

EMRP Call Process
Guide 6: Evaluating Joint Research Projects and
EMRP Researcher Grants

Document: P-CAL-GUI-006

Version: 2.3

Approved: EMRP Programme Manager

2013-06-13



Guide 6: Evaluating Joint Research Projects and **EMRP Researcher Grants**



Contents

1	Scope	3
2	Introduction to the EMRP	3
2.1	Summary of the EMRP Call Process.....	3
2.2	EMRP Joint Research Projects (JRPs)	4
2.3	The 3 types of EMRP Researcher Grant.....	4
2.3.1	Researcher Excellence Grant (REG) (Applications at Stage 2 or Stage 3)	4
2.3.2	Researcher Mobility Grant (RMG) (Applications at Stage 3).....	4
2.3.3	Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant (ESRMG) (Applications at anytime in the Open Call)	4
3	Referees and Evaluators.....	5
3.1	Appointment of Independent Referees for JRP Proposals and REGs at Stage 2.....	5
3.2	Appointment of Referees & Evaluators for REGs and RMGs at Stage 3.....	5
3.3	Appointment of Independent Referees for ESRMG (Open Call)	5
4	Evaluation Process.....	6
4.1	Evaluation Criteria for JRPs	6
4.2	Evaluation Criteria for EMRP Researcher Grants	6
4.3	Principles of Evaluation	6
4.4	Step 1: Before the Review Conference (Stage 2)	6
4.4.1	Acknowledgement of Receipt	6
4.4.2	Eligibility Check	6
4.4.3	Referee's Preparation.....	7
4.5	Step 2: Evaluation of JRP Proposals and REG Applications at Stage 2.....	7
4.5.1	Referees Individual Preliminary Assessment of JRP Proposals and REG Applications	7
4.5.2	The Review Conference & Consensus Marking.....	8
4.6	Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation at Stage 2 (after the Review Conference).....	8
4.6.1	Confirming the Ranked List of JRPs to be funded (and associated REGs)	8
4.6.2	Formal Opinion of the Research Council.....	9
4.7	Evaluation of REGs at post Stage 2	9
4.8	Evaluation of EMRP Researcher Grants at Stage 3.....	9
4.8.1	Evaluation of REGs and RMGs at Stage 3.....	9
4.8.2	Optional Interviews for EMRP Researcher Grant Applications at Stage 3	10
4.9	Evaluation of ESRMGs for the Open Call.....	10
5	Marking Guidance (for JRPs and EMRP Researcher Grants)	11
6	Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation	12
6.1	Programme Owners	12
6.1.1	EMRP Committee Members.....	12
6.1.2	The EMRP Chair & Deputy EMRP Chair.....	12
6.1.3	The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU).....	12
6.1.4	The Referees	12
6.1.5	The Research Council	13
6.1.6	The European Commission's Independent Observer and Representative	13
6.2	The Proposers	13
6.2.1	The JRP-Coordinator (on behalf of the JRP-Consortium)	13
6.2.2	The EMRP Researcher Grant Applicant.....	13
6.2.3	The REG Home Organisation.....	13
7	Appeals	14
7.1	Grounds for Appeal	14
7.2	How to Appeal	14

If you require further help or guidance after reading this document, please contact the helpline

Email: emrpA169@npl.co.uk

Telephone: +44 20 8943 6666.

1 Scope

This Guide explains:

- How to evaluate Joint Research Project Proposals at Stage 2 of an EMRP call.
- How to evaluate EMRP Researcher Grant applications including:
 - Researcher Excellence Grants (at Stage 2 and Stage 3),
 - Researcher Mobility Grants (at Stage 3)
 - Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grants (at Stage 3)
- The responsibilities of the people involved.

It does not include:

- Form 6a: Code of Conduct and Declaration. This is the 'Code of Conduct' and 'Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflict of Interest' that all referees and evaluators must sign before beginning any evaluation.
- Form 6b: Payment to referees. This explains how referees can claim their eligible expenses, and an honorarium.
- Form 6c: JRP Evaluation
- Form 6d: EMRP Researcher Grant Evaluation
- Information about writing a JRP, this is found in Guide 4
- Information about costing a JRP, this is found in Guide 5
- Information about writing an EMRP Researcher Grant application, this is found in Guide 7.

