

**Guidance for Evaluation of JRPs and EMRP  
Researcher Grants, in EMRP Call 2010**

Version 1.0

Approved: EMRP Programme Manager 2010-06-21

---



**Guidance for Evaluation of JRPs  
and EMRP Researcher Grants,  
in EMRP Call 2010 - Industry & Environment**



## Contents

1	Scope .....	3
2	Introduction to the EMRP .....	3
	2.1 The Joint Research Project (JRP) proposals.....	3
	2.2 What are the 3 EMRP Researcher Grant schemes?.....	3
	2.2.1 <i>Researcher Excellence Grant (REG) (Stage 2 or Stage 3)</i> .....	3
	2.2.2 <i>Researcher Mobility Grant (RMG) (Stage 3)</i> .....	4
	2.2.3 <i>Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant (ESRMG) (Stage 3)</i> .....	4
3	Appointment of Referees.....	5
	3.1 Appointment of Independent Referees for JRP-Proposals and REGs at Stage 2.....	5
	3.2 Appointment of Independent Referees for REGs and RMGs at Stage 3.....	5
	3.3 Appointment of Independent Referees for ESRMG.....	5
	3.4 Conflict of Interest of the Referees .....	5
4	JRP-Consortium Member / Home Organisation Representative at Stage 3.....	6
	4.1 Conflict of Interest of the JRP-Consortium Member / Home Organisation Representative .....	6
5	Evaluation Process.....	7
	5.1 Core Evaluation Criteria for JRPs .....	7
	5.2 Core Evaluation Criteria for EMRP Researcher Grants.....	7
	5.3 Principles of Evaluation.....	7
	5.4 Maintaining Confidentiality of the Proposals and Applications .....	7
	5.5 Step 1: Before the Review Conference (Stage 2).....	7
	5.5.1 <i>Call for Proposals</i> .....	7
	5.5.2 <i>Acknowledgement of Proposal Receipt</i> .....	7
	5.5.3 <i>Eligibility Check</i> .....	8
	5.5.4 <i>Preliminary Briefing of the Referees</i> .....	8
	5.6 Step 2: Evaluation of JRP Proposals and REG applications at Stage 2.....	8
	5.6.1 <i>Individual Preliminary Assessment of the Proposals by the Referees</i> .....	8
	5.6.2 <i>The Review Conference &amp; Consensus Marking</i> .....	8
	5.7 Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation at Stage 2 .....	9
	5.7.1 <i>Confirming the Ranked List of JRPs to be funded (and associated REGs)</i> .....	9
	5.7.2 <i>Formal Opinion of the Research Council</i> .....	9
	5.7.3 <i>Submission of the List to the European Commission</i> .....	9
	5.7.4 <i>Proceeding to Contracts</i> .....	9
	5.8 Evaluation of EMRP-Researcher Grants at Stage 3.....	10
	5.8.1 <i>Evaluation of REGs and RMGs at Stage 3</i> .....	10
	5.8.2 <i>Evaluation of ESRMGs</i> .....	10
6	Appeals .....	11
	6.1 Grounds for Appeal.....	11
	6.2 How to Appeal.....	11
7	Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation.....	11
	7.1 Programme Owners.....	11
	7.1.1 <i>EMRP Committee Members</i> .....	11
	7.1.2 <i>The EMRP Chair &amp; Deputy EMRP Chair</i> .....	12
	7.1.3 <i>EURAMET e.V.</i> .....	12
	7.1.4 <i>The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU)</i> .....	12
	7.1.5 <i>The Referees</i> .....	12
	7.1.6 <i>The Research Council</i> .....	13
	7.1.7 <i>The European Commission's Independent Observer and Representative</i> .....	13
	7.2 The Proposers .....	13
	7.2.1 <i>The TP-Facilitator</i> .....	13
	7.2.2 <i>The JRP-Coordinator (on behalf of the JRP-Consortium)</i> .....	13
	7.2.3 <i>The JRP-Participants</i> .....	13
	7.2.4 <i>The EMRP Grant Researcher</i> .....	13
	7.2.5 <i>The Home Organisation</i> .....	14
	7.2.6 <i>The Guestworking Organisation</i> .....	14
	7.2.7 <i>The Employing Organisation</i> .....	14
8	Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees (and Evaluators).....	15
9	Annex 2: Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest .....	17
10	Annex 3: Marking Guidance (for JRPs and EMRP Researcher Grants).....	18
11	Annex 4: Template for JRP Evaluation and Marking (Stage 2).....	19
12	Annex 5: Template for REG Evaluation and Marking (Stage 2).....	20
13	Annex 6: Template for Referees Comments on EMRP Researcher Grant Applications (Stage 3).....	21
14	Annex 7: Template for Evaluation and Marking of EMRP Researcher Grant Applications (Stage 3) .....	22
15	Annex 8: Payment of Referees .....	24
16	Annex 9: Referee Claim Form.....	26

### Abbreviations used:

EMRP = European Metrology Research Programme  
EMRP-MSU = EMRP Management Support Unit  
DI = Designated Institute

JRP = Joint Research Project  
FP7 = 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme  
JRC = Joint Research Centre

NMI = National Measurement Institute  
WP = Work Package

**Need more help?** Contact the EMRP-MSU helpline: [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk) or ☎ +44 20 8943 6666

## 1 Scope

This document explains:

- How to evaluate Joint Research Project (JRP) Proposals (Stage 2)
- How to evaluate EMRP Researcher Grant applications, including:
  - Researcher Excellence Grants (Stage 2 and Stage 3),
  - Researcher Mobility Grants (Stage 3)
  - Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grants (Stage 3)
- The responsibilities of people involved including the *Code of Conduct* and *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest* that the Referees (and other Stage 3 Evaluators) must sign before beginning any evaluations.
- How Referees can claim their eligible expenses, and an honorarium

It does not include information about:

- Writing a JRP
- Costing a JRP
- Writing an EMRP Researcher Grant application

## 2 Introduction to the EMRP

The European Metrology Research Programme (EMRP) is an applied research programme. It seeks to accelerate the development, validation and exploitation of new measurement techniques, standards, processes, instruments, reference materials and knowledge.

The EMRP supports research collaboration between the National Measurement Institutes (NMI) and Designated Institutes (DI) from 22 European States together with the European Commission's Joint Research Centre. These collaborations run as Joint Research Projects (JRPs) co-funded by the national measurement system programmes of the EMRP Member countries and the European Union.

The JRPs supported by the EMRP aim to drive innovative developments in industry and commerce; improve the quality of data for science, industry and policy-making; and support development and implementation of directives and regulations. The JRPs are supplemented by the EMRP Researcher Grant schemes.

### 2.1 *The Joint Research Project (JRP) proposals*

The EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment intends to advance measurement science and technology, that supports the industrial and environmental sectors. Following an open call for “Potential Research Topics” (**Stage 1** of this Call) 28 Selected Research Topics (SRTs) were published in the area of “Industry”, and 18 for “Environment”. The SRTs can be found at <http://www.emrponline.eu/call2010/stage2.html>.

At **Stage 2**, consortia of eligible participants form and prepare proposals for Joint Research Projects in response to the SRTs. There may be more than one proposal for an individual SRT and the process is competitive as only about half the SRTs are likely to result in a funded JRP. The method of selecting the JRPs to be funded concentrates on a Review Conference and is described in this document.

At **Stage 3**, additional Researcher Grants linked to the successful JRPs are evaluated and awarded.

