



THE SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

The Sixth Framework Programme covers Community activities in the field of research, technological development and demonstration (RTD) for the period 2002 to 2006

FP6 Priority 2

INFORMATION SOCIETY TECHNOLOGIES

Integrating and Strengthening the European Research Area

GUIDANCE NOTES FOR EVALUATORS

**Participating in evaluation of proposals for IST FET
Open Scheme**

Continuous submission Call for Proposals

Call identifier FP6-2002-IST-C

(call 17/12/2002 and extension 8/12/2004)



Revised edition: 22nd December 2004

Reference No. 2004/1

Reference doc: b_ge_200202_en.doc

Overview of FET Open Scheme Evaluation

The FET Open scheme is open to the widest possible spectrum of research opportunities that relate to information society technologies as these arise bottom-up. It supports research on new ideas involving high risk; embryonic research and proof-of-concept; and high quality long term research of a foundational nature. Such **research** is implemented through **Specific Targeted Research Projects (STREPs)**, whose overall cost is up to several million euros, and duration is two or three years.

Proposals for **research** (i.e. for STREPs) are dealt with in **two stages**:

1. a short proposal with an anonymous technical description of maximum 5 pages is submitted, at any time, describing the *what* and the *why* of the proposed work. *Short* proposals are evaluated as they come in with the help of remote evaluators.

2. If the short proposal is successful, proposers are invited to submit **a full proposal** by a cut-off date specified in the call. They describe the *what*, *why* and in particular detail the *how* of the proposed work, as well as a description of *who* will do the work. *Full* proposals are batched 3 times a year and are evaluated through a combination of remote evaluation and panels of experts convening in Brussels.

FET Open also helps **support** the structuring, consolidation, or emergence of research communities and the co-ordination of national research programmes or activities in any IST-relevant area of advanced and longer term research. Such activities are implemented through **co-ordination actions (CA)** and **specific support actions (SSA)**. Proposals for **support**, are submitted in a **single step**. They are evaluated following the procedure of the *full* proposals.

The **evaluation** of proposals for research and support follows a numbers distinct **steps**, and almost all of these steps have a particular **report form** linked to them:

- eligibility check of a proposal ;
- evaluation of proposals;
- synthesis of evaluator reports and commentary ;
- feedback to proposers in the form of an evaluation summary report (ESR).

A set of pre-defined **evaluation criteria** are used for the assessment of proposals. Criteria and evaluation forms differ according to the type of instrument (i.e. STREP, CA,SSA).

Evaluators should bear in mind that they need to follow the **code of conduct** and to be free of **conflicts of interest** as defined in the document.

The remainder of this document describes the evaluation and its different stages in more detail. It also supplies templates of the different forms used.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION	4
1.2 OVERVIEW OF FET-OPEN.....	4
1.3 THE STRUCTURE OF PROPOSALS.....	5
2. THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF EVALUATION PARTICIPANTS	7
2.1 INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS EVALUATORS	7
<i>Conflicts of Interest</i>	7
<i>Confidentiality and security</i>	7
2.2 COMMISSION OFFICIALS	8
2.3 INDEPENDENT EXPERTS ACTING AS OBSERVERS	8
3. THE STAGES OF EVALUATION.....	9
3.1 SHORT PROPOSALS FOR RESEARCH (STREPS).....	9
3.2 FULL PROPOSALS FOR RESEARCH (STREP) AND PROPOSALS FOR SUPPORT (CA, SSA)	10
3.3 FINALISATION OF THE EVALUATION AND PROJECT SELECTION	13
4. EVALUATION FORMS.....	14
4.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA PER INSTRUMENT.....	14
4.2 SCORING OF EVALUATION CRITERIA	14
4.3 HORIZONTAL ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED	14
4.4 PRACTICAL GUIDELINES FOR FORM COMPLETION	15
ANNEX I: ETHICAL ISSUES FORM EIR AND CONSENSUS MEETING MINUTE CMM (FOR ALL INSTRUMENTS).....	17
ANNEX II: EVALUATION FORMS IAR, CR AND ESR FOR FET OPEN STREP SHORT PROPOSALS	21
ANNEX III: EVALUATION FORMS IAR, CR AND ESR FOR FET OPEN STREP FULL PROPOSALS	27
ANNEX IV: EVALUATION FORMS IAR, CR AND ESR FOR FET OPEN CA PROPOSALS	34
ANNEX V: EVALUATION FORMS IAR, CR AND ESR FOR FET OPEN SSA PROPOSALS	41
ANNEX VI: PANEL REPORT	47

Priority 2 – Information Society Technologies (IST) FET Open Scheme

1. Introduction

1.1 Evaluation documentation

The evaluation of proposals in FET-Open is based entirely on the ‘**Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures**’, that describe the general principles and the procedures which will be used in the evaluation of proposals.

These guidance notes do not supersede the rules and conditions laid out, in particular, in Council and Parliament Decisions relevant to the Sixth Framework Programme, the Call for proposals or the Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures.

These guidance notes are prepared on the basis of the above Guidelines. They describe the evaluation process in practical detail and contain the evaluation forms needed to be completed at each step of the evaluation of proposals and an indicative format for the panel report which each group of evaluators will prepare at the conclusion of their work.

Documents in which additional information may be found are:

The current IST Workprogramme. The Work Programme provides a detailed description of the content of the research priorities, and indicates which types of instruments may be used for each. The Work Programme also contains details on the eligibility and evaluation criteria which will be applied to proposals.

The IST FET Open Guide for Proposers. This describes in detail how proposals should be prepared and submitted.

