

ANEXA 3 - Fișa de evaluare (*Evaluation Sheet*)

1. Principal Investigator¹ and Mentor (60%)

1.1 (35%) Please assess the **excellence of the PI's research results**, as demonstrated by the list of publications and patents (see sections B1, B2 and B3). Please comment on the originality of the PI's results, on their impact on the state of the art, and on their relevance for the present project.

1.2 (25%) Please assess the **mentors's capacity to autonomously manage scientific activities** as a researcher and/or research group leader, as well as **the visibility and prestige** in her/his international peer group (see sections C1, C2 and C3). Please comment on the mentors's publication record, her/his leadership abilities, the ability to attract funds, and his/her level of international recognition. Please take into account only those facts that you consider relevant for the current proposal.

2. Proposal (40%)

2.1 (20%) Please assess the **overall solution** described in the proposal in the context of the current state-of-the-art and its potential future impact (see section *D1, D2*). **Please comment** on the following aspects: (1) significance and the difficulty of the problem being addressed; (2) the originality of the proposed solution and the appropriateness of the objectives; (3) the potential to advance knowledge in the field and to influence the direction of thought and activity.

2.2 (20%) Please assess the **method and work plan** as defined by the proposal as a concrete approach to reach the envisioned solution (see section *D3*). **Please comment** on how well selected are the methods, design and investigation tools and on the effectiveness off the work-plan within the proposed timescale and resources. Have potential problem areas been appropriately discussed, and have alternative approaches been mentioned?

2.3 Please assess the adequacy of the **proposed budget** and suggest possible corrections (see sections *D3* and *D4*). Please comment on the match between the work-plan and the budget, as well as on the appropriateness of the mobility (conferences, work-visits) and infrastructure acquisitions included in the budget. (There will be no score associated with this item, but the expert opinion will be useful to the funding agency in negotiating the precise financial award.)

¹ PI is the post-doctoral applicant

Recommendations for evaluators:

1. Choose a score **only after** you wrote the comments; make sure that the comments are **concrete, complete** (i.e. address all questions) and **consistent** with the semantics of each score, namely:

0	ABSENT	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to <i>missing or incomplete information</i>
1	POOR	The criterion is addressed in an <i>inadequate manner</i> , or there are <i>serious inherent weaknesses</i>
2	FAIR	While the proposal <i>broadly addresses</i> the criterion, there are <i>significant weaknesses</i>
3	GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion <i>well</i> , although <i>improvements would be necessary</i>
4	VERY GOOD	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although <i>certain improvements are still possible</i>
5	EXCELLENT	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor

2. When scoring use the full scale! **Half marks may be given.**

3. If scores **3** or **4** are used (improvements are necessary/possible) make sure the required improvements are described! If score **1** or **2** are used make sure the inherent/significant weaknesses are described in concrete terms!

Note: The final score will be calculated as a sum of the grades for each of the seven subcriteria weighed by the corresponding percentage and multiplying by 20 (final score between 0 and 100).