### 2.2 *What are the 3 EMRP Researcher Grant schemes?*

#### 2.2.1 Researcher Excellence Grant (REG) (Stage 2 or Stage 3)

The aim of the Researcher Excellence Grant scheme is:

“To enlarge the number of organisations with capacities closely relating to metrology”<sup>1</sup> within the EU Member States and FP7 associated countries.

A REG provides financial support for an experienced researcher to carry out research activities related to a JRP, in organisations that are not part of the National Metrology Systems (non NMI/DI organisations). This enables the involvement of high quality researchers, opening the JRPs to the best science.

<sup>1</sup> *Decision No 912/2009/EC*, Official Journal of the European Union, 30 September 2009, L257, p12 available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:257:0012:0025:EN:PDF>

For REGs applied for at Stage 2 the work undertaken by the REG-Researcher must be integral to the JRP objectives.

For REGs applied for at Stage 3 the work undertaken by the REG-Researcher must be relevant to the JRP objectives.

### 2.2.2 Researcher Mobility Grant (RMG) (Stage 3)

The aim of the Researcher Mobility Grant scheme is:

“To develop the capacity of individuals in Metrology”<sup>1</sup>

The EMRP provides Researcher Mobility Grants (RMGs) to increase the capability of the European metrology researcher community, thereby supporting countries as they are building and furthering their capacity in metrology. RMGs offer allowances that support a researcher, and are mainly aimed at organisations in EURAMET member countries that are not participating in the EMRP<sup>2</sup>.

The work undertaken by the RMG-Researcher must be relevant to the JRP objectives, and undertaken at a funded JRP-Partner’s premises located in a different country to the RMG-Researcher’s employer.

### 2.2.3 Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant (ESRMG) (Stage 3)

The aims of the Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant scheme are:

“To ensure sustainability of cooperation between the NMI and DI”<sup>1</sup> of the EMRP, and  
“To prepare next generation of experienced metrology researchers.”<sup>1</sup>

The EMRP provides Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grants (ESRMGs) to support researchers building experience of metrology collaborations. The ESRMG offers allowances to support a researcher with fewer than 4 years experience, from a participating NMI or DI. The work undertaken by the ESRMG-Researcher must be relevant to the JRP objectives, and undertaken at a JRP-Partner’s premises located in a different country to the ESRMG-Researcher’s employer.

---

<sup>2</sup> RMGs are also available to NMIs, DIs, the JRC and REG Home Organisations (but preference is given to organisations developing their metrology capability)

### **3 Appointment of Referees**

EURAMET appoints independent experts (Referees) to assist with the evaluation of JRP-Proposals and grant applications for the EMRP Calls. Details of potential Referees are maintained in the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) central database of experts. EURAMET has been granted privileged access to this database, and will select Referees considering the skills and knowledge appropriate to the tasks assigned to them.

#### ***3.1 Appointment of Independent Referees for JRP-Proposals and REGs at Stage 2***

To evaluate the JRPs and associated REGs submitted in response to a call, EURAMET compiles a pool of appropriate Referees from the database. EURAMET then selects Referees from the pool taking care to balance:

- an appropriate range of scientific / technical competencies
- an appropriate balance between academic and industrial expertise and users
- a reasonable gender balance, as far as possible
- a reasonable distribution of geographical origins of independent experts
- a reasonable representation of nationalities
- regular rotation of independent experts

A subset of the Referees used to evaluate the JRPs are used to evaluate the EMRP Researcher Grants.

#### ***3.2 Appointment of Independent Referees for REGs and RMGs at Stage 3***

Independent Referees are appointed on the basis of criteria set out in the Rules for Participation in the Seventh Framework Programme<sup>3</sup>. To simplify the evaluation process for EMRP Researcher Grants, the independent Referees will be selected from those Referees who evaluated the JRP proposals at Stage 2 at the Review Conference.

1. EMRP-MSU provides the JRP-Coordinator with Referees' names from those used at the Review Conference for this Call. An "expertise table" containing information collected from the Referees prior to the EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment Review Conference.
2. JRP-Coordinators (on behalf of the JRP-Consortium) select preferred Referees in order of most relevant experience.
3. EMRP-MSU assigns 2 Referees per JRP, dependent on availability and the preferences of the JRP-Consortium.

#### ***3.3 Appointment of Independent Referees for ESRMG***

Independent Referees are appointed on the basis of criteria set out in the Rules for Participation in the Seventh Framework Programme<sup>3</sup>.

To simplify the evaluation process of the EMRP Researcher Grants, the independent Referees will be selected from those Referees who evaluated the JRP proposals at Stage 2.

The EMRP-MSU will appoint the Referees on behalf of EURAMET, dependent on availability.

#### ***3.4 Conflict of Interest of the Referees***

EURAMET takes all reasonable steps to ensure that Referees are not faced with a conflict of interest between their own research/business interests, and their evaluation activities for EURAMET.

All Referees are required to sign a *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2) identifying any conflicts of interest that may undermine their impartiality. This must be signed prior to beginning any evaluation.

<sup>3</sup> Regulation (EC) No 1906/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2006 laying down the rules for the participation of undertakings, research centres and universities in actions under the Seventh Framework Programme and for the dissemination of research results (2007-2013), OJ L391, 30.12.2006, p1, available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2006:391:0001:0018:EN:PDF>

If at any stage during the evaluation a Referee discovers he/she is in any way connected with an application, or he/she discovers some other allegiance that impairs his/her impartiality, he/she must declare this immediately to the EMRP-MSU, who will then take any necessary actions that may include:

- Removal of the Referee from the evaluation process.
- Limiting the applications that the Referee will review.
- Allowing the Referee to continue but with some other restrictions in place.
- Letting the Referee continue without restriction, if the connection to the proposal/application is considered sufficiently tenuous or out dated.

If at any stage in the evaluation a Referee encounters an application outside of his/her area of expertise they should:

- Not comment on that application.
- Inform the EMRP-MSU so that additional Referees can be sought.

#### **4 JRP-Consortium Member / Home Organisation Representative at Stage 3**

The Contract between EURAMET and the European Union requires that EMRP Researcher Grant applications at Stage 3 are evaluated by the JRP-Consortium, with the assistance of at least 2 independent Referees.

This is achieved by the JRP-Coordinator (or a nominated representative of the JRP-Consortium e.g. workpackage leader) marking all the applications taking into account comments from independent Referees.

In some cases the Home Organisation may also be involved in the evaluation.

##### ***4.1 Conflict of Interest of the JRP-Consortium Member / Home Organisation Representative***

EURAMET takes all reasonable steps to ensure that representatives of the JRP-Consortium / Home Organisation are not faced with a conflict of interest between their own research/business interests, and the evaluation of the EMRP Researcher Grant Applications.

All representatives of the JRP-Consortium / Home Organisation who are involved in evaluation are required to sign a *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2) prior to beginning the evaluation. This must identify any conflicts of interest that may undermine their impartiality, and depending on the circumstances, the representative of the JRP-Consortium / Home Organisation may be restricted from evaluating that application.

## **5 Evaluation Process**

### **5.1 Core Evaluation Criteria for JRPs**

The core evaluation criteria for JRPs are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>1</sup>, the core evaluation criteria are:

1. Scientific and/or technical excellence.
2. Relevance to the objectives of the EMRP.
3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of the project results.
4. The quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.

