviewed publications, handbooks and conferences.
- The use of already established websites enhances the potential for an effective dissemination.
- Exploitation and dissemination of the project's results have been planned and demonstrate a strong commitment to influencing the fashion and design communities.
- A range of relevant and high quality journals and viable events are specified with respect to the dissemination.
- Appropriate consideration is given to developing open-access mechanisms for the project's outputs.
- A very promising multisectorial dissemination strategy addresses multiple actors.
- The dissemination strategy is consistent and appropriately formulated, including a large variety of effective measures like, policy papers, scientific publications, project events, conferences for non-academic researchers and practitioners, etc.
- The dissemination strategy is pertinently presented, by including publication indicators, relevant list of peer-review international journals and academic conferences.
- The dissemination strategy is well presented: the project is expected to disseminate widely in the academic community through peerreviewed journals and by presenting the results at a wide range of conferences.
- A designated project committee is expected to take forward the dissemination plan and a further group will monitor its progress.
- The dissemination strategy is clear and convincingly articulated in short, medium and long term.
- The strategy to disseminate the results considers all necessary dimensions and is clearly documented and explained.
- The dissemination plan is well organised and targets various communities of potential stakeholders from local to national level.
- The ways for dissemination of the results are detailed and relevant to the project and scientific community.
- The proposal presents a clear and consistent dissemination strategy, with particular attention to some specific targets to maximize the result's impacts, namely policy makers and relevant international organizations. Performance indicators are provided to monitor dissemination objectives achievement.
- The dissemination strategy has been sufficiently detailed in terms of target groups, goals and measures.
- An appropriate and complete set of measures for dissemination has been taken into account. The strategy to disseminate the project's results is clear and consistent. There is concrete evidence that the project plans to reach targets able to maximize the results' impact, namely the scientific community and policy makers.
- The proposal contains a relevant list of possible activities to disseminate the project results.
- The proposed measures for dissemination of results are very wide and clearly specified. They have potential for specialists and for a general audience.
- The proposal has an appropriate theoretical framework for dissemination. The project will disseminate widely in the academic community through peer reviewed journals and present project results at a wide range of workshops/ seminars/ conferences.
- Promotion of relevant scientific disciplines to young people is considered a positive aspect of the proposal.
- The dissemination strategy is reasonable through the use of different channels and events organised by the project to reach different audiences.
- The proposed measures to disseminate the project results are of good quality.
- A general overview to frame the Open Innovation implications with reference to the existing information available is described in the proposal. Adequate consideration is provided in explaining the extent of Open Innovation advancement under different viewpoints, such as for the SMEs.

- **How results will be taken up/used**
 - It is clear / convincingly shown how the results of the project will be taken up and what will be their expected impact, in particular it is satisfactorily described how the foreseen results are expected to be used in enhancing our understanding of the xxx.
 - There are a range of potentially commercial outputs, with some generic indications given regarding their exploitation.
 - The establishment of an Exploitation Board is a potentially useful instrument to promote the project's outputs.
 - The exploitation of the planned results are well-formulated, targeting the policy and practitioner level in the field, integrating cultural, national and geographical differences in producing a systemic and international approach to the research topic.
 - The exploitation of the expected results is clearly outlined and addressed to the different target groups.
 - The exploitation of the results is seriously taken into consideration in the grant proposal.
 - The exploitation of the project outcomes is well addressed.
 - The strategies to disseminate, exploit and commercialize the results are convincingly explained and highly relevant.

- **Expected impact of the proposed measures (e.g. addressing societal needs/challenges)**
 - Project results could impact society in a pertinent way (for example, contribution to the World Health Organisation xxx strategy).
 - The proposal will have the potential to improve research and innovation in the field of xxx.
 - The results of the project could impact society on the pertinent way e.g. it will improve health management, xxx screening, diagnosis and treatment of xxx disease.
 - There is a good description on how the project results are expected to have a positive impact on the Third Country society.
 - The expected impact of the dissemination measures is adequately addressed as well as the means of verification.
 - The proposal demonstrates that the project's results will impact society in a pertinent way.
 - The selection of the application areas links well with societal challenges and enhanced research translation in these areas will be a direct benefit.
 - The impact of the project on society is made reasonably clear.
 - The proposal has potential to have significant societal impacts relevant to addressing a range of highly relevant and pressing societal challenges.
 - The proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences are credible and very well planned.
 - The societal impact of the project is very well introduced and relevant, e.g. referring specifically to the 2016 xxx Agreement.

- **Intellectual property rights aspects and exploitation of results**
 - IPR aspects are well considered and are adequate to the potential outcome of this project, and for preparing its exploitation.
 - IPR issues related to the project results are sufficiently addressed.
 - Intellectual property rights aspects and potential for future exploitation of results are adequately described.
 - The IPR management is well described and the plan to exploit project results is realistic. The project's partners have documented previous successful experience in commercialisation of their results.
 - The partners are proactive in considering IPR. For example, baseline criteria for shared IPR ownership in the consortium agreement have already been discussed.
 - The IPR aspects are described sufficiently considering the expected results and the related procedures are covered by a Consortium Agreement.
 - Considerations for intellectual property related issues are adequately described and several

key exploitable products of the project have been identified.

- IP is discussed, and a plan for knowledge management and protection is well outlined.
- The IPR issue is adequately taken into consideration in the grant proposal. The planned actions, beneficiaries, potential impact and indicators are presented with details.
- The IPR aspects are well addressed and the proposal outlines a good IPR management process.
- Intellectual property rights issues are properly discussed in the proposal.
- The exploitation and intellectual property plan addresses the possible commercialization outcomes of the project.
- The IPR is adequately discussed with a good plan of exploitation. For example, the inclusion of a plan for monitoring the market in the proposed type of devices is well addressed and engagement of potential beneficiaries (xxx companies, potential investors).
- The exploitation strategy and IPR is very well planned e.g. appointment of an exploitation manager with a role dedicated to these aspects.
- The protection of IP and the justification for protection of results, as well as commercial exploitation preferentially by the non-academic partner, are clearly explained.
- The range of exploitation approaches is diverse and has potential to connect with culturally diverse audiences.
- IPR issues are addressed in detail, making reference to exploitation negotiation and agreement
- The IPR issues are clearly stated with a particular emphasis on the IPR aspects of the images of the artefacts to be studied.
- The proposal identifies a clear position with a sound underpinning rationale for its approach to Intellectual Property, with a stated commitment to open-access journals.
- The plan to exploit results is relevant and the IPR aspects are sufficiently taken into consideration by the consortium.
- The management of intellectual property issues, deriving from the project, has been adequately described.
- The approach to IPR management is well presented.
- IPR issues are correctly addressed including open access items.
- The dissemination measures are convincingly presented, and the project clearly explains which areas will be affected by IPR and how those will be covered in the grant agreement.
- Potential new IP issues generated from the project are identified and detailed commercial exploitation plan is presented.
- Intellectual Property Rights are coherently formulated.
- Exploitation and IPR issues are sufficiently addressed, taking into account the type of foreseen results and their potential for use in an Open Data modality.
- The potential exploitation of the results and intellectual property rights aspects are adequately addressed.
- Aspects related to intellectual property rights are described in detail and are appropriate.
- Intellectual property rights matters are well addressed. The proposal provides detailed information for the internal regulation of the non-commercial exploitation.
- Two main approaches are planned to successfully exploit the commercial results: by developing new intellectual property and by providing advanced service to end users.
- A relevant plan for the management of intellectual property rights is presented which is oriented towards maximized exploitation of the results.

Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

- **Communication strategy of the project and its results, outreach plan and the activities envisaged to engage the public**
 - The proposed actions to disseminate the project results to the scientific community are well described and appropriate, mainly through scientific publications and conferences.
 - There is a strong strategy for communications and engagement with a variety of stakeholders

with well described and distinct mechanisms of communication tailored for different non-scientist target audiences and how this will have impact.

- The communication strategy addresses a diverse audience, e.g. farmers, public health technicians, industry decision makers, and is adequately elaborated and up-to-date, for example, by including the use of social media.
- The communication strategy to public audiences is generally described, with some suitable examples of communication events and previous experience.
- Communication activities for promoting the action and its results to multiple audiences, including the general public, patient organisations, the media and other opinion formers, are adequate, despite insufficient consideration of performance indicators.
- Relevant communication activities directed at a range of audiences, including the general public, are credibly described.
- The strategy to engage the scientific community is clear, consistent and appropriate.
- The consortium describes adequate measures to reach the general public, for example via face-to-face meetings that will ensure proper communication. The communication channels (website, publication, conference, training,...) used during the entire project lifetime are well detailed and clearly state the expected impact in a convincing manner.
- The communication activities target multiple audiences by using diverse methods and styles of communication, clearly explained in detail with participation of every partner. It is considered very good that these activities will be formalised in the Consortium Agreement.
- The proposal presents a concise plan with several effective initiatives for communicating the project to the public.
- The proposed communication strategy will target multiple groups from the general public.
- The overall strategy for communication to lay public is sustainable and detailed, and uses adequate metrics and milestones.
- The proposal presents a good plan with several initiatives for communicating the project, in order to reach non-specialist and non-scientific audiences.
- The communication strategy of the project and its results, outreach plan and the activities envisaged to engage the public are in general well presented and includes some non-traditional tools.
- The proposal offers a credible assessment of the potential impact of the proposed communication and outreach activities.
- The plan to communicate findings through analogue and digital channels from the project is detailed.
- The proposal provides indicators for assessing the progress and impact of the academic communication activities during the implementation phase.
- Gender issues are explicitly addressed in communication, which is a strong point of this proposal.
- The consortium counts on realistic activities, potential outputs and research results to reach academic, non-specialist / non-scientific audiences as well as providing sound awareness-raising about the topic.
- The proposal demonstrates that the communication strategy and outreach activities are highly efficient and targeted to multiple audiences.
- A comprehensive and well-formulated strategy has been devised to communicate project results.
- The coordinator has developed expertise in public engagement and differentiate strategies to communicate the project activities are planned and very well presented.
- The proposed measures to communicate activities have been convincingly presented so is the variety of such measures (exhibition, documentary script, etc.).
- A detailed and appropriate explanation of the communication strategy has been presented. The consortium foresees some adequate specific activities to reach non-scientific audiences; this involves various and appropriate tools, channels and mechanisms to target different

audiences.

- The plan to engage the public in communications for the project and its results is well detailed and adequate to the aim of the project. The communication channels used during the entire project lifetime to communicate results and to explain their benefit to society are sufficiently described. The proposal assess in a good and detailed way the potential impact of the proposed communication and outreach activities for academy and specialists.
- The participants pay particular attention to interactive communication with the local communities, that will be most affected by the project's outcomes.
- The plan to communicate the project and its results to the general public is sufficiently detailed, adequate and includes specific activities.
- The communication strategy is well balanced and appropriate for the established target groups.
- Consideration is given to utilisation of European networks and e-platforms in the overall communication effort.

- **How activities will be targeted at multiple audiences**

- Plans to engage the general public are very good and sufficiently detailed. For example, the communication channels are clearly explained in detail with exact participation of every partner and secondees. Outreach metrics and reports will well ensure reliable assessment of the success of communication activities.
- The communication channels to be used throughout the project are well explained (e.g. press release, digital media, TV).
- Activities to reach to the lay people are well elaborated. Several communication channels, including also social media like twitter and a project website, are described. The regular interactions with high schools students and ageing population will increase the awareness of socio-economic benefit of the research.
- The outreach of communication can potentially attract industry and young researchers. For example, the applicants have planned several events and science festivals to promote bioinformatics in a convincing manner.
- The proposal includes a range of highly credible activities to communicate the project to different target audiences. For example, the inclusion of websites, social media, local events, TV, press media, newsletters targeted at different stakeholders is well thought through and pertinent.
- The plan to engage with the scientific community and policymakers is sufficient using standard yet relevant means.
- The communication strategy shows a clear plan of outreach activities for the public and a good description of how the communication measures will impact multiple audiences
- The consortium foresees various specific communication measures to promote the project activities to wider audiences of non-specialist/non-scholarly audiences; these measures will be used during the entire project lifetime and their benefits to society are clearly addressed.
- A diverse audience is anticipated for the outputs and a wide-ranging strategy for communicating the project outputs is formulated into an overall strategy; this is presented in detail.
- The project contains a plan to reach targets that will maximize the impact of the results.
- The illustrated range of target audiences suggests that the consortium has adopted a very proactive approach to ensuring that a diverse set of academic and professional groups is being addressed.
- The spheres of exploitation of the proposal results, also regarding the reaching non-specialist / non-scientific audiences, are properly formulated, and the relevant IPR aspects are sufficiently described.
- Appropriate outputs for a range of target audiences have been identified, illustrating the intended broad reach of the project's outputs.
- Moreover, the project's plans to reach various targets certainly will maximise the results' comprehensive impact.

- A specific data management plan to reach the widest scientific and non-scientific readership is expected to be developed.
- The proposal presents some adequate measures to communicate the project and its results. The consortium foresees some specific activities to reach non-scientific audiences.
- The proposed measures to communicate the project activities to different target audiences are of very good quality. The applicants introduce original ideas for communication with teenagers and young adults as part of an education outreach. The proposal specifies a meaningful and targeted campaign which aims to address gender balance and attract students from a wider audience.
- Target audiences have been very well identified, structured and described. For each and every of the listed audience there is a dedicated action offered.
- **Channel(s) be used to inform and reach out to society**
 - The messages and channels to be used in public outreach to communicate the project outcomes and their benefits are clearly identified and make suitable use of pre-existing specialized networks.
 - Communication channels to target the general public are well described, varied and appropriate (for example, through newspapers, xxx channels, xxx of Science Festival).
 - The plan to engage the public is very good. Special attention has been taken in making sure that adequate channels (standard and modern) are set-up to communicate the results to a wider audience with quantitative indicators. The list of the planned communication channels is very well detailed and it will be used during the entire life time of the project.
 - The consortium lists suitable specific activities to reach non-specialist stakeholder audiences, including patients and their families. For example, the plan to formulate educational content in several languages is well thought out.
 - The foreseen documentation, media coverage and events are good means to communicate project results and create general public interest.
 - The communication channels to be used and their benefit to society are clearly explained: the consortium foresees specific activities to reach non-specialist / non-scientific audiences such as the patients, public and media. Both traditional and social media ones are presented in sufficient detail.
 - The communication channels that will be used during the entire project lifetime to communicate results and their benefits to society are clearly explained.
 - The various communication channels are well described and the activities envisaged to engage the general public, social media etc. are well presented.
 - The communication channels to be used during the entire duration of the project are clearly demonstrated.
 - The communication channels that would be used during the entire project lifetime to communicate results and their benefit to society are differentiated according to the project needs.
 - By presenting differentiated measures and clearly relating them to the target groups' needs, the project correctly explains the communication channels used during the entire project lifetime to widespread the results and their benefit to society.
 - The Outreach Toolkit is a novel and useful device to support project outreach activities.
 - The various communication channels are well described and the activities envisaged to engage the general public, media etc. are presented.
 - Some communication channels envisaged to engage different target audiences are presented in the proposal. The description of the tasks related to the communication activities is clear.
 - Differentiated communication channels are provided. The target audiences are clearly specified.
 - The network of participating institutions itself reaches out to a global community with participating members from various countries.

