



S&T INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION NETWORK FOR EASTERN EUROPEAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN COUNTRIES

The European Union Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development

The “People” Programme

The following information about evaluation criteria and procedures to be applied for the call *Marie Curie Action: "International Research Staff Exchange Scheme" (IRSES)* is presented below.

The European Commission launched a call for proposals for *"International Research Staff Exchange Scheme"* 25th of November 2008 (see Newsletter N9, 2008). The call closes on **27th of March 2009**.

On receipt by the European Commission, proposals are checked by eligibility criteria before the evaluation begins. The evaluation of proposals is carried out on behalf of the Commission by independent experts. Each proposal will be assessed independently by at least three experts, chosen by the Commission from the pool of experts taking part in this evaluation, against the following criteria:

Quality of the exchanged programme <i>Weighting: 25 %</i>	Transfer of knowledge <i>Weighting: 30%</i> <i>Threshold: 3</i>	Implementation <i>Weighting: 15%</i>	Impact <i>Weighting:30%</i> <i>Threshold: 3</i>
1 (Priority in case of ex aequo)	2	4	3
Objective and relevance of the joint exchange programme	Quality and mutual benefit of the transfer of knowledge	Capacities (expertise/human resources/ facilities/infrastructure) to achieve the objectives of the planned co-operation	Relevance of the proposed partnership to the area of collaboration and for the ERA
Scientific quality of the partners	Adequacy and role of staff exchanged with respect to the transfer of knowledge	Appropriateness of the plans for the overall management of the exchange programme	Potential to develop lasting collaboration with eligible Third country partners
Complementarities /synergies between the partners			

Evaluation scores will be given for each of the four criteria, and not for the sub-criteria. The subcriteria are issues that the expert should consider in the assessment of the relevant criterion. They also act as reminders of issues to be raised later during the discussions of the proposal.

Each criterion will be scored out of 5:

0 – The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1 – Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 – Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 – Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4 – Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5 – Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

The thresholds and weightings for the different criteria for IRSES are summarized in the table below

Evaluation Criterion	Weighting (in %)	Threshold
Quality of the exchanged programme	25	n/a
Transfer of knowledge	30	3
Implementation	15	n/a
Impact	30	3

In addition to the thresholds for individual evaluation criteria, an overall threshold of 14 (out of a maximum possible score of 20) will be applied to the total weighted score.

The experts record their individual opinions in an Individual Assessment Report (IAR), giving scores and also comments against the evaluation criteria. Once all the experts to whom a proposal has been assigned have completed their IAR, the evaluation progresses to a consensus assessment, representing their common views. The consensus discussion may be moderated by a representative of the Commission. The experts attempt to agree on a consensus score for each of the criteria that have been evaluated and suitable comments to justify the scores. After the consensus report the panel review takes place. The main task of the panel is to establish a ranked list of the proposals which passed all evaluation thresholds. The outcome of the panel meeting is a report recording, principally:

- An evaluation summary report (ESR) for each proposal, including, where relevant, a report of any ethical issues raised and any security considerations;
- A list of proposals passing all thresholds, along with a final score for each proposal passing the thresholds and the panel recommendations for priority order.
- A list of evaluated proposals having failed one or more thresholds;
- A list of any proposals having been found ineligible during the evaluation by experts.

Newsletter is prepared with the use of web-site CORDIS within the project «S&T International Cooperation Network for Eastern European and Central Asian Countries» IncoNet EECA (www.inco-eeca.net) financed by European Union.

The information in this document is provided 'as is' and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information at its sole risk and liability.

© State University – Higher School of Economics, Institute for Statistical Studies and Economics of Knowledge, 2009. All rights reserved.

Contacts: Ms. Elena Dybtsyna, tel. +7(495)621-1429, edybtsyna@hse.ru; Ms. Anna Pikalova, tel. +7(495)628-3254, apikalova@hse.ru