



Research Executive Agency



EVALUATION GUIDANCE NOTES for Marie Curie Individual fellowships



Disclaimer: These guidance notes are aimed at assisting experts who are invited for project evaluation. It is provided for information purposes only and its contents are not intended to replace consultation of any applicable legal sources. Neither the REA nor any person acting on its behalf can be held responsible for the use made of these guidance notes.

1. General Comments	3
a. <i>Appointment letters</i>	3
b. <i>Conflict of interest</i>	3
c. <i>RivET</i>	3
d. <i>Useful documents</i>	3
2. Aims of the schemes	3
a. <i>What are Marie Curie Intra-European fellowships (IEF)?</i>	3
b. <i>What are Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships (IOF)?</i>	4
c. <i>What are Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)?</i>	5
3. How are Proposals Evaluated?	5
a. <i>Proposals</i>	5
b. <i>Eligibility</i>	5
c. <i>Evaluation process</i>	5
4. Advice on the evaluation process	6
a. <i>"Do's and Don'ts" for a good Individual Assessment Report</i>	6
b. <i>The role of Chairs, vice-Chairs and Project Officers</i>	7
c. <i>Role of the Rapporteur</i>	8
d. <i>Evaluation criteria</i>	9
5. Practical details	13
a. <i>Timing of Panels</i>	13
b. <i>Payments</i>	13
6. Project Officers	13
Annex 1 – Guidelines to fill out the IAR or CR	14
Annex 2 – Work programme 2009 (European Commission C(2009)5124 of 1 July 2009).....	18
Annex 3 – Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures (Version 3, 21 August 2008 C(2008)4617)	18

1. General Comments

a. Appointment letters

Before the evaluations, experts sign an appointment letter, including a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration before beginning their work. **Confidentiality rules must be adhered to at all times, before, during and after the evaluation.** Only after having returned the signed appointment letter with the declaration of confidentiality and conflict of interest to the EC, will the experts receive their username and password to access the online evaluation tool (RivET).

b. Conflict of interest

Under the terms of the appointment letter, experts must declare beforehand any known conflicts of interest. **S/He must immediately inform her/his vice Chair if one becomes apparent during the course of the evaluation.** The REA will take whatever action is necessary to remove any conflict according to the rules for evaluation.

c. RivET

The evaluations by the independent experts are done through the online evaluation tool, RivET, accessible via <https://rivet.ess-fp7.org/rivet/>. User manuals and Frequently Asked Questions can be downloaded from the homepage. If you experience problems or if you have questions on RivET, please contact the helpdesk at servicedesk@ess-fp7.org. If the helpdesk is unable to answer your query please contact your vice Chair.

d. Useful documents

Experts should consult the following documents (relevant version of the People Work Programme, rules for evaluation, and guides for applicants), all of which can be downloaded from the call page before the start of evaluations:

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=198 (for IEF)

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=199 (for IIF)

http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?fuseaction=UserSite.PeopleDetailsCallPage&call_id=200 (for IOF)

2. Aims of the schemes

Marie Curie individual fellowships are actions aimed at individual and experienced researchers (see definition in the revised 2009 Work programme) to carry out a period of research mobility, advance training, career development and transfer of knowledge. While the IEF and IOF schemes are to a high degree about advanced training and career development, the IIF scheme is more concerned with the transfer of knowledge (Experts must refer to evaluation criteria for further details).

a. What are Marie Curie Intra-European fellowships (IEF)?

Rather than merely providing employment opportunities for experienced researchers, the projects under this action are to contribute to significant steps/changes in such researchers' careers, by specifically adding different and/or complementary research

competences at an advanced level, in the process of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity or to permit them to resume a research career.

Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowships provide financial support for advanced training, career development and trans-national mobility, for a period of 12 to 24 months (full-time equivalent), for individual projects presented by experienced researchers in liaison with a host organisation from another Member State or Associated country. There has been a significant change this year where considerations of nationality are irrelevant. That means that non-European nationals working in Europe are eligible. The paramount consideration is one of “mobility”. Mobility is generally considered to be very positive for the development of a scientist and as such, a central plan to Marie Curie funding. It is evaluated in the “Impact” criterion. Considering the sub-criteria in this section, it is obvious that mobility is interwoven into most aspects, so you need to take a balanced view as to how the candidate intends to benefit from this mobility and how effective it will be. Often, candidates apply for Fellowships to extend a stay beyond the few months that they will be at an Institution. You will have to use your judgement to decide whether maximal benefit will already have been obtained before starting any Fellowship (i.e. the new skill/knowledge base is limited since the candidate is already in their project discipline) or whether the skills/knowledge acquisition is so deep and complex that a further period is required for effective pick-up and development. Again, is returning to a previous Institution a progressive use of mobility by establishing new initiatives or merely a convenience?

In all of this, it is very important that the candidate, in the proposal, clearly and effectively articulates the advantages of mobility as expressed through the Fellowship, to their personal, scientific development. It is not appropriate for you as an evaluator to read such aspects into the submission if they are not clearly appreciated and stated.

b. What are Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships (IOF)?

Similarly to the Intra-European Fellowships, projects under this action contribute to the career development of the best and most promising European researchers, but by exposing them to a research training experience outside Europe. Projects are expected to add significantly to the career development of European researchers, while, by means of an in-built return-phase, their experience and knowledge acquired, as well as the contact-network built up outside Europe, will be used to the benefit of the European knowledge-based economy and society.

Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships provide financial support for advanced training and international mobility (outgoing phase) and transfer of knowledge (return phase) for individual projects presented by experienced researchers in liaison with host organisations in the Member States or Associated countries and Third countries for a total duration of up to 3 years. It is mandatory for the project to include a coherent research programme for the total duration of the contract, of which an initial outgoing phase, of between 1 and 2 years, is to be spent in a distinct legal entity in a third country (“partner organisation”) and a mandatory re/integration phase of 1 year within the contracting organisation (“return host organisation”) in a Member State or Associated country.

c. *What are Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)?*

Projects under this action will add to the research excellence in both public and private sector in the European Research Area, thanks to the sharing and application of new knowledge transferred and developed by highly qualified researchers from outside Europe. At the same time the projects will constitute nuclei for future research relations at international level, beneficial in the frame of the development of the European knowledge-based economy and society. In the case of researchers originating from one of the International Cooperation Partner Countries (ICPC), a return phase might be funded, thus contributing to the establishment of sustainable cooperation between these countries and European research organisations.

Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships provide financial support for knowledge sharing and research cooperation, for a period of 12 to 24 months (full-time equivalent), for individual projects presented by the incoming experienced researchers in liaison with a legal entity (“host organisation”) in a Member State or an Associated country, as well as possibly a “return host organisation” if the researcher’s country of origin is an International Cooperation Partner Country. Also in the case of IIF fellowships, nationality rules have been abolished (see comments on IEF).

In the latter case, the projects may include a return phase in the country of origin, within the framework of an overall and coherent project directed to the development of a mutual interest between the Member States/Associated countries and the third countries concerned.

3. How are Proposals Evaluated?

a. *Proposals*

Each proposal has two parts:

- Part A contains administrative information about the applicants.
- Part B contains the scientific and technical content of the proposal.

Proposals must be evaluated on the content of Part B only. It must include sufficient information regarding each criterion to be evaluated. Material such as web links is not taken into consideration.

b. *Eligibility*

The eligibility criteria for the schemes are outlined in the revised 2009 Work programme (and in the respective guides for applicants). These have been checked by the *REA* before evaluation based on the Part A only; and you should assume that all the proposals are eligible and evaluate them fully. However, if something looks odd, particularly in the light of the new mobility rules, you should consult with your Vice-Chair and/or the *REA* staff but please do not let any doubts about eligibility affect your scores in any way as evaluation criteria are completely independent from eligibility criteria.

c. *Evaluation process*

Eligible proposals are assessed in a single phase process. Each eligible proposal is evaluated by at least three experts remotely. Consensus meetings are held between the three evaluators to produce a single consensus report. One of the experts is designated as Rapporteur. It is her/his responsibility to produce the consensus report, and this report must reflect the views of the 3 evaluators (see section below).