- The dissemination towards the research community is convincingly addressed and relevant high profile publication targets are properly identified.
- **Expected impact of the proposed activities**
 - Collaborations between the SMEs and the other project participants will be sustained through the potential commercialization of the final system prototype.
 - The impact in terms of socio-economic exploitation of the end product is very well addressed. For example, the project is designed to make a real impact in the market enabling an improvement of healing of bone and articular defects which is of high demand for the European ageing population.
 - By taking into account various differentiated social environments, the proposal correctly describes how project results could impact society in a pertinent way.
 - The proposal demonstrates very well that the secondments will help developing permanent structures of collaboration and sustainable collaborations between the project's partners.
 - The inter-sectoral approach is strongly inferred, indicating that the approaches to be used will be fit-for-purpose.
 - The collaboration among team members to establish a transnational social work Masters degree is likely to lead to sustained benefits that outlast the program.
 - The way the proposal assesses the potential impact of the proposed outreach activities for the public is convincing.
 - The outcomes of the project will very likely have an impact to the scientific community and policymakers.
 - The project will expose the involved researchers to new and international research environments.
 - The proposal presents plans to publish in high impact factor journals.
 - The well balanced consortium increases the likelihood of enhancing the European research and innovation capacity in the field of highperforming materials.
 - The project's contribution towards the improvement of the research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is very well described and plausible.

Weaknesses:

Enhancing the potential and future career prospects of the staff members

- **How the action contributes to realising the potential of individuals and provides new skills, enhances their knowledge and career perspectives.**
 - The impact of the proposed action to enhance and provide new career perspectives for the staff members, in terms of new knowledge and expertise, is described in general terms only, and not directly related to the proposed action.
 - The proposal insufficiently details the concrete actions and mechanisms that will enhance the potential and future career for ESR and ER staff. There is a lack of consideration of how the project will address individual staff-member training and knowledge-sharing needs.
 - The description of improving scientific and transferable skills of ERs and ESRs through this project is too general.
 - The specific skills the staff will develop during the secondments are not sufficiently described and is therefore unclear how the newly acquired knowledge will exactly promote the professional growth of the involved staff.
 - The proposal does not convincingly demonstrate positive effects of the project on the career prospects of seconded staff.
 - The improvements in career prospects for the staff involved in the research programme are limited, in particular, for career paths in SMEs.
 - The potential impact of the proposed research in terms of skills/knowledge transfer is poorly

described for staff members from each participating organisation.

- The exact skills and knowledge to be gained by seconded staff are too generally described. In other words, the specific skills and training that each partner will provide is unclear.
- Training opportunities are not discussed in depth and acquisition of skills is defined very broadly.
- The secondments have been described in general terms without detailing the rationale behind the mobility of specific staff members and without illustrating how the acquired knowledge will ensure career progression for them.
- The proposal does not sufficiently highlight specific skills of high impact to improve staff career perspectives.
- The description of training activities and resources is lacking detail and the skills and knowledge to be obtained by the individuals seconded is not described in sufficient detail.
- The proposal only superficially addresses the specific potential and future career prospects of the staff members. For example, benefits for technical staff involved are not sufficiently described and ESR training in the industrial xxx sector is limited.
- How the experience gained in the project will practically promote career advancement of the involved staff has been described in insufficient detail.
- The contribution of the project to providing new skills to the staff members is described in very generic terms.
- The academic skills presented in the proposal are not entirely properly and pertinently formulated. For instance, the long term benefits of academic skills improving during secondments are confusingly presented in terms of generic skills.
- The improving of staff career perspectives regarding different categories of the involved actors like ESR, ER or technicians is not specifically discussed in this section of proposal, this especially applies to the generation and application of transferable, work-based skills and their connection to career progression.
- The proposal does not convincingly discuss the degree of matching between fundamental needed skills for the team and the work proposed for research.
- The specific impact of the planned secondment on the involved administrative and technical staff is only partially analysed.
- Even though the proposal has clear objectives for employees in Academia, it shows a limited potential to improve research- and innovation-related human resources, skills, and working conditions for the non-academic/industrial partners.
- The skills projected to result from the programme are not well enough specified. The proposal does not make reference to the experience of the research staff that will carry out various parts the research, and how career development will be ensured for researchers at different stages in their careers.
- The specific knowledge and skills to be obtained by the seconded individuals are not sufficiently and systematically described.
- The acquisition of new or innovation-oriented skills by the staff members of the participating organisations which goes beyond the previous already shared experience is not fully demonstrated.
- The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate how the knowledge it will produce would enhance the career prospects of all participants.
- Insufficient details are provided on the specific expertise of non academic partners.
- There is insufficient detail and particularly concrete illustrations regarding the extent to which the transferable skills generated are expected to enhance the career pathways of the researchers involved in the project.
- The impact of the project to enhance the career of the staff members is not fully convincing and lots of details are missing.
- Skills and knowledge to be obtained by the individuals seconded are not described in sufficient detail without specific information on different secondments (technicians, administrative,

researchers).

- The capacity of the consortium to offer a very good opportunity for career development for the staff members and to lead to a sustainable cooperation is not convincingly demonstrated.
- What new skills are expected to be acquired by non-academic partners and how their career perspectives is expected to be enhanced is not adequately analysed in the proposal.
- The proposal provides limited evidence of specific modules aimed to equip researchers with a right combination of research-related and transferable competencies or of specific tools to enhance the research related to human resources.
- Career enhancement for non-academic staff is not adequately analysed.
- The impact on the potential and future career prospects of the staff members in relation to social aspects are insufficiently developed.
- The impact of skills to be acquired in the project is not totally evident, namely because the previous projects have already contributed to an enriched network in terms of expertise, experience and research capacity.
- The proposal does not contain sufficient detail as to specific modules aimed to equip researchers with a right combination of research related and transferable competences.
- The skills and knowledge to be obtained by the individuals seconded are not described in sufficient detail in some areas. In particular, it is not adequately presented how the project is expected to improve the career perspectives of the seconded individuals within academia; the information provided on how the program will enhance their methodological and analytical skills is incomplete.
- The proposal lacks sufficient evidence as to what skills and knowledge would be obtained by the individuals to foster the career perspectives of the staff members. In addition explanations of the potential benefits from the secondments are not adequately articulated.
- The proposal does not describe in detail the skills and knowledge to be obtained by the individuals seconded. There is no clear evidence that concrete new skills and knowledge will improve the staff career perspectives. In particular, the proposal does not provide sufficient explanation as to what new skills will be acquired by non-academic partners and how their career perspectives will be enhanced as a result.
- The employment opportunities in industry and in the development of entrepreneur projects have not been sufficiently illustrated with the indication of real job profiles that will be generated or specialized by the proposed activities.
- The enhancement of the future career perspectives of experienced researchers is too generally addressed.

Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels

- **Development and sustainability of new and lasting research collaborations resulting from the intersectoral and/or international secondments and the networking activities implemented**
 - The potential for establishing new and lasting research collaborations is not well demonstrated.
 - Although some of the project partners have proven experience in collaborating in an efficient manner, the proposal does not demonstrate specifically how this will support the extension of long term collaborations beyond the end of the funding.
 - Insufficient details are given on how new and lasting collaborations among participant organisations will be established and maintained.
 - The development of new and sustainable multilateral collaborations is insufficiently discussed so is not convincing.
 - There is insufficient detail on how the project will contribute to development of new and lasting research collaborations and the plans for selfsustainability of the partnership after the

- end of the project are not clearly outlined.
- There is insufficient detail on how the project will contribute to the development of new and lasting research collaborations, and the plans for self-sustainability of the partnership after the end of the project were not clearly outlined.
 - The benefits of networking and possibilities to develop new and lasting research collaborations are poorly described, or not provided. The possibility of sustainable collaborations among participants is not clearly addressed.
 - The proposal contains a limited amount of information about how the research network will carry research objectives forward in the future. The way to develop new research collaborations is described in a general way and is not convincingly addressed.
 - The strategy to establish new and additional collaborations beyond the existing ones is unclear.
 - Although the partners have already benefited from previous collaborations the plans for sustaining the partnership after the end of the project are not clearly described.
 - The plan for self-funding of the project after the end of the European funding is mainly related to seeking new funding opportunities, collaborations with xxx companies are not sufficiently discussed.
 - The application does not provide sufficient elements in support of the sustainability of collaborations beyond the duration of this project.
 - The proposed development of sustainable collaborations between the participants involved is not convincingly presented/ not fully outlined.
 - The proposal does not provide concrete exemplification of the kinds of actions it has noted that are to be employed to stimulate future research collaborations.
 - The process of creating links of collaborations between the participating institutions and respective departments is not concretely presented in the proposal. For instance, how the acquired inter-departmental and cross-sectoral competences will be efficiently transferred at the international network level is not explicitly demonstrated.
 - The proposal does not adequately describe the secondments and resulting activities, and it is thus unclear how they can lead to sustainable research collaboration between the partners in the long run.
 - The financial and institutional sustainability of the future research collaboration is unclear, so the possible risk of a non-lasting collaboration after the financial contribution of RISE is not addressed.
 - The initiatives planned to develop research collaborations, like some activities to be maintained for at least 3 years following the end of the project, need to be better substantiate.
 - There is not a precise description of a strategy that will facilitate new and lasting research collaboration.
 - The Programme does not show with a sufficient level of detail which will be a possible specific programme that can have a new and lasting research collaboration opportunities.
 - The proposal does not provide a convincing explanation as to how the project is expected to lead to lasting inter-sectoral collaborations.
 - The proposed self-sustainable collaboration beyond the research project is not very credible.
 - The ways how the new collaborations will be developed and what are the expectations from the new contacts, are provided with insufficient details.
 - The proposal does not clearly present a strategy or specific initiatives that will support lasting research collaboration.
 - The development of new and lasting research collaborations resulting from the intersectoral and/or international secondments and the networking activities is mentioned but concrete evidence about the new and lasting research opportunities is not provided.
 - The proposal presented insufficient rationale regarding development of new collaborations.
 - The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate how the secondments and resulting activities will develop sustainable and long-lasting collaboration between participants. Similarly, the proposal does not discuss in sufficient detail future funding avenues nor commercialisation

activities/plans for the proposed new technology.

- Insufficient specific measures have been planned in order to develop lasting research collaborations among the participants.

- **Contribution of the action to the improvement of the research and innovation potential within Europe and/or worldwide.**

- The proposal only generally describes its contribution to research and innovation potential at a global level.
- The impact of the project on improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is not described sufficiently.
- It is not clear how the project will improve research and innovation potential at the European or global level.
- The value the project will bring to the innovation and research landscapes at both European and global level has only been discussed in very general terms.
- The contribution of the proposed action to the R&I potential at the European level is described in too general terms, and thus is not convincing.
- The proposal is not convincing in terms of what is the global and European impact of the novel models that will be developed.
- It is not well demonstrated how the project will effectively contribute to improving the research and innovation potential at the European or global levels.
- The potential impact of the project on the European economy and the research and innovation potential at the European and global level is not described in a convincing manner.
- The proposal does not sufficiently describe how the project can improve the European innovation capacity.
- The project's specific contribution to strengthening European innovation capacity is not convincingly demonstrated.
- Although it is expected that this consortium will have a positive impact on research and innovation capacity at the European and Global levels, the more general impact claimed on the level of broader health related issues is overemphasized and not described in a convincing manner.
- There is insufficient detail to adequately assess whether the quality of life aspects of the proposed research will have meaningful impact at European or global levels.
- The project will result in xxx approaches that can potentially improve the treatment of some xxx diseases. However, the proposal does not clearly discuss how these findings will enhance the innovation at European level.
- It is unclear whether the dissemination activities towards policy makers will be at a national level (country-specific) or international level (European) or both.
- The project will have a limited impact on the research/innovation capacity at the European level.
- How the project will improve research and innovation at the European and global levels, particularly in terms of product development and other societal challenges is not convincingly demonstrated.
- It is not convincingly discussed how the expected scientific outputs and exchange contribute to innovating the existing practices or enhancing the research and innovation capacity at the European and global level.
- The impact of the consortium's objectives and research activity on European policy is not fully argued and /not clearly demonstrated.
- The proposal also does not fully demonstrate how the research and innovation potential will be enhanced at a European level.
- The contribution of this project to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global levels is not convincingly argued.
- The description in this section is largely limited to mentions of activities carried out in the past

and potential future partnerships, without much discussion of their ability to enhance the project's impact on research and innovation.

- The project does not adequately demonstrate how it will contribute in an important manner to improve the innovation potential over the Europe.
- The scientific outputs expected from the transfer of knowledge are not adequately argued in order to demonstrate the project's innovation with respect to already existing practices or the possibility of enhancing the European research and innovation capacity.
- The proposal suggests an intention to 'bring together' diverse European research hubs, but does not offer very much substantive information on how this is likely to materialise...
- The proposal does not specify adequately how it will improve research innovation in Europe and elsewhere.
- The contribution towards innovating existing practices or enhancing European research and innovation capacities to testing new methods or developing new solutions is weakly described in the proposal.
- The contribution of the programme to strengthening European innovation capacity is not adequately addressed. General considerations are provided which are not discussed in depth.
- There is no clear demonstration of project's concrete impact at European or global level. For example, there is no emphasis on the particular role of the non-European participants.

Quality of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the action results

- **Dissemination strategy about the results**

- The measures to exploit and disseminate the scientific project results to audiences beyond the scientific community are not clearly specified. The application of the results generated by the project to the medical devices sector is not sufficiently expanded upon within the proposal.
- Involvement of every partner and secondees in dissemination activities was not sufficiently presented.
- Although the dissemination strategy targeting scientific peers is appropriate, efforts to target additional stakeholders are insufficiently described.
- The dissemination, as well as the expected impact of the dissemination measures, is described in vague terms; there is insufficient realistic detail.
- The dissemination strategy is inappropriately developed considering the stated aim of the research.
- The dissemination plan is poor. For example, the target audiences are not specified, specific objectives of the proposed activities are not properly detailed, and the schedule for academic publication is unrealistic.
- The dissemination towards non-academic entities is weak and does not explain which strategies will be used to reach relevant policymakers and stakeholders.
- The dissemination towards relevant policymakers is insufficiently planned.
- Dissemination and public engagement activities are described in general terms, lacking details and timelines.
- Dissemination of exploitable results beyond the scientific community is narrow and engagement of stakeholders in the industrial sector is not sufficiently emphasized.
- The strategy for scientific dissemination has some oversights. For example, how results will be introduced in the clinical setting is not clearly addressed, and the measures to reach other stakeholders such as policymakers are not fully described.
- Dissemination activities through scientific workshops and meeting attendance are limited or unclear, given the broad application of the proposal. For example, justification for holding the summer school at three different locations is not adequate.
- The efficacy of conferences as a vehicle to extend the reach of research outputs, especially in respect of value-for-money is not explicitly justified
- The proposed dissemination measures are not fully convincing, and reference to specific

- exploitable results is not fully elaborated
- The program does not provide sufficient evidence of indicators to measure the success of the dissemination plan.
 - It is not clear how local administrations would exploit and disseminate the project results
 - There is insufficient detail as to how the effectiveness of the dissemination activities in achieving the expected impacts will be determined. The proposal does not provide sufficient detail as to how the partnership will ensure uptake of results.
 - Dissemination approaches via accepted communities and networks who interface directly with individuals with disabilities are not highly visible.
 - The measures described to secure effective dissemination are directed at multiple audiences, rather than being tailored for specific groups.
 - The impact of the exploitation and dissemination effort is to be evaluated mainly by non-quantifiable measures.
 - The potential impact on the policy maker community is not adequately presented; the value of conferences as a tool to impact policy makers community and public as whole is not convincingly presented, and the impact on individual and institutional actors, like schools, education policy governmental departments, NGO's, etc. is not convincing as well.
 - The dissemination actions have not been appropriately described for relevant target groups.
 - However, there is no enough information on the scientific events for dissemination (where they will be organized and how they will reach to the intended audiences). The dissemination strategy relies heavily on a website which is very generally described and largely ignores social media. The target audiences are not clearly identified and explained.
 - Although a range of appropriate dissemination measures are provided, the proposal does not give sufficient detail as to how the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the expected impacts will be determined and how the partnership will ensure uptake of results. The exploitation of the research objectives takes mainly place within academia and an accessible format for other actors is missing, i.e the presentation of research results by civil society to policy-makers, etc.
 - The strategy to disseminate the results of the project is very weak.
 - The dissemination strategy provides limited attention to professionals in xxx sector.
 - The dissemination plan is over ambitious in the number of activities to be undertaken. For example, the organization of sixty events, thirty publications, etc..
 - The Dissemination activities (i.e. websites) that could target some policy decision-makers do not provide an adequate guarantee for any interaction and effectiveness.
 - The dissemination strategy and expected results are insufficiently detailed. The explanation of the expected impact of the proposed measures is not articulated enough.
 - The dissemination plan does not provide sufficiently detailed information about the audiences targeted beyond very broad categories; about the organisation of the activities and it is unclear how the effectiveness of dissemination measures will be assessed and impact determined.
 - Although a range of appropriate dissemination measures are provided, the proposal does not give sufficient detail as to how the effectiveness of such activities in achieving the expected impacts will be determined.
 - The proposal does not present a consistent dissemination strategy. There is no clear information about concrete plans to reach specific targets that would maximise the results' impacts.
 - The dissemination plan is not convincing.
 - The strategy to disseminate the scientific results is not detailed enough.
 - Dissemination measures for academic audiences are insufficiently detailed.
 - The proposed dissemination activities to reach policy makers and regulators are not adequately justified.
 - The dissemination strategy is too generically developed; some key relevant aspects such as the impact of results are not sufficiently addressed.
 - The activities connected to the exploitation strategy are not sufficiently addressed.