### **5.2 Core Evaluation Criteria for EMRP Researcher Grants**

The core evaluation criteria for all three EMRP Researcher Grant schemes are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>1</sup>. The core evaluation criteria are:

1. Scientific and/or technological excellence
2. Relevance to the objectives of the JRP
3. Quality and implementation capacity of the applicant and his/her potential for further progress
4. Quality of the proposed activity in scientific training and/or transfer of knowledge

### **5.3 Principles of Evaluation**

All JRP proposals and EMRP Researcher Grant applications are treated equally. They are evaluated as presented, on their own merit.

JRP proposals are evaluated for their conformity with the SRT supporting documents, and against the published evaluation criteria (above).

EMRP Researcher Grant applications are evaluated against the published evaluation criteria (above).

Any JRP proposal or EMRP Researcher Grant application which contravenes fundamental ethical principles or which does not fulfil any conditions set out in the EMRP Call may be excluded from the evaluation and selection procedure at any time. In clear-cut cases (e.g. a JRP proposal which addresses a research task not open in the Call) the proposal / application may be ruled out of scope without referring it to Referees.

### **5.4 Maintaining Confidentiality of the Proposals and Applications**

EURAMET takes all reasonable steps to ensure confidentiality of proposals and applications, before, during and after the evaluation. The Referees (Evaluators) are required to maintain the confidentiality of all information contained within the proposals and applications they evaluate, and of the evaluation outcomes.

EURAMET requires Referees (Evaluators) to sign a *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest*. This must be signed before the Referee (Evaluator) starts evaluating.

### **5.5 Step 1: Before the Review Conference (Stage 2)**

#### **5.5.1 Call for Proposals**

The EMRP (European Metrology Research Programme) uses a three-stage process. The first identifies potential priority topics, the second requests project proposals from the metrology community on those topics identified as highest priority. The third Stage is a Call of EMRP Researcher Grants

Stage 2 of the EMRP Call 2010-Industry & Environment will open from 21<sup>st</sup> June 2010 to 11th October 2010 (23:59 hours CET). Only eligible proposals will be evaluated.

#### **5.5.2 Acknowledgement of Proposal Receipt**

All proposals that are received will be registered and acknowledged by the EMRP-MSU. Where a proposal is received complete in both electronic and paper formats, only the electronic copy will be evaluated. If more than one copy of the same proposal is received before the deadline, only the last complete eligible version sent is evaluated.

### 5.5.3 Eligibility Check

Each proposal for a JRP and/or EMRP Researcher Grant application will be checked for eligibility by the EMRP-MSU, against the published "Eligibility Criteria for EMRP Calls" on [www.emrponline.eu](http://www.emrponline.eu)

An eligibility checklist is completed for each proposal on the basis of the information contained in the proposal.

Where any of the eligibility criteria are not met, the proposal is declared ineligible. Ineligible proposals are withdrawn from the evaluation process, and the proposers are informed. Ineligibility can be declared at any point in the evaluation process, whenever it is proven. Ineligibility always overrides evaluation.

Where there is a doubt on the eligibility of a proposal, EURAMET reserves the right to proceed with the evaluation, pending a final decision on eligibility. The fact that a proposal is evaluated in such circumstances does not constitute proof of its eligibility.

### 5.5.4 Preliminary Briefing of the Referees

This guidance document is intended to inform Referees of the evaluation process, and their responsibilities.

For the Stage 2 evaluation, Referees receive an invitation to the Review Conference with venue details and the agenda.

Prior to an evaluation the Referees receive an email containing all the documentation they need for the process. This usually occurs at least 2 weeks in advance of an evaluation or Review Conference (except in the case of additional Referees). Typical contents of this email are:

- The SRT "supporting document(s)" relating to their technical area/areas.
- The JRP proposal(s) to be evaluated.
- The EMRP Researcher Grant applications to be evaluated.
- This document "Guidance for Evaluation of JRPs and EMRP Researcher Grants, in EMRP Call..."

## **5.6 Step 2: Evaluation of JRP Proposals and REG applications at Stage 2**

### 5.6.1 Individual Preliminary Assessment of the Proposals by the Referees

Before the Review Conference, Referees should read all the JRP proposals/REG applications to which they are assigned in their own time, and form their initial opinion about the JRP proposals and REG applications. Referees may wish to begin marking the JRP proposal and any associated REG applications against the evaluation criteria given on the marking sheets, noting any areas that need clarification or comment. The Consensus Evaluation Marking Sheet can be used as personal marking sheet to record the Referee's opinion prior to the Review Conference or as an aide-memoire. The opinion of the individual Referee is entirely private, and no documentation need be returned to the EMRP-MSU, and no individual marks will be collected.

JRP proposals/REG applications should not be discussed with proposers or other Referees during this time.

Referees should inform the EMRP-MSU (who will take action as per section 3.4) if they:

- encounter a JRP proposal or REG application outside of their area of expertise (Though it should be noted that it is beneficial to have some Referees with general rather than very specific expertise)
- discover a conflict of interest

### 5.6.2 The Review Conference & Consensus Marking

The Review Conference includes the following activities:

- A briefing on the evaluation process
- The Referees clarify their understanding of the JRP proposals and associated REG application(s) through the poster presentations, and informally discussing and questioning the JRP representative.
- A formal question and answer session is held between the Referees and the JRP representative.
- Referees meet and discuss each JRP proposal and REG application, agreeing a consensus view on the marks for each of the evaluation criteria.
- The marks for each JRP enable a "draft ranked list" of all the JRPs to be formed, where JRPs have equal marks further discussions may be held by the Referees.

- A panel discussion of Referees may be convened to examine and compare the consensus reports and marks in a given area, to review the JRP proposal/REG application with respect to each other and, in specific cases (e.g. equal scores) to make recommendations on a priority order and/or on possible clustering or combination of proposals. The panel discussion may include hearings with the JRP proposers.
- The Referees validate their final “draft ranked list” of JRPs. This list and the marks form the Referees’ recommendations to the EMRP Committee.
- The Referees recommend each REG application for either:
  - ‘Funding’ as proposed (Note that REGs are only funded if the associated JRP is funded)
  - ‘Amending’:
    - a) Minor amendments (e.g. the Referees advise a duration change) This can be incorporated at contract negotiations.
    - b) Significant amendments (e.g. identification of the REG-Researcher). The REG must be re-evaluated by a subset of the independent Referees used in the Review Conference. This usually occurs in parallel to Stage 3 evaluation, and by the Stage 3 process described below.
  - ‘not funding’ – even though the REG is rejected the concept of having a REG in the JRP must be accepted, so that the REG application can be reworked at “Stage 3”.

## **5.7 Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation at Stage 2**

### **5.7.1 Confirming the Ranked List of JRPs to be funded (and associated REGs)**

The EMRP Committee discuss which JRPs (and associated REGs) to fund based on:

- The recommendations of the Referees. Generally the “draft ranked list” of JRPs will be funded until the available budget is spent
- The available budget. The EMRP-MSU is responsible for calculating where the budget cut-off falls. The JRP that crosses the funding limit may be funded or not at the discretion of the EMRP Committee.
- Any special comments or recommendations from the Referees, regarding a particular proposal.

If the EMRP Committee raises any issues or concerns about any JRP proposals, REG applications or the marking, then an “extended panel” of Referees comprising a subset of Referees could be convened.

The EMRP Committee agree the “Ranked List” and identify the JRPs to be funded.

The budget for the REGs is separate from the budget for JRPs; therefore for every funded JRP the associated REG will also be funded if it was recommended for funding by the Referees and subsequently approved by the EMRP Committee.