These documents may be found on the specific call page for this priority:
http://fp6.cordis.lu/fp6/call_details.cfm?CALL_ID=55

Evaluation criteria and evaluation forms, and in some cases the evaluation procedures, differ according to the type of instrument. For each proposal which is evaluated, ONLY THE CRITERIA, FORMS AND PROCEDURES APPROPRIATE TO THE TYPE OF INSTRUMENT MUST BE USED

1.2 Overview of FET-Open

The FET Open scheme is open to the widest possible spectrum of research opportunities that relate to information society technologies as these arise bottom-up. It supports: research on new ideas involving high risk; embryonic research and proof-of-concept; and high quality long term research of a foundational nature. Such research is implemented through Specific Targeted Research Projects (STREPs).

FET Open also supports the structuring, consolidation, or emergence of research communities and the co-ordination of national research programmes or activities in any IST-relevant area of advanced and longer term research. Such activities are implemented through co-ordination actions (CA) and specific support measures (SSA).

COORDINATION ACTIONS (CAs) will address at least one of the following objectives:

- stimulate the emergence of ideas for new long-term and visionary IST-related research areas, which might become future FET proactive initiatives or provide a definitive added value to FET activities;
- identify the research challenges, assess Europe's research position and potential, and derive strategic roadmaps and implementation routes for long term research driven by visionary scenarios, in particular for the preparation of FP7;
- structure and support emerging multi-disciplinary communities in the relevant areas. For established communities, CAs will become a platform for a critical assessment of their role in FET and their evolution into new/visionary fields of research.

FET may also ask for the submission of CAs for the co-ordination of national research programmes or activities in any IST-relevant area of advanced and longer term research (ERA co-ordination); as support to a running proactive initiative (in case where there is no supporting Network of Excellence); and, for INCO support activities.

SPECIFIC SUPPORT ACTIONS (SSAs) will be used to implement activities to support and prepare the FET policy and activities like studies, impact measure reports, roadmapping of future research areas, conferences, workshops and expert meetings for defining FET future activities, etc.

FET may ask for SSAs to fulfil particular and well-defined tasks that may be relevant to FET activities.

To increase the impact of FET on the innovation potential of Europe, proposers having specific background in the field are encouraged to submit Specific Support Actions which could actively promote and disseminate the results of IST-FET projects and initiatives (over and above the standard diffusion and exploitation activities of individual projects).

Objectives may include:

- Raising awareness of FET projects and FET itself through wide and targeted diffusion of results, success stories and notable experiences achieved in FET projects to the broader scientific and technical community, as well as to decision makers and the wider public. This entails the production of high-level PR material on the work of FET projects and initiatives: images, photos, videos, reports, press releases and other dissemination and awareness materials.
- Contacting and stimulating research groups, potentially interested constituencies and the European public at large to diffuse new ideas emerging from FET projects and initiatives, in particular in the new Member States, the Associated Candidate Countries and the target countries for International Cooperation, where the organisation of appropriate events can be envisaged (except for information exchange initiatives that would take place anyway without Commission support).

Such action(s) could have a duration of 12-24 months and a global budget not exceeding a few hundreds of thousands of euros, in line with the general guidelines.

Proposals for research (i.e. STREPs) have to be submitted in two steps: first a *short* proposal with an anonymous technical description of maximum 5 pages is submitted, at any time, describing the key objectives and motivation for the proposed work. *Short* proposals are evaluated as they come in with the help of remote evaluators. If the *short* proposal is successful, they are invited to submit a *full* proposal by one of the cut-off dates specified in the call. *Full* proposals are batched 3 times a year and are evaluated through a combination of remote evaluation and panels of experts convening in Brussels.

Proposals for support, namely for the structuring and consolidation of research communities (i.e. CAs and SSAs) are submitted in a single step. They are evaluated following the procedure of the *full* proposals.

1.3 The structure of proposals

Part A provides basic information about the proposal and the proposers, e.g. proposal name, proposers' names and addresses, brief description of the work (an abstract), total funding requested; it has a similar format for all types of proposals (research *short*, research *full*, or support).

Part B describes the technical content of the proposal, including e.g. the objectives, potential impact, workplan, management, requested resources etc. However, in the case of research proposals, the format and contents of Part B depend on whether the proposal is *short* or *full*:

- **In the case of *short* proposals for Research**, Part B mainly describes the “*what*” and the “*why*” of the work being proposed, within a maximum of 5 pages. This must be written anonymously.
- **In the case of *full* proposals for Research**, in addition to the “*what*” and “*why*”, Part B also describes in detail the “*how*” and “*who*” of the work being proposed, within a recommended 20-30 pages. *Full* proposals are not anonymous.

Any additional material sent with a proposal (company brochures, supporting documents and reports, videos etc.) will be disregarded. In proposals submitted electronically, other embedded material or hyperlinks to other documents will be disregarded.

2. The roles and responsibilities of evaluation participants

2.1 *Independent experts acting as evaluators*

The evaluation and selection of proposals is carried out by the Commission with the assistance of external experts (evaluators).

Evaluators perform evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are expected to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout in a professional manner. They conform to the “Code of Conduct for independent experts appointed as evaluators” which is appended to the “Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures” and must sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration prior to beginning their work. These must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.

Additional experts may also be requested by the Commission to perform the roles of rapporteur of consensus discussions and panel chairperson or rapporteur.

Conflicts of Interest

Evaluators are required to sign before starting work a Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality Declaration.

For **remote evaluation** of FET Open proposals, a conflict of interest may include the following cases:

- A. The evaluator participates personally and/or has contributed to the preparation of the proposal(s) he/she is requested to evaluate.
- B. The organisation where the evaluator works is involved in the proposal, or has close contractual links with the organisations involved in that proposal.
- C. The evaluator has a family relation to one of the proposal’s participants

Remote evaluation of FET Open *short* proposals is anonymous, therefore, cases B or C above may arise without the evaluator being aware. In such a cases, to the extent that the evaluator has declared no conflict on the Individual Assessment Report (IAR), it is considered that there is no conflict of interest.