- **How results will be taken up/used**

- Despite the potential significance of the proposed research, the exploitation of the project results is not discussed in sufficient detail. Specifically, the up-front knowledge (short term and long term toxicity of the proposed therapy) needed to estimate the feasibility of the proposed outcome for patients is not well presented.
- The exploitation of the project results is not developed in full detail. There is a slight concern on how are the project's results going to be used in the society in general, e.g. by lower classes, those who are less technologically literate, etc.
- The exploitation strategy does not address with sufficient detail the end users uptake of the results.
- The proposal does not demonstrate well how the results could be used and how they are able to impact society in a pertinent way.
- The exploitation of the on-line certification programme is unclear; in particular, there is little information directly relating to the way in which this opportunity is to be brought to the attention of a global audience.
- The exploitation plans by the academia and related institutions are not explained with adequate clarity and detail.
- The proposal does not provide sufficient detail as to how the partnership will ensure to uptake of results.
- The exploitation measures remain vague without a clear vision of what to precisely exploit.
- Despite identifying some relevant societal impact related statistics, the proposal does not describe how the results can be used to impact society in any meaningful way.
- There is insufficient presentation of the ways how results could be used and exploited.
- The application and the market uptake of the results is planned in an adequate approach, matching the technology readiness level of the scientific outcomes.
- The exploitation of project outcomes is insufficiently elaborated.
- The commercial exploitation aspects are insufficiently elaborated.

- **Expected impact of the proposed measures (e.g. addressing societal needs/challenges)**

- The project outcomes do not directly address relevant societal challenges, so are not expected to have a strong impact on society.
- Some of the envisioned impacts are overstated.
- The immediate societal impact of the project is overstated. For example, the stated direct economic impact of job creation is overestimated, and the impact on xxx costs is not rigorously estimated.
- The strategy for societal impact is not satisfactory detailed, and the project's societal impact is not sufficiently justified.
- There is little information provided in the proposal to highlight the value of specific exploitable results.
- The proposal does not clearly explain how the project's results could impact society in a very pertinent way, nor how could these results lead to clearly relevant progress in societal challenges.
- The description of the impact of project results on society is insufficient and very generic.
- The exploitation of the project results which would impact local societies and contribute to the societal challenges are not addressed in depth.
- The impact of the action for some of the stakeholders (e.g. benefits for society) is not convincingly demonstrated.
- The social and societal impacts of the project outcomes are insufficiently elaborated. Credible measurable indicators to assess these impacts are not provided in a satisfactory manner.

- **Intellectual property rights aspects and exploitation of results**

- IPR issues are only generally described and there is not sufficient detail on how any IP would be managed.
- Exploitation plans, IPR and the potential impact on the participating SMEs are not properly addressed in a project-specific manner.
- The exploitation plan is described in too general terms to be convincing and IPR issues are not adequately addressed.
- The exploitation strategy is vague in light of the stated research & innovation objectives. e.g. the potential owner of the final product is not clearly listed.
- The exploitation strategy is not fully convincing. The expected outcomes of the research are not clearly addressed.
- Exploitation of results is not sufficiently elaborated in the proposal. For example, the proposal contains a limited amount of information on the opportunities to maximize the impact in the non-academic sector.
- IPR issues are only generally described. This aspect detracts from the credibility in light of the xxx and materials that will be exchanged.
- The exploitation and commercialisation plan, including freedom-to-operate (e.g. legal aspects to bring xxx devices to market) is not properly addressed. In addition, the expertise for the development/commercialization of xxx tools is not demonstrated, which limits the exploitation potential.
- The management and attribution of possible IPR is not described in sufficient detail, which is particularly problematic given the number of non-academic partners involved with the project. This undermines the exploitation strategy.
- Although the IPR strategy is well planned, the exploitation plan for the project results is not sufficiently described.
- The information provided on the exploitation is limited and relevant aspects about the commercial interest are not made clear.
- Intellectual property rights aspects are not clearly exposed/ are discussed with limited detail
- The specific exploitable results are not adequately analysed/not clearly exposed to demonstrate convincingly their value.
- There is no precise description of how IPR will be managed. There is not provisions to consider this aspect under a specific plan for exploitation of results.
- The IPR issues are discussed in a limited way, with exploitable results not considered relevant, as public institutions are involved.
- The proposal states that there are several pathways for exploiting the results but does not detail them sufficiently.
- There is limited consideration of the plan to exploit the results from the project. The results to be exploited have not been clarified.
- It is declared that the IPR will be linked to the project partners but how this will be achieved and shared is not clearly explained.
- The plan to exploit the results is based on a theoretical approach but it lacks practical detailing.
- The commercialisation and exploitation strategy is not sufficiently discussed.
- The plan to exploit results is insufficiently presented. The responsibilities within the consortium for facilitating the exploitation of the project results are clearly assigned.
- There is no concrete strategy described for the exploitation and possible commercial uptake of the results.
- The exploitation strategy is not sufficiently developed and does not demonstrate satisfactorily the impact that industry involvement in the project can realise.

Quality of the proposed measures to communicate the action activities to different target audiences

- **Communication strategy of the project and its results, outreach plan and the activities envisaged to engage the public**
 - Although some target audiences have been identified for communicating the project, the specific details on engagement activities, such as events, number of participants, timetable and duration, are not clearly presented.
 - The specific role of each partner in the communication activities is not sufficiently described. In addition, measures for assessing effectiveness of communication are not well described or sufficiently supported by mechanisms of verifiable metrics.
 - Metrics for measurement of proposed communication activities in terms of their effectiveness has not been considered.
 - There is little convincing evidence of how communication beyond academia will be achieved in relevant sectors.
 - The involvement of ESRs and ERs in communication activities is not clearly articulated.
 - Although some communication and public outreach strategies are presented, they are not very well developed and are mostly related to those already existing in the partner institutions. Moreover, their benefits to society are not well elaborated.
 - The communication plan is not well developed. For example, the nature of the proposed public awareness campaigns is unclear, unambitious and unspecific. In addition, it is unclear how the consortium plans to measure the effectiveness of their communication endeavours.
 - The communication actions are not described in detail. Specific measures linked to the project aims are not discussed. The potential impact of the communication activities on the public are not properly assessed.
 - A communication plan to reach the lay audience is presented. However, it lacks of original activities and project specific events.
 - The communications strategy is too generally described and has not sufficiently considered target stakeholders. In addition, how the effectiveness of the communication endeavours will be measured is unclear.
 - The communication channels and timetable of public engagement are not sufficiently detailed.
 - Some actions (e.g. Scientific articles and Conferences) designed for the general public are in fact activities mainly directed to academics.
 - The presentation of the communication strategy is not very adequate. The planned actions, the diverse public to be reached and the channels to be used are insufficiently elaborated.
 - The outlined communication strategy is not convincingly defined and the target groups are not clearly specified.
 - The contribution of the project to decision makers is not convincingly illustrated by a concrete communication plan and stakeholders engagement.
 - Although the potential impact of the proposed communication and outreach activities for the project partners and the public is specified, the communication strategy mainly consists of a list of communication channels that potentially can be used, without linking these to the project objectives, explaining why they are suitable given the type of information/target audiences, or providing evidence that they are accessible to the researchers. Table xx is hastily completed and contains some evident errors (eg. that scientific articles are listed to benefit “commoners”, but not academics).
 - The communication measures are addressed in a very generic way, making their potential impact difficult to assess.
 - The proposal overestimates the potential for publication of results in top-tier global news channels.
 - The impact of the proposed communication measures (interactive website, documentary, school toolkit, course on the implementation of xxx) is insufficiently discussed in the proposal.

- The communication strategy has been too broadly described. It lacks details and ambition, as well as consideration to very relevant aspects like xxx.
 - The proposal does not sufficiently demonstrate an effective communication of the activities to non-academic audiences. The proposal does not detail the specific key audiences and how they will be directly targeted. Project brochures and video content are mentioned but their purpose and how they will reach the target audiences are not explained. Similarly university-wide open days are proposed without identification of targeted audiences. Overall, the communication activities are not supported by measurable targets and Key Performance Indicators.
 - The activities to reach non-specialist and non-scientific audiences are not always clearly presented.
 - Whilst a communication approach is given, which measures will be addressed to which target group, although formulated, is not clear. The proposal does not insist enough as to how the effectiveness of the activities would be assessed in order to achieve the communication objectives.
 - The proposal does not provide clear assessment of the potential impact of the proposed communication and outreach activities for the project and the public. It is stated that a clear impact on communication will be achieved, but no specific details are given about this impact.
 - The activities to outreach non-specialist / non-scientific audiences are insufficiently addressed.
 - The proposal does not present adequate information concerning the proposed communication activities. Impact goals and success indicators for these activities are not well defined.
 - The proposed communications channels to engage with non-scientific audiences is insufficiently detailed. The societal impact is treated superficially.
 - The communication strategy is insufficiently detailed with regard to the public engagement.
- **How activities will be targeted at multiple audiences**
 - Indicators to evaluate the impact of communication activities on target audiences are not detailed enough.
 - The plans for public engagement lacks specificity with respect to the subject of the research project.
 - Strategies to engage the general public by communicating the project and its results are not sufficiently detailed. For example, the number, timing and location of communication activities is unclear which lessens the likelihood of effective or targeted outreach.
 - While the communication plan directed towards non-academic audiences is detailed in terms of activities and channels, the proposal lacks information on how interest in the project results will be generated, which is key to reaching non-specialist audiences.
 - Although the proposal has a communication strategy, it is however not sufficiently substantiated as target groups are not clearly identified or properly nominated and the communication channels to be used during the entire project lifetime to communicate results for the benefit of society at large, though mentioned, are not clearly explained.
 - The proposal indicates that xxxs are to be targeted, without a substantive rationale being given; inadequate measures are indicated to reach this target audience.
 - The communication activities to reach non-specialist / non-scientific audiences such as the public or the media are very generic.
 - The proposal does not provide sufficient detail about the effectiveness of the communicative strategy towards different audiences.
 - It is not convincingly clear how the project is expected to ensure the communication of results beyond the research community, being the communication measures mainly limited to SME and business private sector.
 - The communication plan is insufficiently detailed in relation to the proposed research activities, duration and target audiences.
 - The audience is defined and suitable activities are listed to reach the target audience: via website and scientific events to the general public and via publications to the scientific community.

- The measures for communicating the programme activities to different target audiences are not elaborated adequately.
- The communication of the project activities to different target audiences insufficiently addresses mechanisms to evaluate their impact.
- **Channel(s) be used to inform and reach out to society**
 - There is insufficient account taken of the potential to engage actively with existing international networks, organisations and movements in xxx to secure a greater opportunity for knowledge transfer.
 - The channels to communicate results and their benefit to wider society is not entirely clearly presented.
 - The interaction with different audiences is not fully developed in terms of scale or identified users and in terms of impact. Thus, although the fora are appropriate, limited justification is offered for the choice of location for the three xxx meetings nor is a methodology for selecting xxx described.
 - The proposal does not describe in a pertinent way how project results could impact society.
 - Plans to engage the public in the research are limited in scope.
 - The explanation of how the dissemination tools provided would be specific to the project is not fully convincing. For example “social media” and “media sources” categories, generally refers to the use of means of communication (eg twitter, facebook etc).
 - Specific details on the appropriateness of the channels to communicate the project’s activities are not adequately presented and measurable indicators are lacking. There is no clear discussion of the identified potential impacts of the proposed communication activities.
 - Strategies to extend already existing partnerships and research collaborations between participants are not sufficiently detailed.
 - The potential impact of the communication and outreach activities is not adequately assessed. The involvement of policy makers has been insufficiently considered.
 - The proposal does not adequately demonstrate the potential impact of the communication and outreach activities.
- **Expected impact of the proposed activities**
 - It is unclear how the consortium plans to measure the effectiveness of the proposed communication activities.
 - Plans to monitor the impact of the proposed public outreach are not well demonstrated.
 - Overall, the communication plan is adequate. However, the proposed indicators are not well quantified.
 - The measures to quantify and monitor the impact of events, publications and workshop appearances are not adequately elaborated.
 - It is not clearly indicated how the consortium will evaluate the success of the dissemination activities.
 - It is not clearly explained how the impact of the project and its exchanges is going to have an effect on non-academic partners.
 - The proposal lacks detail on how project results could impact society at large.
 - The proposal does not provide sufficient explanation of the expected impact of the various measures proposed. Specifically how the project’s outcomes could impact society and how they could lead to relevant progress in societal challenges is not adequately discussed.
 - The proposal does not explain in sufficient detail the potential impact of the proposed communication nor specific outreach activities.
 - Quantitative goals for the impact of the proposed communication measures are insufficiently elaborated within the context of stated technical ambitions and research objectives.
 - The proposal does not adequately elaborates on the measurable indicators to sufficiently justify the potential impact of the communication activities.

