

## **ANEXA 3 – Fișă de evaluare (*Evaluation Sheet*)**

### **1. Principal Investigator (60%)**

1.1 How would you rate the PI's professional prestige and international visibility in his/her research field? (20%)

1.2 How do you assess the quality of the PI's publications in his/her field of research? (15%).

1.3 How relevant is the PI's expertise, as derived from his/her publications and background, for the proposed objectives? (15%).

1.4 How would you rate the level of originality and creativity of the previous results of the PI? (10%)

### **2. Proposal and budget (40%)**

2.1 Significance. How would you rate the level of importance of the specific problem studied and the potential impact of the proposed objectives for science, society or technology? (10%)

2.2 Approach. To what extent are the methods, design and investigation tools adequately selected and/or developed, well integrated, well reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project? Does the applicant acknowledge potential problem areas and consider alternative approaches ? (10%).

2.3 Innovation. Is the project original and innovative? For example: Does the project challenge existing paradigms or address an innovative hypothesis or critical barrier to progress in the field? Does the project develop new methods/technologies or significantly extend/improve previous ones? Does the project employ novel concepts, approaches, tools, or technologies within the specific area? (10%)

2.4 Work plan and resources. How appropriate and well adapted is the work plan for achieving the goals of this project, and how likely is it that the goals be achieved within the proposed timescale and resources, taking into account the existing and newly acquired resources and infrastructure? (5%)

2.5 How adequate is the proposed budget, based on:

- i) the type of research activities envisioned (theoretical research, experimental research)?
- ii) the proposed expenditure on personal mobility related to the project (conferences, networking activities, visits to other labs, etc)?
- iii) the aim of expanding the research infrastructure in the PI's laboratory?

Please comment and/or suggest possible corrections.

(5%)

### **Recommendations for evaluators:**

- a) Please give a note for each subcriteria: 0 – absent, 1 – very poor, 2 – poor, 3 – fair, 4 – good, 5 – very good;
- b) The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each of the subcriteria weighed by the corresponding percentage and multiplying by 20 (final score between 0 and 100);
- c) Please add comments in support of your evaluation, for each of the subcriteria.