



ΙΔΡΥΜΑ  
ΕΡΕΥΝΑΣ ΚΑΙ  
ΚΑΙΝΟΤΟΜΙΑΣ



**THE RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FOUNDATION**

**PROGRAMMES**

**FOR RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND**

**INNOVATION**

**“RESTART 2016 – 2020”**

**GUIDE FOR EVALUATORS**

**(Single-stage Evaluation)**

<b>PROPOSAL DETAILS</b>	
<b>PILLAR</b>	<b>I. SMART GROWTH</b>
<b>PROGRAMME</b>	<b>Bilateral Collaborations</b>
<b>CALL IDENTIFIER</b>	<b>BILATERAL/GREECE/1124</b>



Co-funded by  
the European Union



RESEARCH  
& INNOVATION  
FOUNDATION

## **GUIDELINES AND GENERAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATORS**

1. The Proposal, which the Evaluator is called upon to evaluate, was submitted under the **“Bilateral Collaborations” Programme** of the Research and Innovation Foundation **Programmes for Research, Technological Development and Innovation “RESTART 2016-2020” for the period 05/2022-12/2024.**
2. The objectives of the abovementioned Programme and all necessary definitions and procedures are described in:
  - the relevant **Call for Proposals**, and
  - the **Work Programme (relevant Programme description in Section II/Pillar I).**
3. Before producing the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are expected to study the relevant Proposal thoroughly. This consists of:
  - Proposal Part A – General Information & Budget,
  - Proposal Part B – Technical Annex,
  - Annex I – Curricula Vitae, and
  - Annex II – Call-specific Information (where applicable).
4. The Evaluation Procedure is carried out on the Research and Innovation Foundation’s (RIF) **IRIS (Innovation Research Information System) Portal** (<https://iris.research.org.cy/#/>). Evaluators should first register on the Portal in order to be granted access to the Proposal and the relevant documents.
5. According to the Evaluation Procedure, each Proposal should be evaluated by **one (1) independent Evaluator**. The Evaluator fills his / her Evaluation Report Form, which consists of 3 Parts.
6. In Part I, the Evaluator should provide:
  - a. A fully justified assessment on whether the Proposal is **compatible with**:
    - (i) the objectives of the selected Programme and the Call for Proposals, and
    - (ii) the proposed Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) and types of activities allowed by the Call for Proposals, and
    - (iii) the selected Smart Specialisation Sector / Sub-sector / Focus Area, and.
    - (iv) the “Do No Significant Harm” Principle.
  - b. A score on each of the **3 evaluation criteria (assigning marks between 0,00 and 5,00 with an accuracy of 0,25 marks)** as well as relevant comments and detailed justification. It is noted that each criterion carries a **different weight**, as shown on the respective part of the Evaluation Report Form.

**The Evaluator will not proceed with the scientific evaluation of the 3 criteria should a Proposal fail the compatibility assessment.**

7. The evaluation criteria on which the scientific evaluation will be based are:
- Excellence,
  - Added Value and Benefit, and
  - Implementation.

The content of the criteria is specified in each **Call for Proposals** so that it expresses each Programme's philosophy and aims, and differences pertaining to the interpretation, analysis and specialisation of each criterion and its weight over the total evaluation score. The description of each criterion is **available in Part I of the present document**. Evaluators are kindly requested to **read the description of each Criterion thoroughly** before assigning their scores.

8. The **Evaluation Score** will be automatically calculated (in the relevant Table in Part III) by adding the scores assigned to each of the three criteria following the application of the relevant weights.
9. The table below provides an interpretation of the scores and should be applied for the evaluation of all Proposals:

<b>Score</b>	<b>Evaluation Interpretation</b>
<b>0</b>	The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
<b>&lt; 0,99</b>	The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
<b>1,00 – 1,99</b>	The proposal addresses the criterion to a limited degree and there are significant weaknesses.
<b>2,00 – 2,99</b>	The proposal addresses the criterion partly and a number of shortcomings/weaknesses are observed.
<b>3,00 – 3,99</b>	The proposal addresses the criterion quite sufficiently but a small number of shortcomings/weaknesses are observed.
<b>4,00 – 5,00</b>	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