Criterion 3 – Implementation

Strengths:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- **Consistency and adequacy of the work plan**
 - The workplan organization is overall coherent with the objectives to be achieved. Sufficient details are given on the technical and scientific activities to be performed within each WP and the proposal well described the procedure for final testing and comparison of the new xxx.
 - The work plan description includes appropriately defined objectives and tasks to be fulfilled in relation to the proposed objectives. The roles of each partner are clear.
 - The work plan is realistic and work packages are convincingly integrated. The tasks are appropriately allocated including work package leadership roles.
 - The work plan is adequately structured and WPs have indicated objectives, specific tasks and participating institutions.
 - The overall work plan is coherent and logically follows the project aims.
 - Tasks are detailed and allocated according to the scientific needs and expertise of the participants.
 - The work plan is coherent, with well defined and appropriately allocated tasks. Feasibility is clearly demonstrated by a detailed description of each work package. In addition, all partners in the project have a clear responsibility in each step of the work plan.
 - A comprehensive work plan which also includes separate Work Packages dedicated to the management of the project and to the dissemination activities is described.
 - The proposal describes an appropriate allocation of tasks and resources, taking into consideration the scientific challenges to be solved, and is explicit in terms of the roles of participants and objectives for secondments.
 - The work plan is suitably divided into work packages that are well described and clearly linked to the research objectives. For each WP, objectives are clearly presented, and clear and scientific deliverables are defined. The tasks are well formulated.
 - The coherence and effectiveness of the work plan is very good, as the work packages, tasks, milestones and deliverables are in line with the research objectives.
 - The allocation of the resources is adequate to achieve the project's goals in the proposed timelines. The group of secondees and the direction of the secondments have all been well thought through.
 - The overall outline of the workplan has been sufficiently described and laid out in a logical, coherent manner.
 - The allocation of tasks and resources is appropriate for the described work plan. Activities proposed are concrete and credible.
 - The work plan comprises appropriate objectives and tasks to be fulfilled in relation to the proposed objectives.
 - The proposal's actions are systematically divided into specific incremental phases; each of these is described at an appropriate level of detail to illustrate that the consortium recognises the importance of both institutional (local) and network (EU and international) levels.
 - The proposal is also detailed with regards to the characteristics of each of the project elements, for example, it provides a clear insight into the way that the consortium is going to make use of

a distinct 'reintegration' strategy for returning researchers.

- A clear work plan has been provided showing a coherent allocation of tasks and milestones across the different WPs.
- The general structure of the work plan is convincing and coherent with respect to the project objectives, the tasks as described, are allocated appropriately amongst the participants, and the secondments are coherently organized.
- There is a good division of labour, based on the skills and competencies of the partners/ Tasks and resources are mostly very well shared between the participants, ensuring that main responsibilities lay within the most suitable institutions.
- The work-plan is described clearly. A deliverable list is also provided with milestones that clearly detailed the participation of all the partners.
- The work plan is clearly presented and is in line with the goals. Each work package is appropriately demonstrated in terms of tasks description, leading beneficiaries, partners' organizations and secondments.
- The work plan is clear, well elaborated, and based on an appropriate allocation of tasks and resources between the participants. The individual contributions of all partners are precisely specified for each work package.
- The structure of the work plan with time sequences are in line with the aims of the proposed research project.
- The work plan is well detailed with concrete information of the task to be performed. It is consistent with the projects goals.
- The Work Plan involves contributions from both academic and non-academic personnel; the rationale for such an approach is strongly stated and is justifiable in respect of sustainability.
- The overall approach to the project's actions is stated to involve an interactive approach, whereby continuous feedback is made available to secure ongoing improvements to the project's functioning.
- The proposal presents an overall detailed work plan and list of secondments.
- The work plan is generally well prepared and consistent.
- The project timeline is realistic and demonstrates an incremental development of the designated outputs.
- The work plan is clearly articulated and is coherent with stated objectives.
- The work plan and the work packages are clearly organized, and a specific WP dedicated to knowledge exchange is in place.
- The general lines of the work plan are well prepared and properly structured.
- The work plan is well elaborated, the WPs are well defined, and the resources and tasks have been mostly allocated in an appropriate manner in particular for the work packages addressing research aspects.
- The proposal presents a comprehensive and detailed work plan, interconnections between the different Work packages are properly shown. A Gantt chart is provided which properly reflects all the activities of the project.
- The work plan presented is complete in all the required activities. The structure of the work-plan is adequately presented, tasks and resources are reflective of the organisational requirements of the project and appropriately specified within the work packages.
- The feasibility of the project is clearly demonstrated and well explained. Tasks are appropriately allocated across the Work plan.
- The work-flow is clear and the involvement of partners' organisations and their resources is appropriate.
- The work plan is effective and coherent with respect to the academic pursuits of the project.
- Proposed activities are carefully planned and feasible. The work is overall well-planned.

- **Activities proposed to reach the action objectives (research/innovation activities, training, transfer of knowledge, etc.)**
 - The number and duration of the secondments are in line with the knowledge transfer actions.
 - The plan for secondments is very well thought through and necessary to implement the proposed activities. The length of secondments is adequately considered, and takes into account staff type.
 - The proposed secondments are necessary to implement the activities. Their duration is appropriate to achieve the objectives and adequate enough to acquire specific knowledge whilst not negatively affecting each researcher's duties at their original organizations.
 - At the beginning of the project each researcher involved in the secondment will attend topic specific training sessions for the smooth integration into the hosting organisation.
 - Secondments are relevant and well justified in terms of reaching the objectives.
 - The number of planned secondments and person months is adequate in relation to the complexity of the work plan/tasks and to implement the activities.
 - The plan for secondments proposed is well balanced to implement the activities described
 - The proposed secondments are satisfactorily presented and their duration is appropriate
 - The proposal clearly justifies that secondments are the necessary part of activities to achieve the expected objectives / explained in all necessary details, / co-funded by TC partner.
 - The proposal convincingly argues that the number of the planned secondments and their duration are appropriate to achieve the project's objectives.
 - A clear position is highlighted in respect of researcher integration; the notion of an 'integration' path, with a set of mandatory activities, is a highly visible demonstration of a coherent policy.
 - The secondments are clearly outlined and properly designed.
 - The comprehensive and fully appropriate presentation of the proposed activities confirms the feasibility of the project.
 - The secondments are justified and relevant for the achievement of the project objectives.
 - The duration of most secondments is adequate to reach the stated objectives.
 - The planned secondments correspond very well to the work plan, are necessary and of appropriate duration.
 - The list of deliverables and their planning are well presented and appropriate. The list of milestones is suitable for the work plan.
 - The proposed secondments are necessary to realise the project.

- **Credibility and feasibility of the action**
 - The feasibility of the research part of the project is, in overall, well demonstrated.
 - The feasibility of the project is well demonstrated by a detailed WP description, tasks, participating organisations and resource allocations.
 - There is a good description of the work packages with clear and feasible deliverables.
 - Feasibility of the project is clearly demonstrated e.g. Specificities of the different countries (laws, healthcare policies, etc.) have been duly taken into account.
 - The feasibility of the project is clearly demonstrated as all the proposed activities and resources of the consortium are very well foreseen and organized.
 - The commitment for project tasks accomplishment is credibly illustrated.
 - The proposed activities and their duration are clearly explained and the feasibility of the project is proven.
 - The allocation of task and resources is adequate to the capacities of participating institutions. Thus the proposal well justifies the credibility and feasibility of the action thanks to the envisioned activities.
 - A feasible work plan is presented providing information on single work packages and their specific objectives and milestones.
 - There is a rational distribution of responsibilities and tasks amongst the partners, with work-strand leadership roles being equally distributed.

- The proposed activities are concrete and credible, and the feasibility of the project is convincingly demonstrated.
- The proposal clearly shows how credible and feasible the scientific production (books and articles) is in the given timeframe and because of the partners' expertise.
- The timeline is organizationally realistic.
- Feasibility of the project is clearly demonstrated.
- The allocation of tasks and resources is appropriate and convincing.
- The overall work plan is credible, adequate and consistent with the planned research and training activities.
- Resources are appropriately allocated to the respective tasks.

- **Work Packages, deliverables, milestones**
 - The work packages dedicated to the project management and dissemination activities are considered beneficial.
 - Relevant deliverables are appropriately identified.
 - Clear milestones and deliverables are indicated with respect to the research objectives.
 - The deliverables are reasonably planned and achievable due to the complementary expertise in xxx.
 - Milestones are well distributed across the timeline of the project, and in accordance with reasonable deliverables.
 - Individual work packages are aligned with the scientific objectives. The deliverables described for each of the work packages are clearly defined.
 - Precise tasks have been described in the work packages. In addition, the roles of each participating organization are well described.
 - Tasks are properly allocated according to the expertise present at the participating organisations. Milestones are linked to deliverables and well spread over the time course of the project.
 - All deliverables are well designed, significant and not too ambitious in the context of each workplan and the project as a whole includes measurable key performance indicators that will facilitate the monitoring of the project progress and eventual troubleshooting.
 - The project lists an adequate number of significant deliverables and milestones not only for the scientific aspects but also for the management, training and dissemination activities.
 - Activities in the work packages are appropriate.
 - Deliverables are realistic and measurable.
 - The work package structure fits very well to the proposed project. The research objectives and deliverables of the project are significant, clearly stated and relevant to the proposal.
 - There is a good distribution of responsibilities for each partner to achieve the deliverables in work packages.
 - Key deliverables and milestones are well presented/credible, convincingly planned/significant and realistic. They are clearly presented with a justified mix of various type of project results both for the scientific outputs and the training activities.
 - Each Work Package incorporates coverage of methodological issues relating to individual sub-tasks.
 - The milestones to monitor the progress of the whole action and consortium's endeavour are appropriately demonstrated.
 - All deliverables are significant and in accordance with the project main and specific objectives, and the milestones are very clearly described.
 - The WPs details make a strong case for the coherence and effectiveness of the project as exemplified by tasks/resources allocated and adequate person/months. Additional significant deliverables list and milestone adequately summarises the work plan.
 - The stated project milestones are reasonable and appear achievable in the suggested time-frames.

- Each of the component work-packages provide a coherent account of the tasks to be performed.
- The WPs description is appropriate with details about tasks and resources.
- The offered work packages are detailed and they have appropriate measures for a balanced allocation of tasks and resources among participants.
- The various project tasks have been thoughtfully distributed and are consistent with the skills and research orientations of the partners; there is an equitable distribution of leadership functions.
- Deliverables and milestones are discussed well and in detail.
- The listed deliverables are significant and realistic.
- The deliverables are clearly articulated, realistic and fully adequate to the project possibilities.
- The list of deliverables is realistic, also because the allocation of task and resources is adequate to the capacities of participating institutions.
- Deliverables and milestones are clearly articulated with respect to the Work Packages planned.
- A detailed work plan is presented. From a research perspective the work plan is coherent, appropriate and sufficiently resourced. Milestones are appropriate.
- A clear description of milestones and deliverables is provided in the light of the whole project and the sharing of knowledge objective.
- The objectives of the work packages are sufficiently described.
- Majority of the deliverables and milestones are significant, feasible, clearly described and relevant to the overall project's goals.
- The deliverables and the tasks are appropriately allocated. The milestones are linked with the main anticipated research results and allow for efficient project monitoring.
- The work packages are detailed in terms of tasks and deliverables. They clearly demonstrate the planned activities and their contribution towards the achievement of the overall project goal.
- The deliverables are significant and credible in the context of the outlined work plan.
- The deliverables are precisely defined. The secondments are suitably distributed amongst the respective work packages.

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management

- **Action organisation and management structure**

- The management structure is clearly outlined and includes a project manager. Decision making processes and governing positions with sufficiently defined roles, have been identified clearly.
- The proposal appropriately describes the management structure and procedures of the project.
- The management structure is simple, lean and robust and procedures are properly addressed to solve potential problems.
- The management structure and procedures are well suited for coordinating this type of project.
- The management structure, including the appointment of a project manager, is well-described, comprehensive, professionally prepared and different boards are convincingly integrated. The inclusion of ESRs in the various committees is a strength.
- All aspects of the managements process have been properly addressed which reflects the participants' previous experience in similar projects. It is convincingly demonstrated that the coordinating organization has the capacity of the coordination of the project.
- The management procedures necessary are adequate and sufficiently described. The coordinating organisation has extensive experience with project management at the national and international levels.
- The governance structure is well designed and includes a Scientific Advisory Board.

- The general management structure and procedures for project management are appropriately described. Decision making, conflict resolution as well as financial and quality management are reasonable.
- The coordinating organisation demonstrates the capacity and experience necessary to manage an EU grant.
- The management structure is simple but adequate. The coordinator's vast involvement in managing other international consortia is an added value. The roles of the defined governing bodies are clearly explained. An appropriate financial management strategy is foreseen.
- An effective multi-level management structure will ensure the smooth project execution. The organisation is well complemented by a Scientific Advisory Board with three international experts already identified.
- Management and decision making processes are clearly outlined, with a dedicated management WP.
- The governance structure together with the role of the coordinator and WP leaders are well described and suitable for the effective management of the project. The management process is addressed adequately.
- The management structure is well suited for the project. The proposed procedures are appropriate and effective, including quality and financial management.
- The management structures and governance are well described. The administrative, financial and progress monitoring processes are properly planned with personnel experienced in managing similar consortiums.
- Standard and appropriate project governance and management is proposed, and the roles of the main management positions are well chosen and clearly explained. For example, the coordinating organisation has many years of experience in the management of projects involving multiple countries and sectors.
- The steering committee (governance) and its role is fully described and appropriate to manage the project.
- The governance structure, including quality management of the project, is appropriately designed and the roles of the project members are clearly presented.
- The proposed governance based on two-level management structure is convincingly explained and fully appropriate. The different responsibilities of the governing bodies are clearly presented and the management capacity of the coordinating organization is convincingly demonstrated
- The management structure is well defined appointing several roles to the coordinator and supporting bodies and considering a quality management plan
- The governance structure and the management processes are well conceived.
- A transparent arrangement is in evidence regarding the management of the project, with a range of bodies established to cover all aspects of project operation.
- The interrelationships of each of the management bodies and decision-making procedures are explicitly stated and are appropriate for their respective purposes.
- The proposal demonstrates a good level of management experience, by courtesy of involvement in international research projects.
- The management processes (administrative aspects, financial strategy, progress monitoring, etc.) including risk management and mitigation strategies are properly addressed, clearly illustrated.
- The management structure is for the most part well presented including relevant bodies and committees responsible for research, dissemination and communication
- The governance structure is simple, but adequate for implementing the proposed project's activities; the role of the coordinator and of the work package leaders are appropriately presented
- The management structure is pertinent and reflects very well the needs of the research, and that of the information exchange.

- Gender aspects are also addressed in management, which is a strong aspect of this proposal.
- A complete and detailed management structure is proposed. Effective measures, tools and boards will support an effective implementation of the project.
- The proposal convincingly shows how management structure and procedures have been carefully planned through a detailed explanation about various committees.
- The work plan demonstrates that all the consortium partners are actively engaged in the project's management and delivery,/there is an appropriate distribution of inputs by all partners in the Project and Management Board. Roles and tasks are clear.
- The management structures and procedures are appropriate and specifically described for each major strategic activity: the research, financial and monitoring management structures and procedures are well planned; the project will set up a Supervisory Board, where all partners will be represented; the management procedures will be discussed in detail in the Consortium Agreement and in the Partnership Agreement.
- The governance structure, the financial strategy, the progress monitoring organization are well presented.
- The processes related to the management are properly addressed.
- The practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the research project is appropriately described.
- All the management processes are satisfactorily presented.
- The management structure of the project is overall adequate, presenting a leadership, co-leadership and participants team well balanced in gender.
- A clear and systematic research project management strategy is anticipated to ensure effective project delivery, including clear distribution of management roles.
- The governance structure is very well conceived with a clear and effective organization and partition of roles and responsibility.
- The proposed governance structure is briefly explained but is adequate to the project needs.
- The governance structure is adequate and the procedures are good and well thought-out to deliver the work packages. The management structure addresses risks pertinent to the proposal.
- The management strategy and procedures are adequately considered.
- Sufficient details are provided regarding the appropriateness of the monitoring and quality checking mechanisms to be put in place.
- An effective multilevel management structure is presented.
- The management procedures are described in detail and cover the strategies for scientific and financial management as well as for quality management and research progress monitoring.
- Overall, management structure and procedures are adequate to manage the project.
- The tasks are well detailed and appropriately distributed between the project partners.
- The proposal provides convincing information on the well-developed management structures for project development. Specifically, the management bodies of the project roles are sufficiently put forward.
- The project management structures are well detailed and appropriate to the project requirements. From a governance perspective the inclusion of an external advisory board is highly appropriate given the trans-sectoral nature of the project. The balance of the proposed advisory board appears effective.
- The management structure and procedures, including quality management and risk management are presented in a simple but convincing way.
- The management structure as well as the quality management are well described and appropriately developed. The governance structure is adequate.
- The management structure and procedures presented are appropriate for the project implementation and convincing.
- The overall management structure and the roles of key personnel is very well explained. The functions and roles are specifically assigned and the meetings of the individual bodies programmed.