Case B is to be interpreted in a flexible way in the case of large universities or research institutions.

For **panel evaluation** taking place in Brussels, a conflict of interest may include any of the above cases as well as:

- D. The evaluator, or the evaluator’s company or research lab, or a family relation of the evaluator participates in a proposal that is in competition (i.e. being evaluated in the same panel and session where the evaluator participates) to the proposal(s) assigned to the evaluator.

The above cases are mentioned by way of example and are not exhaustive. If an evaluator has a direct or indirect link with a proposal, or any other vested interest, or has any other allegiance which impairs or threatens to impair his/her impartiality with respect to a proposal, he/she must declare such facts to the responsible Commission official as soon as he/she becomes aware of this. In addition the evaluator signs a declaration at the bottom of the individual evaluation report for each proposal that he/she examines for the Commission notifying that no conflicts of interest for this particular proposal exist. The Commission ensures that, where the nature of any link is such that it could threaten the impartiality of the evaluator, he/she does not participate in the evaluation of that proposal, and, if necessary, competing proposals.

Confidentiality and security

Evaluators may neither discuss individual proposals nor any aspects of their evaluation with other persons inside or outside the Commission during or after the evaluation period, except in meetings specifically convened for that purpose by Commission services.

The Commission undertakes to keep confidential any information which could identify which proposals have been read by individual evaluators, and the comments made by an individual evaluator on any proposal. Evaluators undertake never to subsequently reveal the identity or opinion of their co-evaluators.

Nothing may be photocopied by an evaluator without the express permission of the Area Co-ordinator. No documents or electronic data in any form may be taken off the evaluation premises.

It may be necessary, in exceptional cases, to seek some clarification from proposers concerning the proposal received. Any such contacts with proposers are only carried out by the Area Co-ordinator or other Commission staff. Any evaluator requesting some clarification on a proposal should contact his Area Co-ordinator, who will then take the necessary action. **Under no circumstance should an evaluator contact a proposer.**

2.2 Commission officials

Commission staff will organise a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the criteria applicable for this specific call, in full respect of the relevant procedures, rules and regulations. They will ensure that the process runs smoothly and fairly, that access to the information pertaining to proposals is strictly controlled, and that the most efficient use possible is made of the time of all concerned.

In consensus and panel meetings Commission staff will act as **moderators**, seeking consensus between the independent experts, without any prejudice for or against particular proposals or the organisations involved.

Commission staff will not attempt to influence the opinion of the independent experts. Even if asked, they may not express any opinion to the experts on the merits or otherwise of any proposal. They may however provide additional information or assistance on request.

In organising the evaluation, the Commission is assisted by contracted support staff from the Evaluation Service Provider (ESP). They play no formal part in the evaluation process, but provide logistical support.

2.3 Independent experts acting as observers

Independent experts may be appointed as observers to examine the evaluation process from the point of view of its working and execution. The role of the observers is to give independent advice to the Commission on the conduct, fairness and equity of the evaluation sessions, ways in which the procedures could be improved, the evaluation criteria used in the sessions and the way in which the evaluators apply these criteria. They do not express views on the proposals under examination or the evaluators' opinions on the proposals.

They conform to the "Code of Conduct for independent observers of the evaluation process" which is appended to the "Guidelines on proposal evaluation and selection procedures".

3. The stages of evaluation

3.1 Short proposals for research (STREPs)

The main purpose of the evaluation of a *short* proposal is to establish whether a *full* proposal should be requested or not. The proposals are evaluated against specific evaluation criteria and thresholds are linked to the criteria (see criteria, thresholds and weights on forms in Annex II). It is essentially a “go” or “no go” decision on a *short* proposal, i.e. all *short* proposals passing the required thresholds will be invited to submit *full* proposals. Only short proposals having a realistic chance of success should be allowed to submit the full proposal.

A second aim of the evaluation of *short* proposals is to provide initial feedback to proposers on how their ideas fit the scope of FET-Open; this also helps improve the overall quality of *full* proposals.

Step S1 Eligibility check

On receipt by the Commission, proposals are opened, registered and acknowledged and their contents entered into a database. For each proposal, a Commission Moderator is assigned to follow the proposal through the evaluation.

Basic eligibility checks will be carried out as proposals are received:

- Completeness – i.e. checking that it contains a Part A and a Part B.
- Anonymity – to verify that Part B is indeed anonymous
- Eligibility – that the consortium meets the minimum eligibility rule¹
- In scope – that the proposal, on first inspection, appears to be within the scope of FET Open.

Step S2 Assignment of remote evaluators to short proposals

Commission staff will examine the contents of each proposal to determine the expertise needed for its assessment, and will assign at least three independent experts (evaluators) to each proposal.

The evaluation of *short* proposals is undertaken by external independent remote evaluators, who work at their site to assess the proposal.

Step S3 Remote Evaluation of short proposals

The remote evaluators will be sent the anonymous (part B) of the proposals, as well as forms A1 and A3. They will be requested to assess the proposals in terms of four pre-determined evaluation criteria (see criteria, thresholds and weights on forms in Annex II), and to record their individual opinions on the Individual Assessment Report (IAR). The opinion expressed for each of the evaluation criteria should be factual and justify the assessment. The scores should be in line with the comment. They are also requested to make a judgement on whether there are any ethical issues associated with proposal. Please consult section 4 on how to apply the evaluation criteria and provide marks.