4. Advice on the evaluation process

At this stage it is your individual evaluation that we are focusing on. Please form a view based on your own expertise. Please do not consult with other evaluators at this stage and **do not, under any circumstances, contact the applicant.**

It is advised that you evaluate all proposals within the same scheme before finalising your scores and comments as this will enable you to see the full spectrum of proposals allocated to you before assigning marks.

Please give your impression by pointing out strong and weak points in the proposal by using full clear sentences. Many evaluators find it useful to make comments highlighting what they perceive as weak and strong for each criterion and use that to form the judgement of the overall mark. The meaning of a score of 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 (see tables below) corresponds to excellent, very good, good, fair, poor and criterion not addressed. **The first question therefore is which of these words best describes the proposal. Then marks should be given to 1 decimal place (0.1) and the overall range of decimal should also be used (0.1-0.9).**

To give you a feel for the proportion of proposals that we have seen in the various ranges in the past, it would be very exceptional if more than about 10% scored below 2 or above 4.7 (bearing in mind the numbers you will be evaluating). More than half might score from 4.0 to 4.7. If the **average overall score for ALL** your proposals lies somewhere around 80%, then we will all be marking to the same standard and it will make consensus much easier. There will be a consensus meeting for nearly EVERY proposal so getting it right ahead of time facilitates the subsequent outcome. If you are deviating significantly from these rough proportions, please re-consider your marking and re-scale your quality expectations higher or lower as the case may be.

Do not be afraid to give your frank opinion and support it with an appropriate mark. Any such opinions will either be supported by others at the consensus stage or will be the subject of a discussion. It is the consensus score that determines a proposals position in the ranking the individual scores being a valuable input to this consensus building process.

The scoring profile of each expert will be reviewed by the Chairs and vice Chairs at the end of the individual evaluation stage in order to ensure that evaluators are not marking systematically high or low and that a full range of marks is being used.

a. "Do's and Don'ts" for a good Individual Assessment Report

- Write your comments **using full and clear sentences** for each criterion;
- **Avoid** summarising the proposal. The proposer knows what the proposal is about;
- **Avoid** blow-by-blow accounts but use **strong** and **weak** points based on the given sub-criterion; everything that is included in the report must be **briefly justified**. You **must not** use general statements such as: "*The research could have been better described*";
- **Avoid** generalisations "*Country X is weak in this area!!*" If it is necessary to make a comment like this **say rather**, e.g. "*It has not been demonstrated in the proposal that the host has the capacity to run this project*";

- **Do not assume or anticipate** the quality of an institution (even prestigious): it must be clearly detailed and demonstrated in the proposal;
- **Avoid** “*there are few publications for their age*”. Publication rates vary widely across (sub) disciplines and sector (private). If you believe the track record of any participant is inadequate then, again, a phrase of the kind “***It has not been demonstrated in the proposal that the proposed fellow has the background to carry out this project***”. Please take into consideration the possible resume of a research career and assess the total time spent in research;
- **Above all avoid** writing personal comments and insults;
- Check the consistency of **scores** and **comments** (see tables below); Examples of statements to **avoid**: “*very good candidate*” and then allocating a mark of 3.9/4, i.e. a rejection (*because of a threshold of 4 for the 'researcher' criterion*);
- **Stick to what is in the proposal only**;
- It is recommended that you **use a spell checker** when preparing the reports.
- Ethics are of considerable concern and you should make a note of those which do appear to involve ethical issues because Rapporteurs will be required to discuss all proposals which require ethical approval with the appointed Ethics Assessor (VC) on your Panel. **Again, ethical issues should NOT affect your evaluation.**