- The management procedures and the progress monitoring, as well as the financial management are adequately developed and effective.
- The management structure and procedures regarding administrative aspects, financial strategy and progress monitoring are properly addressed and appropriate for the project realisation.
- The management structure is well planned and appropriate to the planned research cooperation. Main management bodies are defined and assigned clear roles. Dependencies between the major management bodies are explicit and efficient.
- **Role of the coordinator/WP leaders**
 - The organization has previous experience with EU projects which is convincing in terms of being able to administrate the project.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to oversee the project is good.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation is convincingly demonstrated, having coordinated and participated in previous EU-funded projects.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international consortium is very well demonstrated as shown by the successful administration of several EU funded grants currently or in the past.
 - The leading institution and the coordinator have extensive experience in execution and managing projects funded by national and international grants, including EU projects.
 - The capacity of the coordinating institute is convincing with previous and current experience with coordinating and reporting of EU grants.
 - The role of the project coordinator is appropriately described in order to prove the level of management capacity required by such an extended international academic consortium
 - The roles of the coordinator and the WP leaders are clearly outlined and convincingly interconnected.
 - The WP Leaders are experienced researchers with a good knowledge and appropriate experience relevant to the tasks of their WPs.
 - The role of the coordinator and WP leaders in this management structure are appropriate.
 - The governance structure is adequate, well described and the leadership roles of the coordinator and work package leaders in the management structure are appropriate and balanced among the partners.
 - The practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the research project is appropriately described. The role of the coordinator and WP leaders in this management structure are appropriate.
 - An appropriate allocation of tasks to the different partners and a clear description of roles of the coordinators as well as the activities are provided in the work packages description.
 - The accumulated experience with the previous projects demonstrates the capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international project funded by the EU.
 - The project coordinator organisation has relevant experience in managing a portfolio of smaller projects, however, as this project is relatively small in RISE terms this gap is not significant.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international consortium funded by EU grant is convincingly demonstrated.
 - The role of the Work Package leaders is appropriately demonstrated.
 - The role of the coordinator and the WP leaders is clearly presented including specific responsibilities and terms of action.
 - The capacity of the co-ordinating participant to lead EU-funded international projects is demonstrated to be good.
 - The experience of the coordinator and of some academic partners is excellent.
 - The proposed coordinator has previous experience of delivering on such projects.
 - The roles of the Coordinator, the Steering and Scientific Committee and Secondments and Organizing Committee are well described and appropriate.

- **Financial management strategy**
 - Financial issues have been carefully planned.
 - The allocation of resources is adequately presented in terms of person-months allocated to each participant institution and is aligned with the general goals of the project.
 - The financial administration unit is experienced in administration of transnational projects.
 - The financial management is adequately defined and efficient measures for progress monitoring are in place.
 - The project coordinator has very good experience in the management of research projects.
 - The coordinating organisation has the capacity to manage an international consortium funded by an EU grant.
 - The management processes in the sense of general administration, financial strategy, and progress monitoring are properly addressed.

- **Progress monitoring mechanisms**
 - Meaningful milestones have been identified to monitor research progress.
 - The project includes effective measures to gauge the progress and outcome of secondments.
 - The management procedures referring to monitoring of project progress, decision-making and financial matters are well elaborated.
 - Procedures to monitor the advancement of the project and to manage the exploitation aspect, solving potential conflict (between the partners) are properly described.
 - The monitoring mechanism put in place to monitor the progress of the project is well addressed.
 - The use of national advisory boards in each of the countries is particularly beneficial to the project. Frequency of meetings is appropriate.
 - Management procedures related to administration, financial strategy, progress monitoring and indicators are also well considered.

- **Quality management (relating to the availability of adequate resources of the coordinating organisation)**
 - The quality management measures to monitor the project progress and to handle the financial aspects of the project are appropriate.
 - The proposal outlines appropriate management procedures which include also quality management and risk management.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international/intersectoral consortium funded by a EU grant is convincingly demonstrated.
 - The presentation of the coordinating organisation's capacity to cope with international/intersectoral consortium is credible.
 - The proposal convincingly demonstrates that the coordinating organisation and its leader have the necessary capacity to manage such an extensive international consortium.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage international consortium funded by a EU grant is demonstrated.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international and intersectoral consortium funded by an EU grant is fully convincingly demonstrated.
 - The quality of the management and the capacity of the coordinating organization is clearly demonstrated in the proposal.
 - The coordinating organisation has adequate capacity to manage an international/intersectoral consortium.
 - The management structure is clearly articulated and appropriate. The role of the coordinator is well outlined. The management processes are sufficiently considered.
 - Management procedures, including quality and risk management are appropriate to the implementation plan. The structure incorporates key management elements and is well

illustrated and explained.

- **Risks and the contingency plans**

- The project includes a list of potential risk issues and mitigation measures, some of which are appropriate for a project of this scope. The idea to continuously assess risks throughout the life of the project is commendable.
- Risk management is described well and identified risks cover appropriate research-specific and management issues.
- General non-scientific risks are well addressed and appropriate mitigation measures are proposed.
- The risks related to the project implementation are addressed and the proposed mitigation measures are appropriate.
- Relevant managerial and scientific risks have been identified and appropriately prioritised.
- The administrative risk analysis is appropriate and possible solutions to overcome problems are realistic.
- Potential risks facing the project are addressed. Risk mitigation plan proposes appropriate corrective strategies.
- Risks are well estimated and the proposed mitigation measures are convincing. A sufficiently detailed risk assessment with contingency plans for scientific risks have been provided.
- The risk assessment and proposed mitigation measures are well addressed and provide realistic solutions.
- The main risks are correctly identified and detailed. Proposed mitigation measures are consistent with an efficient management of the project.
- Risk and contingency plans identify key issues in scientific and administrative tasks.
- The proposal provides a list of risks (delays in secondments, lack of reports, disputes) with a list of mitigation measures.
- The risk management strategy and its implementation are well thought,/ credible, carefully designed and well described.
- Several articulated risks (scientific, dissemination, communication) are presented and realistic mitigation measures to overcome them are proposed.
- The proposal demonstrates suitably procedures of evaluation and mitigation risks.
- The risk management plan is comprehensive and credible, and most risks have been considered in depth for local participants/ study objects.
- Quality and risk management are very good. In risk management, all potentially upcoming issues have been addressed in a very good manner.
- The risk management procedures are properly considered.
- The proposal adequately addresses some potential implementation risks and envisions proper mitigation activities.
- The risks are realistically defined and the contingency measures are effective and clearly underlined.
- The proposal presents a set of mitigation measures appropriate for the identified risks.
- The proposal present a sufficient risk assessment.
- The potential risk and the contingency plan are properly addressed.
- The risk procedures present appropriate considerations considering the research topic and the mobility dimension.
- The list of potential risk is credibly addressed. The project provides realistic solution to overcome them.
- Various risks and their potential levels are adequately identified and methodically addressed with contingency plans.
- The proposal demonstrates suitably well-developed procedures for the evaluation and minimisation of most of the potential risks.
- The proposal sets out an appropriate assessment of the risks with overall the potential of risks

occurring deemed low. It is beneficial that each WP has a risk plan, facilitating a focus on risks from the WP leaders.

- The proposal has a convincing risk analysis, identifying eventual risks and proposing adequate and realistic mitigation measures.
- The proposal adequately addresses the potential risks and provides realistic solutions to prevent and overcome them.
- The risk management and contingency planning are correctly addressed.
- The proposal adequately addresses the potential risks and provides realistic mitigation plans.

Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure)

• **Availability of the expertise and human resources**

- The competences described are well suited to the project main research objectives.
- Key staff members and their profiles are clearly shown.
- The profiles of the key staff involved in the project are well described and relevant.
- Number of available staff and involved staff member profiles are adequate to implement the activities.
- The participants have documented extensive research experience.
- The expertise of many partners is well demonstrated by impressive publication records.
- The participants document high quality infrastructure, environment and human resources.
- The number of available staff and their profiles are described appropriately to implement and disseminate the activities linked to the different secondments.
- The roles of the staff in the proposal are well described.
- Overall the participants have appropriate technical capacity for the proposed activities. Human resources and technical resources are well described.
- The technical and scientific institutional environment (infrastructure, facilities, resources) are well described and fully appropriate for implementing the project's activities; overall, the partners are committed to the activities to be carried out.
- The number of available staff and staff member profiles are appropriate for the proposed project. The descriptions of the available staff and the staff member profiles are satisfactory, and appropriate to implementing the planned activities.
- The number and profiles of staff members correspond to the activities linked to different secondments. The participating academic organisations have excellent and relevant experience in research activities and the needed expertise to participate in research and provide specialised training.
- There is an indication of the specialist profiles of the participating staff - this provides a good indication of the range of academic coverage to be provided by the consortium.
- Each academic and non-academic institution guarantees an adequate number of personnel to implement the activities.
- The proposal sufficiently shows that the staff member profiles are appropriate to implement activities linked to different secondments.
- The expertise and human resources are clearly appropriate for carrying out the action.
- The host institutions have adequate staff and suitable profiles to undertake the role assigned to them in the WPs, and confirm that implementation of the activities linked to the secondments is necessary and would be effective.
- The participating academic organizations have excellent and relevant experience in research activities and the needed expertise in international programs.
- The description of the available staff and the staff member profiles is appropriate.
- Also the personal in charge of the supervision for the secondments taking place is clearly presented.
- Description of the available staff and staff member profiles are sufficiently put forward. Specifically, the proposal adequately pays attention as to how they are in line with the project's objectives.

- The academic host institutions offer a good institutional environment in terms of expert teams and infrastructure.
 - The consortium partners expertise on the different fields of work involved in the proposal is adequately addressed, as well as the complementarity between them.
 - The consortium includes significant relevant expertise, particularly relating to academic expertise on open innovation, to support the proposed project. The network has a well-defined multidisciplinary complementarity and is balanced in terms of academic and non-academic membership.
 - The partnership has a wide range of relevant experiences that are adequately described and demonstrated.
 - The appropriateness of the institutional environment is sufficiently presented. Staff members to host the seconded staff are presented.
 - There is a very good level of complementarity of the expertise and infrastructures of the participants.
 - Host institutions provide suitable conditions for the secondments to be executed correctly and the host institutions have extensive experience in hosting researchers.
 - The proposers satisfactorily demonstrate their experience and competencies, which includes patents and other relevant ongoing activities in the targeted technological areas.
 - The availability of human resources and the expertise necessary to carry out the action is well described for all the participants.
 - The host institutions have long prior experience in staff exchanges and they provide suitable conditions to host the staff and provide the infrastructure necessary to implement the activities linked to the secondments.
- **Hosting arrangements/infrastructure**
 - A detailed table conveys well how the individual hosting organisations will support secondees.
 - The host institutions provide excellent conditions for the secondments with regard to facilities, advisory and technical staff, family polices, and childcare and the joint supervision approach will help ensure secondments progress well.
 - The infrastructure of the beneficiaries/partners is adequate and the scientific background is credible to support the development of the project. The institutional environments are thus well suited to address the project objectives.
 - Most of the consortium institutions that will host secondees have high quality environments that are adequate to carry out the described research activities.
 - The institutional environments and infrastructures are very appropriate to support the research activities.
 - The infrastructures at the participating organisations are adequately suited for a successful implementation of the project.
 - Project host institutions provide adequate infrastructure and staff to support the completion of research tasks.
 - The host institutions provide suitable conditions for the seconded staff. The secondees will be fully integrated in the hosting organization with the help of tutors.
 - The scientific and technical infrastructures of each partner are well detailed, relevant and sufficient to perform the proposed objectives and to support the secondments. The core staff member profiles required to implement the different secondments are appropriate.
 - Essential practical arrangements for hosting seconded personnel are included.
 - Hosting arrangements for secondments including a “welcome researcher” are appropriate.
 - The infrastructures to implement the activities are well described and adequate.
 - Hosting arrangements for secondment stays are very well detailed and convincing. For instance, the designation of a PI at the sending institution, a co-PI and a tutor at the hosting institution demonstrate a professional preparation of secondments.
 - The institutional environment of host institutions is fully consistent with the needs of the

- project objectives/ clear details about the institutional environment are provided
- The research infrastructure of the partner institutions is suitably described for its disciplinary perspective, providing secure evidence of the capacity to address the thematic fields identified in the project.
 - The participating organisations are proven to provide suitable conditions for the majority of members of the consortium (staff, infrastructures, etc.) for the secondments to be executed correctly. The support for incoming secondments is also convincingly addressed.
 - There is a solid demonstration of the institutional environment of all the participating organizations in EU and TC, including infrastructure, human resources to be put in place and experience with hosting researchers, carrying out field works, desk analysis, etc. This also pertains to respective COSs, in charge of social intervention.
 - The available infrastructures in the EU participating organizations that correspond to the needs set out for the execution of the project are suitably specified.
 - The institutional environment to implement the activities is appropriately described in the proposal: the access to datasets, the arrangements for events participation and the work place of seconded fellows in the receiving institutions are explicitly presented.
 - The hosting infrastructure is fully described and is entirely appropriate.
 - The proposal confirms that each of the principal partners has a well-established structure to provide the required academic facilities to support high-level research, including appropriate information technology expertise.
 - All beneficiaries are renowned institutions with standard facilities. The infrastructure proposed for the activities of participants is appropriate.
 - The infrastructures are completely described and fully adequate to implement the planned activities.
 - The partnership has the appropriate infrastructure to facilitate the work planned. In addition, the partners of the consortium offer a good environment for the proposed project development.
 - The institution environment, infrastructure and resources are sufficient to carry out the project.
 - The description of infrastructure and hosting arrangements are explained adequately for the coordinating institution.
 - The institutional infrastructure of the partner organisations is properly discussed, and consistent with the expected research activities.
 - The institutional environment and infrastructure of the partner organisations are properly discussed.
 - The description of the infrastructures are appropriate and they fit the needs of the project and of the secondments.
 - The participating academic organisations have very good and relevant infrastructures and the description of hosting arrangements is good.
 - Each of the beneficiaries give specific details regarding the infrastructure, which is overall consistent with the scope of the project.
 - The infrastructure of the participating organizations is appropriate and specific to the project. A suitable environment for implementing the planned activities of the staff members is offered.
 - Participating organizations have the proper infrastructure to conduct their tasks. The key facilities and infrastructure available are properly outlined. Each partner has sufficient capacity to offer a suitable environment for supervising the activities and training staff members involved.
 - The hosting arrangements infrastructure is very good, and especially the academic partners are very experienced in hosting visiting researchers and fellows of different international projects.
 - The hosting arrangements are very well thought out and will ensure the successful delivery of the knowledge transfer objectives.
 - The proposal sufficiently demonstrates that technical infrastructure and human resources are

- appropriate for the programme implementation.
 - The host institutions convincingly describe suitable conditions to be provided (staff, infrastructures, etc.) for the secondments to be executed correctly.
 - The infrastructure at the participating organisations is appropriate for the execution of the action. The hosting arrangements are satisfactorily considered.
 - The infrastructures to implement the activities are adequate and described appropriately in the proposal.
 - The hosting arrangements for secondees such as office space and access to learning resources are clearly presented.
 - The institutional environment is adequate for achieving the proposed research activities.
 - Participating organisations have the scientific capabilities, key research facilities and appropriate infrastructure to host the envisioned secondments and achieve the research and innovation goals.
- **Necessary infrastructures and any major items of technical equipment**
 - The quality of the available infrastructures at the participating organizations is diverse, but sufficient to implement and carry out the dedicated tasks. Moreover, some of the partners are members of useful European research infrastructure that will be available for all participants.
 - All parties can provide good technical infrastructures and facilities.
 - The project requires computational infrastructure, which is adequately provided by the participating institutions.
 - The institutional environments of most consortium members that will host secondees are of high quality and adequate to carry out the described activities.
 - Scientific and technical infrastructure of the participating institutions is first-rate and fully accessible to seconded staff to execute the research activities.
 - The infrastructure presented by the participating organizations is appropriate for the project's execution. All partners have the equipment necessary to carry out the project.
 - The infrastructure and technical equipment offered by the participating organisations are appropriate for the project execution. The number of available staff for the project is sufficient to implement the proposed activities.
 - The infrastructure of the participant institutions is appropriate for the needs of the project
 - The infrastructures of the participating organisations are appropriately described and adequate for the implementation of the planned activities
 - The majority of the participating organisations have demonstrated the availability of the appropriate infrastructure to implement the project successfully.
 - It is convincingly demonstrated that appropriate infrastructure with all technical and analytical facilities required for the project are available.
 - The participating institutions have all of the necessary infrastructure required to undertake the proposed research and innovation activities.
 - The appropriateness of the institutional environment (infrastructures) is clearly demonstrated.
 - Infrastructures are sufficiently described.
 - A very good explanation is given of the research infrastructures and equipment available within the consortium and how these are required to achieve the proposal aims.
 - Participants have the necessary facilities and equipment needed for research and training activity and to achieve objectives of the action.
 - Necessary infrastructure will be made available for the project. It is high quality and suitable for the planned research tasks.
 - The research infrastructures are suited to meet the needs of the project.
 - The partners of the consortia have excellent and relevant infrastructures, which will be available during the course of the project.

Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the action

- **Adequacy of the consortium to carry out the action**

- The participating organisations display a good level of complementarity, and bring together the necessary expertise and skills to ensure a successful project implementation. The commitment of all participating organisations is good.
- The competencies in terms of technologies, skills and human resources of the partner organizations are adequately presented.
- The proposal sufficiently demonstrates that the consortium has the necessary expertise and capabilities to obtain the necessary information needed for the project.
- All of the parties involved in the consortium have a good track record in relevant disciplines.
- The complementarity of expertise as well the new competencies to be acquired by each partner within the project is well demonstrated.
- The beneficiaries and partners have documented a complementarity and strong commitment to the current project.
- The commitment of the consortium members to the project is well demonstrated.
- The consortium organizations possess cutting-edge laboratory infrastructures, expertise in innovative methods, and scientific background required to execute the planned research.
- All beneficiaries are committed to the project. Synergies among most of them are well demonstrated, including expertise in complementary methodologies essential to the success of the project.
- The complementarity of the different partners is well described and of good quality. Although each participating organization will carry out research in its specific domain, the research will be enriched by the knowledge and the competences from the secondments.
- The proposal clearly shows how each member of the consortium complements each other and is well integrated to implement the activities.
- The beneficiaries are leaders in their respective fields and represent the state-of-the-art in TRP research. TC partners have well-established research groups working on related but complementary areas to the European participants.
- Overall, the participants represent a broad range of competences, scientific experience, and well interconnected activities as required to undertake the project. Several participants have track records of exceptional quality.
- The consortium can benefit greatly from access to the ample resources provided by one TC partner.
- The consortium pools high-level expertise and complementary experience. For example, many of the partners have collaborated successfully in the past.
- All participating institutions have a well demonstrated commitment to the assigned tasks, including the partner organizations from third countries.
- The participants have a good degree of complementary technological experience.
- Competences and experience of the partners is adequate for the implementation of the activities proposed. All the partners have already been involved in international projects in the same area of the research.
- The consortium includes competent partners with complementary expertise necessary to execute the proposed project.
- The participating academic organisations have relevant competences in research activities and the needed expertise to participate in archaeological research or to provide training in the field. Their commitment is well demonstrated. The non-academic sector partners also evidence current activities that would strengthen the proposal.
- Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations are well addressed.
- All the beneficiaries in the consortium have the necessary experience and competences for

carrying out the tasks described.

- The commitment of the participants to the implementation of the proposal is clearly presented.
- The grass-roots engagements in the non-academic partners and academic competencies of the academic partners combined with their respective geographical locations make all partners necessary for the implementation of the programme.
- The complementarity, expertise as well as the commitment of all participating organisations is credibly demonstrated. Also there is an ample evidence of already established cooperation among some of the members as well as solid previous EU funded research in the field, / partners are largely already cooperating on aspects relevant for this proposal.
- The full commitment of all the participants to the project is adequately endorsed
- The proposal indicates that the consortium has the skills and experience in addressing both macro and micro research orientations within the thematic area of the project.
- A very pertinent consortium is in place to encompass diverse cultural, legal and political contexts of the addressed topic.
- The disciplinary background, competences, and experiences of the participating organisations are complementary, and well chosen to successfully implement this project.
- The third country partner's commitment is adequately demonstrated.
- The proposal convincingly shows that the host institutions have suitable conditions for the secondments to be executed correctly.
- Competences and experience of the beneficiaries and partner organizations are convincingly presented.
- All the beneficiaries in the consortium are necessary to complete the envisaged activities and they have complementary competencies. Their commitment is clearly confirmed.
- The majority of the project's leading beneficiary entities have interdisciplinary expertise and are familiar with the management of projects at the national and EU level and, therefore, have specialized knowledge that will help the remaining entities to be integrated into a sound collaboration network.
- The project shows the competences and experience of the partners to achieve the objectives.
- The complementarity of the partners to successfully complete and optimise the project's impact is adequately detailed.
- The proposal successfully foresees the involvement of established organisations and experts from the research field.
- The participating academic organisations demonstrate relevant competences and experience in the core field of the proposal.
- Competences and experiences of the participating organisations are convincingly stated.
- The participant institutions have experience in welcoming international researchers and are able to provide suitable conditions for the secondments.
- It is demonstrated that the participating organizations to the consortium are competent and experienced.
- The commitment of the beneficiaries is evident within the project. Clear commitment letters are provided also by the TC involved in the consortium.
- The proposal demonstrates that all beneficiaries and partner organisations are necessary to complete the planned tasks. The presentation of personnel expertise shows sufficient complementarity across the participating organisations.
- The proposal elaborates very well on the importance of the different partners for the implementation of the proposal. Specifically, the combination of theoretical expertise mainly provided by the academic partners, and the experience in the region, mainly provided by the non-academic partners, is very important.
- The composition of the consortium is highly complementary, providing a good balance of expertise in relevant disciplines.
- The commitment of the participating organisations is well described and their involvement is

- necessary for the successful implementation of the project.
 - The research competences, experience in research and participation in international projects, as well as complementarity of participating organizations is adequately described in the proposal.
 - The proposal demonstrates that participants have suitable experience, complementarity and synergy for the successful programme execution.
 - The proposal demonstrates how it will exploit the complementary expertise of the participants and will create synergies between them.
 - The capacity of the coordinating organisation to manage an international and intersectoral consortium funded by a EU grant is convincingly demonstrated.
 - The competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations are adequate to support the proposed action.
 - The consortium members possess good individual skills.
 - The staff member profiles and staff availability are appropriately described and are appropriate to implement the activities linked with secondments.
- **How participating organisations' synergies and complementarities will be exploited**
 - All partners, who have extensive track records of collaboration in past EU-funded research projects, possess complementary scientific expertise in metagenomics and are vital for the successful development of this project.
 - The participating organisations demonstrate a high level of scientific and complementary expertise, with good potential synergies.
 - The complementarity and commitment of participants is well demonstrated.
 - All partners show their commitment to the project.
 - The research team brings together complementary expertise across disciplines in academia and industry, that is necessary to complete the outlined tasks.
 - It is clearly explained how the resulting synergies are to be exploited with competencies and experience of most participants discussed in sufficient detail and are appropriate for the execution of the project.
 - The consortium members have complementary expertise that is essential to reach the project objectives.
 - Competence, experience and complementarity of the participants is very well explained and it is of sufficiently high quality to achieve the project's main objectives.
 - The technical expertise of the participating organisations is complementary and well demonstrated to carry out the proposed activities.
 - The individual strengths of the partners are described and are generally complementary and aligned to the thematic focus.
 - There is a good level of scientific and sectoral complementarity between the partners in most of the thematic areas in the project.
 - The synergies and complementarities across the participating organisations are high since there is a long lasting collaboration between partners.
 - The complementarities of the participating organisations are well demonstrated and the need to jointly implement the proposed project is clearly justified.
 - The complementarity is fully developed in the proposal.
 - The proposal successfully shows how previous managerial experience of large EU grants will benefit the consortium while the vast network of all partners based on previous interactions will provided the consortium with complementary knowledge and strengthened commitment to the current project.
 - The proposal convincingly argues the high competencies, experience and complementarity of the participating partners. Their commitment to the project is well demonstrated.
 - The synergies and complementarities across the participating organisations is high since some of them have already a long lasting collaboration.

- The commitment of the participating organisations is ensured.
- Complementarity of the participating organisations to the programme is balanced.
- The competence, experience, complementarity and commitment of the participating organizations are evident.
- Competences and experience of the participating organisations are satisfactorily explained. They have already previous experience of collaboration in project of the proposed size and their commitment to the programme is proven.
- Overall, the necessary involvement of all the beneficiaries in the consortium to implement the described tasks is confirmed.
- The contribution of the participating organisations to the project as a whole and their complementarity is well demonstrated.
- The institutional commitment and the institutional environment of the partner organisations are convincingly elaborated.
- Competence and synergies among the participants are in general well demonstrated.
- The participating organisations have good previous experience of working together, while the non-academic participants bring relevant skills and strengthen the proposal.
- The commitment to the project is sufficiently demonstrated.
- The complementarities of the partners are demonstrated. In addition key individual personnel complementary contributions are also addressed.
- The participants have complementary experience, and it is evident how this will contribute to a successful implementation of the project.
- All participating organisations are fully committed to hosting and supervising secondments and are necessary for the successful implementation of planned actions. Their competences, experience and complementarity are described appropriately.
- The exploitation of synergies is very precisely and convincingly defined and carefully integrated into the planned research and training activities.
- All participants are experienced in the relevant fields of the proposed research and each partner brings a unique perspective and highly complementary expertise to the research and training programme.
- The participating organisations bring their unique competences and experiences together to support the project. Their commitment to the project is evident.

Weaknesses:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

- **Consistency and adequacy of the work plan**

- The proposal is not fully clear and coherent in the allocation of tasks and resources to secondments. For example, the description is not entirely clear in assessing the role of each seconded researcher in the achievement of the objectives. The work plan does not clearly define the training objectives and the specific competences and skills that are to be shared during the secondments.
- The project lacks coherence. Although the workplan is outlined, the diverse nature of the research makes specific tasks within WPs, and WPs themselves, quite disjointed. For example, feasibility of data integration is not described in depth and is challenging.
- The work packages are not fully coherent. For example, the epigenetic analysis goals are overestimated while the xxx experiments in WPX will not be conclusive within the project timeframe.

- Some aspects of the work plan lessen its likely effectiveness. For example, the timing of some of the work packages is not logically scheduled considering the interconnection between them.
- The description of the work plan does not convincingly demonstrate feasibility and credibility of the project as there are insufficient tangible scientific research deliverables.
- There is insufficient explanation in the WP descriptions to confirm the effectiveness of the work plan.
- The specific contribution of each TC partner to the work plan, and the tasks allocated to them, have not been adequately addressed.
- Coherence and efficiency of the work plan is not fully demonstrated. For example, workshops are scheduled late in the programme which limits the early gain in knowledge and expertise across the consortium.
- Allocation of resources to some of the WPs and key tasks is not described rigorously.
- The allocation of resources is not convincingly justified given that within each work package the same Person-Months per task have been allocated, regardless of the task's objectives.
- In Task xx, case study selection, the total number of persons month allocated is zero. Given the central nature of the choice of case studies such a decision might constitute a critical risk for the success of the implementation of the proposal.
- The secondments proposed to implement the project are not credibly aligned to the defined objectives, overall, the feasibility of the proposed work plan is not clearly demonstrated.
- The allocation of tasks and resources among the network partners is not fully clearly justified / The allocation of tasks and resources is not described in sufficient detail.
- The resources and supports to be available for the support of the marginalised research sample are not adequately detailed.
- There is insufficient commentary regarding the extent to which the partners (other than the lead partner) are to provide appropriate services or opportunities to support the project's actions: examples of specific services (for instance, discipline-specific library resources) are only provided for the lead partner.
- The effectiveness of the work plan to reach the proposed key outcomes of the project such as a new model of knowledge co-creation and an integrated evidence base around DIY APS solutions is insufficiently demonstrated.
- A clear and coherent Gantt chart is not provided, which precludes evaluation of the coherence and effectiveness of the work plan.
- The distribution of the secondments is imbalanced (heavily skewed towards the first half of the project period).
- The justification of the unbalanced distribution of resources between partners is not convincing. Although the work plan provides good division of the main activities with a well-designed WPX it is not well balanced and detailed in its implementation
- The project's development timetable is compressed in certain places (for example, the establishment of certification) and in others it is not expressed with sufficient clarity (as in the list of project milestones).
- The work plan does not include, with the same level of detail, all the activities mentioned in the proposal.
- The project plans a large number of secondments, however the necessity for each secondment to achieve the expected research objectives is insufficiently elaborated.
- The work plan is realistic, however, the timetable does not clearly reflect the interdependencies between the work packages. Furthermore, the balancing of the efforts of the participant is not clear and adequately justified.
- The work plan is not clearly coherent and effective. WPs are not well delineated mostly because they are overlapping. Furthermore, the proposed activities are not sufficiently concrete and credible, thus the feasibility of the project is not fully demonstrated.
- The secondments plan and the implementation of the activities are not sufficiently justified. The scientific activities are not adequately incorporated into work plan.
- Implementation of data collecting activities at field sites is not convincingly presented as the

- types of modern and historical data are not sufficiently specified in the implementation plan.
- Implementation of training activities is not sufficiently mapped onto the overall project objectives. Moreover the work plan specifically in regards to modelling components does not outline in sufficient detail how secondment activities will be effectively used by different participants.
 - Several secondments of managerial and administrative staff are not adequately justified.
 - In allocating resources to some work packages, the required effort is partially underestimated
 - The exploitation of project outcomes is insufficiently elaborated.
 - The allocation of resources is not adequately explained and justified in some cases.
- **Activities proposed to reach the action objectives (research/innovation activities, training, transfer of knowledge, etc.)**
 - The timing and duration of some of the planned secondments is not well justified with the envisaged work load. For example, it is unclear what will be achieved in very short-term secondments.
 - Secondment lengths are inappropriately planned. Many secondments are of 2 months or more in length, but the utility of this is not justified by the described gain in knowledge for the individual researcher, since many secondments provide very generic training experience. The description of how knowledge transfer will occur following return from secondments is insufficiently discussed.
 - Insufficient detail has been given on the activities that will occur during the secondments and the timetable for some secondments is not clearly justified with respect to the workplan.
 - The rationale for the number and duration of secondments is not sufficiently justified considering the exploratory, open-ended nature of some of the scientific activities proposed.
 - The proposal does not satisfactorily outline or justify the secondment plan. For example, the appropriateness of the large number of secondments hosted by participant 8 with only one full time employee involved in the project is insufficiently demonstrated. In addition, there are discrepancies between the secondments declared in part A and those described in part B1.
 - The secondment plan among participants is not well elaborated. For example, the availability of human resources for secondments is not clearly described for all the participants.
 - The necessity and duration of the secondments in light of the activities/tasks to be accomplished are not clearly explained.
 - Specific activities during secondments have been insufficiently described. Additionally, the secondments distribution is not fully realistic.
 - The secondment tasks have been described in insufficient detail, reducing the overall effectiveness of the work plan.
 - The number of secondments and PMs reported on Part A (Table A3.2) appears highly exaggerated as regard to the work plan to do. Moreover, all secondments have only a duration of 1 month for a huge number of people that might be problematic for establishing a sustained research.
 - The proposal does not provide detailed and systematic information on the content of training activities to be organized during the secondment stages. The lack of details about their concrete content impedes assessment of their appropriate duration and feasibility.
 - The activities on how the proposed edutainment platform prototype development will occur and how it will be integrated with existing museological practice is not sufficiently specified. For instance, this part of the proposal fails to provide critical information on how the prototypes will be developed, tested and compared with the on-going research on similar areas
 - Some activities proposed in the work plan are insufficiently detailed or integrated in the proposal.
 - There is insufficient information regarding the selection process of the research participants; for example, there is too little information regarding the sample group and the process of identifying them: this can only be undertaken by key gatekeepers who have the confidence of marginalised individuals/groups.

