

EMRP A169

Guidance for EVALUATION AT STAGE 2

Version v1.0

Approved: EMRP Programme Manager, 2009-09-04



CONTENTS

1	Scope	2
2	Introduction	2
3	Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation	3
3.1	Programme Owners	3
3.1.1	EMRP Committee Members	3
3.1.2	The EMRP Chair	3
3.1.3	The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU)	3
3.1.4	The Referees	3
3.1.5	The Research Council	4
3.1.6	The European Commission's Independent Observer and Representative	4
3.2	The Proposers	4
3.2.1	The TP-Facilitator	4
3.2.2	The JRP-Coordinator	4
3.2.3	The JRP-Participants	4
3.2.4	The REG-Applicant	4
4	Evaluation Process	5
4.1	Step 1: Before the Evaluation	5
4.1.1	Call for Proposals	5
4.1.2	Acknowledgement of Proposal Receipt	5
4.1.3	Eligibility Check of Proposals	5
4.1.4	Appointment of Referees	5
4.1.5	Preliminary Briefing of the Referees	6
4.2	Step 2: Evaluation of Proposals	6
4.2.1	Conflict of Interest of the Referees	6
4.2.2	Maintaining Confidentiality of the Proposals	7
4.2.3	Evaluation Criteria for the JRP Proposals and REG Applications	7
4.2.4	Proposal Marking	7
4.2.5	Individual Preliminary Assessment of the Proposals by the Referees	7
4.2.6	Overview of the Review Conference	8
4.2.7	Consensus Marking of the Proposals at the Review Conference	8
4.3	Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation	8
4.3.1	Funding the Ranked List	8
4.3.2	Validation by Representatives of the Referees	8
4.3.3	Agreement of the Final JRP List by the EMRP Committee	9
4.3.4	Formal Opinion of the Research Council	9
4.3.5	Submission of the List to the European Commission	9
	Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees	10
	Annex 2: Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest	12
	Annex 3: Consensus Evaluation and Marking Sheet (for JRP and REG)	13
	Annex 4: Payment of Referees	16
	Annex 5: Referee Claim Form for Review Conference	18

Abbreviations used:

EMRP = European Metrology Research Programme	JRP = Joint Research Project	REG = Researcher Excellence Grant
EMRP -MSU = EMRP Management Support Unit	FP7 = 7 th Framework Programme	SRT = Selected Research Topic (of the Call)
NMI = National Measurement Institute	DI = Designated Institute	JRC = Joint Research Centre

Need more help?

If you require further help or guidance after reading this document please contact the EMRP-MSU helpline.

emrpA169@npl.co.uk

telephone: +44 20 8943 6666.

1 Scope

This document explains the process of evaluation of Joint Research Project (JRP) proposals and Stage 2 Researcher Excellence Grant (REG) applications. It details the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved, along with the actions and activities they must undertake, this will help proposers understand the evaluation process.

The document also provides Referees with information about how to evaluate the JRP proposals and REG applications, and how to claim expenses as well as an honorarium. The document also includes the Code of Conduct together with the *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* that the Referees must sign before beginning the evaluation.

2 Introduction

The EMRP Call 2009-Energy JRPs are intended to advance measurement science and technology in the field of Energy. The EMRP Outline 2008¹ (pages 8 and 23) gives an overview of the European research agenda in the area of energy. Following an open call for “Potential Research Topics” 16 Selected Research Topics (SRTs) have been opened for the Call and can be found at www.emrponline.eu.

1 European Metrology Research Programme (EMRP) Outline 2008 (Edition - November 2008)
<http://www.euramet.org/fileadmin/docs/EMRP-outline2008.pdf>.

3 Role and Responsibilities of Those Involved in Evaluation

3.1 Programme Owners

3.1.1 EMRP Committee Members

The EMRP Committee members are responsible for:

- The effective implementation of the EMRP,
- The selection of the JRPs, and REGs taking into account advice from the Referees,
- All decisions relating to the appeal process.