### **5.7.2 Formal Opinion of the Research Council**

The Research Council provides a formal “opinion” regarding the overall view of the Call and selection process, and on the “final ranked list” of selected JRPs and REGs. This formal opinion is sent to the European Commission.

### **5.7.3 Submission of the List to the European Commission**

The “final ranked list” of JRPs (and associated REGs) to be funded is forwarded to the European Commission.

### **5.7.4 Proceeding to Contracts**

The EMRP-MSU checks the eligibility criteria, and then informs the proposers and applicants of the decisions. The EMRP-MSU then negotiates contracts with the JRP-Consortium and EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries.

## **5.8 Evaluation of EMRP-Researcher Grants at Stage 3**

### **5.8.1 Evaluation of REGs and RMGs at Stage 3**

Applications may be in competition with one another as all positions are openly advertised.

The JRP-Coordinator (or their representative(s)) on behalf of the JRP-Consortium will evaluate applications, supported by the independent Referees, and will propose a Beneficiary.

The independent Referees have around 2 weeks in which to:

- Read each application bearing in mind the evaluation criteria (given in section 5.2).
- Write formal comments about each application to assist the JRP-Coordinator.
- Email the results of the process to the EMRP-MSU, with one completed comments sheet (Annex 6) per application

The JRP-Coordinator (on behalf of the JRP-Consortium) has around 2 weeks in which to:

- Read each application and the independent Referees comments.
- Evaluate and mark each application against the evaluation criteria (given in section 5.2) bearing in mind the comments of the independent Referees.
- Email the results of the process to the EMRP-MSU, with;
  - One completed marking/comments sheet (Annex 7) per application, with the formal comments explicitly stating how the Referees' comments were taken into account.
  - The preferred EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiary, including the reason why this candidate is most appropriate.
  - If interviews were undertaken, a summary of the interview process.

The EMRP-MSU:

- Check the eligibility criteria of the proposed EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries (Where a preferred candidate is ineligible the JRP-Coordinator may suggest an alternative Beneficiary).
- Award the EMRP Researcher Grants to eligible proposed EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries.
- Negotiate contracts with the EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries.

#### **5.8.1.1 Optional Interviews for EMRP Researcher Grant Applications at Stage 3**

The JRP-Coordinator (or Home Organisation for REGs) may chose to hold interviews with some or all of the applicants, although this is not a mandatory requirement. (The interviews could be by telephone, face-to-face, by video-conference, or some other means.)

EURAMET is not responsible for the interviews or any expenses incurred by the Evaluators or applicants, in most cases the interviews would be conducted in line with the normal policies of the interviewer's organisation.

When interviews are held:

- Only candidates who applied by the deadline may be interviewed.
- Records must be provided to the EMRP-MSU of the reasons why candidates were not selected for interview – note that when interviews are held, only candidates who are interviewed can be recommended for funding.
- Interviews must fulfil all requirements of European law (e.g. non-discrimination etc).
- Relevant representatives of the JRP-Consortium should be included (e.g. the JRP-Coordinator, appropriate work-package leader, and/or Home / Guestworking Organisation).
- They must be conducted during the designated period.
- They must evaluate candidates against the published evaluation criteria (in section 5.2).
- The results must be recorded on the Evaluation and Marking Sheet (Annex 7).

### **5.8.2 Evaluation of ESRMGs**

Applications may be in competition with one another as all ESRMG positions are openly advertised.

The independent Referees have around 4 weeks in which to:

- Read each application
- Evaluate and mark each application against the evaluation criteria (given in section 5.2) and create a ranked list of all the applications

- Email the results of the process to the EMRP-MSU, one completed marking/comments sheet per application, and a ranked list of the preferred EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries.

The EMRP-MSU:

- Check the eligibility criteria of all applicants
- Award the EMRP Researcher Grants to eligible applicants, according to the ranked list, until the funding runs out

The EMRP Researcher Grant that crosses the funding limit may be funded or not at the discretion of the EMRP-MSU.

*Note: that there will not be interviews for the ESRMGs (since they are proposed by the JRP-Consortium)*

## **6 Appeals**

### **6.1 Grounds for Appeal**

The only grounds for appeal are where an organisation's or individual's eligibility is in question or where the evaluation criteria have been unfairly or incorrectly applied.

Appeals related to the views of the Referees, or other Evaluators, are not grounds for appeal.

When an appeal is lodged the EMRP-MSU will examine the claim and will aim to reply to the submitting party within 7 days.

Complex cases will be escalated to the EMRP Chair and may take longer to decide.

### **6.2 How to Appeal**

- 1) Once informed that an organisation or individual is ineligible, parties have 7 days to lodge an appeal after which no appeals will be accepted.
- 2) If a JRP proposer (or EMRP Researcher Grant applicant) believes the selection criteria have been unfairly applied they should appeal within 7 days of the selection being published.
- 3) Only the organisation/individual in question can lodge an appeal (if they believe they have been wrongly categorised as ineligible).
- 4) Only one appeal can be lodged for each case. Usually the JRP-Coordinator would lodge appeals related to JRP, and the applicant for the EMRP Researcher Grant application. If the appeal is rejected there is no further right of appeal.
- 5) Any decisions made are binding to all parties.
- 6) All appeals should be submitted to the EMRP-MSU. The appeal should contain:
  - Grounds of appeal: "Incorrect eligibility categorisation" or "unfair application of selection criteria".
  - Clear unambiguous details about appeal.
- 7) Submit the appeal to the EMRP-MSU at [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk).

## **7 Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation**

### **7.1 Programme Owners**

#### **7.1.1 EMRP Committee Members**

The EMRP Committee members are responsible for:

- Implementing the EMRP including the EMRP Researcher Grant schemes.
- The selection of the JRPs, and REGs taking into account advice from the Referees,

The EMRP Committee members may not attempt to influence the opinion of the Referees or express any opinion to the Referees on the merits or otherwise of any proposal.

### 7.1.2 The EMRP Chair & Deputy EMRP Chair

The EMRP Chair is responsible for:

- Approving the list of Referees
- The overall EMRP Researcher Grants process,
- All decisions relating to the appeal process.

The EMRP-Chair is responsible for the selection of the Referees used at the Review Conference. The Referees used at Stage 3 for evaluation of EMRP-Researcher Grants are a subset of this group; thus the EMRP Chair has approved them.

The EMRP-Chair may choose to delegate some activities to the Deputy EMRP Chair

### 7.1.3 EURAMET e.V.

EURAMET enters into a contract with JRP-Partners, and enters separate contracts for each EMRP Researcher Grant (with the Home and Guestworking Organisations as appropriate).

EURAMET is responsible for making payments to the JRP-Partners and EMRP Grant Beneficiaries.

### 7.1.4 The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU)

The EMRP-MSU operates under the guidance of the EMRP Committee, and act independently of their employing organisation.

The EMRP-MSU is responsible for:

- Arranging the administration and logistics of the evaluation of the proposed JRPs (and EMRP Researcher Grants applications) using independent international Referees.
- Collating information and ensuring all concerned have the required electronic transmissions and paperwork on time.
- Liaising between the JRP-Coordinators, EMRP Committee and the Referees.
- Checking the eligibility of each JRP proposal & EMRP Researcher Grant application
- Recording the outcome of the evaluations and Review Conference.
- Dealing with expenses claims and honorarium for the Referees.
- Negotiating contracts for successful applications.