When sending forms back to the Commission the remote evaluators will use electronic mail. Unless an electronic signature compatible with the European Commission’s email system or an electronically signed PDF document is used, the signed papercopy of the final CR can be sent by fax to the European Commission.

The remote evaluators are acting individually and independently. They do not discuss the proposal with any third party; they will record only their own personal opinions.

¹ The minimum number of participants shall not be fewer than three independent legal entities established in three different Member States or associated States, of which at least two shall be Member States or associated candidate countries.

Step S4 Synthesis of remote evaluator reports

When all the remote evaluators of a particular proposal have completed and delivered their IAR forms, a Consensus Report (CR) will be prepared. The Commission moderator will prepare a draft CR which will be sent to the evaluators for comments and signature. In the event of disagreement between evaluators, the Commission may convene a discussion among the evaluators. For this task, an expert may be appointed to act as proposal rapporteur and draft the CR report. In case that it is impossible to reach a consensus, the report sets out the majority view of the independent experts.

If one or more evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, this will be discussed in order to decide whether or not the issues require further attention. If so, the relevant box on Form CR will be ticked stating the nature of the ethical issues.

A weight and a threshold apply to each evaluation criterion. The weights are used to calculate an overall score on which a threshold also applies. Proposals that fail on one of the thresholds will be excluded from further consideration.

The CR will be sent to the individual evaluators for their signature. Unless an electronic signature compatible with the European Commission's email system or an electronically signed PDF document is used, the signed papercopy of the final CR can be sent by fax to the European Commission.

Step S5 Evaluation results

Based on the above, the Commission services will prepare the evaluation summary reports (ESR) and send them out to each proposal co-ordinator giving the results of the evaluation of their proposal. All proposers will be informed of the outcome of the evaluation normally within 8 weeks of a proposal's reception. All proposals that passed all the thresholds will be invited to submit a full proposal.

Unsuccessful proposers will receive formal notification of a Commission decision not to retain their proposal at a later stage (such decisions will be batched every 3-4 months).

3.2 Full proposals for research (STREP) and proposals for support (CA, SSA)

Proposers of successful *short* STREP proposals will be given at least 2 months for preparing a *full* proposal. Proposals that are received by a given cut-off date are evaluated at a session that is normally organised within a month of that cut-off date. In a first step the individual evaluations are carried out remotely so that top-level expertise can be accessed in the very broad scientific and technical areas covered by FET Open. *Full* proposals are evaluated against specific evaluation criteria with weights and thresholds linked to them as described in forms in Annex III. Evaluators should make sure that they are aware of how these criteria are specifically applied to FET Open *full* proposals. In the second step, evaluators in Brussels draft a synthesis of the individual evaluations, discuss the syntheses and scores and compare the proposals in a series of panel meetings.

Proposals for CAs and SSAs follow the same procedure as full proposals for research (forms in Annex IV & V).

Step F1 Eligibility check

On receipt by the Commission, proposals are opened and registered. For each proposal, a Commission Moderator is assigned to follow the proposal through the evaluation.

Basic eligibility checks will be carried out as proposals are received:

- Completeness – i.e. checking that it contains a Part A and a Part B.
- Eligibility – that the consortium meets the minimum eligibility rule¹
- In scope – that the proposal, on first inspection, appears to be within the scope of FET Open.

¹ The minimum number of participants shall not be fewer than three independent legal entities established in three different Member States or associated States, of which at least two shall be Member States or associated candidate countries. SSAs may be executed by a single legal entity.

This information will be recorded in a database.

Step F2 Assignment of remote evaluators to proposals

Commission staff will examine the contents of each proposal to determine the expertise needed for its assessment, and will assign at least three independent experts (evaluators) to each proposal.

The independent evaluation of *full* proposals is undertaken by external independent remote evaluators, who work at their site to assess the proposal.

Step F3 Remote evaluation of full proposals

The remote evaluators will be sent the proposals (the proposal abstract and the financial information, i.e. the forms A1 and A3 from Part A, and Part B) and will be requested to assess the proposals in terms of six pre-determined evaluation criteria (see criteria, thresholds and weights on forms in Annex III). They will record their individual opinions on Individual Assessment Report (IAR) and provide comments to accompany each of their marks. They are also requested to make a judgement on whether there are any ethical issues associated with proposal. Please consult section 4 on how to apply the evaluation criteria and provide marks, and the list of general issues that should be considered.

When sending forms back to the Commission the remote evaluators will use electronic mail, or in exceptional cases fax. Unless an electronic signature compatible with the European Commission's email system or an electronically signed PDF document is used this has to be followed by a signed paper version.

The remote evaluators are acting individually and independently. They do not discuss the proposal with any third party; they will record only their own personal opinions.

Step F4 Synthesis of remote evaluator reports

The synthesis of the IAR reports will be carried out by evaluators convened to an evaluation session in Brussels. The evaluation sessions will be organised in a number of parallel thematic panels.

Each evaluator will be assigned a number of proposals for which he/she is the *proposal rapporteur*. The rapporteur will typically not be chosen from among the remote evaluators employed to assess a particular proposal. The rapporteur will be given: the *full* proposal under evaluation, the remote evaluators' reports (IAR forms), and the *short* proposal that preceded it with its evaluation results (ESR form).

On the basis of this material the rapporteur will produce a draft Consensus Report form (CR) where scores, conclusions and recommendations are recorded. While the rapporteurs must base their comments and scores on the remote evaluators' reports, they are given the flexibility to exercise judgement and make critical synthesis of the information available. Scores should not be obtained by simple averaging scores from remote evaluators' reports but by a judicious synthesis. In case of strongly diverging remote evaluator reports the rapporteur should justify the scores chosen. Priority should be given to the comments, the scores adjusted to reflect the comments. The rapporteur may also request that an additional expert acts as an individual evaluator.

