

## Guidance notes for proposal evaluation (peer reviewer)

Dear expert,

Please find attached the evaluation form for assessing proposals submitted to the latest 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 your evaluation in a short report**.

Specific questions to French-German proposals are also included. These are to be addressed only when applicable.

For French- only proposals, please, leave the boxes empty.

### 1) Marks and comments:

**Please fill in the heading of the report with the proposal acronym and the name of the coordinator**

You are kindly requested to score and comment on 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 stated 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 clearly express the difference between what is a piece of advice and 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 3 categories (A, B or C).

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

| Total sum | Group (Letter) | Meaning  |
|-----------|----------------|--|
| [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 weaknesses. Advice can be provided for increasing the strengths.  |

### 2) Consolidated report

The consolidated report 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 used eventually in the final report . 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 state a brief description of the proposal, a critical analysis of its aims and a few lines summary on how each evaluation criteria was addressed by the proposal should follow.*

*A detailed description of the strengths and weaknesses should be provided as bullet points (copy/paste from the criteria comments is possible). Please also consider making a clear hierarchy within the bullet points, showing 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, it is kindly requested to strongly justify why.*

**Please send a signed electronic version of your report to [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) before DD/MM/YY or by fax to +33 142 759 319 to the attention of Ms Alice P  legrin.**

*NB: Evaluation reports of French-German proposals will be transferred to the DFG.*

## 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 German and French collaboration. 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 its requirements?
- Does the proposal address the objectives of ALIA?
- Is the proposal relevant within the European and international context?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an ability to gather and integrate different scientific disciplines and justify clearly its anchorage to the food ( industry / consumers) area?
- Is the proposal sufficiently innovative, cutting edge, audacious, 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 with respect to the technical and scientific aspects?
- Does the proposal integrate interdisciplinarity and multidisciplinary within the proposed work?
- Does the proposal manage to well 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 choices suitable to reach the objectives of the proposal?
- Are the data management and analyses suitable to reach the objectives of proposal?
- Is the proposal structured with clear working hypotheses?

**For French-German projects: Does the proposal show even 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 address well the planned activities?
- Does the structure of the proposed work take scientific and technological risks but ensure the readiness of the structural background (availability of equipment, alternative B in case of failure, delay...)?
- Are the amount and the description of milestones and deliverables sufficient to ensure a smooth follow up of the proposed work?

<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

- Does the global management of the project sufficiently address the requirement of the proposed work (time dedicated by coordinator, planned meetings, dedicated budget...)
- **Could the German part or the French part of the project be managed alone?**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Criterion 4: Global impact of the proposal</b> |
|---|

*To what extent*

- Does the proposal state and justify robust dissemination plans towards the
  - Scientific community
  - Policy makers
  - Consumers (specific targeted groups)
  - Industry?
- May the expected results impact the economy, the regulation, the consumer's behaviour and /or health, the environment?
- Is the implementation plan adequately described and sounding with respect to the proposed activities?
- Will the proposal contribute to increase the competitiveness of the food industry and/or the awareness of policy makers and/or the well-being of the 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?**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Criterion 5: Quality of the consortium</b> |
|---|

*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 discipline traditionally underrepresented within food and nutrition research involved (mathematics, sociology...)?
- Is the core team of the proposal showing its ability to manage the project?
- Are industrial partners actively involved within the proposal?
- Do you think the industry is sufficiently represented in the consortium?

**For French-German projects: Are the teams sufficiently complementary and scientifically excellent?**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Criterion 6: Mobilisation of resources (see annex)</b> |
|---|

*To what extent*

- Is the requested funding adequate to the proposed work?
- Is the proposed work feasible within the project duration?
- Are the personals adequately mobilised (permanent/temporary staff, senior/junior scientist, number of person. month/proposed activities) as per the text of the call?