The Guides, Forms and associated Templates are all available from www.emrponline.eu

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 (NMIs) and Designated Institutes (DIs) from 23 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 Grants.

2.1 Summary of the EMRP Call Process

Following an open call for "Potential Research Topics" (Stage 1 of an EMRP Call), a number of Selected Research Topics (SRTs) are published on www.emrponline.eu. This forms Stage 2 of the EMRP Call. Consortia of eligible participants respond to the needs identified in the SRT, by proposing a Joint Research Project (JRP) that must aim to advance measurement science and technology in the technical area of the SRT. There may be more than one JRP proposal for each SRT of the call.

The method of selecting the JRPs to be funded concentrates on a Review Conference, see section 4.5.2. The evaluation process is competitive as only about half the SRTs are likely to result in funded JRPs.

At Stage 3 of an EMRP call, applications are made for additional EMRP Researcher Grants linked to the successful JRPs. This is an open and competitive process, and the evaluation process is described in section 4.8.

There is a parallel "Open Call" for EMRP Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grants (ESRMGs) where applications are evaluated up to twice a year, the evaluation process is described in section 4.9.

2.2 EMRP Joint Research Projects (JRPs)

The aim of JRPs is to coordinate research and development and facilitate closer integration of national metrology research programmes. JRPs should accelerate innovation and competitiveness in Europe whilst continuing to provide essential support to underpin the quality of our lives.

Potential JRP-Consortia must consist of a minimum of three funded partners from at least three different countries participating in the EMRP. Other organisations can participate as unfunded partners.

JRPs can be supported by EMRP Researcher Grants.

2.3 The 3 types of EMRP Researcher Grant

2.3.1 Researcher Excellence Grant (REG) (Applications at Stage 2 or Stage 3)

The aim of the Researcher Excellence Grant is “to enlarge the number of organisations with capacities closely relating to metrology”¹ within the EU Member States and FP7 associated countries.

An **Individual Researcher Excellence Grant** provides financial support for an **experienced researcher** who is capable of making a substantial contribution through research activities relevant to the JRP objectives. The research must be mainly undertaken at a Home Organisation that is not part of the national metrology systems (i.e. a non NMI/DI organisation). This aims to “open the JRPs to the best science”¹.

Additionally, there is the opportunity to undertake a period of research based at a Guestworking Organisation (a funded JRP-Partner, or REG Home Organisation) located in a different country to the Home Organisation. This transnational Guestworking can be between 1 month and 30 % of the total REG duration.

An **Organisation Researcher Excellence Grant** provides financial support for an organisation that is capable of making a substantial contribution through research activities relevant to the JRP objectives. A researcher must be named, as the key link to the JRP, but the research activities may also be undertaken by others within the organisation. The research activities must be undertaken at a Home Organisation that is not part of the national metrology systems (i.e. a non NMI/DI organisation).

The Organisation REG will not include any Guestworking element, but any member of the research team at the Home Organisation can apply for a separate Researcher Mobility Grant.

2.3.2 Researcher Mobility Grant (RMG) (Applications at Stage 3)

The aim of the Researcher Mobility Grant (RMG) is “to increase the capability of the European metrology researcher community”¹.

An RMG provides financial support for a researcher at any stage of their career, to undertake research activities relevant to the JRP objectives. This aims to “to develop the capacity of individuals in Metrology”¹.

The research must be undertaken at a Guestworking Organisation (a funded JRP-Partner, or REG Home Organisation) located in a different country to the researcher’s employer.

RMGs are open to many countries, but EURAMET particularly encourages applications from researchers in EURAMET member countries which are not yet participating in the EMRP: **Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, FYR Macedonia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro and Serbia**. This aims to support EURAMET member countries building and furthering their capacity in metrology.