b. The role of Chairs, vice-Chairs and Project Officers

The *REA* has appointed Chairs and vice-Chairs to assist in the preparation and follow-up of the evaluation process. The Chair and vice-Chairs assist in the management process of the evaluation in order to achieve the highest possible level of quality. They closely work with the *REA* officials (Project officers) who are responsible for managing the evaluation process. They monitor the remote evaluation process, including the use of the statistics on low/high scorers.

During the evaluation week in Brussels:

- Support in the organisation of the evaluation meetings;
- Along the process, are receptive to questions, suggestions from expert evaluators and take appropriate action, organise information sessions with all experts to discuss recurrent problems;
- Consensus meetings will not be systematically attended by Chairs, vice-Chairs or Project Officers, but they are available for clarification. However, during a consensus meeting, the Rapporteur may ask a C/VC/PO to be present if clarification and guidance are requested by the experts;
- However, in case of particularly difficult Consensus Meetings, if Chairs, vice-Chairs and Project Officers attend, they should be considered as neutral moderators;
- They must not express an opinion on the quality of a proposal, they are not supposed to influence the opinion of the experts;
- Their role is to ensure a common understanding and interpretation of the evaluation criteria and aims of the schemes and marking range which will enable the group of experts to reach a consensus on a proposal;

- Final check of the quality and consistency of the Consensus Reports (CRs) produced by the Rapporteurs;
- Chair the Plenary Panel meeting sessions for approval of the final ranked list.

c. Role of the Rapporteur

Rapporteurs are fully responsible for the smooth running of the Consensus Meeting and for the production of high quality Consensus Report. S/He moderates the discussion with the 2 other evaluators based on all the Individual Assessment Reports.

Remotely (evaluation stage)

To guarantee a successful meeting, it is strongly recommended (*but not requested – no payment can be claimed for the preparation of the remote consensus report*) to prepare the consensus meeting that will take place in Brussels. For that purpose, Rapporteurs are advised to carefully examine all experts' individual assessment reports and prepare a draft consensus report once each IAR are finalised.

In Brussels (consensus meeting stage)

It is the responsibility of the Rapporteurs to chair and lead the Consensus meeting in order to achieve consensus amongst individual evaluators at the meeting:

- **Make a very quick round-table** for experts to introduce themselves and specify their field of competence in relation to the proposal;
- **Give an overview** of the results of the remote evaluation;
- **Open the discussion**, allow all other experts to explain their individual assessment; ensure that all experts have fully expressed their views;
- **Achieve consensus amongst experts**: remind the experts that they can revise their marks and that consensus scores should not necessarily be the average; make use of statistics on high/low markers; seek agreement on scores; ensure that comments are in line with the scores;
- **Think globally of the proposal**: make sure the discussion is not blocked on small details;
- Remember that Project Officer or vice-Chairs won't normally attend the Consensus Meeting, but they are available in case of critical issues. In those rare cases where they attend the meetings, they should be considered as neutral moderators;
- In case of doubt, always refer to the Evaluation Criteria only and do not judge on any personal criterion;
- **In exceptional cases**, when consensus would not be achieved after the time elapsed, stop the meeting and reschedule another Consensus meeting; in that case inform vice-Chairs or Project Officer;
- **Produce high quality Consensus Report (CR)** in terms of content, wording and consistency between marks and comments (the consensus report is a new document that should not just be created by a copy-paste of Individual Assessment Reports comments). Please keep in mind that applicants will receive a finalised version of the CR i.e. an Evaluation Summary Report where scores and comments will appear.

d. Evaluation criteria

- 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 **IEF** and **IOF** thresholds and weightings for the different criteria are summarized in the table below:

Evaluation Criterion	Weighting (in %)	Threshold
S&T Quality	25 ¹	3
Training	15	3
Researcher	25	4
Implementation	15 ¹	N/A
Impact	20	N/A

The **IIF** thresholds and weightings for the different criteria are summarized in the table below:

Evaluation Criterion	Weighting (in %)	Threshold
S&T Quality	25 ²	3
Transfer of Knowledge	15	N/A
Researcher	25	4
Implementation	15 ²	N/A
Impact	20	N/A

In addition to the individual thresholds for the first three criteria, an overall threshold of 70% will be applied to the total weighted score.