Step F5 Ethical Issues check by the rapporteur

If one or more evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, and if the proposal is considered to be above threshold, the relevant box will be ticked on the draft Form CR and a draft Ethical Issues Form (EIR) completed, stating the nature of the ethical issues, for discussion in the panel. The evaluation of the proposal will then proceed as normal. If the proposal is later selected for negotiation as a project, a further special ethical review will be carried out.

Step F6 Panel meetings

According to the number and topic of proposals received, the evaluation session is organised in parallel thematic panels each of which is composed of the proposal rapporteurs. A panel rapporteur is assigned whose main tasks are to report at the consolidation panel meeting (see F7) and to provide input to the panel report.

Before panel meetings evaluators familiarise themselves with all proposals to be discussed. For this they are provided with the abstracts (form A1) of all the proposals. They may also access the proposals themselves as well as the individual evaluator reports (IAR forms).

Proposal rapporteurs will be expected to briefly present each proposal to the panel and to justify the scores given. The panel will review the scores and opinions given by the rapporteurs in view of finalising the CR. This serves both to bring together the weight of the whole panel's experience and expertise for the evaluation of all proposals, and also to ensure that the same standard of scoring is applied to each.

For certain evaluation criteria, a threshold score applies. An overall score is calculated using the weight assigned to each criterion and reflecting its relative importance. Note that for full STREPs a weight of 0% is applied to the first criterion (relevance to the objectives of the programme) since the relevance was established already at the short proposal stage. As defined in the workprogramme, a threshold on the overall score also applies.

All proposals passing all thresholds will then be ordered according to scores. For panels combining several instruments, the lists will be produced separately for STREP, CA and SSA proposals.

The panel will also review proposals where the proposal rapporteur considers that there are important ethical issues to be discussed and modifies EIR form accordingly.

Each proposal rapporteur completes the Consensus meeting minute form (CMM) as a record of the panel discussion on a particular proposal. CMM contains justifications for the choices made, any dissenting views from panel members, as well as salient points to be taken into account in the contract negotiations.

Forms CR, CMM and EIR (if used) are signed as a minimum by the proposal rapporteur and the Commission Moderator.

Step F7 Consolidation Panel meeting

The objective of the consolidation meeting is to ensure that the same standards of quality have been used in assessing proposals across the thematic panels, that all proposals are treated equitably, as well as to establish a global prioritisation of proposals for each type of instrument. In doing this, the consolidation panel is the main mechanism of controlling and guaranteeing the quality of the evaluation process.

The consolidation panel is moderated by a Commission representative and includes the panel rapporteurs, one of whom will be assigned to be the consolidation panel rapporteur. Additional members of panels are present as needed.

The consolidation panel will have to finalise the Evaluation Summary Report (ESR) for each proposal, i.e. the document which is returned to each proposal co-ordinator to give an account of the results of the evaluation. A draft ESR, based on the scores and conclusions initially reached in the CR, supported with any relevant information from the CMM and EIR, is made available to the consolidation panel members at the start of the panel meeting. At the end of the meeting the panel confirms the global proposal priority as established on the basis of the ESR scores.

Step F8 Panel report

Each panel will conclude its work by preparing a Panel report, written to a pre-determined structure, which will summarise its activities and conclusions. The panel report represents the advice of the evaluators to the Commission, which the Commission will take into account in the final selection of

projects for negotiation. The panel report format is shown in annex VI. Thematic panels may provide additional input to the panel report. In particular they may provide written justification for any judgements made concerning the relative prioritisation of proposals which have achieved the same overall scores. It may also highlight new and important scientific and technological trends that are evident in the proposals, as well as potential co-operation or clustering between proposals. In addition, the panel report must identify proposals requiring a special attention due to ethical issues.

The panel report will be signed, as a minimum, by three experts, including the Panel rapporteur. The ESRs for all of the proposals considered by the panel will be appended to the report.

3.3 Finalisation of the evaluation and project selection

At this stage, the Commission services review the results from the evaluators, make their assessment of the proposals based on the advice from the evaluators and prepare the final evaluation results according to the provisions described in the 'Guidelines on proposal evaluation selection procedures'.

4. Evaluation forms

4.1 Evaluation criteria per instrument

The evaluation criteria to be used for the three different types of instruments (STREP, CA and SSA) are given in the forms in Annex. It also shows the weights and thresholds that will be used for each criterion.

The evaluators should make sure they are using the correct set of criteria for the type of instrument proposed.

The form used in the evaluation during the stage of individual reading lists under each criterion a number of detailed issues (“sub-criteria”), which the evaluator has to consider and comment each of them during the assessment of that criterion. These sub-criteria are not scored;. The comments should support the scores given, and should remind the evaluator of issues he/she may wish to raise during the consensus discussions.

When examining proposals, evaluators may *only* apply the evaluation criteria which are set out in the Work Programme and shown on the evaluation forms.

4.2 Scoring of Evaluation criteria

Evaluators examine the individual issues comprising each block of evaluation criteria and mark the blocks on a six-point scale from 0 to 5. In this scheme, the scores indicate the following with respect to the block under examination:

- 0- the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information
- 1 - poor
- 2 - fair
- 3 - good
- 4 - very good
- 5 - excellent

Where appropriate, half marks may be given.

For all criteria a threshold score is applied, as well as a threshold on the overall score (calculated following a pre-determined weighting scheme). Proposals that fail to achieve one or more of the threshold scores will not be considered for support.