2.3.3 Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant (ESRMG) (Applications at anytime in the Open Call)

In addition to the aim of the Researcher Mobility Grant, the Early-Stage Researcher Mobility Grant (ESRMG) aims to “ensure sustainability of cooperation between the NMI and DI”¹ of the EMRP.

An ESRMG provides financial support for a researcher with fewer than 4 years experience, employed by an NMI or DI from an EU Member State or FP7 associated countries, to undertake research activities relevant to

¹ 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>

the JRP objectives. This aims to “prepare the next generation of experienced metrology researchers”¹ by building experience of metrology collaborations.

The research must be undertaken at a Guestworking Organisation (any member of the JRP-Consortium) located in a different country to the researcher’s employer.

3 Referees and Evaluators

EURAMET appoints independent expert referees to assist with the evaluation of JRP proposals and EMRP Researcher 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. ‘Guide 8: Registering as a referee for the EMRP’ explains how to register. EURAMET has been granted privileged access to this database.

Evaluators are members of the JRP-Consortium or REG Home Organisation who evaluate EMRP Researcher Grant Applications at Stage 3 of an EMRP Call. The referees support evaluators by providing comments.

EURAMET takes all reasonable steps to ensure that referees and evaluators are not faced with a conflict of interest between their own research/business interests, and their evaluation activities for EURAMET. All referees and evaluators must abide by a “Code of Conduct” and must sign Form 6a prior to beginning any evaluation.

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, creating:

- 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 are used for evaluation of REGs at “post Stage 2” when the minor amendments to REGs are evaluated.

3.2 *Appointment of Referees & Evaluators for REGs and RMGs at Stage 3*

The contract between EURAMET and the European Commission requires that EMRP Researcher Grant applications at Stage 3 be evaluated by a representative of the JRP-Consortium (an “evaluator”), with the assistance of at least 2 independent referees.

At least 2 independent referees are selected from the referees who evaluated the JRP proposals at the Review Conference.

- EURAMET contacts the referees to establish availability.
- In the event of a sufficient number of referees being available EURAMET may ask the JRP-Coordinator to select preferred referees from a list of names.

The “evaluator” is usually the JRP-Coordinator, but can be another nominated representative of the JRP-Consortium e.g. workpackage leader, or a representative of the REG Home Organisation.

3.3 *Appointment of Independent Referees for ESRMG (Open Call)*

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

EURAMET appoint the referees dependent on availability of referees.

4 Evaluation Process

4.1 Evaluation Criteria for JRPs

The core evaluation criteria for JRPs are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council². They 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.

Form 6c: Evaluation Sheet for JRPs gives some components of each criterion that may be considered.

4.2 Evaluation Criteria for EMRP Researcher Grants

The core evaluation criteria for all three EMRP Researcher Grants are defined in the Decision of the European Parliament and the Council¹. They 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.

Form 6d: Evaluation Sheet for EMRP Researcher Grants gives some components of each criterion that may be considered.

4.3 Principles of Evaluation

All JRP proposals and EMRP Researcher Grant applications (proposals/applications) are evaluated against the published evaluation criteria. They are evaluated as presented, on their own merit.

JRP proposals are also evaluated for their conformity with the SRT supporting documents.

All proposals/applications are treated equally.

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

Any proposal/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 proposal/application which addresses a research task not open in the call, or doesn't include the required number of participants) the proposal/application may be ruled out of scope without referring it to the referees.

4.4 Step 1: Before the Review Conference (Stage 2)

4.4.1 Acknowledgement of Receipt

Every proposal/application is registered and receives an email acknowledgement from EURAMET.

4.4.2 Eligibility Check

EURAMET check the eligibility of each proposal/application against Guide 1.

² *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>

An eligibility checklist is completed for each proposal/application, and only eligible proposals/applications are evaluated.

Where an eligibility criterion is not met the proposal/application is withdrawn and the proposer/applicant(s) are informed. If ineligibility is discovered at a later time during the evaluation process, the proposal/application will be withdrawn.