The EMRP Committee members may act as moderators in discussions at the Review Conference (or this may be undertaken by the EMRP-MSU). 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 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.

3.1.2 The EMRP Chair

The EMRP Chair is responsible for:

- Approving the list of Referees,
- Supervising the Referees,
- The overall process.

3.1.3 The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU)

The EMRP Management Support Unit (EMRP-MSU) undertakes the administration and logistics of the evaluation process to make sure that: the process runs smoothly; that access to the information relating to proposals is strictly controlled; and everyone's time is used efficiently. The EMRP-MSU operates under the guidance of the EMRP Committee, and act independently of their employing organisation. The EMRP-MSU can clarify the process of evaluation, and can be contacted on the EMRP helpline emrpA169@npl.co.uk or by telephone: +44 20 8943 6666.

The EMRP-MSU, under the guidance of the EMRP Committee, will organise a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each JRP proposal and REG application, following the procedures and rules given in this document. The EMRP-MSU will not attempt to influence the opinion of the Referees and may not express any opinion to the Referees on the merits or otherwise of any proposal.

The EMRP-MSU is responsible for:

- Arranging the administration and logistics of the evaluation of the proposed JRPs and REGs 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.
- Manning a telephone and email helpline to assist those involved.
- Checking the eligibility of each JRP proposal/REG application and all participants.
- Recording the outcome of the evaluations and Review Conference.
- Dealing with expenses claims and honorarium for the Referees.

The EMRP-MSU staff may act as moderators in discussions at the Review Conference (or this may be undertaken by the EMRP Committee).

3.1.4 The Referees

EURAMET appoints Referees to assist in the evaluation of JRP proposal/REG application. A Referee is an independent expert who is acting in a personal capacity, and, when performing the evaluation does not represent any organisation, national interest, or other entity.

Referees must be independent, impartial and objective, and behave in a professional manner. This document gives details of the documents that Referees must sign prior to beginning the evaluation.

Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees contains a description of the values that Referees are expected to maintain during their duties. This Code of Conduct does not however establish a contract with the Referee.

The Referees are responsible for:

- Evaluating the merits of each JRP proposal/REG application against the given evaluation criteria.
- Maintaining confidentiality of the documents they are assessing.
- Deleting all documents after the Review Conference.
- Informing the EMRP-MSU of any conflict of interest.

Referees may be invited by the EMRP Committee members to perform the roles of rapporteur to the EMRP Committee meeting. This would occur if extra guidance or advice is required after the Review Conference. An “extended panel” of Referees may be established to ensure any follow up actions from the Review Conference can be completed.

3.1.5 The Research Council

The Research Council does not participate directly in the evaluation of the JRP proposal/REG 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.

3.1.6 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.

3.2 The Proposers

3.2.1 The TP-Facilitator

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

3.2.2 The JRP-Coordinator

The JRP-Coordinator holds responsibility for writing the JRP proposal, and ensuring that the proposed project is agreeable to all participants, and needs of the Call. They are responsible for ensuring that the JRP proposal is submitted on time with all the required forms and paperwork.

The JRP-Coordinator is also responsible for preparing a poster detailing the JRP. The JRP-Coordinator should present the JRP poster to the Referees, and answer the Referees questions at the Review Conference. However 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 each JRP-Consortium is able to represent each JRP proposal at the Review Conference.

3.2.3 The JRP-Participants

The JRP-Participants hold no responsibilities relating to the evaluation of the JRP proposal/REG application. They should ensure that they have provided the JRP-Coordinator with all required information to enable the submission of the JRP proposal on time.

3.2.4 The REG-Applicant

The REG-Applicant holds no responsibilities relating to the evaluation of the JRP proposal/REG application. The REG-Applicant is responsible for writing the REG application, after agreeing its content with the JRP-Coordinator. The REG-Applicant must ensure that the REG application form is received by the JRP-Coordinator in plenty of time for checking prior to the Call deadline on the 2nd November 2009.

