

## **Guidance note for proposal evaluation (rapporteur and reader)**

*Dear expert,*

*Please find attached the evaluation form for assessing proposals that have been submitted to the recent call of the programme ALIA.*

*In order to be able to assess the proposals, you are kindly requested to read the text of the call for proposals.*

*This form consists of 4 parts:*

- \* This guidance note.*
- \* List of guidance questions for each criterion.*
- \* Frames for carrying out the evaluation of the proposal (notes),*
- \* Template to **summarise the evaluation in a short report.***

*For responses to the joint French- German proposals additional specific questions are also included. These are to be addressed when applicable.*

### **1) Marks and comments:**

***Please fill in the heading of the report with the proposal acronym and the name of the coordinator and report the individual scores of each peer reviewer.***

*You are kindly requested to score and comment each of the 6 criteria. Your comments can be listed as bullet points as long as these provide sufficient information to clearly justify your score.*

*For each criterion, the scores are between 0 and 5 (integer only, no half point).*

*The values mean the following: **5=Excellent; 4=Very Good, 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=Not addressed or Out of scope.***

*In some cases, it might happen that you are not in position to assess some of the issues, therefore a “?” can be given instead of a digit. The use of the “?” should be limited and strongly justified.*

*It is also important that the comments clearly state what are the strengths or the weaknesses of the project, and express the difference between what is a piece of advice from what is a requested improvement.*

***As guidance, you will find a list of questions covering each criterion. These questions do not necessarily apply to the same extent to every proposal.***

*Summing up the scores for each criterion will help you to rank the proposal into one of the 3 categories (A, B or C).*

***The overall mark should reflect the overall impression of the expert on the proposal:***

<i>Total sum</i>	<i>Group (Letter)</i>	<i>Meaning</i>
[0-20]	C	Not ready or not pertinent for funding. Presence of weaknesses which cannot be corrected without a major rewriting / rethinking of the proposal and or of the research activities.
[21-25]	B	Good proposal with some minor weaknesses which can be corrected. Minor improvements are required. These issues need to be discussed
[26-30]	A	Excellent proposal. Should be proposed for funding. No evident weaknesses. Advice for increasing the strengths of the proposal should be offered.

## **2) Consolidated report**

*The rapporteur is in charge of drafting the report. The reader can provide complementary views during the discussions.*

*The consolidated report summarises all of the expert opinions including yours and should reflect the overall mark (i.e. an excellent proposal should not have more weaknesses than strengths). The comments should be drafted in order to be sent to the coordinator of the proposal. It is therefore advised to write sentences making robust assessments with clear justifications. Also, it is recommended to clearly state the difference between what is a recommendation or advice and what is a requested improvement.*

*The introduction should give a brief description of the proposal, a critical analysis of its aims and a few lines in summary should be given on how each evaluation criteria was addressed by the proposal.*

*A detailed description of the project's strengths and weaknesses should be provided as bullet points (copy/paste from the criteria comments is possible). Please also show a clear hierarchy within the bullet points, listing clearly what is important before what is secondary.*

*The last part should contain the recommendations and advice for improvement. This part is particularly sensitive for proposals which will be marked "C" in order to encourage the applicants to improve their proposal and to be able to eventually submit it to other call(s).*

*In the case of a proposal considered as being out of scope, we would request you to strongly justify the reasons for reaching the decision.*

**Please send your evaluation (electronic version) to [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) before DD/MM/YY**

## Guidance for Evaluation report

### Marks and comment

The following questions are to be used as guidance and all are not necessarily to be answered except questions in bold font for the German and French collaborative projects. However, for highly ambitious and expensive projects, most of these questions should be addressed.

#### Criterion 1: Relevance of the proposal to the call

To what extent:

- Does the proposal fit within the themes of the call for proposals and meet all of its requirements?
- Does the proposal address the objectives of ALIA?
- Is the proposal likely to complement, fill gaps in information or help with the interpretation of other work that is underway in Europe or internationally?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an ability to gather and integrate different scientific disciplines and justify clearly its relevance to the food ( industry / consumers) sector?
- Is the proposal sufficiently innovative, cutting edge, radical, etc with respect to the call ?
- **For French-German projects: does the proposal fit with the selected topics<sup>1</sup>?**

#### Criterion 2: Technical and scientific quality of the proposal

To what extent:

- Does the proposal contribute to a significant scientific progress beyond the state of the art?
- Is the proposal innovative and original as far as the technical and scientific aspects are concerned?
- Does the proposal integrate interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary within the proposed work?
- Is the proposal structured with clear working hypotheses?
- Does the proposal manage to sensibly integrate unusual scientific disciplines?
- Does the proposal open new scientific and technical perspectives?
- Does the proposal contribute to an increase of knowledge (also in relation to the costs)
- Does the proposal contribute to unlock scientific bottlenecks?
- Are the methodological and technological approaches suitable to enable the objectives of the proposal to be achieved?
- Are the data management and analyses proposed suitable to ensure the validity of the proposed work?