The EMRP-MSU may act as moderators in discussions at the Review Conference. The moderator seeks consensus between the Referees, without any prejudice for or against particular proposals or the organisations involved, and may assist with details of the processes involved.

The EMRP-MSU will not attempt to influence the opinion of the Referees or JRP-Coordinators and must not express any opinion on the merits or otherwise of any application.

The EMRP-MSU man a telephone and email helpline to assist those involved, they will clarify any areas of the evaluations process where you are unclear. You can contact the EMRP helpline [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk) or by telephone: +44 20 8943 6666.

### 7.1.5 The Referees

Referees are independent experts, acting in a personal capacity, and when performing the evaluation do not represent any organisation, national interest, or other entity. Referees must declare any links to a particular JRP-Consortium, or EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries.

Referees must adhere to Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees (and Evaluators and must sign “Annex 2: Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest” prior to beginning the evaluation).

The Referees are responsible for:

- Maintaining confidentiality of the documents they are assessing.
- Evaluating the merits of each application against the given evaluation criteria.
- Reporting results of the evaluation to the EMRP-MSU on the relevant forms.
- Deleting all documents after evaluation.
- Informing the EMRP-MSU of any conflict of interest.

### 7.1.6 The Research Council

The Research Council does not participate directly in the evaluation of the JRP proposal/EMRP Researcher Grant Application.

The Research Council provides an independent opinion to EURAMET and the European Commission about the success of the evaluation process, and about the list of successful projects. Their opinion is based on the information provided to them by the EMRP Committee and the EMRP-MSU.

### 7.1.7 The European Commission's Independent Observer and Representative

The European Commission may send an 'Independent Observer' to the Review Conference. He/she does not participate directly in the evaluation procedure. He/she will have access to all areas of the evaluation process, and will report back his/her observations and opinions on the process to the European Commission.

The European Commission may also send a Representative to the Review Conference.

## **7.2 The Proposers**

### 7.2.1 The TP-Facilitator

The TP-Facilitator holds no responsibilities associated with the evaluation of JRP proposals or EMRP Researcher Grant applications.

### 7.2.2 The JRP-Coordinator (on behalf of the JRP-Consortium)

The JRP-Coordinator's responsibilities include:

- Preparing a poster detailing the JRP
- Attending the Review Conference to present the JRP poster to the Referees, and answer their questions. (The JRP-Coordinator may nominate another member of the JRP-Consortium to replace him/her if he/she prefers. Note that only one member of the JRP-Consortium can represent the JRP proposal at the Review Conference).
- (At Stage 3 only) Evaluating the EMRP Researcher Grants, taking into account the Referees comments, and reporting results of the evaluation to the EMRP-MSU
- Agreeing how communications will be handled within the JRP-Consortium
- Agreeing how communications will be handled between the EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries and the JRP-Consortium.
- Ensuring that the JRP-Participants and EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries enter into appropriate arrangements for intellectual property rights and confidentiality. In particular, access to Background IP, the use of Foreground IP, and publication. These arrangements must be compatible with the provisions foreseen in the JRP-Contract.

The JRP-Coordinator may choose to delegate his/her responsibilities to another JRP-Partner. If this occurs the JRP-Partner will take on the responsibilities of the JRP-Coordinator. The EMRP-MSU must be informed.

### 7.2.3 The JRP-Participants

The JRP-Participants hold no responsibilities relating to the evaluation of the JRP or EMRP Researcher Grant Application.

The JRP-Coordinator may choose to delegate his/her responsibilities to another JRP-Partner. If this occurs the JRP-Partner will take on the responsibilities of the JRP-Coordinator. The EMRP-MSU must be informed.

### 7.2.4 The EMRP Grant Researcher

The EMRP Grant Researcher holds no responsibilities for evaluation however they may be requested to:

- Attend interviews
- Provide additional information

If the application is successful, the EMRP Grant Researcher must:

- Enter into a contract with the Home / Guestworking Organisation as applicable.
- Witness the contract between EURAMET and the Home / Guestworking Organisation as applicable
- Accept both contractual and reporting responsibilities in delivering the work.

- Enter into appropriate arrangements for intellectual property rights and confidentiality with the JRP-Consortium and the Home / Guestworking / Employing Organisation as applicable. In particular, access to Background IP, the use of Foreground IP, and publication. These arrangements must be compatible with the provisions foreseen in the JRP-Contract.

### 7.2.5 The Home Organisation

The “Home Organisation” is the research organisation which employs a REG-Researcher and where a REG-Researcher will undertake the majority of his/her work. There is no “Home Organisation” for RMG and ESRMG applications.

For Stage 3 REGs: The Home Organisation is responsible for:

- Working with the JRP-Coordinator to evaluate EMRP Researcher Grant applications
- Optional: Undertaking interviews of candidates (in collaboration with the JRP-Coordinator, or representative). If interviews are undertaken then the Home Organisation is responsible for:
  - Ensuring that any internal requirements of the Home Organisations interview process are met.
  - Marking the candidates against the EMRP evaluation criteria (see section 5.2)
  - Reporting the results of the interview process to the JRP-Coordinator including:
    - One completed marking/comments sheet per application Annex 7: Template for Evaluation and Marking of EMRP Researcher Grant Applications (Stage 3), with the formal comments explicitly stating how the Referees’ comments were taken into account.
    - The preferred EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiary, including the reason why this candidate is most appropriate.
    - If interviews were undertaken, provide a summary of the interview process.

If the application is successful, the Home Organisation must:

- Enter into a contract with EURAMET regarding the REG.
- Enter into a contract of employment with the REG-Researcher for the duration of the REG.
- Enter into appropriate arrangements for intellectual property rights and confidentiality with the JRP-Consortium and the REG-Researcher. In particular, access to Background IP, the use of Foreground IP, and publication. These arrangements must be compatible with the provisions foreseen in the JRP-Contract.

### 7.2.6 The Guestworking Organisation

The Guestworking Organisation is the research facility where an RMG-Researcher, or ESRMG-Researcher will undertake their research. A REG-Researcher may also choose to undertake a period of additional research at a Guestworking Organisation. The Guestworking Organisation must be located in a different country to the employing organisation.

The Guestworking Organisation is responsible for:

- Attending interviews if requested
- Providing additional information if requested

If the application is successful, the Guestworking Organisation must:

- Enter into a contract with EURAMET
- Enter into appropriate arrangements for intellectual property rights and confidentiality with the JRP-Consortium, the Researcher, the Researchers employing organisations, and for REGs, the Home Organisation, as appropriate. In particular, access to Background IP, the use of Foreground IP, and publication. These arrangements must be compatible with the provisions foreseen in the JRP-Contract.

### 7.2.7 The Employing Organisation:

The RMG-Researchers and ESRMG-Researchers employers are responsible for entering into appropriate arrangements for intellectual property rights and confidentiality with the JRP-Consortium, the Researcher, and Guestworking Organisations, as appropriate. In particular, access to Background IP, the use of Foreground IP, and publication. These arrangements must be compatible with the provisions foreseen in the JRP-Contract.

## 8 Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees (and Evaluators)

### 1. Scope

This *Code of Conduct* applies to **all** Referees, and **all** Evaluators of JRP proposal(s) and/ or EMRP Researcher Grant application(s) submitted to the EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment. Evaluators will include independent Referees, and at Stage 3 may additionally include members of the JRP-Consortium and/ or representatives of the Home Organisation.

### 2. When to Sign

The *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2) must be “signed” (i.e. type your name or add your signature block) and email to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk) prior beginning the evaluation. You must not open emails containing proposals / applications until the signed *Declaration* has been sent.