10. Proposals are deemed eligible for funding if they secure an **Evaluation Score of at least 12,00/15,00**. Only proposals deemed eligible under national regulations in both countries will be forwarded to the Joint Committee for final selection.
11. **Comments provided by the Evaluator should be written in a manner that would justify and explain the specific score provided for each criterion.** Proposals should be judged on merit and scored as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. If significant shortcomings are identified (including in budget issues such as size, structure, allocation, aid intensity etc.), this must be reflected by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned. **No recommendations for improving Proposals should be provided.**

12. Please note that:

- Proposal Part B – Technical Annex has a **max page limit of 20 pages**. Any excess pages must be disregarded and not taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation.
- Annexes should only include the information described in the Call for Proposals (e.g. Annex I should only include Curricula Vitae). Any extra information that might be included must be disregarded and not taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation.
- Any hyperlinks that direct to information beyond what is provided in the proposal, should not be considered by the evaluators for the evaluation of the proposal.

13. In Part II of the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are asked to provide supplementary comments (but no scores) with regards to:

- the need for an Ethics Review for the Proposal under evaluation,
- any potential negative impacts and/or risks to the environment stemming from the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the Project's expected results/products, and
- the degree to which the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced.

14. A positive reply to the first question would mean that the Proposal should **undergo an Ethics Review** before a funding decision can be reached, whereas a positive reply to the second question should be **reflected in the comments and scores** provided for individual criteria, if applicable. Finally, the reply to the third question will be taken into account as one of the **ranking factors** for Proposals eligible for funding that have achieved equal Evaluation Scores, when budget restrictions apply.

15. Information relevant to both the evaluation criteria and the issues for which supplementary comments are requested (please refer to point 13 above) can be found throughout the Proposal and, thus, Evaluators are advised to study it thoroughly before starting their work. References to the most relevant Sections of the Proposal (Part B) for each criterion / supplementary issue can be found in the next section of this document.

16. It is noted that participants will secure funding through national resources and therefore, Project Proposals are submitted by the project participants at national level, at their respective national funding organisation. Through the "Bilateral Collaborations" Programme, the RIF financially supports the Cypriot organisations participating in the joint projects, and therefore, **Evaluators are expected to give emphasis on evaluating the role, activities etc. of the Cypriot partners**. The final selection of the Proposals to be funded will be made by the Joint Cyprus – Greece Committee, based on the evaluation results of both countries.

## PART I – EVALUATION

### COMPATIBILITY WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE PROGRAMME AND THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- Compatibility with the Objectives of the Programme and the Call for Proposals.
- Compatibility with the selected S3Cy Priority Sector / Sub-sector / Focus Area ([Digital Technologies, Agri-food, Marine and Maritime Ecosystems, Renewable Energy Sources, Health](#))
- Compatibility of the proposed type(s) of research activities with those allowed by the Programme/Call for Proposals (As [selected](#) in “Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget” and [analysed](#) in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”).
- Compatibility with the proposed Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) (This specific Programme/Call for Proposals addresses research activities the majority of which should fall within TRL [4-8].
- Compatibility with the “Do No Significant Harm” principle as per Article 17 of Regulation (EU) No 2020/852<sup>1</sup> on the establishment of a framework to facilitate sustainable investment (EU Taxonomy Regulation). The proposed methodology must not include or support activities that could cause significant harm to any of the six environmental objectives of the Taxonomy Regulation.

**Please note that a proposal should be deemed incompatible if it fails to fulfill any of the abovementioned compatibility criteria.**

The relevant information can be found in:

1. [Section “General Profile of the Project Proposal” and “Aid Intensity” Table](#) in “Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”, and
2. [Sections B1 & 4](#) in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.