**For French-German projects: Does the proposal show evenly-balanced and high quality research for both parts?**

#### Criterion 3: Project management; mastering the project as a tool for delivering scientific and technological results

To what extent

- Is the proposal structured as a project with clearly identified and judicious milestones, deliverable, and decisional trees?
- Does the proposal clearly delimit its scope?
- Is the schedule of the activities well planned with respect to the difficulty of the tasks?
- Does the proposal show strong interactions between the partners?
- Does the proposal constitute a project as a whole and not a sum of loosely or artificially linked activities?
- Do the proposed approach and the methodologies soundly address the planned activities?
- Are the quantity and the description of milestones and deliverables sufficient to ensure the progress of the proposed work can be successfully monitored?
- Does the overall management of the project sufficiently address the demands that the proposed work (time dedicated by coordinator, planned meetings, dedicated budget...) will make?

---

<sup>1</sup> 1. New models for joint research in animal and human nutrition,  
2. From physiology to the pathophysiology of diet-induced diseases,  
3. Connecting diet and metabolic control at the intestinal level  
For more information please see AAP text

- *Could the German part or the French part of the project be managed alone?*

#### **Criterion 4: Global impact of the proposal**

*To what extent*

- *Does the proposal state and justify robust dissemination plans towards the*
  - *Scientific community*
  - *Policy makers*
  - *Consumers (specific targeted groups)*
  - *Industry?*
- *To what extent are the expected results likely to have a significant impact on the economy, regulatory needs, the consumer's behaviour and /or health, as well as the environment?*
- *Is the implementation plan adequately described and sound with respect to the proposed activities?*
- *Will the proposal contribute to ensuring an increase in the competitiveness of the food industry and/or the needs of policy makers and/or the well-being of specific consumers groups?*
- *Will the food industry be the major beneficiary of the results?*

***For French-German projects: Does the proposal demonstrate sufficient integration between the partners of both countries to expect longer term collaboration?***

#### **Criterion 5: Quality of the consortium**

*If relevant, to what extent*

- *Are the partners well suited to the tasks?*
- *Do the scientific profiles of the participants fit to the allocated tasks?*
- *Is the scientific and technological excellence of the participants adequately described?*
- *Are partners from scientific disciplines traditionally underrepresented within food and nutrition research involved (mathematics, sociology...)?*
- *Does the core team of the proposal show its ability to successfully manage the project?*
- *Are industrial partners actively involved within the proposal?*
- *Do you think that the industry is sufficiently represented in the consortium?*

***For French-German projects: Are the teams sufficiently complementary and of equal scientific excellence?***

#### **Criterion 6: Mobilisation of resources (see annex)**

*To what extent*

- *Is the requested funding adequate to the proposed work?*
- *Is the proposed work feasible within the duration of the project?*
- *Are the personnel adequate in number and of sufficient skill to ensure the project's success? (permanent/temporary staff, senior/junior scientist, number of person. month/proposed activities)*

*Please also whenever relevant,*

- *State the level of industry involvement*
- *Propose amendments to the budget if you consider that there are major weaknesses (i.e. unrealistic costs, unbalanced financial categories...)?*

***For French-German projects: Are the financial contributions from the collaboration well balanced?***

Proposal number	Acronym	Name
-----------------	---------	------

**Evaluation grid for the rapporteur**

For each criterion, please refer to the list of questions provided.