4.3 Horizontal issues to be addressed

In addition to the blocks of evaluation criteria to be evaluated, the following issues also need to be considered during the evaluation of full STREP, CA and SSA to FET Open, and recommendations made if appropriate:

1. Ethical and/ or safety aspects – have they been identified and taken into account?
2. Other horizontal issues
 - Gender – are there any gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal and, if so, have they been adequately taken into account?
 - Readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the work.
 - The synergies with education at all levels.
 - The justification and integration of any third country participation in the proposal.

If during their individual reading of a proposal evaluators have noted that there are ethical issues touched on by the proposal, they must flag this by using the tick box provided on the Form IAR. The issue will then be further discussed at the next step.

4.4 Practical guidelines for form completion

Assess the proposal as it is described and presented - do not make any assumptions or interpretations about what the proposers have written in their proposal.

- Make sure you are using the correct form for the type of instrument (note that forms are different for FET Open short STREPs and full STREPs).
- Keep to the evaluation criteria as stated in the forms.
- Give all required evaluation scores.
- Try to maintain consistency in your scoring throughout your work.
- Provide clear justification for your scores. Do not write generic comments such as “the proposal is not very innovative” without specifying where exactly it fails. Quote proposal text if useful.
- Priority should be given to the comments as they will justify the outcome of the evaluation. Scores should be adjusted to reflect the opinion expressed in the comments. The scores are only a mathematical tool allowing the comparison of the relative quality of different proposals.
- Part of your remarks will be used to inform the proposers on the evaluation outcome; they need to be objective, non-personal, and formulated in a polite manner.
- Please note that for each criterion a threshold score applies. Furthermore, a weight may be applied, reflecting the relative importance of the criterion. The weights are used to calculate an overall score on which a threshold also applies.
- Give clear recommendations for modifications, if needed, particularly in case of relatively highly scoring proposals.
- If you are a proposal rapporteur and you are completing the draft CR, make a synthesis of the views of the individual evaluators – not a synthesis of their views with yours. If you think that the individual evaluators have not adequately covered the technical aspects of the proposal alert Commission staff.
- Please complete your forms clearly, so that they are readable by the Commission staff, or use the Project Evaluation Support System (PESS) provided.
- Remember to sign and date your forms.

The proposal evaluation forms are:

Form	Name	Content
	Eligibility form (Commission only)	Eligibility check
EIR	Ethical issues report form	Ethical issues
IAR	Individual assessment report	Records the results of the assessment of the proposal by an individual evaluator
Draft CR	Draft consensus report form	Form where the proposal rapporteur records his synthesis of the individual evaluators' assessments
CR	Consensus report	Records the outcome of the panel's deliberations on a particular proposal in terms of scores and supporting comments
CMM	Consensus meeting minute	Notes of the consensus discussion between evaluators on short STREP proposals; or notes of the panel meeting discussions

		regarding a particular full STREP, CA or SSA proposal
ESR	Evaluation summary report	Final outcome of the assessment of the proposal; sent to the proposers
	Panel report	Summary of the conclusion of the evaluation

**ANNEX I: Ethical Issues form EIR and Consensus Meeting Minute CMM
(for all instruments)**

IST Priority**EIR****ETHICAL ISSUES REPORT**

Proposal Acronym: _____

Proposal Number: _____

1. Does the proposed research involve any of the following activities which are not allowed for funding under the rules of FP6?

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
Research activity aiming at human cloning for reproductive purposes			
Research activity intended to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable ¹			
Research activities intended to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer			

2. Many of the following areas of research are likely to give rise to ethical issues

Please indicate whether the proposal involves	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
• Research on human beings			
- Persons not able to give consent			
- Children			
- Adult healthy volunteers			
• Human embryos			
• Human biological samples			
- Human embryonic stem cells			
- Human foetal tissue/cells			
• Human Genetic information			
• Other personal data			
• Sensitive data about health, sexual lifestyle, ethnicity, political opinion, religious or philosophical conviction			
• Animals (any species)			
- Non- human primates			
- Transgenic small laboratory animals			
- Transgenic farm animals			
- Cloning of farm animals			
• Research involving developing countries (e.g. clinical trials, use of human and animal genetic resources...)			
• Dual use			

3.	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
Have the proposers indicated in which country(s) any research raising ethical issues will be carried out?			
Have they indicated which national, EU and/or international regulations will apply?			

¹ Research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads can be financed.

4.	YES	NO	N/A
If the research involves use of human embryos or human embryonic stem cells, do you consider that this research methodology is necessary in order to achieve the proposal's scientific objectives?			

5. Proposals involving sensitive ethical issues such as research on children or those unable to consent, the use of human embryos, human embryonic stem cells, human foetal tissue, non-human primates, the generation of novel transgenic animals or cloning of farm animals and use of sensitive personal data **should automatically be identified as requiring an ethical review**. Proposals involving **other ethical issues**, such as research involving animals, confidentiality, informed consent, possible risks to health or the environment and other issues, **which have not been identified or addressed by the proposers, should also be considered for ethical review**.

	YES	NO	
Are there other ethical issues that you consider have not been identified or properly addressed? If yes please specify:			

.....

6. CONCLUSION

	YES	NO	UNCERTAIN
SHOULD THIS PROPOSAL BE SUBMITTED TO AN ETHICAL REVIEW? If yes, please indicate the main reason(s).			

.....

Evaluator NAME					
Signature					

Moderator Signature _____

Date: _____

Rapporteur signature _____

IST Priority**CMM**

Consensus Meeting Minute
All instrument types

Proposal number

Proposal acronym

Type of instrument

Describe how the decisions regarding the evaluation results were reached. Always provide comments if the consolidated evaluation differs significantly from the individual scores on given criteria or if scores have moved above or below thresholds. Record any dissenting views, if any.

The information on this form is retained on the proposal archive as a record of the evaluation decision.