- The total number of activities outlined in the proposal (workshops, training, dissemination initiatives, etc.) is unrealistically high given the allocated resources. In some sections, the allocation of tasks and resources is not sufficiently precise.
 - There is a lack of clarity regarding the allocation of secondments, in order to explain the significant variation in the numbers allocated to each partner.
 - The research advancement and inter-disciplinary innovations expressed in tasks and milestones are not clearly described.
 - The objective of certain secondments is not convincingly presented and the allocation of tasks and resources are not clearly articulated. For example, the number of person-month in the WPs is not always appropriate to carry out the proposed activities. (WPX has zero person-month per participating organisation).
 - Knowledge transfer activities are not well defined. For example, there are discrepancies in the planned secondments where, for example, research is defined as ongoing for almost the entire duration of the project, while dissemination starts in month 36, yet the great majority of the secondments are planned for the first reporting period.
 - The planned secondments are not credibly covering all the fields necessary to achieve the planned tasks.
 - The work plan inadequately addresses the secondment activities.
 - The secondments' specific content, duration, activities, benefits, contributions and staff are not appropriately presented and unbalanced between the different members of the consortium.
 - The activities to be carried out during some of the secondments are not sufficiently described.
- **Credibility and feasibility of the action**
 - The credibility of the project is undermined because relevant knowledge and expertise of a participant with proposed key roles in management and exploitation is not well demonstrated.
 - The proposal does not provide sufficient information regarding the pre-visit preparations, especially for early career researchers.
 - There is too little information regarding the way that the mobility aspects of the project are to be managed.
 - Some of the research deliverables do not seem achievable in light of the low number of total and person months allocated to them.
 - The production of three edited volumes in addition to 10 papers is very ambitious, and it is possible that this task can not be fulfilled during the duration of the project.
 - The feasibility of the project is not clearly demonstrated.
 - There is insufficient information present regarding resources and task allocation in the WPs concerning Management, Innovative Tok, Quality Control and Dissemination.
 - The feasibility of the action is not convincingly demonstrated.
 - The time schedule for some tasks and deliverables is not fully realistic.
 - The technical deliverable plan is not credibly presented; specific intermediate measures are insufficiently identified.
 - The feasibility of the work-plan of the project is not clearly demonstrated. The success criteria are not always clear and some of the subgoals are not very tangible.
 - **Work Packages, deliverables, milestones**
 - Deliverables and milestones are poorly defined and distributed. For example, deliverables linked with the xxx Partner activities associated with almost half the resource allocation are insufficiently described.
 - The number and timeliness of the deliverables are not sufficiently discussed. Not all deliverables result in tangible outputs beyond minutes, plans, reports and data. Additionally, the milestones are not considered in detail, nor do they appropriately support progress monitoring.
 - Deliverables are not specified in sufficient detail and the relevance of the proposed milestones

- is not evident, detracting from the quality control procedures.
- Some deliverables lack clarity and specificity. For instance, it is unclear the exact type of protocol that will be developed in D3.2.
 - There are numerous oversights in the allocation of task and resources. For example, timing of milestone M1.2 (which is crucial for the project) is not properly justified as this occurs too late in the project. Considering that WP4 is the most challenging WP, the lack of resources is not properly justified. It is notable that the industrial partners are not involved in WP4, which is incoherent with the main objective of the proposal.
 - The interdependence and feedback mechanisms between different WPs, in particular for results obtained from WP7, are inappropriately addressed.
 - Most of the deliverables are in the form of reports, which is not credible in light of the research and innovation objectives.
 - The project lacks scientific milestones.
 - Aspects of the work packages are unclear. Insufficient detail is given on the activities that will occur during work packages X and X, and the associated deliverables. There is insufficient justification for the long secondments in WPX.
 - The scientific deliverables are not significant in the context of the research objectives.
 - Excessive amount of resources have been allocated to WP X and X.
 - Some of the deliverables are intangible, based on presentation of reports and lack sufficient specificity and coherence with project objectives.
 - The number and timeliness of milestones and deliverables are not discussed and sometimes deliverables are vague without tangible outputs or metrics, beyond plans and data, with no tasks attached to some deliverables.
 - Milestones are inadequate with mechanisms for the monitoring of the progress of the project reliant on generation of research data.
 - Milestones are not sufficiently considered.
 - Deliverables related to statistical analysis are not appropriate.
 - The milestones are only vaguely defined.
 - The number and timeliness of the deliverables are not sufficiently discussed and lack tangible outputs.
 - The list of scientific deliverables is rather modest and their description is too generic. For instance, the proposal does not offer clear information on how the first six months of the proposal will cope with the finalization of the first deliverable on transfer of knowledge.
 - The proposal does not provide sufficient detail as the relationship between its main milestones and deliverables.
 - The work package description is not fully detailed and coherent with research objectives, for instance the appropriateness and focus of the travelling exhibition is not convincingly demonstrated.
 - The WPs are not detailed enough, and inadequate information is included regarding who is implementing what parts of the project, which resources are associated with these tasks, who takes the lead in which activities, procedures for integrating partner organizations and local stakeholders, and how the deliverables will be ensured.
 - The deliverables are not defined specifically enough to demonstrate their significance and feasibility. Furthermore some of the deliverables are timed late in light of their role in the project and/or their level of complexity.
 - There is insufficient evidence of a shared input to the various Work Packages as well as to the individual tasks that they comprise; the descriptions of individual Work Packages are too abbreviated.
 - The deliverables list is not sufficiently diversified, it is made mainly by book chapters or papers and university curriculum development in the field of xxx policy.
 - The deliverables reflect few scientific outputs.
 - The information regarding how the choice of months for secondments will be made for each

team member is not adequately provided in the work package description and insufficient information is given on how the xxx toolkit will be developed, tested and compared with on-going research.

- The work packages are not convincingly elaborated in order to clearly indicate the transfer of knowledge activities in terms of project goals and structures furthering research and innovation.
- The content of the work packages and of the training actions is only partially satisfactory presented.
- It is only partially demonstrated that the non-academic partners have the capacity to deliver the knowledge transfer's elements described in the work packages.
- Two large and key WPs have no months allocated as these are claimed to come from overheads and offer unclear information on resource allocation and management.
- The deliverables list is not sufficiently detailed.
- The expected deliverables are insufficiently described (e.g. tasks and deliverables do not match, lack of PM dedicated to specific WPs, etc.), making very difficult to monitor the project.
- The research advancement and inter-disciplinary innovations expressed in task and milestones are not clearly described.
- The deliverables and milestones are not well linked with the tasks within the WP, making it difficult to monitor the tasks.
- The coherence of the overall structure of the work plan schedule with the project objectives has not been convincingly explained.
- The milestones do not fully reflect the project's objectives. Moreover, there is limited description of the indicators that are expected to help assess the progress of the project.
- The allocation of tasks, resources, activities and majority of outcomes (deliverables) stemming from WPs is not fully in line with the objectives set out.
- The feasibility of the project is not fully demonstrated. The work packages are described in a generic manner only.
- The planned deliverables are not well-documented. For example, the scientific papers are not clearly included in any deliverable.
- The planning of milestones are not adequate to monitor the progress of the project.
- The allocation of tasks and resources is not fully justified based on the given overall work packages description.
- The milestones are insufficiently described to ensure the proper progress monitoring of the project.
- The task assigned to review the key gaps in staff knowledge and skills is not sufficiently justified.
- The lists of deliverables and milestones are not sufficiently ambitious and detailed.
- The proposed deliverables lack information allowing to measure and quantify them in the context of the work plan and the project objectives.
- Some deliverables and technical solutions are sufficiently described. Furthermore, there were some inconsistencies between the list of deliverables and the description of work packages.
- Some of the deliverables are scheduled relatively late in the project.
- The descriptions of tasks in work packages are not sufficiently elaborated.
- The time line for completing the tasks of some work packages is unclear.
- Milestones are not defined sufficiently to enable efficient progress monitoring.
- Some elements of the work plan which include the task descriptions and the timing schedule are incomplete.

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including quality management and risk management

- **Action organisation and management structure**

- The management structures and procedures for decision making and monitoring the project lack clarity. Specifically, the competence and quality of the Supervisory Board is not demonstrated. Moreover, it is unclear how the Supervisory Board and Secondments Committee will interact.
- Some aspects of progress monitoring are not convincing. For example, it is unclear who will participate in regular teleconferences and the frequency of teleconferences is not well-aligned with large number of partners in the consortium.
- The decision making process by the Project Management Board and the procedures to monitor the progress of the work are weak.
- Several management aspects are unclear. For example, the administrative roles are not clearly defined. Relevant experience of the project coordinator or the technical manager is not well demonstrated. Quality management tasks such as the measures to evaluate the progress of the projects are not sufficiently discussed.
- The management procedures are not explained in enough detail to ensure adequate risk assessment, mitigation actions, decision and conflict resolving mechanisms, or financial and administrative progress monitoring.
- Management responsibilities are inequitable, and the proposal lacks sufficient detail on quality management measures and conflict resolution mechanisms.
- The decision making process is not discussed in detail and the role and the responsibilities of the some entities are not sufficiently clear.
- The management structure including quality management is not sufficiently detailed. For example, the consortium intends to have routine and regular discussions on project progress, but the exact number and timing of these discussions is not clearly presented.
- The overall management structures and procedures are not sufficiently detailed. How all the participants will be involved in managing and monitoring the project is not adequately described.
- The project governance has not been organized or explained in sufficient detail.
- The governance structure is defined in general terms and insufficiently considers the engagement of all organisations involved.
- The governance structure is not clearly described to meet the challenges of this diverse intercontinental network. The role of the coordinator and of the work package leaders is not clearly defined in view of a joint management structure.
- The management structure does not accommodate inputs from disability/marginalised persons interest groups, nor the individuals themselves.
- The composition of the Scientific Advisory Board is not appropriately justified.
- Arrangements for support and intervention of vulnerable individuals should be embedded within the consortium's management arrangement.
- The composition of the Quality Control Board is not specified in sufficient detail and there is little information regarding independent external inputs to this process.
- The project is very broad regarding the geographical focus, the proposed methodologies, and the empirical and theoretical objectives, and the proposal does not convincingly outline how effective management will be ensured under these circumstances.
- The composition and role of the training committee is not sufficiently specified.
- The role and the structure of supervision committee is ambiguous since it is foreseen to consist of leaders of the participating entities, which does not correspond to its projected oversight role.
- Administrative Management is unclear and there is insufficient explanation of competences, duties, responsibilities etc.

- The structure of the supervisory board is unsound.
 - The management structure is imbalanced, based on extensive number of committees and other bodies; also their composition is not fully clear.
 - The management structures and procedures are not described in sufficient detail. Insufficient elaboration is presented about the roles of the managing bodies and how the management is expected to work.
 - Membership of the project management groups is insufficiently identified. Specific details in relation to management processes are lacking. For example, the quality assurance arrangements are in the main presented in terms of QA objectives rather than the QA process that will be applied.
 - The overall management structure is presented but not sufficiently detailed. The proposal does not describe in sufficient detail the management processes, particularly the financial strategy and the progress monitoring.
 - The management processes are not properly addressed. There is insufficient description of the administrative aspects, financial strategy and progress monitoring.
 - The governance structure and management processes, which is crucial for the success of this long-term, large, multi-partner, international project, are presented insufficiently.
 - The governance structure is insufficiently detailed. The specific components of each board are not sufficiently addressed.
 - The management structure and the experience of the coordinating organisation in management are not convincingly demonstrated.
 - Some of the organisational profiles are not sufficiently detailed, in particular, those of the industry sector.
 - The conflict resolution and certain management mechanisms are generically described.
- **Role of the coordinator/WP leaders**
 - A significant amount of operational activity in management terms is concentrated in the coordinating institution (for example, financial management); given the diverse scope of the consortium this is an important issue in maintaining project impetus.
 - The work packages description insufficiently describes the role of each partner in them.
 - The experience of the coordinating organisation in leading EU-funded international research projects is inadequately addressed.
 - The work package leaders' role is not defined clearly enough to enable a successful management of the project.
 - The role of work package leaders is not sufficiently addressed.
 - **Financial management strategy**
 - There is insufficient information concerning the financial audit team.
 - There is not a clear and detailed description of the Financial Management of the project.
 - Within most work packages, one institution receives a great share of the resources, leaving few months of financing to other participants and depleting the possibilities for real collaborative partnership.
 - The appropriateness of the budget allocation to task and sources, based on the description of the secondment activities, is unclear and leads to an unbalanced and unjustified distribution of resources across the partners.
 - The proposal does not present a clear description of the financial management strategy.
 - The proposal has not provided sufficient motivations on the distribution of the resources among the participants in view of foreseen roles and output.
 - There is not a clear and detailed description of the financial management of the project: a dedicated member of the staff is expected without describing in detail how things will be done.
 - The financial management strategy is not adequately described.
 - The management processes (including the financial management strategy and the progress

- monitoring mechanisms) are not properly addressed.
 - The proposal inadequately explains how the planned joint activities will be financed.
 - Financial management procedures are not described in sufficient way.
 - The financial management of the project is not sufficiently addressed and is generic in nature.
- **Progress monitoring mechanisms**
 - The description of the progress monitoring is insufficiently addressed as key performance indicators have not been sufficiently detailed.
 - Progress monitoring is undermined because the means of verification of the listed milestones are not specific enough in terms of the sampling quality and sequence quantity.
 - Key performance indicators for assessing progress are not sufficiently identified or described.
 - The strategy for progress monitoring is not well developed which seriously detracts from quality management.
 - The procedures related to research monitoring of the project (meetings, secondment mentoring, administrative details) are insufficiently described.
 - The procedures related to research monitoring of the project are insufficiently described.
 - The description of the progress monitoring is insufficient and not commensurate to the large size of the consortium.
 - Progress monitoring via milestones is not sufficiently developed.
 - There are insufficient indicators for project progress assessment
 - The procedures for quality management are not fully elaborated.
 - The explanations on the progress monitoring and evaluation of the project is not adequately detailed.
 - Insufficient description of how the project progress will be monitored and assessed is given and limited information on the procedures for administrative flows is provided as well.
 - Given the scale of the project and the large number of secondments it is not satisfactory to have annual meetings. It is also unclear who is involved in these meetings.
 - Monitoring the progress of the project will be hindered by having all the scientific deliverables not due until month 30.
 - Project milestones are restricted to project meetings. This is not a significant gauge of monitoring progress achievement.
 - The progress monitoring is not convincingly presented.
 - The composition of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Committee is unbalanced. The decisions of this entity could be strongly conditioned by the representation of one participant.
 - Distribution of the milestones is inappropriate for the proper progress monitoring.
 - The composition of the Scientific and Technical Committee is unbalanced on which holds the majority of votes and influences the execution of the project and the decisions for the mitigation of technical and scientific risks. The recruiting mechanism is insufficiently transparent as the selection will be made by the WPs leaders that mostly refer to a participating organisation.
 - The identified milestones do not provide the basis for effective monitoring of the advancement of the project.
 - The progress monitoring through milestones is not adequately addressed.
 - The proposal does not adequately justify that the selected key performance indicators will be valid progress measures.
 - Procedures for effective monitoring of project progress are not clearly defined.
 - **Quality management (relating to the availability of adequate resources of the coordinating organisation)**
 - Quality management (e.g financial and progress monitoring procedures) is not discussed in sufficient detail within the proposal.