4 Evaluation Process

The evaluation of JRP proposal/REG application is carried out using the procedure described below:

4.1 Step 1: Before the Evaluation

4.1.1 Call for Proposals

The EMRP (European Metrology Research Programme) uses a two-stage process to identify potential priority topics and then request project proposals on those topics identified as highest priority from the metrology community.

Stage 2 of the EMRP Call 2009-Energy is launched on 2nd September 2009. To be eligible for evaluation JRP proposals must:

- Be received in electronic format before the deadline of 2nd November 2009 (23:59 hours CET).
- Be submitted on the official forms.
- Contain the JRP Protocol and the JRP Costing Spreadsheet.
- Contain the REG application form(s) for proposals where a REG is requested.
- Comprise of eligible participants.

4.1.2 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.

4.1.3 Eligibility Check of Proposals

Each proposal for a JRP and/or application for a REG (proposal) will be checked for eligibility by the EMRP-MSU. 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.

The exact eligibility criteria for the EMRP Call 2009-Energy are given in the relevant guidance documents for writing a JRP and REG. They include:

- Receipt of proposal before the Call deadline of 2nd November (23:59 hours CET).
- All participants must be eligible.
- Minimum number of countries and participants must be included.
- JRP proposal/REG application must be submitted on the official forms.
- Completeness of the JRP proposal/REG application (Note the eligibility check will ensure that the appropriate forms are present in the JRP proposal/REG application, the completeness of the information contained in the JRP proposal/REG application is evaluated by the Referees).

4.1.4 Appointment of Referees

EURAMET appoints independent experts (Referees) to assist with the evaluation of proposals for the EMRP Calls. Details of potential Referees are maintained in the central European Commissions Framework Programmes database of experts. EURAMET has been granted privileged access to this database, will select Referees considering the skills and knowledge appropriate to the tasks assigned to them.

To evaluate the proposals submitted in response to a call, EURAMET draws up a list of appropriate Referees (including if necessary a reserve list). The lists of individuals from which panels of Referees may be chosen, are drawn up by EURAMET using the following selection criteria:

- an appropriate range of 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.
- regular rotation of independent experts.

EURAMET may, if deemed appropriate, select any individual with the appropriate skills from outside the lists.

4.1.5 Preliminary Briefing of the Referees

This guidance informs Referees of the evaluation process, and of their responsibilities during the evaluation process.

They will also receive an invitation and document pack containing:

- The “supporting document(s)” relating to their technical area/areas.
- Venue details for the Review Conference.
- Agenda of the Review Conference.
- JRP proposal(s) to be evaluated.
- REG application(s) to be evaluated.

4.2 Step 2: Evaluation of Proposals

Evaluation consists of a number of steps:

- Referees evaluate all eligible JRP proposals for their conformity with the supporting documents, and against the published evaluation criteria relevant for the EMRP Call 2009-Energy. Each eligible JRP proposal is independently evaluated by a minimum of three Referees.
- Referees evaluate all eligible REG applications against the published evaluation criteria for REGs relevant for the EMRP Call 2009-Energy. Each eligible REG application is independently evaluated by a minimum of two Referees.
- Following the individual evaluation of JRP proposal/REG application, a Review Conference is held where the Referees prepare consensus marking.
- At the Review Conference a panel discussion 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 proposers.
- The Referees prepare a ranked list of the JRP proposals, and they recommend that the REG applications are funded, not funded, or revised.

4.2.1 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 the evaluation of the JRP proposals and REG application.

All Referees are required to sign a *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2) identifying any conflicts of interest that may undermine their impartiality. This must be signed prior to beginning the evaluation.

If at any stage during the evaluation the Referee discovers he/she is in any way connected with a proposal, 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 JRP proposals and/or REG application that the Referee will review.

- Allowing the Referees to continue but with some further restrictions of agreements 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 a proposal outside of his/her area of expertise they should:

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

Though it should be noted that it is beneficial to have some Referees with general rather than very specific expertise.

4.2.2 Maintaining Confidentiality of the Proposals

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

EURAMET requires Referees to sign a *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2). This must be signed before the Referee starts evaluating.