*Please also whenever relevant,*

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

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

|                 |         |             |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|
| Proposal number | Acronym | Coordinator |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|

**Evaluation report  
Scores and comments**

The following pages will have to be sent to [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) before **DD/MM/YY**

For guidance, please refer to the list of questions.

|   |
|---|
| <b>Criterion 1: Relevance of the proposal to the call</b> |
|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p align="center"><b>Relevance of the proposal to the call</b></p> <p><i>Comments (approx. 5 lines)</i></p><br><br><br><br><br> | <p><b>Score<sup>2</sup></b></p><br><br><br><br><br><p><b>/5</b></p> |
|---|---|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Criterion 2: Technical and scientific quality of the proposal</b> |
|--|

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Technical and scientific quality of the proposal</b></p> <p><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p><br><br><br><br><br>                    | <p><b>Score<sup>1</sup></b></p><br><br><br><br><br><p><b>/5</b></p> |
| <p><b>Technical and scientific quality of the German part of the proposal</b></p> <p><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p><br><br><br><br><br> | <p><b>/5</b></p>  |

<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 | Coordinator |
|-----------------|---------|-------------|

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Overall mark</b>  |                            |
| Sum of the score of each criterion (please, indicate whereas a “?” is stated above)  | <b>Score</b><br><b>/30</b> |
| <b>Overall mark for the project<sup>3</sup> (A, B or C)</b>  | <b>A B C</b>               |
|  |                            |
| <b>Overall mark for the German part of the project<sup>4</sup> (A, B or C)</b>   | <b>A B C</b>               |
| Sum of the score of each criterion (please, indicate whereas a “?” is stated above)  | <b>Score</b><br><b>/30</b> |
|  |                            |
| <p><b><u>For all projects: Feel free to state any confidential comment to the Scientific Board for the ANR programme:</u></b></p><br><br><br><p><b><u>For French-German projects: Feel free to state any confidential comment to the German Scientific Board (DFG/Fachkollegium) of the programme:</u></b></p><br><br><br> |                            |

<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 = [25-30]**; Excellent project, should be proposed for funding.

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

<sup>4</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 = [25-30]**; Excellent project, should be proposed for funding.

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

|                            |                 |   |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|
| Proposal number            | <b>Acronym</b>  | Coordinateur  |
| <b>Consolidated report</b> |                 | <b>Can partly be used to draft the evaluation report that will be communicated to the applicant</b> |
| <b>Proposal ID:</b>        | <b>Acronym:</b> |   |

| <b>Comments of the referee</b>   |
|--|
| <p><u>Introduction:</u><i>(should state a brief description of the proposal and a critical analysis of its aim)</i><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p>  |
| <p><i>For French-German proposals: <b>Introduction:</b></i><i>(should state a brief description of the German part of the proposal and a critical analysis of its aim)</i><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p> |
| <p><u>Strengths of the proposal:</u><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>  |
| <p><i>For French-German proposals: <b>Strengths of the German part of the proposal:</b></i><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>   |
| <p><u>Weaknesses of the proposal:</u><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>   |
| <p><i>For French-German proposals: <b>Weaknesses of the German part of the proposal:</b></i><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>  |
| <p><u>Recommendations and advice:</u><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines)</i></p>  |
| <p><i>For French-German proposals: <b>Recommendation and advice for the German part of the proposal</b></i><br/><i>Comments (approx. 5 to 10 lines, bullet points)</i></p>   |

✂-----  
To be removed .

**Signature and sending**

We need at first an electronic version of this report even without signature at [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) before DD/MM/YY

|                 |                |              |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Proposal number | <b>Acronym</b> | Coordinateur |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|

**Then, please do not forget to sign the form.**

The signed version can be sent either by e-mail at [expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr](mailto:expertise-anr@paris.inra.fr) (with an electronic signature) or by fax to +33 142 759 319 to the attention of Ms Alice Pélegrin

|  |  |                         |  |
|--|--|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Proposal acronym :</b>  |  | <b>Proposal Number:</b> |  |
| <b>Name:</b>   |  | <b>First Name:</b>      |  |
| Referee's area of expertise (key words):   |  |                         |  |
|  |  |                         |  |
|  |  |                         |  |
| Signature:   |  | Date:                   |  |
| I hereby attest that I honestly carried out this evaluation and that I have no conflict of interest, direct or indirect with the above mentioned proposal. |  |                         |  |

**ALIA 2009– ANNEX  
FRENCH BUDGET RULES**

|                                     | <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>• overhead costs up to 80 % (This will depend 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 %<br>(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.