

Eracobuild, Sustainable Renovation Call 2009 – ANNEX 1 Guidelines for project evaluation - Criteria

1. Context and motivation for the guidelines

The Sustainable Renovation Call 2009 will generate plenty of highly interesting project proposals with competent teams and a sound mix of countries/regions. As stated in the call text, the evaluation procedure will be set up as follows:

- Formal eligibility check of the common proposal by NICE
- National/regional pre-evaluation of eligibility
- Evaluation by an international expert panel with ranking of proposals
- Formal national/regional funding approval

All common proposals are first checked by NICE for formal eligibility. Proposals which fail this formal eligibility check will be rejected without substantive consideration as stated in the call text. All other proposals will be forwarded to the full evaluation procedure. The three-stage evaluation procedure begins with the national/regional eligibility check to determine whether the project proposal can be funded, according to national eligibility rules. The second step involves an international expert panel which ranks the proposals according to the criteria below. After the international expert panel ranking has been determined, a final decision on projects to be funded will be decided at the funders meeting taking into account the budget availability of each funding partner and the usage of the total funding available for the Call. The ranking produced by the expert panel is recognised by the funding bodies and can only be changed for cogent reasons. The formal decision of what projects to fund is taken by the national/regional funding bodies.

Evaluation criteria applicable to Collaborative project proposals		
Scientific and Innovative Quality “Scientific and innovative excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)”	Project Implementation “Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”	Impact “Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives • Progress beyond the state-of-the-art • Quality and effectiveness of the scientific methodology and associated work plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures • Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants • Quality of the consortium as a whole (including interdisciplinarity, complementarity, balance of workload per country) • Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribution, at the national and European level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity • Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property

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

The relevance of a proposal will be considered in relation to the topic(s) of the given call, and to the objectives of a call. These aspects will be integrated in the application of the criterion "Scientific quality". When a proposal is partially relevant because it only marginally addresses the topic(s) of the call, or if only part of the proposal addresses the topic(s), this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected on eligibility grounds.

Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Half marks can be given. Proposals failing to reach an average >3 will be rejected. The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:

- 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*
- 1 - Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.*
- 2 - Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.*
- 3 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.*
- 4 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.*
- 5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*