### 3. Description of Tasks

You are participating in the confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each application, to the best of your abilities, professional skills, knowledge and ethics.

Evaluations shall be undertaken in accordance with these guidelines and the time-schedules provided by EURAMET (EMRP-MSU).

You are required to comment on JRP proposal(s) and EMRP Researcher Grant application(s), complete marking reports, and provide comments. The reports and comments should be submitted to EURAMET (EMRP-MSU) on the templates provided. In addition you may be asked to provide recommendations of the most suitable applications to be funded, or act as a rapporteur.

### 4. Inability to Perform Obligations and/or Termination

If for some reason you are unable to evaluate applications, the EMRP-MSU should be informed immediately. You may not delegate the evaluation to another person.

Failure to comply with this *Code of Conduct* may result in exclusion from the evaluation process, without prejudice to penalties that may derive from other applicable regulations.

### 5. Independence

You must act independently, and provide a personal view without influence from others (including your organisation and country); therefore you may not discuss any application with any person.

You may not contact third parties, about the application without the prior written agreement of the EMRP Chair.

You may seek further information (for example through the internet, specialised databases, etc.) to allow you to complete your examination of the applications, provided that the obtaining of such information respects the overall rules for confidentiality and impartiality.

At Stage 3 Representatives of the JRP-Consortium or Home Organisation may undertake evaluations in discussion with one another, providing all have signed the *Declaration*. During Stage 3 evaluations they must act in the best interests of all JRP-Consortium members, and independently of their organisation and country.

### 6. Conflict of Interest

If you have a direct or indirect link with a JRP proposal / application, or any other vested interest, are in some way connected to, or have any other allegiance which impairs or threatens to impair your impartiality, you must declare such facts by email to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk) as soon as you become aware of this. Depending on the circumstances you may be restricted from evaluating some proposal(s) / application(s)

Referees must be completely independent of applications, any conflicts of interest must be declared to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk)

Representatives of the JRP-Consortium / Home Organisation may have links to the applicants, but in all cases any conflicts of interest must be declared.

**Table 1: Circumstances Causing Conflict of Interest**

	Independent Referee	JRP-Consortium member / Home Organisation Representative
<b>Disqualifying conflict of interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the applicant</li> <li>- Was involved in the preparation of the application.</li> <li>- Stands to benefit directly should the application be accepted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the applicant</li> <li>- Has a close family relationship with any person representing an applicant or organisation in the application.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has a close family relationship with any person representing an applicant or organisation in the application.</li> <li>- Is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organisation</li> <li>- Is employed by one of the applicant organisations</li> <li>- Is a member of one of the Technical Committees of EURAMET</li> </ul>	
<b>Potential conflict of interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was employed by one of the applicant organisations within the previous three years.</li> <li>- Is involved in a contract or research collaboration with an applicant organisation, or had been so in the previous three years.</li> <li>- Is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the application impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Was involved in the preparation of the application.</li> <li>- Is employed by one of the applicant organisations</li> <li>- Was employed by one of the applicant organisations within the previous three years.</li> <li>- Is involved in a contract or research collaboration with an applicant organisation, or had been so in the previous three years.</li> <li>- Is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the application impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.</li> </ul>

## 7. Confidentiality

You must treat all proposals/ applications, results of the evaluation, and the identity of other Referees / Evaluators, in the strictest of confidence.

You are not allowed to disclose the names of other Referees / Evaluators. The European Commission may be informed of your name, and they may publish this list of names (as may EURAMET), however the proposals / applications that were assigned to each person will not be disclosed.

You are personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents, copies or notes, either on paper or in electronic form, relating to the evaluation of proposers. Your marks and comments are confidential, and should only be given to the EMRP-MSU. All documentation, marking and comments must be deleted or destroyed upon completing the evaluation.

**At Stage 3** If representatives of JRP-Consortium / Home Organisation want to discuss the application with another member of the JRP-Consortium/ Home Organisation, each person must sign the *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest* prior to the discussion, and a copy must be emailed to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk)

## 8. Processing of Personal Data

All personal data processed shall be processed in accordance with Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies and on the free movement of such data. Such data shall be processed solely in connection with the implementation and follow-up of the evaluation process, without prejudice to a possible transmission to the bodies in charge of a monitoring or inspection task in accordance with European Union legislation and this *Code of Conduct*.

You may, on written request, gain access to your personal data and correct any information that is inaccurate or incomplete. You should address any questions regarding the processing of your personal data to the EMRP-MSU, via the EMRP helpline to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk) or +44 20 8943 6666. You may lodge a complaint against the processing of your personal data with the European Data Protection Supervisor at any time.

## 9. Other Conditions

All results of the evaluation and marking are the property of EURAMET, except where industrial or intellectual property rights already exist.

EURAMET shall not under any circumstances or for any reason whatsoever be liable for damage sustained by you during the performance of the evaluation.

The provisions of this *Code of Conduct*, including the *Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest* do not constitute an employment agreement and EURAMET is not liable to provide you with any compensation in the event of injury or illness.

## 9 Annex 2: Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest

I, the undersigned, confirm that I have read, understood and accepted the above *Code of Conduct* for Referees / Evaluators relating to the evaluation of JRP-proposals and EMRP Researcher Grant applications submitted in response to the EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment.

*Tick the box:*

- I declare that I am not (to my knowledge), directly or indirectly involved in any JRP proposal or EMRP Researcher Grant application submitted under the EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment, other than those detailed below (complete as applicable):

*Application number    Reason(s) for conflict of interest*

.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....
.....	.....

If I later discover any additional *Conflicts of Interest* with the proposals / applications I am evaluating or discussing I will update this *Declaration* immediately and email a signed copy to [emrpA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:emrpA169@npl.co.uk)

I will not reveal any detail of the proposals / applications, the evaluation process and/or its outcomes, or the Referees and Evaluator’s identities without the express written approval of the EMRP Chair.

I accept personal responsibility for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent and for erasing or destroying all documents and files upon completing the evaluation.

I agree to the use of my personal data for the sole purpose of the evaluation process and according to the provisions set out in the Code of Conduct.

Signed .....

Name.....

Date.....

## **10 Annex 3: Marking Guidance (for JRPs and EMRP Researcher Grants)**

**At Stage 2:** One completed copy of Annex 4 is required per JRP proposal (noting the consensus view of all Referees) and one copy of Annex 5 per EMRP Researcher Grant application (noting the consensus view of all Referees).

**At Stage 3:** Each Referees should complete one copy of Annex 6 per application, the EMRP-MSU send this to the JRP-Coordinator who then completes one copy of Annex 7 per application.

### **Evaluation Marking for JRPs**

- There are four evaluation criteria for JRPs.
- Each criterion is to be marked out of 5, giving a maximum score of 20.
- Marks must be in the range 0-5; half marks may be given.
- Marking is required per section; the *"Referees may wish to consider the following"* give the Referee a guide but should not be directly marked against.
- JRPs will not be considered for funding if they receive a mark of less than 3 in any section.
- All marking forms must be completed and signed.