1 This weighting will be split between the 3rd country institution and the European host (**IOF only**)

2 This weighting will be split between the 3rd country institution and the European host in case of **request for a reintegration phase only**

Intra-European Fellowships for Career Development (IEF)				
S&T Quality Threshold 3, Weighting:25%	Training Threshold 3, Weighting:15%	Researcher Threshold 4, Weighting:25%	Implementation Weighting:15%	Impact Weighting:20%
Priority in case of ex aequo 3	2	1	5	4
Scientific/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal	Clarity and quality of the research training objectives for the researcher	Research experience	Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host	Potential of acquiring competencies during the fellowship to improve the prospects of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity, diversity and independence, in particular through exposure to complementary skills training
Research methodology	Relevance and quality of additional scientific training as well as of complementary skills offered	Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc., taking into account the level of experience	Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the scientific project	Contribution to career development, or re-establishment where relevant.
Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field	Host expertise in training experienced researchers in the field and capacity to provide mentoring/tutoring	Independent thinking and leadership qualities	Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan	Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness
Timeliness and relevance of the project		Match between the fellow's profile and project.	Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow	Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area.
Host scientific expertise in the field		Potential for reaching a position of professional maturity.		
Quality of the group/supervisors		Potential to acquire new knowledge.		

Marie Curie International Incoming Fellowships (IIF)				
S&T Quality Threshold 3, Weighting:25%	Transfer of knowledge Weighting:15%	Researcher Threshold 4, Weighting:25%	Implementation Weighting:15%	Impact Weighting:20%
Priority in case of ex aequo 3	2	1	5	4
Scientific/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal	Potential of transferring knowledge to European host and/or bringing knowledge to Europe	Research experience	Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host	Potential for creating long term collaborations and mutually beneficial co-operation between Europe and the third country
Research methodology	Clarity and quality of the transfer of knowledge objectives	Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc.	Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the scientific project	Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness
Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field		Independent thinking, leadership qualities, and capacity to transfer knowledge	Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan	Contribution to the socio-economic development of the Developing Countries or emerging and transition economies by transfer of knowledge and human capacity building (where relevant)
Timeliness and relevance of the project		Match between the fellow's profile and project.	Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow	Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area
Host scientific expertise in the field				
Quality of the group/researchers in charge				

Marie Curie International Outgoing Fellowships for Career Development (IOF)				
S&T Quality Threshold 3, Weighting:25%	Training Threshold 3, Weighting:15%	Researcher Threshold 4, Weighting:25%	Implementation Weighting:15%³	Impact Weighting:20%
Priority in case of ex aequo 3	2	1	5	4
Scientific/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal	Clarity and quality of the research training objectives for the researcher	Research experience	Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host (outgoing and return host)	Potential of acquiring competencies during the fellowship to improve the prospects of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity, diversity and independence, in particular through exposure to complementary skills training
Research methodology	Relevance and quality of additional scientific training, as well as complementary skills offered	Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc., taking into account the level of experience	Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the scientific project (outgoing and return host)	Contribution to career development, or re-establishment where relevant.
Originality and innovative nature of the project and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field	Host expertise in training experienced researchers in the field and capacity to provide mentoring/tutoring (outgoing and return host)	Independent thinking and leadership qualities	Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan	Potential for creating long term collaborations and mutually beneficial co-operation between Europe and the third country
Timeliness and relevance of the project		Match between the fellow's profile and project.	Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow (outgoing and return host)	Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness
Host scientific expertise in the field (outgoing and return host)		Potential for reaching a position of professional maturity		Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area
Quality of the group/supervisors (outgoing and return host)		Potential to acquire new knowledge.		