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

4.4.3 Referee's Preparation

Referees must attend a Review Conference for the Stage 2 evaluation of proposals/applications. A few weeks prior to the Review Conference each referee will be emailed links to the following documents:

- The Selected Research Topics (SRTs) relating to the referees technical area(s),
- Other relevant supporting documents of the call,
- The JRP proposal(s) to be evaluated,
- The EMRP Researcher Grant applications to be evaluated,
- This Guide, which explains the evaluation process and their responsibilities.

4.5 Step 2: Evaluation of JRP Proposals and REG Applications at Stage 2

4.5.1 Referees Individual Preliminary Assessment of JRP Proposals and REG Applications

Before the Review Conference referees should:

- Familiarise themselves with the four evaluation criteria
 - Read the evaluation sheets; Form 6c and Form 6d.
 - Understand the impact requirements of JRPs, by reading Guide 4.
 - Understand the management requirements of JRPs, by reading Guide 4. All JRPs must demonstrate that they are collaborative projects; each JRP-Participant must bring value and share benefits, with no single partner dominating.
- Read all proposals/applications assigned to them in their own time.
- Form an initial opinion about each proposal/application.
- Note any key issues, or areas that need clarification or comment.
- Formulate questions that they may wish to ask the JRP representative at the Review Conference.
- Referees may choose to privately mark each proposal/application against the evaluation criteria given on the marking sheets. Noting that their opinion is entirely private and only the final consensus mark (agreed between all referees) is collected by EURAMET at the Review Conference.
- Email emrpA169@npl.co.uk if they discover a conflict of interest, or find that the research is outside of their area of expertise; however it is beneficial to have some referees with general rather than very specific expertise.

The format of the proposals/applications is designed to make contracting the successful projects and subsequent monitoring and reporting as efficient as possible. The JRPs and Researcher Grants are separate contracts and this imposes a separation in the documentation with explicit links required between them. The documents that give detail regarding the content of the work are the JRP-Protocol for the JRP and the Research Schedule for each Researcher Grant. This structure may seem complicated to referees at first but there are key sections where they will find most of the information relevant to them:

- Section B of the JRP-Protocol gives an overview of the proposed research against the four evaluation criteria. The "Research Outline" (a single page at the front of the Research Schedule for the Researcher Grants) serves the same purpose for the Researcher Grants.
- Section F of the JRP-Protocol gives a description of each participant including their key roles and contributions. The Covering Letter serves the same purpose for the Researcher Grants.

Remaining sections in both documents with long lists of activities, tasks and deliverables are not aimed primarily at the referees, but at the project officers in EURAMET that will negotiate the contracts for

successful projects. Referees may find useful information here on how the consortia plan to deliver the work, but they are not asked to critique these sections.

Referees may choose to read other proposals made available to them for comparison with those assigned to them. If they do, it should be sufficient to just read Section B rather than the detailed project plans.

Referees **must not** discuss proposals/applications with proposers or other referees at this time.

4.5.2 The Review Conference & Consensus Marking

The Review Conference includes the following activities:

- Briefings about the evaluation process
- The poster session where referees clarify their understanding of the JRP proposals and associated REG application(s) through informal discussions with the JRP representative (around 20 minutes per JRP)
- Private referee meeting. Referees share initial opinions and formulate formal questions for each JRP. One referee (who is a specialist in the JRP topic) will lead the discussions, which last around 15 minutes per JRP.
- Formal question and answer session between the referees and the JRP representative.
- Private referee meeting: referees discuss each JRP proposal and associated REG application(s). One referee (who is a specialist in the JRP topic) will lead each discussion that lasts around 30 minutes.
 - For each JRP proposal, referees complete one Form 6c:
 - Referees must agree a consensus view on the marks for each evaluation criterion.
 - Referees agree by consensus if the JRP is suitable for funding or not. If a JRP has scored less than 3 in any one section then it cannot be funded.
 - REG applications are only evaluated if the associated JRP was suitable for funding.
 - Referees ascertain if each REG application is complete. Incomplete applications are not marked now and pass to post Stage 2 or Stage 3 of the call
 - The remaining REG applications are evaluated by completing Form 6d
 - Referees comment (yes/no) on whether each REG application is integral to the JRP (i.e. the JRP could not deliver a key objective without this work) if the referees believe it is not integral a comment should be made on Form 6d.
 - Referees must agree a consensus view on the marks for each evaluation criterion, comments should be made.
 - Referees agree by consensus if the JRP is recommended as either:
 - ‘Fund’ - REGs are only funded if the associated JRP is funded
 - ‘Amend’ - an amendment that can be incorporated at contract negotiations (e.g. the referees advise a duration change or identification of the REG-Researcher).
 - ‘Reapply’ - the REG application can be reworked at “Stage 3”.
- A “draft ranked list” of all the JRPs is formed based on the marks, where JRPs have equal marks the referees may hold further discussions.
- The referees validate their final “draft ranked list” of JRPs and marks, which will be recommended to the EMRP Committee.

