

## Annex to the evaluation concept of the COMET Programme (Version April 1<sup>st</sup> 2015)

### Evaluation Form K-Projects Application (6<sup>th</sup> Call)

You are kindly asked to evaluate the proposal verbally in section I followed by a quantitative evaluation by marks in section II

“K Projects” present the so called “newcomer” line of COMET, allowing the entry into the excellence programme. Thus the evaluation should take into consideration high demands on the quality of the application as well as a focus on application oriented research.

#### Section I: Written Evaluation

Please justify your answers with brief explanations

---

(Excerpts of the report will be made available in anonymous form to the applicants)

#### ***I. General Criteria for COMET***

##### **1. Research programme defined jointly by science and industry with a mid- to long term perspective**

###### 1.1 State of the art and novelty of the research:

- Are the goals clearly presented?
- Is the work scientifically and technologically relevant and current?
- Does the research programme correspond to the international state of the art in the field?
- Is enough attention paid to related work performed by other groups in related subject areas?
- Is the work directed towards providing new knowledge of central scientific or technological interest?
- Are the approaches and methods chosen to address the goals likely to find widespread acceptance in the future?
- Are gender aspects adequately considered in the research field?

## 1.2 Relevance of the scientific and technological developments and innovations and their market potential:

- Will the proposed programme initiate relevant scientific and technological developments with a clearly recognizable innovative potential?
- Is the knowledge gained being processed and implemented in a manner that is targeted towards commercial applications?
- Do the markets being targeted have a lasting potential for development?
- Do the expected results have sufficient chance of being applied or marketed?

## **2. Research competence and connection to science**

### Assessment of the consortium's scientific quality:

- Are the consortium's scientific standing and its previous research activities sufficient to meet the programme's requirements?
- Are the key persons able to point to suitable reference projects? (publications, reference projects etc.)

## **3. Relevance of implementation in industry**

### Assessment of the consortium's quality with regard to the company partners:

- Is the proposed research programme useful in terms of commercial utilization? Are the relevant industrial partners involved?
- Are appropriate measures for technology transfer in place?
- Does the consortium's quality with regard to the company partners meet the programme's requirements and can the key company partners point to suitable reference projects?
- Is the consortium complete or should the number of partner firms be increased?

## **4. Quality of the cooperation between science and industry, coherence and quality of the consortium**

- Is all the required expertise present in the consortium? Is the consortium's ability appropriate to the proposed research programme, both in scientific and in industrial terms?

- Do the various subprojects complement one another in a sensible manner?
- Does the overall research programme show an “added value” and significant synergy effects compared with the sum of the individual projects?

#### **5. Management and implementation**

- Do the proposed organisational structure and management meet the actual needs?
- Do the milestones as well as the time schedules and the cost and financing planning, correspond to the research plans?

#### ***II. Target values***

- Have the applicants chosen appropriate target values for the project?

#### ***III. Contribution of the K-Project to Gender Aspects***

- Is there a fair gender balance of male and female researchers ensured in the context of all research projects and activities?

#### ***IV. Suggestions for overall improvements***

What changes and / or improvements should be considered? Which of these changes and / or improvements should be made immediately, which can be effected - insofar as can be judged - in the mid-term, over the course of the proposed project existence?

## Section II: Formal Evaluation

(Confidential to the funding organisation)

Please note that we make high demands on the quality of the applications. In all cases decisions are based on the written reviews from referees as well as on the numerical ratings they assign.

The evaluation scale is:

Excellent			Very good			Average				Below average				Unsatisfactory						
100	95	90	85	80	75	70	65	60	55	50	45	40	35	30	25	20	15	10	5	0

- "excellent" (100-86 points; only strengths, no relevant weaknesses)
- "very good" (85-71 points; much more strengths than weaknesses)
- "average" (70-51 points; strengths and weaknesses are equal)
- "below average" (50-31 points; much more weaknesses than strengths)
- "unsatisfactory" (30-0 points; only weaknesses, no relevant strengths)

### Part 1 – Evaluation of the research programme by criteria

Please provide assessments of the following aspects of the research programme by allocating marks according to the scale given above.

Please fill in the rating boxes (0-100 per criterion):

Criteria	Rating
<b>1.1</b> State of the art and novelty of the research:	0-100
<b>1.2</b> Relevance of the scientific - technological developments and innovations and their market potential	0-100
<b>2.</b> Research competence and connection to science	0-100
<b>3.</b> Relevance of implementation in industry	0-100
<b>4.</b> Quality of the cooperation between science and industry; coherence and quality of the consortium	0-100
<b>5.</b> Management and implementation	0-100

**Part 2 - Overall evaluation of the K- Project**

You are kindly requested to record your evaluation of the entire application: (please mark a number by a cross):

- "excellent" (the application should receive top ranking)
- "very good" (the application is worthy of funding)
- "average" (the application is worthy of funding only after major revision)
- "below average" (the application has serious weaknesses and deficiencies)
- "unsatisfactory" (the application is not worthy of funding)

**Part 3 – Confidential remarks**

We would ask you to use this section of your review only for any confidential remarks concerning the application. They will not be forwarded to the applicants.