### **Evaluation Marking for EMRP Researcher Grants**

- There are four evaluation criteria for EMRP Researcher Grants.
- Each criterion is to be marked out of 5, giving a maximum score of 20.
- There are no minimum scores for EMRP Researcher Grants.
- At Stage 2: The Referees should simply recommend funding, recommend minor amendments, or recommend that the EMRP Researcher Grant is reapplied for at Stage 3.
- At Stage 3: The each application should be recommended as suitable for funding (yes/ no)

### **Marking Guidance for Referees and Evaluators:**

- 0 = Fail:** the proposal fails to address the criterion under examination, or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information
- 1 = Poor:** there are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question, or the criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.
- 2 = Fair:** while the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.
- 3 = Good:** the proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.
- 4 = Very Good:** the proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.
- 5 = Excellent:** the proposal demonstrates excellence in this criterion.

## 11 Annex 4: Template for JRP Evaluation and Marking (Stage 2)

Complete all yellow cells on the form. One form is required for each application

<b>Call</b>	<b>EMRP Call 2010 – Industry &amp; Environment</b>
JRP name & version number:	
JRP mark	_____/20
Is this JRP suitable for funding	Yes /No

<b>CONFORMITY WITH THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:</b>	
<i>Tick one box:</i> <input type="checkbox"/> JRP proposal conforms fully and addresses all the objectives <input type="checkbox"/> JRP proposal partially conforms & any deviation is appropriately justified <input type="checkbox"/> JRP proposal does not conform, OR any deviation is NOT justifiable	<i>Comments:</i>

The Referees are asked to mark the JRP proposals against the following four criteria, which are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>4</sup>. Please refer to Annex 3 for guidance on marking scores

<b>SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE:</b>	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does this JRP facilitate progress beyond the state-of-the-art? Is the concept scientifically sound as well as sufficiently clear and ambitious?	
	Mark (out of 5)

<b>RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EMRP:</b>	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does the proposal address the overall objectives of the EMRP, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>to develop the metrological capacities of the participating states coherently and aligned with stakeholder needs</li> <li>to develop the European metrology landscape through integration of the national metrology research programmes</li> <li>to stimulate innovation by metrological developments?</li> </ul> If the proposal has deviated from the specific objectives within the supporting documents of this Call, how appropriate is this deviation?	
	Mark (out of 5)

<b>POTENTIAL IMPACT THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION AND USE OF THE PROJECT RESULTS:</b>	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does the impact workpackage address appropriate and effective measures focussed on the stakeholder needs for this research topic, including those explicitly described in the call text? Are the activities in this workpackage sufficient?	
	Mark (out of 5)

<b>THE QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT:</b>	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following</i>	<i>Comments</i>
<b>Quality:</b> Do the proposed participants bring high quality and relevant experience to the project? <b>Balance:</b> Are the tasks suitably assigned between partners, exploiting complementarity, balance and expertise? <b>Resource:</b> Overall does the JRP have adequate resources and justification to deliver the objectives (staff, equipment etc)? Note if the proposed budget figures for the JRP appear too high or too low. <b>Planning:</b> Are deliverables, integration of resources and use of common resources clearly described?	
	Mark (out of 5)

<b>Date:</b>			
<i>Referees Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>	<i>Referees Name</i>	<i>Signature</i>

<sup>4</sup> Decision No 912/2009/EC, Official Journal of the European Union, 30 September 2009, L257, p12 available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:257:0012:0025:EN:PDF>

## 12 Annex 5: Template for REG Evaluation and Marking (Stage 2)

Complete all green cells on the form. One form is required for each application.

Call	EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment
JRP Number and REG identifier	e.g. JRP01i – REG1
Date of evaluation:	
Is this REG suitable for funding	Yes / No
Marks Awarded	Mark _____ (out of 20)

The Referees are asked to mark applications against the following four criteria, which are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>5</sup>. Please refer to Annex 3 for guidance on marking scores

CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA These are examples of areas you <u>may</u> wish to consider, but comments do not need to be made against each bullet	Referees comments on each of the core evaluation criteria:	Mark
<b>SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL EXCELLENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will the proposed work progress beyond the state-of-the-art?</li> <li>- Is the proposed work scientifically or technically excellent</li> <li>- Is the work based on sound scientific and/or technological methodology?</li> <li>- Is the proposed research going to benefit Europe?</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
<b>RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JRP:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the proposed work <u>integral</u> to the JRP</li> <li>- Will the proposed work support/ compliment the JRP objectives?</li> <li>- Is the number of months work requested realistic to produce the deliverables?</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
<b>QUALITY &amp; IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER PROGRESS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of the EMRP Grant Researcher and the Organisation (s)</li> <li>- Experience of the EMRP Grant Researcher</li> <li>- Potential of the EMRP Grant Researcher to show progress</li> <li>- Ability and suitability of EMRP Grant Researcher to engage in collaboration</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
<b>QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN SCIENTIFIC TRAINING AND/OR TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowledge exchange within the JRP- Consortium</li> <li>- Knowledge exchange beyond the JRP- Consortium</li> <li>- Planned training activities</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
<b>ANY FURTHER COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- About the researcher</li> <li>- About the organisation(s)</li> <li>- About the planned work</li> </ul>		

Date:			
Referees Name	Signature	Referees Name	Signature

<sup>5</sup> Decision No 912/2009/EC, Official Journal of the European Union, 30 September 2009, L257, p12 available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:257:0012:0025:EN:PDF>

### **13 Annex 6: Template for Referees Comments on EMRP Researcher Grant Applications (Stage 3)**

Complete all blue cells on the form. One form is required for each application (No marks are required).

<b>Call</b>	EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment
Grant Application Number	e.g. JRP01i – REG1-APP001
Date of evaluation:	
Referee's Name (s)	E.g. Firstname LASTNAME (Independent Referee)

The Referees are asked to comment on the applications against the following four criteria, which are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>6</sup>.

<b>CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA</b> These are examples of areas you <u>may</u> wish to consider, but comments do not need to be made against each bullet	Referees comments on each of the core evaluation criteria:
<b>SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL EXCELLENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will the proposed work progress beyond the state-of-the-art?</li> <li>- Is the proposed work scientifically or technically excellent</li> <li>- Is the work based on sound scientific and/or technological methodology?</li> <li>- Is the proposed research going to benefit Europe?</li> </ul>	Comments:
<b>RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JRP:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the proposed work <u>relevant</u> to the JRP</li> <li>- Will the proposed work support/compliment the JRP objectives?</li> <li>- Is the number of months work requested realistic to produce the deliverables?</li> </ul>	Comments:
<b>QUALITY &amp; IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER PROGRESS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of the EMRP Grant Researcher and the Organisation (s)</li> <li>- Experience of the EMRP Grant Researcher</li> <li>- Potential of the EMRP Grant Researcher to show progress</li> <li>- Ability and suitability of EMRP Grant Researcher to engage in collaboration</li> </ul>	Comments:
<b>QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN SCIENTIFIC TRAINING AND/OR TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowledge exchange within the JRP-Consortium</li> <li>- Knowledge exchange beyond the JRP-Consortium</li> <li>- Planned training activities</li> </ul>	Comments:
<b>ANY FURTHER COMMENTS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- About the researcher</li> <li>- About the organisation(s)</li> <li>- About the planned work</li> </ul>	

<sup>6</sup> Decision No 912/2009/EC, Official Journal of the European Union, 30 September 2009, L257, p12 available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:257:0012:0025:EN:PDF>