*\*As a general guideline, if the majority of the proposal’s activities lies outside any of the compatibility requirements, then the proposal should be judged as ‘out of scope’.*

*\* RIF would like to draw the Evaluators’ attention to the requirement that Projects must fall within Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) 4-7 in compliance with the relevant definitions adopted by the EU. Within this context, the Evaluator for each Proposal should provide a [fully justified assessment](#) on whether the Proposal is compatible with the proposed TRLs.*

The Technology Readiness Levels adopted by the EU are the following:

- TRL 1 - basic principles observed,
- TRL 2 - technology concept formulated,
- TRL 3 - experimental proof of concept,
- TRL 4 - technology validated in lab,
- TRL 5 - technology validated in relevant environment,
- TRL 6 - technology demonstrated in relevant environment,
- TRL 7 - system prototype demonstration in operational environment,
- TRL 8 - system complete and qualified,

TRL 9 - actual system proven in operational environment (competitive manufacturing in the case of key enabling technologies).

### 1. EXCELLENCE (40%)

<sup>1</sup> <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32020R0852&from=EN>

*The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:*

- *Quality of Project Objectives.*
- *Degree of Project Innovation and Originality in relation to the existing knowledge (state-of-the-art) at international level.*
- *Soundness, credibility and feasibility of the proposed concept.*
- *Justification for the selection of the involved research teams, particularly the Collaboration Country Organisation(s) (CCO).*
- *Degree of collaboration between partners from the two countries.*
- *Relevance of the proposed research activities (industrial research and experimental development) with the Project's and Call's objectives.*

*The relevant information can be found in [Sections B1 and B2](#) in "Proposal Part B – Technical Annex".*

## **2. ADDED VALUE AND BENEFIT (30%)**

*The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:*

- *Scientific and/or technological and/or social and/or economic impact at national and international level and measures to maximize it.*
- *Effectiveness of the proposed measures for the exploitation and dissemination of results for achieving maximum Project visibility (including the management of intellectual property rights).*
- *Added value generated through this cooperation and prospects for further collaboration between the participating research teams.*

*The relevant information can be found in [Sections B3 & 4](#) in "Proposal Part B – Technical Annex".*

## **3. IMPLEMENTATION (30%)**

*The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:*

- *Completeness and appropriateness of the proposed work, the allocation of the various activities, the timetable and the budget.*
- *Effectiveness of the proposed methodology for the implementation of the deliverables.*
- *Completeness, quality and capacity of the Consortium and the CCO(s) (qualifications /*

expertise / experience / available resources and infrastructures) for the joint qualitative implementation of the Project (at the level of Organisations and/or individuals) and achievement of the proposed objectives.

- Suitability and adequacy of the proposed coordination and management activities, including identification and handling of potential risks.

The relevant information can be found in:

1. [“Project Budget Overview”](#) and [“Aid Intensity” Tables](#) in [“Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”](#),
2. [Sections B4-6](#) in [“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”](#), and
3. [Annex I – Curricula Vitae](#).

*\*Including a validation of the selected distribution (%) of proposed type(s) of research activities per Partner, available in [“Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”](#).*

**Important Note:**

- The Consortium is presented in [“Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”](#) and is analysed in [Section B5 “Consortium and Resources to be Committed”](#) in [“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”](#). If any inconsistencies between Part A and Part B are observed with regards to the proposed participating organisations, Part A should be the one considered as valid for evaluation purposes.

## **PART II - SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS**

QUESTION
<p>Do you believe that any part of the Proposal under evaluation (e.g. methodology, Work Packages and activities, expected results, products etc.) requires to undergo an Ethics Review (e.g. a bioethical assessment by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee)?</p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in <a href="#">Sections B4</a> and <a href="#">B7</a> in <a href="#">“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”</a>.</i></p>
<p>Do you believe that the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the expected results/products could have any potential negative impacts and/or pose risks to the environment?</p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in <a href="#">Sections B4</a> and <a href="#">B7</a> in <a href="#">“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”</a>.</i></p>
<p>Do you believe that the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced, both in terms of its research content as well as the key research personnel to be involved in its implementation?</p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in <a href="#">Sections B4</a> and <a href="#">B5</a> in <a href="#">“Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”</a>.</i></p>

**\*Note:**

The RIF recognizes that evaluators play a critical role in ensuring excellence in the funded research and, therefore, acknowledges the importance of integrating in the proposals gender and/or sex analysis. Please

*take a minute to consult the following informative videos (<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hlceez1Dx5E>) that have been developed by the Canadian Institute for Gender and Health to guide evaluators when assessing Health-related proposals. The information provided in the videos may also apply when assessing proposals in other thematic areas.*