4.6 Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation at Stage 2 (after the Review Conference)

4.6.1 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 (including any special comments or recommendations from the referees, regarding a particular proposal).
- The available budget. Generally the “draft ranked list” of JRPs will be funded until the available budget is spent. EURAMET 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.

The EMRP Committee can choose to convene an “extended panel” of referees comprising a subset of referees in the unusual circumstance that they have concerns about a proposal/application or marking.

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

The EMRP Committee will approve all REGs recommended as “fund” by the referees, providing that the associated JRP is funded. This is because the budget for the REGs is separate from the budget for JRPs.

4.6.2 Formal Opinion of the Research Council

The Research Council provides a formal “opinion” regarding the overall view of the EMRP Call and selection process, and on the “final ranked list” of selected JRPs and REGs.

4.7 Evaluation of REGs at post Stage 2

Integral REGs that receive an “amend” recommendation at the Review Conference can be reworked and re-evaluated via a “fast-track” process known as “post Stage 2”. This enables any changes requested by the referees (e.g. finding a researcher or amending some activities) to be re-evaluated, and if successful, start at the same time as the JRP.

EURAMET check the eligibility criteria of the application and, if acceptable, the revised applications are emailed to referees. They complete Form 6d providing marks and comments, and return it to emrpA169@npl.co.uk usually within 2 weeks.

The evaluation criteria and guidance are the same as Stage 2 of a call. Only parts of the applications that have changed since this original application need be evaluated (EURAMET will advise referees of the criteria to mark).

Applications that are marked “amend” or “reapply” carry forward to Stage 3 (and are no longer part of the post Stage 2 process).

4.8 Evaluation of EMRP Researcher Grants at Stage 3

4.8.1 Evaluation of REGs and RMGs at Stage 3

All opportunities are openly advertised; therefore applications may be in competition with one another.

The evaluator(s) are the JRP representative(s) and or REG Home Organisation employees who consider the EMRP Researcher Grant applications on behalf of the JRP-Consortium. They mark applications supported by formal comments from the independent referees. Applications can only be sent to referees / evaluators who have completed, signed and returned Form 6a: Code of Conduct and Declaration.

EURAMET have around 1 week to check the eligibility of each application, after which eligible applications are sent to the referees.

The referees have around 2 weeks in which to:

- Read each application bearing in mind the evaluation criteria
- Write formal comments about each application against each evaluation criteria on Form 6d Evaluation Sheet for EMRP Researcher Grants
- Email completed form(s) to emrpA169@npl.co.uk

EURAMET forward the referees’ comments and the applications to the evaluators.

The evaluator(s) have around 2 weeks in which to:

- Read each application and the referees’ comments.
- Hold interviews if required, see section 4.8.2.
- Mark each application against all criteria, taking into account the referees formal comments.
- Email emrpA169@npl.co.uk the following information:
 - One completed Form 6d for each application; this must explicitly state how the referees’ comments were taken into account.
 - If interviews were held, documented reasons of why applicants were/were not interviewed, and a summary of the interview process.
 - The preferred EMRP Researcher Grant Applicant, including the reason why they are most appropriate.