4.2.3 Evaluation Criteria for the JRP Proposals and REG Applications

All JRP proposals/REG applications are treated equally, and are evaluated as presented, on their own merit. In all circumstances, JRP proposals are evaluated for their conformity with the supporting documents, and against the published evaluation criteria. And REG applications are evaluated against the published evaluation criteria for REGs. Any JRP proposal/REG application which contravenes fundamental ethical principles or which does not fulfil any conditions set out in the EMRP Call 2009-Energy shall not be selected and may be excluded from the evaluation and selection procedure at any time. In clear-cut cases, (for example, a proposal which addresses a research task which is not open in the Call) the proposal may be ruled out of scope by the EMRP Committee without referring it to Referees.

The evaluation criteria for JRP proposals and REG applications are given in the evaluation forms that forms an Annex to this document.

4.2.4 Proposal Marking

JRP proposals are examined for their conformity with the supporting documents, and then each JRP proposal and REG application are marked against predefined evaluation criteria. Full details of the Marking Guidance and the evaluation criteria are given in Annex 3: Consensus Evaluation and Marking Sheet (for JRP and REG).

4.2.5 Individual Preliminary Assessment of the Proposals by the Referees

The EMRP-MSU will forward electronic copies of the JRP proposals, supporting documents, and REG applications to be examined to each Referee. JRP proposals/REG applications will normally be made available to the Referees at least 2 weeks in advance of the Review Conference (except in the case of additionally added Referees).

During this review period the 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 (Annex 3) can be printed and used as personal marking sheet to record the Referee's opinion prior to the Review Conference as an aide-memoir. 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.

If at any stage in the evaluation the Referee encounters a JRP proposal outside of their area of expertise they should:

- Not evaluate that JRP proposal.
- Inform the EMRP-MSU so that additional Referees can be sought.

Though it should be noted that it is beneficial to have some Referees with general rather than very specific expertise.

4.2.6 Overview of the Review Conference

The Review Conference includes the following key elements:

- Briefing on the evaluation process.
- JRP poster presentations and discussions with representatives of each JRP proposal.
- Q&A follow-up session with representatives of each JRP proposal.
- Consensus marking of the JRP proposals/REG applications by the Referees.

4.2.7 Consensus Marking of the Proposals at the Review Conference

The Review Conference will give Referees and the EMRP Committee an opportunity to evaluate whether the proposed JRPs and REGs address the needs of the Call.

It enables Referees to clarify their understanding of the JRP proposals by meeting and questioning the proposers, and seeing their presentations related to each JRP and REG. There will be a formal question and answer session between the Referees and the proposers. After this session, the Referees will discuss the JRP proposals and REG applications and reach a consensus view on the marking. The marks for each JRP will form a consensus report, which will form the Referees' recommendations to the EMRP Committee regarding the merit of each JRP. REGs will be recommended for funding, not funding, or revision.

4.3 Step 3: Finalisation of the Evaluation

Following the Review Conference some post processing and financial checks are made before the final list of funded JRPs is confirmed in the meeting of the EMRP Committee.

The EMRP Committee meets to select the JRPs to fund based on the recommendations of the Referees, and taking into account the closing out of any outstanding comments. For special cases, Referees may be invited to attend the meeting.

The REGs will either:

- be funded as they are proposed.
- have some minor revisions made (e.g. the duration changed if the Referees advise this).
- the concept of having a REG in the JRP will be accepted, but the REG itself must be reworked and re-applied for at "Stage 3".

In no cases can a REG be funded where the associated JRP is not funded.

4.3.1 Funding the Ranked List

The ranked list of JRPs (and, where successful, their associated REGs) will be funded until the available budget is spent. The EMRP-MSU is responsible for calculating where the budget cut-off falls. The JRP / REG that crosses the funding limit may be funded or not at the discretion of the EMRP Committee.