- Quality management is not sufficiently addressed. For example, how the steering committee will monitoring progress, approval of deliverables and conflict resolution is not clear.
- Quality control management strategies have not been described in sufficient detail.
- It is not clearly demonstrated in the proposal that the coordinating organization has experience with working with non-academic partners. The proposal furthermore lacks information about how the non-academic partners will benefit from the exchange. It is not sufficiently demonstrated that the non-academic partners have the human resources necessary to undertake exchanges at the scale envisioned in the proposal.
- The procedures for coordination and the quality management processes are not fully convincingly presented.
- Quality management on the need for converting knowledge and ideas into products and services for the economic and social benefit it is not specified.
- Quality management is insufficiently addressed.
- Plans for quality management are lacking in the proposal.
- The approach to the quality management and the role of the scientific coordinator are not sufficiently presented.
- The quality management procedures are not sufficiently described.
- Quality management matters are only partially addressed.
- Management processes are not sufficiently described in the proposal.

- **Risks and the contingency plans**

- Although some risks have been identified, the overall risk management is not well addressed, considering the complexity imposed by the number of institutions involved. Moreover, most mitigation measures presented are not adequate corrective actions.
- The consideration of risks is insufficiently detailed. There is limited consideration of technical/scientific risks and appropriate mitigation measures linked to the fabrication of such a medical device.
- Scientific risks, e.g. biomaterial isolation and functional testing, are underestimated and not adequately addressed.
- The risk management strategy is not convincing. The risk assessment is limited in scope and details related to technical or theoretical challenges of the research objectives are insufficient.
- The risk list is generic and not comprehensive. Risks specific to this project are not described in enough detail creating a risk mitigation strategy that is superficial and does not address potentially adverse managerial and scientific situations.
- The risk management is not well elaborated considering the risks of the proposed approach. Mitigation measures for the failure of the scientific approach are not specific enough.
- The contingency plans are not convincing. In particular, those proposing to downsize the research efforts detract from the credibility and feasibility of the project.
- Research and technical risks are insufficiently considered in the proposal.
- The risk assessment does not comprehensively cover potential barriers associated with the proposed research. Relevant mitigation strategies are also insufficiently explained.
- The risk analysis and contingency plan do not sufficiently take account of the heavy dependence on two partners for staff exchange in WP3.
- Assessment of risk levels for identified risks, risk management and mitigation measures for HR risks are not adequately identified.
- Risk management is not fully addressed. For example, the XXX Partner is central for the success of the project, and the associated risk of losing this key partner has not been mitigated.
- Risks related to some potential management/administrative problems (e.g. lack of resources) are not sufficiently addressed and some of the mitigating measures proposed are vague.
- The risk analysis is not described in sufficient detail, leading to an underestimation of risks. Some of the mitigation measures are not rigorous enough. For example, some WPs are dependent on the results of WP1 and this potential risk for the deliverables is not well

addressed.

- Although some risks are mentioned, they are not described with sufficient detail. Possible mitigation measures are not adequately elaborated.
- The overview of risk strategies is incomplete because it does not contain risks associated with the scientific objectives and methods.
- The risk procedures and quality check discussion presents inappropriate considerations considering the research objectives and the specific aim to recruit non-specialist (citizen newcomers).
- Risks and mitigation strategies are not presented in a sufficiently systematic fashion. Scientific, political, and implementation risks are not adequately addressed.
- The academic risks are insufficiently addressed in the risk assessment, and the mitigation strategies are not given full attention.
- Some potential risks are not convincingly identified.
- The contingency plan does not consider the appearance of some critical risks as delays, and several measures proposed are for prevention instead of mitigation.
- Scientific risks are not sufficiently addressed.
- The proposal does not adequately address many potential risks (i.e. delays in secondments, lack of resources, quitting of a partner) that could occur.
- Some of the risks are underestimated, and sufficient mitigation measures have consequently not been put in place.
- The risk management is not fully elaborated including mitigation measures (e.g. data-collection phase has several potential risks attached to it; these risks have not been fully embedded within this aspect of the project).
- Risk management covers only three issues and is not explained in sufficient detail.
- A clearly underestimated risk factor is the communication among the beneficiaries and human factor related aspects while dealing with such a large consortium. This is a significant weakness with limited mitigation plans.
- The risks management plan fails to address critical risks as the limited data availability or the willingness of stakeholders and citizens to cooperate.
- The risks associated with the research objectives are not convincingly addressed, and proper mitigation strategies remain unidentified.
- Although the approach to risk mitigation is presented, the approach to risk and contingency management does not adequately address the importance of involvement from the business sector.
- The risk management is not well addressed. Several risks are not sufficiently considered and the proposed mitigation measures are not fully adequate.
- The risk management is insufficient. Some risks and mitigation measures are not properly identified and addressed. The risk probability and severity of their impact considerations is missing.
- While some pertinent risks are addressed, key risks such as how the consortium will address long-term unavailability of key personnel such as the coordinator or WP leaders are not sufficiently considered.
- Risks with potentially serious consequences (i.e. illness / unavailability of the co-ordinator or scientist-in-charge of one or more participants) are inadequately addressed. Some of the mitigation measures are insufficiently considered.
- The implementation risk related to the availability of Third Country funding for some secondments is not adequately addressed in the risk management.
- The risk management is only described in high-level terms and does not convincingly address realistic solutions to mitigate risks.
- The risk management plan does not adequately address research risks. The probability and potential impact of such risks are not well considered.
- The scientific and technical risks typically associated with the proposed research and

innovation activities are not fully identified.

- The risk mitigation measures have not been adequately considered.
- Some elements of the risk management are not sufficiently addressed.
- The mitigation measures proposed are insufficiently detailed.

Appropriateness of the institutional environment (hosting arrangements, infrastructure)

• Availability of the expertise and human resources

- The expertise of some participants is overlapping while for others the description is insufficient to distinguish the original contribution. The description of complementarities between the participants is thus quite limited.
- The number of available staff and the staff member profiles necessary to implement the activities of different secondments are not described sufficiently.
- The availability of human resources, for secondments and supervision, is not described in depth for all participants.
- The description of the available staff and the staff member profiles is only partially elaborated
- Technical, administrative or management staff exchange and involvement are not highlighted in the proposal, which undermines the feasibility of hosting arrangements.
- The non-academic participation is described in a limited way.
- Competences, experience are only partially demonstrated, because the proposal provides limited information on the individual profiles of the participant institutions.
- Little detailed information is provided about the institutional environment of the remaining participating organisations, therefore its appropriateness is not convincingly demonstrated.
- The staff proportion in relation to the secondments for some of the beneficiaries is not optimal.
- Limited information is provided about individual profiles comparing to the description of the participant institutions.
- Appropriateness of the institutional environment is not sufficiently proven.
- Some participating organisations have insufficiently described the available infrastructure and expertise.
- The coordinator's experience in managing similar research programmes is not sufficiently demonstrated.
- The availability of staff members and their corresponding profiles are not sufficiently described.
- The availability of sufficient human resources is not credibly provided for one participating organisation.

• Hosting arrangements/infrastructure

- The hosting arrangements are not well specified.
- The proposal does not adequately describe supportive hosting arrangements for secondments.
- Description regarding the hosting arrangements has been discussed inadequately.
- Capacity for hosting and seconding staff is not adequately described in practical terms.
- The proposal does not provide sufficient details on the specific hosting arrangements.
- Hosting arrangements and additional support for incoming secondments are not adequately discussed.
- The relevant infrastructure and associated competency of the partner xxx is not sufficiently described.
- The host arrangements, staff and the institutional environments of some of the consortium partners have not been clearly described.
- The infrastructures available, and the staff member profiles, have not been sufficiently linked to the different secondment and scientific objectives to ensure proper hosting arrangements.
- The quality of hosting arrangements for staff during secondment and reintegration is insufficiently described.
- The proposal does not describe hosting arrangements for the seconded staff in sufficient detail

by describing how the integration of the seconded personnel in the hosting institution is to be achieved.

- Support for the secondees at the non-academic participants, in terms of numbers of R&I active staff and infrastructure to facilitate achievement of research tasks, are insufficiently described.
- The hosting arrangements do not sufficient account of the host and seconded staff needed in order to carry out research tasks.
- The appropriateness of the institutional infrastructure is inadequately described.
- The expertise and relevant infrastructures for some of the participants are only briefly described.
- The level of the input from the hosts in providing suitable hosting arrangements is not explained.
- How the secondees will be hosted is not sufficiently described.
- Supervision and hosting arrangements during secondments, training and reintegration are not sufficiently addressed.
- Hosting arrangements provided in limited detail/ not clearly explained.
- Two beneficiaries have not convincingly demonstrated the availability of an adequate infrastructure and human resources to host the proposed secondments.
- The proposal does not provide sufficient details concerning the institutional environment of the non-academic partners
- The proposal provides limited information regarding the hosting arrangements to be given to visiting researchers.
- The hosting arrangements supporting research and innovation and providing training developing the proposed objectives are not clearly defined.
- The arrangements for hosting secondees in the participating organizations are not sufficiently well specified.
- Despite the brief information regarding specialization of the partners and persons involved in the project, the proposal does not provide enough details about the concrete hosting arrangements and infrastructure allocated to the project.
- The appropriateness of the institutional environment, including hosting arrangements and infrastructure, is insufficiently addressed.
- The infrastructure of some non-academic participants is insufficiently presented.
- Conditions for hosting secondments throughout the consortium are not adequately addressed.
- The hosting arrangements for the secondments are not well described.
- Specific hosting arrangements are not clearly presented.
- The hosting arrangements, to enable smooth secondments execution, are not satisfactorily presented.
- The hosting arrangements are insufficiently described.

- **Necessary infrastructures and any major items of technical equipment**

- The adequacy of the infrastructures for the implementation of the activities is not sufficiently demonstrated in the proposal.
- The infrastructures to implement activities are not properly described in the proposal.
- The quality of the infrastructure of the hosts is insufficiently provided in respect to the project objectives and the main research and training activities.
- The description of the necessary infrastructures is incomplete.
- The infrastructures to implement the activities are not specified thoroughly.

Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organisations and their commitment to the action

- **Adequacy of the consortium to carry out the action**

- Expertise profiles of some of the key staff from consortium organizations is not sufficiently

- explained in context of the scientific aims.
- Relevance of some participants to specific work packages is not explained or demonstrated sufficiently.
- The project does not clearly describe how the partners complement each other and how they are needed to implement the activities.
- The complementary domains of the industrial partners and the academic partners are not sufficiently described.
- The commitment of some of the consortium partners is not convincingly demonstrated. For example, it is unclear whether the involvement of xxx Partner is necessary to achieve the project's goals.
- The scientific background of some partners is not described in enough detail to demonstrate a credible contribution to the project.
- The complementarity between organizations is not well demonstrated.
- The expertise across most of the participants is complementary. However, the experience in the management of NGS data and in manufacturing processes is not sufficiently described.
- The complementarity of some the participating organisations are insufficiently described with respect to the main objectives of the project.
- The expertise of the key people in managing an international consortium has not been convincingly shown.
- Supervision arrangements during secondments and secondees reintegration mechanisms are not sufficiently addressed.
- The involvement of key people in some R&I actions is not clearly explained.
- There is little information regarding the direct involvement of non-academic partners or of seconded researchers within management operations.
- The consortium includes too few non-academic partners who have a networking function in respect of on-line safety.
- The proposal provides limited information about the needs of the entities involved during the potential exchanges.
- The role of some beneficiaries in the project in terms of allocation of tasks and financial resources is not clearly identified.
- The proposal does not demonstrate the full commitment of non-academic partners with the project since their involvement in the activities is limited.
- There is limited clear explanation concerning data organization, data management and data preservation strategies.
- The complementarity between partners is not always clearly demonstrated throughout the proposal.
- The proposal does not present enough information to allow an appropriate assessment of the competences and experience of the participating organisations.
- It is not clearly demonstrated that all participants are necessary to implement the programme because inconsistencies are detected with the participants' names throughout the proposal.
- The complementarities of the beneficiaries needed to implement the research activities are not well addressed and are not supported from specific technical details.
- The consortium does not sufficiently demonstrate all of the necessary competences.
- The competencies of the participating organisations are not sufficiently detailed in the proposal.
- The contribution is not adequately defined for all partners.

- **How participating organisations' synergies and complementarities will be exploited**

- The synergy amongst the participants was not sufficiently described. This is an important issue in times, when operative problems and difficulties appear and the collective effort and help from other partners working on the same project is beneficial.
- Although complementary expertise are well described, how they will result in research synergy and advancement of the project is not discussed adequately. For example, some of the

institutions mentioned in part B are not involved in any of the secondments and therefore their role is not clear.

- There are some concerns regarding the capacity in training and in research of the xxx Partner due to its limited number of resources at the time of the proposal submission.
- Inter-disciplinary complementarity of the participating organisations is only partially elaborated in the proposal.
- The proposal does not adequately describe the partners' skills and knowledge and the complementarity between them.
- The complementarity of the partners is not sufficiently demonstrated in the proposal
- The size of the consortium is not fully justified, more over the competences and experience of the participation organizations in relation to social aspects are insufficiently elaborated.
- Given the number of work packages assigned to the coordinator, the ability of the other participating organizations to influence the project could be affected.
- The complementarity of the participating organisations is too briefly analysed in the proposal.
- Complementarity of the participating organisations to the programme is unbalanced. For the nature of the project, the number of private partners directly involved in the project is not consistent.
- The complementary of different partners is not well demonstrated. The outlines in the proposal are mainly about previous work but does not demonstrate adequately how these collaborations are expected to complement each other within the current project.
- The complementarity of expertise required to back the socio-economic aspects of the proposed evaluation model are not clearly documented by the consortium members.
- There is insufficient demonstration that the complementarities of all beneficiaries and partner organizations are needed to implement the activities proposed.
- While the consortium institutions are described along with their core competencies and activities, the participating institutions' synergies and complementarities throughout project's various phases are not fully explained.
- It is not convincingly described how participating organisations' synergies and complementarities will be exploited in the various phases in order to reach the successful project implementation.
- The complementarity between the participants is not sufficiently described. There is an overlap between the partners in technical and expertise capabilities.
- Competences, experience complementarity of the participating organisations are not sufficiently described.
- The proposal does not sufficiently detail how the potential synergies and complementarities will be exploited.
- The complementarity of the participating organisations is not described in sufficient detailed.
- The complementarity of the participating organisations is not adequately demonstrated.