EURAMET will then:

- Re-check the eligibility of the proposed applicant. If a preferred applicant is ineligible, or does not accept, the JRP-Coordinator may suggest an alternative applicant.
- Award the EMRP Researcher Grant
- Negotiate contracts with the EMRP Researcher Grant Beneficiaries. (The Home/Employing Organisation, EMRP Grant Researcher and the Guestworking Organisation as appropriate.)

4.8.2 Optional Interviews for EMRP Researcher Grant Applications at Stage 3

The evaluator(s) may choose to hold interviews with some or all of the applicants; this is not mandatory.

Interviews could be by telephone, face-to-face, by videoconference, or some other means.

EURAMET is not responsible for the interviews or any expenses incurred by the evaluators or applicants.

When interviews are held:

- Only applicants who applied by the deadline may be interviewed. (Note that if interviews are held, only applicants who were interviewed can be recommended for funding).
- The evaluator documents reasons why applicants were/were not selected for interview.
- The evaluator documents a summary of the interview process (noting that interviews must fulfil all requirements of European law (e.g. non-discrimination etc) and in most cases the interviews would be conducted in line with the normal policies of the organisation concerned).
- Relevant representatives of the JRP-Consortium should be included (e.g. the JRP-Coordinator, appropriate work-package leader, and/or Home / Guestworking Organisation).
- Interviews must be conducted during the designated period.
- Interviews must evaluate applicants against the evaluation criteria, and the results must be recorded on Form 6d.

4.9 Evaluation of ESRMGs for the Open Call

Applications are evaluated up to twice a year.

All ESRMG applications are in competition with one another.

EURAMET have around 1 week to check the eligibility criteria of each application.

The independent referees have around 4 weeks in which to:

- Read and evaluate each application.
- Mark each application against the evaluation criteria, recommending each for “fund”, “amend” or “reapply”.
- Complete one Form 6d for each application.
- Create a ranked list of all the applications based on the marks awarded, and recommendation for funding.
- Email emrpA169@npl.co.uk the completed marking sheets, and ranked list.

EURAMET will then:

- Re-check the eligibility criteria of all applicants.
- Award the EMRP Researcher Grants according to the ranked list, until the available funding has been allocated.

The EMRP Researcher Grant that crosses the funding limit may be funded or not at EURAMET’s discretion.

Note: that there are no interviews for ESRMG, since they are proposed by the JRP-Consortium.

5 Marking Guidance (for JRPs and EMRP Researcher Grants)

At Stage 2 of a call: One completed copy of Form 6c is required per JRP proposal, one completed copy of Form 6d is required per EMRP Researcher Grant application. These must contain the **consensus** view of all referees, and are completed during the Review Conference.

At post Stage 2 of a call: Each referee should complete one copy of Form 6d per EMRP Researcher Grant. This records the referee's personal opinion and is undertaken remotely. EURAMET collate the referees marks and in the event of different opinions may take a majority view, or convene a telephone conference.

At Stage 3 of a call: Each referee should complete COMMENTS ONLY (no marks) on Form 6d, one form per application. This records the referee's personal opinion and is undertaken remotely. EURAMET send the comments of at least 2 referees to the nominated representative of the JRP-Consortium who will add his/her comments and marks.

Evaluation / marking for JRP proposals

- There are four evaluation criteria for JRP proposals.
- Each criterion is to be marked from 0 to 5; half marks may be given.
- In some calls the evaluation criteria may be weighted after marking; this occurs at the decision of the EMRP Committee before the call opens.
- Marking is required against each evaluation criterion. Form 6c contains some example areas of consideration relating to each criterion, but these examples should not be directly marked against.
- JRPs are not considered suitable for funding if they score less than 3 for any criterion (before weighting has been applied).
- Comments must be given to support the marks and provide feedback to applicants.
- The marking forms documenting the referees' consensus view must be complete.
- All referees in the group must sign the marking books.