	Rapporteur	Moderator
NAME		
Signature		
Date		

**ANNEX II.: Evaluation forms IAR, CR and ESR for FET Open STREP
short proposals**

IST Priority

IAR /FET Open STREP- short

Individual assessment report - FET Open Short proposal (STREP)

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%) <i>Is the proposed project within the scope of IST in general and FET Open in particular? Does it concern research on new ideas involving high risk, embryonic research and proof-of-concept, or long term research of a foundational nature?</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact (Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%) <i>If successful: Will the project have a large scientific or technological impact? Can this research open new prospects for IST? And/or, will it have, in the longer term, a large economic impact or contribute to solving societal problems? Are the potential long term benefits sufficiently large to justify the level of risk of the project? Will the impact be best achieved if the project is carried out at European level?</i>	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%) <i>Are the objectives challenging and clearly defined? Do they represent clear progress well beyond the current state-of-the-art? Is the research highly innovative? Is the proposed S&T approach plausible? (Note : only a short outline of the approach should be provided in short proposals).</i>	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (Threshold -; Weight 0) <i>Not evaluated in the short proposal.</i>	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (Threshold -; Weight 0) <i>Not evaluated in the short proposal.</i>	Mark:

6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>) <i>Do the resources requested seem reasonable for achieving the project objectives?</i>	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES
---	-----------	------------

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

IST Priority**CR/FET Open STREP short****Consensus report - FET Open Short proposal (STREP)**

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%</i>)	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium <i>Not evaluated in a short proposal</i>	
5. Quality of the management <i>Not evaluated in a short proposal</i>	
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES
---	-----------	------------

	Rapporteur	Moderating
Name		
Signature		
Date		

1. Relevance <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%)</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%)</i>	Mark:
3. S&T excellence <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%)</i>	Mark:

4. Quality of the consortium <i>Not evaluated in a short proposal</i>	
5. Quality of the management <i>Not evaluated in a short proposal</i>	
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an *Ethical issues report* is attached to this *Evaluation Summary Report*)

NO

YES

ANNEX III: Evaluation forms IAR, CR and ESR for FET Open STREP full proposals

IST Priority

IAR/FET Open STREP- full

Individual assessment report - FET Open full proposal (STREP)

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (Threshold 3/5; Weight 0%) <i>Is the proposed project within the scope of IST in general and FET Open in particular? Does it concern research on new ideas involving high risk, embryonic research and proof-of-concept, or long term research of a foundational nature?</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact (Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%) <i>If successful: Will the project have a large scientific or technological impact? Can this research open new prospects for IST? And/or, will it have, in the longer term, a large economic impact or contribute to solving societal problems? Are the potential long term benefits sufficiently large to justify the level of risk of the project? Will the impact be best achieved if the project is carried out at European level?</i>	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%) <i>Are the objectives challenging and clearly defined? Do they represent clear progress well beyond the current state-of-the-art? Is the research highly innovative? Is the proposed S&T approach well thought out? Could it enable the project to achieve its objectives?</i>	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%) <i>Is all necessary expertise available in the consortium? Are the participants well-suited to the tasks assigned to them? Are they committed to the project? Do the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality? Is there good complementarity between participants?</i>	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (Threshold 0; Weight 10%) <i>Is the project management demonstrably of high quality? Is there a clearly laid out plan of work? Is there a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge (e.g. dissemination, use, intellectual property, etc) and for promoting innovation, where relevant?</i>	Mark:

6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>) <i>Are the foreseen resources (personnel, equipment, financial...) necessary and sufficient for success? Are the resources convincingly integrated to form a coherent project? Is the overall financial plan for the project adequate?</i>	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable)

- If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
- If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

IST Priority**CR/FET Open STREP full****Consensus assessment report - FET Open full proposal (STREP)**

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 0%</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%</i>)	Mark:
3. S&T excellence (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 0/5; Weight 10%</i>)	
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

Proposer name	Country	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
Total			100%		100%

Proposal abstract

1. Relevance <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 0%)</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 30%)</i>	Mark:
3. S&T excellence <i>(Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%)</i>	Mark:

4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 0/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

ANNEX IV: Evaluation forms IAR, CR and ESR for FET Open CA proposals

IST Priority

IAR/FET Open CA

Individual assessment report - FET Open Coordination Actions (CA)

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%) <i>The extent to which the proposed project supports the scientific, technical, socio-economic and policy objectives of the work programme in the area open for the particular call.</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact (Threshold 4/5; Weight 30%) <i>The extent to which:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the proposed work can best be achieved if carried out at European level the Community support would have a real structuring and/or strategic impact on the area concerned and the scale, ambition and outcome of the research activities/programmes to be coordinated exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the action 	Mark:
3. Quality of the coordination (Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the research actions/programmes to be coordinated are at the forefront of the current state-of-the-art the proposed activities are sufficiently well designed to bring about the coordination envisaged 	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the participants collectively constitute a consortium of high quality that can pursue the objectives of the proposed action effectively the participants are well suited to the tasks assigned to them and committed to the proposed action the project combines the complementary expertise of the participants to generate added value with respect to the individual participants' programmes 	Mark:

5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project management is demonstrably of high quality there is a clearly laid out plan of work there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge (e.g. dissemination, intellectual property, etc.) and for promoting innovation where relevant. 	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed action is cost-effective, providing for the resources (personnel, equipment, financial ...) that are necessary and sufficient for success the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project the overall financial plan for the project is adequate 	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES
---	-----------	------------

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account? Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results? To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work? Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out? If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

IST Priority**CR/FET Open CA****Consensus assessment report - FET Open Coordination Actions (CA)**

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 30%</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the coordination (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

1. Relevance <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%)</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact <i>(Threshold 4/5; Weight 30%)</i>	Mark:
3. Quality of the coordination <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%)</i>	Mark:

4. Quality of the consortium (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%</i>)	Mark:
5. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
6. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 2/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

ANNEX V: Evaluation forms IAR, CR and ESR for FET Open SSA proposals

IST Priority

IAR/FET Open SSA

Individual assessment report - FET Open Specific Support Actions (SSA)

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%) <i>The extent to which the proposed project supports the scientific, technical, socio-economic policy objectives of the work programme in the area open for the particular call.</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact (Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the proposed work can best be achieved if carried out at European level the impact will be significant in scientific, technological, socio-economic or policy terms exploitation and/or dissemination plans are adequate to ensure optimal use of the project results, where possible beyond the participants in the support action 	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action (Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the support action proposed represent a high quality work; the applicant(s) represent(s) a high level of competence in terms of professional qualifications and/or experience the proposed activities are sufficiently well designed to support the programme objectives 	Mark:
4. Quality of the management (Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%) <i>The extent to which:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project management structure is demonstrably of high quality there is a satisfactory plan for the management of knowledge (e.g. Dissemination, use, intellectual property, etc.) and for promoting innovation where relevant 	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%) <i>The extent to which</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the proposed action is cost-effective, providing for the resources (personnel, equipment, finance ...) that are necessary and sufficient for success the resources are convincingly integrated to form a coherent project, if relevant the overall financial plan for the project is adequate 	Mark:
Overall remarks (Threshold 3.5/5)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?

NO

YES

Horizontal issues (comment if applicable)

- If there gender issues associated with the subject of the proposal, have they been adequately taken into account?
- Have the applicants identified the potential ethical and/or safety aspects of the proposed research regarding its objectives, the methodology and the possible implications of the results?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate a readiness to engage with actors beyond the research community and the public as a whole, to help spread awareness and knowledge and to explore the wider societal implications of the proposed work?
- Have the synergies with education at all levels been clearly set out?
- If third country participation is envisaged in the proposal, is it well justified and the participation well integrated in the activities?

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

IST Priority

CR/FET Open SSA

Consensus assessment report – FET Open Specific Support Actions (SSA)

Proposal No. :	Acronym :
1. Relevance (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
2. Potential impact (<i>Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%</i>)	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%</i>)	Mark:
4. Quality of the management (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%</i>)	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources (<i>Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%</i>)	Mark:
Overall remarks (<i>Threshold 3.5/5</i>)	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?	NO	YES
---	-----------	------------

	Rapporteur	Moderator
Name		
Signature		
Date		

1. Relevance <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%)</i>	Mark:
2. Potential impact <i>(Threshold 4/5; Weight 40%)</i>	Mark:
3. Quality of the support action <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%)</i>	Mark:

4. Quality of the management <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%)</i>	Mark:
5. Mobilisation of the resources <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 10%)</i>	Mark:
Overall remarks <i>(Threshold 3.5/5)</i>	Total score:

Does this proposal have ethical issues that need further attention?
(if "yes", an Ethical issues report is attached to this Evaluation Summary Report)

NO

YES

Annex VI: PANEL REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This panel report covers the following... within the Continuous Submission call of IST published on 17/12/2002 and extended in November 2004...

The following table gives an overview of proposals dealt with by the panel:

Total proposals in panel	Ineligible	Failed threshold(s)	Proposals above threshold
100%	%	%	%

Every panel must follow the procedures given in the Guidelines on proposal evaluation & selection, therefore the methods of the panel need not be described in detail, unless some specific elements of the standard procedure have had a significant impact on the outcome of the Panel

2. ANALYSIS OF RECEIVED PROPOSALS

Overview of the issues covered by the received proposals, proposal quality, important omissions or areas not covered.....

The total grant requested by all received proposals is €XXX

3. PROPOSAL PRIORITY

The Panel recommends that a decision of the Commission on funding of proposals will be based on the priority as given in the following table(s). The total grant requested by all prioritised proposals is €XXX

(Separate tables and comments per instrument type)

Prior-ity	Proposal Number	Proposal Acronym	Overall score	Total cost proposed (K€)	Grant requested (K€)	Other Countries involved*
1						
2						
3						
4						

*(*countries outside EU and Associated states)*

Individual short comments per prioritised proposal, explaining their relevance and any considerations of the panel leading to the priority list given above.

- *Pay particular attention to the reasons for the choice of priority given here to proposals which have tied scores.*
- *Highlight proposals which were evaluated as “cross-objective”*
- *For proposals involving organisations from “other countries”, comment on the significance of their participation to the project*
- *Highlight any issues of SME participation, if relevant*
- *Identify proposals requiring special attention due to either the importance of ethical issues raised or the inadequacy of the way ethical issues are addressed, if relevant*

4. Key issues

a) Clustering/merging/overlapping of priority proposals.

Any suggestions of proposals to be work together as a cluster; to be negotiated together as a merged project; which overlap in activity and where therefore one is first choice and one is “backup”

b) Comments on coverage

Comments concerning the relevance/coverage of the proposals which have reached the prioritised list, in terms of the technical area to be covered by this panel.

c) Recommendations for future calls

Recommendations/corrective action in future calls e.g. future need to target particular technical areas, instrument types, types of organisation, SMEs, countries....

5. Below threshold/ineligible proposals

The following table provides the list of proposals which have not been prioritised due to ineligibility or the score of at least one of the criteria falling below threshold, or the proposal falling below the overall threshold.

(E = eligibility failure; T1, T2 etc = individual criterion failure; TO = failure on overall threshold; TS = failure on multiple criteria.)

(Separate tables per instrument type)

Proposal no.	Acronym	Failing

6. ANNEX

Attach proposal Evaluation Summary Reports