

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Proposal number:

Please write also comments (not only numerical grades) to each of following sub-items.

Numerical evaluation of the sub-items and Item 1 (Research plan) and Item 2 (Competence of applicant and quality of research environment) and Item 3 (Overall assessment) is made with ratings ranging from 1 (poor) to 6 (outstanding).

1 = poor, 2 = satisfactory, 3 = good, 4 = very good, 5 = excellent, 6 = outstanding

1 Research plan

Rating (1–6):

1.1 Relevance of the project to the research programme

Sub-rating (1–6):

How does the proposal contribute to achieving the objectives of the research programme?

1.2 Scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Is the project scientifically significant? Is the project innovative? Is the project breakthrough research containing risks and does it have potential for exceptionally significant outcomes? Is the project ambitious? Can the project generate new knowledge, new methods, new technology or new practices to end-users? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, how?

1.3 Feasibility of the research plan

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the research plan, objectives and hypotheses clearly presented and realistic? Does the applicant acknowledge potential scientific or methodological problem areas and how are alternative approaches being considered? Are the research methods and materials appropriate for the project? Are the project management, resources and the division of labour and the proposed schedule appropriate and well-planned?

1.4 Ethical questions (to be answered if relevant)

Are ethical issues involved and if so, how are they taken into account?

2 Competence of applicant and quality of research environment

Rating (1–6):

2.1 Competence and expertise of the applicant/research team

Sub-rating (1–6):

Are the merits and scientific expertise of the applicant appropriate and sufficient for the proposed project? Do the members of the research team bring complementary expertise to the project (if applicable)? What are the merits of the applicant to supervise doctoral/postdoctoral students (if applicable)?

2.2 Research environment

Sub-rating (1–6):

Does the research environment support this project (including appropriate research infrastructures) and offer a wide base for researcher training? How is the project integrated into the research environment?

2.3 Description and significance of research collaborations

Sub-rating (1–6):

Is the project engaged in national and/or international research collaborations that can significantly contribute to the success of the project? If the project is multi/inter/transdisciplinary, how does the collaboration contribute to this?

2.4 Research consortium

If a consortium is involved what is the significance and added value of the consortium for the attainment of the research objectives?

Panel/Name of reviewer:
Name of applicant:
Title of proposed project:

Proposal number:

3 Overall assessment	Final rating (1–6):
-----------------------------	----------------------------

3.1 Main strengths and weaknesses of the project. Additional comments and suggestions.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Please note that the final rating should not be a mathematical average of the sub-ratings.