³ split where appropriate between the 3rd country institution and the European host

5. Practical details

a. Timing of Panels

The panel meetings will normally begin at 9.00 on Monday morning and end at 17.30 on Friday afternoon. Evaluators should plan their travel accordingly.

b. Payments

All payments are now handled by a separate unit. Basic information on rates and reimbursements has been included with your contract (appointment letter – Annexes). For any question please contact directly the person indicated in the letter. Further information and contact details will be provided at the panel meeting. Please note that the REA will only pay for remote work in the case of finalised individual assessments and central consensus meetings. In particular there will be no remote consensus payment.

6. Project Officers

CHEMISTRY

Brito FERREIRA

Brito.FERREIRA@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0)2 299 2388

ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Adelma DI BIASIO

Adelma.DI-BIASIO@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0) 2 299 6365

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Marianne PAREL

Marianne.PAREL@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0) 2 298 0576

LIFE SCIENCES

Gianpaolo SURIANO

Gianpaolo.SURIANO@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0) 2 295 1985

MATHEMATICS, ENGINEERING AND IT

Raquel LOPEZ LOZANO

Raquel.LOPEZ-LOZANO@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0) 2 296 4604

PHYSICS

Thierry JACQUIN

Thierry.JACQUIN@ec.europa.eu

+32 (0)2 295 4116

Annex 1 – Guidelines to fill out the IAR or CR

The following guidelines should not replace the indicated criteria (pp10-13 of this guide) but are only aimed at assisting experts.

Scientific and Technological Quality: Threshold 3, weighting 25%

Scientific and technological Quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal:

- Are the research objectives outlined against the background of the state-of-the-art and the expected results?
- Is the state-of-the-art of the research topic clearly described?
- Are the scientific, technological or socio-economic reasons for carrying out further research in the field (covered by the project) described?
- Is there information describing the interdisciplinary/multidisciplinary and/or inter-sectoral aspects of the proposal?

Research methodology:

- Is the methodological approach, which will be employed in the project, explained for each objective?
- Is the methodological approach justified in relation to the overall project objectives?
- If novel methods or techniques are proposed, are the advantages and disadvantages explained?

Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the “state-of-the-art” of the research field:

- Is the contribution that the project is expected to make to advance the state-of-the-art within the field, explained?
- Are the novel concepts, approaches or methods, that will be employed, described in the proposal?

Timeless and relevance of the project:

- Is the proposed research appropriate and relevant against the state-of-the-art?
- Are the benefits that will be gained from undertaking the project at Community level presented?
- Is it stated, in the proposal, how the fellowship will contribute to enhance EU scientific excellence?

Host scientific expertise in the field:

- Is there information on the Host Institute explaining its level of experience on the research topic of the proposal?
- Is there information on the Host Institute documenting its track record of work, including all international collaborations?
- Is there information on the Host Institute regarding their participation in projects, publications, patents and any other relevant results?
- Is there information provided on the scientist in charge of the supervision of the project, including participation in projects, publications, patents and any other relevant results?
- Have gender issues associated with the proposal been adequately taken into account?

Quality of the group/supervisors:

- Has the Host Institute demonstrated its track record of previous training achievements, especially at an advanced level within the proposed field of research?

Training: Threshold 3, weighting 15% (For IEF & IOF only)

Clarity and quality of the research training objectives for the researcher:

- Are the training objectives of the proposal explained in detail?
- Is there an explanation provided on how these training objectives can be beneficial to the development of an independent research career?

Relevance and quality of additional

- Is there an explanation given on how the training that will be provided will contribute to the addition of different/complementary scientific competencies to the fellow's career?
- Are the complementary training and skills that will be provided during the course of the project (such as research management, presentation skills, ethics etc) described?

