



RESEARCH
& INNOVATION
FOUNDATION



THE RESEARCH AND INNOVATION FOUNDATION

PROGRAMMES

FOR RESEARCH, TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT AND

INNOVATION

“RESTART 2016 – 2020”

GUIDE FOR EVALUATORS & RAPPORTEURS

PROPOSAL DETAILS	
PILLAR	II. SUSTAINABLE RTDI SYSTEM
PROGRAMME	Horizon Europe – 2 nd Opportunity EIC
CALL IDENTIFIER	OPPTY_EIC/0323/XXXX



**Funded by the
European Union**
NextGenerationEU



Republic of Cyprus

GUIDELINES AND GENERAL INFORMATION FOR EVALUATORS & RAPPORTEURS

1. The Proposal under evaluation was submitted under the “**Horizon Europe – 2nd Opportunity EIC**” Programme of the Research and Innovation Foundation (RIF) Programmes for Research, Technological Development and Innovation “**RESTART 2016-2020**” for the period **05/2022 – 03/2023**.
2. The objectives of the abovementioned Programme/Call and all necessary definitions and procedures are described in the relevant **Call for Proposals**.
3. Before producing the Individual Evaluation Reports and the Consensus Report, the Evaluators and the Rapporteur are expected to study the relevant Proposal thoroughly. This consists of:
 - Proposal Part A – General Information & Budget,
 - Proposal Part B – Technical Annex,
 - Annex I – Curricula Vitae (Optional submission), and
 - Annex II – Call Specific Information (Mandatory submission):
 - Copy of the EU Notification Letter to the participants, on the evaluation result of the third evaluation stage (face-to-face interviews) and the Evaluation Summary Reports for the second and third evaluation (Remote Evaluation of Full Proposal and Face-to-face interviews), and
 - Copy of the Full Proposal submitted to the EU under the EIC Accelerator Programme.
4. A two-stage Evaluation Procedure will be followed, where each Proposal should first be evaluated by **three (3) Independent Evaluators**. An **additional (4th) expert is assigned as Rapporteur** for each Proposal in order to guide and facilitate the preparation of a Consensus Report.
5. The three (3) Independent Evaluators and the Rapporteur form the Consensus Group (the Group).
6. Evaluators and Rapporteurs will be contacted by the RIF Staff via email message, and should return a signed «Evaluation Agreement and Conflict of Interest Statement» for the proposal under evaluation, within **three (3) calendar days** from the receipt of the invitation by the RIF to participate in the evaluation procedure. Evaluators and Rapporteurs should also register in the RIF’s IRIS (Innovation Research Information System) Portal (<https://iris.research.org.cy/#/>) before gaining any access to the Proposal Documents.

7. All relevant documents for evaluation will be sent to the Evaluators (via email message) by the responsible RIF Staff.

Stage I – Preparation of Individual Evaluation Reports by the Evaluators:

8. As a first step, each of the three (3) Evaluators provides his/her own independent assessment by filling in his / her own Individual Evaluation Report Form, which consists of 3 Parts.
9. In Part I, the Evaluator should provide:
 - a. A fully justified assessment on whether the Proposal is **compatible with** the objectives of the specific Call of Proposals.
 - b. Evaluation comments assessing each of the Evaluation Criteria.

The Evaluator will not proceed with the assessment of the evaluation criteria should a Proposal fail the compatibility assessment.

10. The evaluation criteria on which the scientific evaluation will be based are described in the Call for Proposals and the Part I section of the present document, below.
11. Evaluators are requested to provide detailed comments for each one of the Evaluation Criteria. No Evaluation Scores should be provided.
12. **Comments provided by the Evaluators should be written in a manner that would justify and explain the Evaluators' opinion on the extend the proposals meets each of the evaluation criteria.** Proposals should be judged on merit and assessed as they were **submitted**, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. If significant shortcomings are identified (including in budget issues such as size, structure, allocation, aid intensity etc.), this must be reflected in the Evaluator's comments in the appropriate criteria. **No recommendations for improving Proposals should be provided.**
13. Please note that Proposal Part B – Technical Annex has a **max page limit of 20 pages**. Any excess pages must be disregarded and not taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation.
14. In Part II of the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are asked to provide supplementary comments (but no scores) with regards to:
 - the need for an Ethics Review for the Proposal under evaluation,
 - any potential negative impacts and/or risks to the environment stemming from the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the Project's expected results/products, and
 - the degree to which the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced.
15. A positive reply to the first question would mean that the Proposal should **undergo an Ethics Review** before a funding decision can be reached, whereas a positive reply to the second question should be **reflected in the comments** provided for individual criteria, if applicable.

16. Information relevant to both the evaluation criteria and the issues for which supplementary comments are requested can be found throughout the Proposal and, thus, Evaluators are advised to study it thoroughly before starting their work. References to the most relevant Sections of the Proposal (Part B) for each criterion / supplementary issue can be found in the next section of this document.
17. In Part III of the Evaluation Report, Evaluators are asked to provide their recommendation whether the proposal should be funded or not.
18. Once finalised, each Evaluator sends (via email message) his / her Individual Evaluation Report to the responsible RIF staff, in PDF Format, within **ten (10) calendar days** from the receipt of the email message by the RIF with the documents for evaluation.