## 14 Annex 7: Template for Evaluation and Marking of EMRP Researcher Grant Applications (Stage 3)

Complete all pink cells on the form. One form is required for each application

<b>Call</b>	EMRP Call 2010 – Industry & Environment
Application Number	e.g. JRP01i – REG1-APP001
Date of evaluation:	
Evaluator's Name (s)	Firstname LASTNAME (independent Referee 1) Firstname LASTNAME (independent Referee 2) Firstname LASTNAME (Representative of JRP-Consortium) Firstname LASTNAME (Representative of Home Organisation) (Add more names as applicable)
Is this application suitable for funding (subject to available Budget)	Yes / No
Marks Awarded	Mark _____ (out of 20)

The Referees are asked to mark the proposals against the following four criteria, which are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council<sup>7</sup>. Please refer to Annex 3 for guidance on marking scores

<b>CORE EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	Evaluators comments on each of the core evaluation criteria:	Mark
These are examples of areas you <u>may</u> wish to consider, but comments do not need to be made against each bullet		
<b>SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL EXCELLENCE:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will the proposed work progress beyond the state-of-the-art?</li> <li>- Is the proposed work scientifically or technically excellent</li> <li>- Is the work based on sound scientific and/or technological methodology?</li> <li>- Is the proposed research going to benefit Europe?</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
How have the Independent Referees comments been taken on board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referee 1</li> <li>- Referee 2</li> </ul>		
<b>RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JRP:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is the proposed work <b>relevant</b> to the JRP</li> <li>- Will the proposed work support/ compliment the JRP objectives?</li> <li>- Is the number of months work requested realistic to produce the deliverables?</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
How have the Independent Referees comments been taken on board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referee 1</li> <li>- Referee 2</li> </ul>		
<b>QUALITY &amp; IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER PROGRESS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Quality of the EMRP Grant Researcher and the Organisation (s)</li> <li>- Experience of the EMRP Grant Researcher</li> <li>- Potential of the EMRP Grant Researcher to show progress</li> <li>- Ability and suitability of EMRP Grant Researcher to engage in collaboration</li> </ul>	Comments:	Mark out of 5
How have the Independent Referees comments been taken on board: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referee 1</li> <li>- Referee 2</li> </ul>		

<sup>7</sup> Decision No 912/2009/EC, Official Journal of the European Union, 30 September 2009, L257, p12 available from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2009:257:0012:0025:EN:PDF>

<p><b>QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN SCIENTIFIC TRAINING AND/OR TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Knowledge exchange within the JRP-Consortium</li> <li>- Knowledge exchange beyond the JRP-Consortium</li> <li>- Planned training activities</li> </ul>	<p>Comments:</p>	<p>Mark out of 5</p>
<p>How have the Independent Referees comments been taken on board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referee 1</li> <li>- Referee 2</li> </ul>		
<p><b>ANY FURTHER COMMENTS:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- About the researcher</li> <li>- About the organisation(s)</li> <li>- About the planned work</li> </ul>		
<p>How have the Independent Referees comments been taken on board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Referee 1</li> <li>- Referee 2</li> </ul>		

## **15 Annex 8: Payment of Referees**

### **1. Scope**

This Annex gives guidance to Referees on how to claim expenses for participation in the Review Conference, and an honorarium. The proposers of Joint Research Projects (JRPs) and/or EMRP Researcher Grants are not eligible to claim any expenses.

### **2. Eligible Claims**

Referees are not remunerated but will be entitled to an honorarium for evaluating JRP proposals and EMRP Researcher Grant applications. This is an ex-gratia payment, not a payment for the supply of services to EURAMET. In addition to the honorarium, Referees can claim their major travel expense for attending the Review Conference, and the hotel accommodation at the Review Conference.

#### **a. Honorarium**

The honorarium is a fixed amount of 900 € for evaluating JRP proposals and EMRP Researcher Grant applications. It is only paid to Referees who satisfactorily complete the evaluation for the entire duration of the Review Conference. No further payments are made for any preparatory reviewing, or for subsequently reviewing any EMRP Researcher Grant applications.

The honorarium is offered to all Referees as a recognition of their expertise, a reward for their contribution to the review process, and to cover all minor incidental expenses such as meals, local transport (bus, tram, metro, taxi, parking, petrol costs, etc.), VAT on hotel accommodation, travel and accident insurance.

#### **b. Travel Expenses**

The major travel expense to the Review Conference can be reimbursed on the basis of actual expenditure. The most economical means of travelling must be chosen. This is usually:

- an economy flight, non-flexible (note that for air travel, the air ticket, e-ticket or receipt are all acceptable proof of purchase), or
- an economy train fare.

Any additional expenses for minor transport should be paid from the honorarium.

In case of expenses in a currency other than EURO, EURAMET will apply the monthly accounting rate established by the European Commission and published on its website, referring to the month of the invoice (<http://ec.europa.eu/budget/inforeuro/>).

#### **c. Accommodation Expenses**

The Review Conference will be held at a place chosen by the EMRP Committee, which is usually at a hotel in an easily accessible city in Europe.

The accommodation is reimbursed for the duration of the Review Conference, usually one night. In the exceptional circumstance that staying an extra night enables the Referee to obtain cheaper travel (saving more than the hotel's nightly rate) then an extra night of accommodation may be claimed. In such cases, please contact the EMRP-MSU in advance. Please note that we are unable to reimburse costs for VAT, all VAT paid on hotel costs will be deducted from your claim.

### **3. Claim Procedure – How to Claim**

The honorarium is usually paid to the individual Referee, however we recognise that some companies / institutions do not allow this. Therefore the claim form enables you to indicate if this is to be paid to your company / institution rather than your personal account, or if the honorarium cannot be accepted at all.

Expenses are usually reimbursed to your company, however if you incurred the expenses yourself you may claim these back directly. Proof of expenses is required, and in most circumstances original receipts are required for each item on your claim form. However, if your company requires the originals receipts for their accounts, we will accept photocopies of your receipts.

All claims must be received on the official claim form, within one month of the Review Conference or no payment will be made. The completed claim form, with the hotel invoice, and travel ticket attached, should be posted to:

EURAMET e.V.  
EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU)  
National Physical Laboratory  
Hampton Road  
Teddington, Middlesex  
TW11 0LW  
UK  
  
Tel: +44 (0)20 8943 6666  
Email: [empA169@npl.co.uk](mailto:empA169@npl.co.uk)

Please contact the EMRP-MSU on the number or email above if you have any queries or concerns.

## 16 Annex 9: Referee Claim Form

### MEETING DETAILS:

Review Conference	Date and Location
-------------------	-------------------

### CONTACT DETAILS:

Name of Referee	
Name and address of Employer	
Telephone	
Fax	
Email	

### CLAIM DETAILS: I wish to claim the following items (use one line per receipt /item please)

	Amount claimed in €	Receipt included	Date of expenditure	Details (hotel or restaurant name, details of journey etc)	Reimburse (delete as appropriate)
Honorarium	900 € or 0 €	Not required	N/A	Honorarium for evaluation	Referee/employer
Hotel costs		Yes/No			Referee/employer
Economy plane/train ticket (non-flexible)		Yes/No			Referee/employer
<b>Total.</b>		N/A			

### BANKING DETAILS: only complete the relevant column/s for your claim

		Referee's Personal Account	Employer's account
Name of account holder (as registered with the bank)			
Full address of account holder (as registered with the bank)			
Contact person for the account holder (normally the company financial contact)		N/A	Name: Tel: Fax: Email:
Bank name			
Branch address (Full address - PO box not accepted)			
For UK:	Account number		
	Bank code		
For Europe:	SWIFT address code		
	IBAN number		
For the US:	A.B.A/Routing Code		