Host expertise in training experienced researchers in the field and capacity to provide mentoring / tutoring:

- Is the host's expertise in training, mentoring/tutoring researchers outlined in the project?

Transfer of knowledge: Weighting 15% (For IIF only)

Potential of transferring knowledge to European host and/or bringing knowledge to Europe:

- Is there an explanation provided on how this transfer of knowledge can be beneficial to the European host institution/Europe?

Clarity and quality of the transfer of knowledge objectives

- Are the transfer of knowledge objectives of the proposal explained in detail?
- Is the transfer of knowledge relevant to the European host institution?

Host expertise in training experienced researchers in the field and capacity to provide mentoring / tutoring:

- Is the host's expertise in training, mentoring/tutoring researchers outlined in the project?

Researcher: Threshold 4, weighting 25%

Research experience:

- Is a comprehensive description of the applicant's experience presented?
- Is there a scientific/professional CV provided?
- Does the CV mention explicitly: academic achievements, list of other professional activities and any other relevant information?

Research results:

- Are the major achievements of the researcher outlined? *They may include results in the form of funded projects, publications, patents, reports, invited participation in conferences and should take into account the level of experience of the researcher.*
- Is there a short description (250 words) of a maximum of 3 of the major accomplishments of the researcher? This should mention the purpose and results of the work and describe the skills that were acquired and subsequent research applications that were derived from these accomplishments.

Independent thinking and leadership qualities:

- Are the activities of the fellow, reflecting initiative, independent thinking, project management skills and leadership qualities, described?
- Is the potential for future development of the applicant outlined?

Match between the fellow's profile and project:

- Is it demonstrated that the applicant's skills and experience are suitable for the project proposed?

Potential for reaching a position of professional maturity:

- Are the measures foreseen to help the researcher to reach professional maturity described?

Implementation: Weighting 15%

Quality of infrastructure/facilities and international collaborations of host:

- Are the available infrastructures in the host institution specified?
- Do these infrastructures correspond to the needs set out for the execution of the project?
- Has the Host Institution demonstrated its participation in international collaborations?

Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the project:

- Have the applicant and Host Institution provided information on how the implementation and management of the fellowship will be achieved?
- Do the described practical arrangements have an impact on the feasibility and credibility of the project?

Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan:

- Is a work plan, including the goals to help assess the progress of the project, provided?
- *If appropriate*, is the approach to be taken regarding intellectual property that may arise from the project, described?

Practical and administrative arrangements and support for the hosting of the fellow:

- Are the practical arrangements in place to host a researcher coming from another country?
- Is the support given to the researcher to settle into their new host country described?(*such as language teaching, help with local administration, obtaining permits, accommodation, schools, childcare, etc*)

Impact: Weighting 20%

Potential of acquiring competencies: Are the opportunities for the fellow to acquire complementary competencies and skills during the fellowship described?

- Is the impact that this will have on the prospects of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity, diversity and independence, described?

Contribution to career development or re-establishment where relevant:

- Is the way in which the fellowship will contribute in the medium and long term to the development of the fellow's career presented?

- In case of a fellow returning to research: is it described how the fellow's re-establishment will be helped by this fellowship?

Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness:

- Is the extent to which the project will increase the attractiveness of Europe for researchers described?

- Is the extent to which the project will increase European competitiveness and produce long-term synergies and/or structuring effects described?

Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area:

- Have the benefits of the proposed mobility to the European Research Area been described?

- Is a convincing explanation presented to confirm that the mobility is genuine? (*genuine mobility allows the researcher to work in a significant different geographical and working environment different from the one in which the fellow has already worked before*).

Annex 2 – Work programme 2009 (European Commission C(2009)5124 of 1 July 2009)

Annex 3 – Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures (Version 3, 21 August 2008 C(2008)4617)