Stage II – Preparation of Consensus Report by the Rapporteur:

19. After submission of the Individual Evaluation Reports by the three (3) Evaluators, the Reports will be shared to all Evaluators, as well as to the Rapporteur.
20. The Rapporteur:
 - a. Does not evaluate the Proposal.
 - b. Prepares a first draft of the Consensus Report based on the Individual Evaluation Reports. In doing so, he / she takes into consideration all agreements / divergences / contradictions and proposes comments that could potentially be acceptable by all three (3) Evaluators involved.
 - ***The format of the Consensus Report is exactly the same as that of the Individual Evaluation Report. The same guidelines also apply with regards to providing detailed feedback and comments for each criterion.***
 - c. Shares the first draft of the Consensus Report to the Evaluators to review and provide their comments / feedback on it. If deemed necessary, the Rapporteur may arrange for an online / remote meeting with all three (3) Evaluators present for further discussion and coordination.
 - d. Coordinates the editing of the draft Consensus Report based on comments / feedback seeking to reach consensus resulting in the **Final Consensus Report**.
 - It is noted that in cases where the Group cannot reach consensus, the Rapporteur will arrange for an online / remote meeting with all three (3) Evaluators present to discuss the matter and, if required, a decision will be reached by means of majority voting among the three (3) Evaluators.
 - e. Will not proceed with providing comments for the Evaluation Criteria, should a Proposal, according to the consensus opinion of the Evaluators, fail the compatibility assessment with the objectives of the specific Call of Proposals. **This should be**

sufficiently argued and reflected in the relevant Section of the Consensus Report.

- f. Submits the Final Consensus Report (via email message) to the RIF, in PDF Format, within **ten (10) calendar days** from the receipt of the email message by the RIF with the Individual Evaluation Reports.

21. The Consensus Report is signed by all Evaluators.

PART I – EVALUATION

COMPATIBILITY WITH THE OBJECTIVES OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS

The following should be considered in the assessment of this criterion:

- *Compatibility with the Objectives of the Call for Proposals.*
- *Compatibility of the proposed type(s) of research, innovation and other activities with those allowed by the Programme/Call for Proposals (As selected in “Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget” and analysed in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”).*

The relevant information can be found in:

1. Sections B1 & B2 in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”, and
2. Section “General Profile of the Project Proposal” and “Project Budget Overview Table” in “Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget”.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following should be assessed:

- **Criterion 1:** *The proposed plan responds to a large extent to the comments provided by the EIC Jury by addressing the weaknesses of the original proposal identified by the Jury.*
- **Criterion 2:** *The activities of the proposed project are expected to significantly improve the technological and commercial readiness of the innovative idea included in the original proposal submitted to the EIC Accelerator, which will enable the Proposal resubmitted to the Programme to claim EU funding with higher chances of success.*
- **Criterion 3:** *The content of the project proposal and the working packages, the time plan, the proposed person-months, and the proposed budget, are complete, credible and appropriate for the implementation of the project objectives.*
- **Criterion 4:** *The project team (including any third parties/subcontractors) has the appropriate skills for the implementation of the proposal and the proposed objectives, and demonstrates its commitment for the project implementation within the proposed time plan.*

Important Notes:

1. *If any inconsistencies between “Proposal Part A – General Information and Budget” and “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex” are observed, Part A should be the one considered as valid for evaluation purposes.*
2. *Documents under Annex II should not be evaluated. They are provided to give the evaluators the context to the proposal.*

PART II - SUPPLEMENTARY COMMENTS

QUESTION
<p><i>Do you believe that any part of the Proposal under evaluation (e.g. methodology, Work Packages and activities, expected results, products etc.) requires to undergo an Ethics Review (e.g. a bioethical assessment by the Cyprus National Bioethics Committee)?</i></p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in Sections B2 & B4 in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.</i></p>
<p><i>Do you believe that the implementation of the proposed activities or the delivery of the expected results/products could have any potential negative impacts and/or pose risks to the environment?</i></p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in Sections B2 & B4 in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.</i></p>
<p><i>Do you believe that the Proposal under evaluation is gender balanced*, both in terms of its research content as well as the key research personnel to be involved in its implementation?</i></p> <p><i>The relevant information can be found in Sections B2-3 in “Proposal Part B – Technical Annex”.</i></p>

***Note:**

The RIF recognizes that evaluators play a critical role in ensuring excellence in the funded research and, therefore, acknowledges the importance of integrating in the proposals gender and/or sex analysis. Please take a minute to consult the following [informative videos](#) that have been developed by the Canadian Institute for Gender and Health to guide evaluators when assessing Health-related proposals. The information provided in the videos may also apply when assessing proposals in other thematic areas.