

Reviewers are asked to rate the plan of intent using the scale below.

- 6 = outstanding: demonstrates exceptional novelty and innovation; potential to substantially advance science at global level; high-gain project that can include risks
- 5 = excellent: extremely good in international comparison – no significant elements to be improved
- 4 = very good: generally sound plan, but contains a few elements that could be improved
- 3 = good: generally sound plan, but contains important elements that should be improved
- 2 = fair: contains flaws; in need of substantial modification or improvement
- 1 = poor: contains severe flaws that are intrinsic to the proposed project or the application

For each specific question, provide a written evaluation in addition to a numerical rating. Please make sure that there is consistency between the written comments and the numerical rating.

1.	Research plan	Rating
----	---------------	--------

1.1 Assess the scientific quality and innovativeness of the research plan.

Sub-rating
Comments

1.2 Assess the potential of this research to produce significant new outcomes and scientific breakthroughs and to contribute to the progress of science in the field. To what extent are the objectives ambitious and beyond the state of the art (e.g. novel concepts and approaches or development across disciplines)?

Sub-rating
Comments

1.3 Assess the scientific added value of working as a CoE compared to traditional research collaboration.

Sub-rating
Comments

2.	Scientific merits	Rating
----	-------------------	--------

2.1 Are the merits and scientific expertise of the proposed CoE director and principal investigators appropriate and sufficient for the proposed CoE? Do they bring appropriate and required complementary expertise to the proposed CoE?

Comments

3.	Research environment	
----	----------------------	--

3.1 Assess the compatibility of the CoE's research with the strategies of the host institutions.

Sub-rating
Comments

3.2 How does the research environment support this CoE, including use and development of the research infrastructures?

Sub-rating
Comments

4.	International competitiveness	
----	-------------------------------	--

4.1 Current situation: Assess how the CoE as a whole rates in relation to *top* or *close to top* international research in its field. The CoE as a whole belongs to the

- *top*: best 1% (= rating 6)
- *top*: best 5% (= rating 5)
- *close to top*: best 10% (= rating 4)
- *close to top*: best 20% (= rating 3)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 2 not applicable)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 1)

Sub-rating
Comments

4.2 Potential to raise the level of research with CoE funding: Assess how the CoE as a whole rates in relation to reaching the *top* or *close to top* international research in its field. The CoE as a whole is likely to belong to the

- *top*: best 1% (= rating 6)
- *top*: best 5% (= rating 5)
- *close to top*: best 10% (= rating 4)
- *close to top*: best 20% (= rating 3)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 2 not applicable)
- neither *top* nor *close to top* (= rating 1)

Sub-rating
Comments

5	Impact beyond academia	
---	------------------------	--

Comment on the expected societal impact of the CoE project (beyond scientific or scholarly impact).

(No numerical rating)

6	Overall assessment	
---	--------------------	--

Overall rating (not required to be mathematical average of the ratings given above):

Strengths, weaknesses

	Final rating	Rating
--	--------------	--------