<b>Criterion 1: Relevance of the proposal to the call</b>				
Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	<b>Relevance of the proposal to the call</b> <i>Comments (approx. 5 lines)</i>	<b>Score<sup>2</sup></b>
				<b>/5</b>
<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>		

<b>Criterion 2: Technical and scientific quality of the proposal</b>				
Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	<b>Technical and scientific quality of the proposal</b> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i>	<b>Score</b>
				<b>/5</b>
<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>		

<b>Criterion 3: Project management</b>				
Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	<b>Project management: mastering the project as a tool for delivering scientific and technological results</b> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i>	<b>Score</b>
				<b>/5</b>
<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>		

<b>Criterion 4: Overall impact of the proposal</b>				
Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	<b>Overall impact of the proposal</b> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i>	<b>Score</b>
				<b>/5</b>
<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>	<i>/5</i>		

<sup>2</sup> Consistency of the marks: 5=Excellent; 4=Very Good, 3=Good, 2=Fair, 1=Poor, 0=not addressed or out of scope, ?= not able to give a mark.

Proposal number	Acronym	Name
-----------------	---------	------

**Criterion 5: Quality of the consortium**

Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	Quality of the consortium <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i>	Score
/5	/5	/5		/5

**Criterion 6: Mobilisation of resources (see annex)**

Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3	Mobilisation of resources <i>Comments (approx. 5 lines)</i>	Score
/5	/5	/5		/5

If it is felt that the proposal shows some weaknesses from the financial point of view or that the requested budget is somehow inadequate or insufficiently justified or too high with respect to the proposed work, it is kindly requested the reviewer (rapporteur) highlights the need for a deeper financial analysis of the proposal to be carried out by ANR and the support unit during the negotiation. Does the project need a deeper financial analysis?  
YES      NO

**Overall mark**

Expert n°1	Expert n°2	Expert n°3		Score <sup>3</sup>
/30	/30	/30	Sum of the score of each criterion (please, indicate whereas a “?” is stated above)	/30
<b>Global mark for the project<sup>3</sup> (A, B or C)</b>				<b>A   B   C</b>

**For French-German projects: if the proposal is favourably assessed solely for the teams of one country, do you think these teams could be funded independently based on the technical and scientific quality of the project?**      YES      NO

*Comments:*

<sup>3</sup> The overall category must reflect the total score:

**C = [0-20]** ; not ready or not pertinent for funding;

**B = [21-25]**; Very Good project, Could be proposed for funding after minor improvements. These issues should be discussed during negotiation;

**A = [26-30]**; Excellent project, should be proposed for funding.

**No sub-category is allowed (neither A+ nor B-).**

Proposal number	Acronym	Name
-----------------	---------	------

**Evaluation report**

<b>CONSOLIDATED REPORT</b>	<b>Can partly be used to draft the final evaluation report that will be communicated to the coordinator of the proposal</b>
<b>Proposal ID:</b>	<b>Acronym:</b>

<b>Comments of the referee</b>
<p><u>Introduction:</u> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p>
<p><u>Strengths of the proposal<sup>4</sup>:</u> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>
<p><u>Weaknesses of the proposal<sup>4</sup>:</u> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>
<p><u>Recommendations and advice<sup>4</sup>:</u> <i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p>

**The electronic version of this report should be sent to [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) before DD/MM/YY**

<sup>4</sup> : For German-French projects, please indicate if your remarks concern more the French or the German part

**ALIA 2009— ANNEX  
BUDGET RULES IN FRENCH CONTEXT**

	<b>Public teams (universities, research institutes)</b>	<b>Private Teams (Firms, associations, ...)</b>
<b>Full cost scheme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanent staff cost</li> <li>• Additional costs scheme               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Temporary staff cost</li> <li>b) Equipment cost</li> <li>c) consumables and running costs</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permanent staff cost</li> <li>• Temporary staff cost</li> <li>• Provision for depreciation of the equipment on the project duration</li> <li>• consumables and running costs</li> <li>• Surrounding cost up to 80 % (It depends on the legal private statutes)</li> </ul>
<b>Eligible cost for subvention</b>	Additional costs scheme (a+b+c)	Full cost scheme
<b>Subvention rate</b>	100 %	25 to 35 % (45 % for SMEs)

*NB:* gross salaries

For junior staff:

- Post-doc scientist: 45 000 €/year (2 200 €/month)
- PhD Student: 30 000€/year (1 500€/month)
- Engineer: 40 000€/year (2000€/month)
- Technician: 30 000€/year (1 500€/month)

For senior staff:

The cost may be more than twice the indicative costs stated above.

*NB:* temporary staff must be limited. The rule is that their cost should be less than 50 % of the subvention requested. If not, it should be precisely justified.