Evaluation / marking for EMRP Researcher Grant applications

- There are four evaluation criteria for EMRP Researcher Grant applications.
- Each criterion is to be marked from 0 to 5; half marks may be given.
- There are no minimum scores for EMRP Researcher Grants, and no weighting of criterion.
- Marking is required against each evaluation criterion. Form 6d contains some example areas of consideration relating to each criterion, but these examples should not be directly marked against; additionally;
 - **At Stage 2 of a Call:** The referees must recommend "fund", "amend", or "reapply".
 - **At Post Stage 2 of a Call:** The referees should recommend, "fund", or "reapply".
 - **At Stage 3 of a Call:** Evaluators should recommended "fund" (yes/no) to indicate if the application is suitable for funding, regardless of whether it is the preferred applicant. The evaluators must also provide the name of their preferred applicant, a second choice can be provided.
- Comments must be given to support the marks and provide feedback to applicants.
- All marking forms must be signed (at Stage 2 just the marking book can be signed)

Marking guidance for referees and evaluators:

0 =	Fail: 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: broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.
3 =	Good: addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.
4 =	Very Good: successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.
5 =	Excellent: demonstrates excellence in this criterion.

6 Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation

6.1 Programme Owners

6.1.1 EMRP Committee Members

The EMRP Committee members are responsible for:

- Implementing the EMRP including the EMRP Researcher Grants.
- 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.

6.1.2 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.

The EMRP Chair and deputy EMRP Chair 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.

6.1.3 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 and must not express any opinion on the merits or otherwise of any proposal/application.

6.1.4 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 Participants.

Referees must adhere to the “Code of Conduct for Referees and Evaluators” and must sign the “Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest” prior to beginning the evaluation. This is given in Form 6a.

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 EURAMET on the relevant forms.
- Deleting or destroying all documents after evaluation.
- Informing EURAMET of any conflict of interest.

6.1.5 The Research Council

The Research Council does not participate directly in the evaluation.

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

6.1.6 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.

6.2 The Proposers

6.2.1 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. (Only one member of the JRP-Consortium can attend the Review Conference).
- At Stage 3, selecting appropriate "evaluators" from the JRP-Consortium and/ or REG Home Organisation. The evaluators are jointly responsible for evaluating the EMRP Researcher Grants, taking into account the referees comments and reporting results to EURAMET.
- Evaluators must adhere to the Code of Conduct for Referees and Evaluators and must sign the "Declaration of Confidentiality and Any Conflicts of Interest" prior to beginning the evaluation. (See Form 6a).
- Optional: Undertaking interviews of applicants (sometimes with the REG Home Organisation):
 - Ensure a fair process is followed according to section 4.8.2
 - Reporting the results of the interviews and summarising the interview process to EURAMET.

* The JRP-Coordinator may choose to delegate or share his/her responsibilities with another JRP-Participant or a member of the REG Home Organisation (if appropriate). If this occurs the substitute will take on the responsibilities of the JRP-Coordinator. EURAMET must be informed.

6.2.2 The EMRP Researcher Grant Applicant

The EMRP Grant Researcher holds no responsibilities for evaluation, however they may be requested to attend interviews and / or provide additional information.

6.2.3 The REG Home Organisation

The REG "Home Organisation" is the REG-Researcher's employer. For an Individual REG, the Home Organisation may be involved in the evaluation of REG applicants at the request of the JRP-Coordinator; this can include marking applications

Optional: Undertaking interviews of applicants (in collaboration with the JRP-Coordinator, or JRP-representative). If interviews are undertaken then the Home Organisation must ensure the internal requirements of the Home Organisations interview process are met and report the interview process and results to the JRP-Coordinator (see section 4.8.2).

7 Appeals

7.1 Grounds for Appeal

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

Appeals related to the views of the referees, or other evaluators, are not grounds for appeal. (At stage 2, the EMRP Committee can choose to convene an "extended panel" of referees comprising a subset of referees in the unusual circumstance that they have concerns about a proposal/application or marking, but this would occur before they agree the "Ranked List" and identify the JRPs to be funded. See section 4.6.1)

When an appeal is lodged EURAMET 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.

7.2 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 by email to emrpA169@npl.co.uk. The appeal should contain:
 - Grounds of appeal: "Incorrect eligibility categorisation" or "unfair application of selection criteria".
 - Clear unambiguous details about appeal.