

Individual Evaluation Form

Proposal No. : RF_ - P_ - 08____	Acronym :
Research programme: Research Fund for Coal and Steel	
Type of proposal: Research <input type="checkbox"/> Pilot/Demonstration <input type="checkbox"/>	

I. Evaluation summary

Please carry out the detailed evaluation on the following pages and then summarise your results here. Scores for the evaluation criteria should reflect the quality of the proposal as submitted by the proposers.

Criterion (scored 0 to 5)*	Mark
1. Scientific and technical approach (<i>if < 3, proposal is eliminated</i>)	
2. Innovative content (<i>if < 3, proposal is eliminated</i>)	
3. Consistency of resources and quality of partnership (<i>unrealistic budgeting should result in very low scoring</i>)	
4. Industrial interest and scientific / technical prospects	
5. Community added value and contribution to EU policies	
TOTAL SCORE (maximum 25)	

II. Recommendation

a) Please summarize <u>in your own words & in one single sentence</u> the main objective of the project: The proposal aims at
b) Overall comments (highlighting strengths and weaknesses in a <i>concise and comprehensive</i> manner) :

III. Conflict of interest and confidentiality declaration

I undertake to inform the Commission staff immediately if I discover any conflict of interest, direct or indirect, with any proposal that I am asked to evaluate or which is the subject of discussion in any evaluation meeting at which I am present. I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest. I declare that I will not reveal any detail to third parties of any proposal submitted for evaluation without the express written approval of the Commission.
--

Name:	Signature:	Date:

IV. Detailed evaluation**CRITERION 1. SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL APPROACH**

1.1. Does the proposal address the scientific and technological issues of the RFCS programme objectives?	
1.2. To what extent do the applicants demonstrate their knowledge of the international state-of-the-art of related work (adequate documentary evidence, including results of current or completed RTD projects)?	
1.3. Is the feasibility of the proposed work convincingly addressed?	
1.4. Are the proposed methods and techniques clearly described and well explained? Is the overall approach suitable for achieving the project objectives?	
Overall mark (out of 5)	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 10px;">⇒</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px; display: flex; gap: 5px;"> 012345 </div> </div>

CRITERION 2. INNOVATIVE CONTENT

2.1. Please summarise the innovative aspects of the proposal. To which extent do the expected results lead to a progress beyond the current state-of-the-art? May the nature of the proposed research work be qualified as incremental or breakthrough?	
2.2 Does the proposal clearly describe the claimed innovative aspects?	
2.3 Please assess the span of the expected findings: Do these offer the perspective of a wider & general use or are their innovative value of restricted use for a specific application and/or product?	
Overall mark (out of 5)	<div style="display: flex; align-items: center;"> <div style="margin-right: 10px;">⇒</div> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px; display: flex; gap: 5px;"> 012345 </div> </div>

CRITERION 3. CONSISTENCY OF RESOURCES AND QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP

3.1 Is the work plan adequate? Is it clearly described & well defined? Are the scheduled tasks responding to the set objectives?	
3.2. To what extent are the manpower, technical and financial resources in line with the tasks described in the different Work Packages?	
3.3. Do the partners fulfil complementary tasks without duplication of work?	
3.4. Is the partnership appropriate to achieve the expected results? To what extent are the profiles and the skills of the partners complementary?	

3.5. Do bar charts clearly show partner/task inter-dependencies? Is the project scheduling realistic and adequate?		
3.6. If applicable: Is the need to organise a workshop within the proposed research work clearly identified? Is the estimated cost realistic?		
Overall mark (out of 5)	⇒	0 1 2 3 4 5

CRITERION 4. INDUSTRIAL INTEREST AND SCIENTIFIC / TECHNICAL PROSPECTS

4.1. What are the industrial benefits for the related sector? Are the main project deliverables in terms of industrial interest, scientific/technical prospect and strategic relevance clearly identified?		
4.2. What impact will the expected project results have on the competitiveness of the related sector? Is this clearly explained?		
4.3. For coal proposals: Which of the current priorities listed in Chapter 5.1 of Volume I of the Information Package are being addressed in the proposal? For steel proposals: Which of the current priorities listed in Chapter 5.2 of Volume I of the Information Package are being addressed in the proposal?		
4.4. Are issues on the use and/or implementation of the results addressed and credible? Do these include modelling, simulation and/or field testing?		
4.5. Does the proposal include relevant industrial participation?		
Overall mark (out of 5)	⇒	0 1 2 3 4 5

CRITERION 5. COMMUNITY ADDED VALUE AND CONTRIBUTION TO EU POLICIES

5.1. Is there a clear need and clear benefit to carry out the project at European level instead of at national or private level?		
5.2. Does the proposal show strategic importance to the related sector? Will the expected results be transferable throughout the European Coal or Steel industry?		
5.3. Which local impact can be expected from the project results on health, safety & the workplace conditions of the operators?		
5.4. Which global impact can be expected from the project results on the preservation of the environment, natural resources & energy?		
Overall mark (out of 5)	⇒	0 1 2 3 4 5