4.3.2 Validation by Representatives of the Referees

The Referees will validate the final ranked list of JRPs – this creates a draft-list of JRPs and REGs to fund. If the EMRP Committee raises any issues or concerns about any proposals, applications or the marking, then an "extended panel" of Referees comprising a subset of Referees could be convened to answer the EMRP Committee's questions.

4.3.3 Agreement of the Final JRP List by the EMRP Committee

Following acceptance of the draft list by Referees, the EMRP Committee will agree the final list of JRPs (and REGs) to fund.

4.3.4 Formal Opinion of the Research Council

The Research Council provides a formal “opinion” regarding the overall view of the EMRP Call 2009-Energy, the selection process, and on the final list of selected JRPs and REGs. This formal opinion is sent to the European Commission.

4.3.5 Submission of the List to the European Commission

The final list of JRPs and REGs to be funded is forwarded to the European Commission.

Annex 1: Code of Conduct for Referees

1. Scope

This Code of Conduct applies to Referees assisting EURAMET with the evaluation of proposals submitted to EURAMET for funding in response to Calls supported through the Article 169 based EMRP.

2. When to Sign

When Referees open the email(s) containing the JRP proposal(s) / REG application(s) for evaluation, they are deemed to have accepted and be bound by this Code of Conduct and all its requirements. On arrival at the Review Conference a paper copy of the *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* (Annex 2) must be signed before the evaluation commences.

3. Description of Tasks

The task of an independent Referee is to participate in a confidential, fair and equitable evaluation of each proposal according to the procedures described in this document.

Evaluation includes formulating recommendations on the proposals submitted to EURAMET. The Referee shall apply to the best of his/her abilities, his/her professional skills, knowledge and ethics, in accordance with the guidelines and time-schedules provided by EURAMET (EMRP-MSU).

The Referee shall provide EURAMET (EMRP-MSU) with any information it may request for the management of the evaluation. Evaluation requires the Referee to complete reports, provide comments on proposals, and submit these to EURAMET (EMRP-MSU) using the forms provided, as appropriate. In addition, the Referee may be asked to act as a "rapporteur" for consensus discussions or meetings of panels of experts.

4. Inability to Perform Obligations and/or Termination

If for some reason the Referees are not able to assist in evaluating the proposals or attend the Review Conference, the EMRP-MSU should be informed immediately.

The Referee may not delegate another person to carry out the evaluation.

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

5. Independence

The Referee acts as an independent person. He/she is deemed to act in a personal capacity and, in performing the evaluation, does not represent any organisation or country.

- Referees may not discuss any proposal with others, including other Referees or EMRP Committee members not directly involved in the evaluation of the proposal, except during the formal discussion, or with the knowledge and prior written agreement of the EMRP Chair.
- Referees may seek further information (for example through the internet, specialised databases, etc.) to allow them to complete their examination of the proposals, provided that the obtaining of such information respects the overall rules for confidentiality and impartiality. Referees may not contact third parties without prior written agreement of the EMRP Chair.
- It is strictly forbidden for Referees to make contact with proposers, except at the Review Conference organised by the EMRP Committee as part of the evaluation process.

6. Conflict of Interest

If a Referee has a direct or indirect link with a proposal, or any other vested interest, is in some way connected with a proposal, or has any other allegiance which impairs or threatens to impair his/her impartiality with respect to a proposal, he/she must declare such facts to the EMRP-MSU as soon as he/she becomes aware of this.

EURAMET ensures that, where a link could threaten the impartiality of the Referee, he/she does not participate in the evaluation of that proposal, and, if necessary, competing proposals.

7. Circumstances Causing Conflict of Interest

A disqualifying conflict of interest exists if a Referee:

- Was involved in the preparation of the proposal.
- Stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted.
- Has a close family relationship with any person representing an applicant or organisation in the proposal.

- Is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organisation.
- Is employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal.
- Is a member of one of the Technical Committees of EURAMET.
- Is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially.

A potential conflict of interest may exist, even in cases not covered by the clear disqualifying conflicts indicated above, if a Referee:

- Was employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal within the previous three years.
- Is involved in a contract or research collaboration with an applicant organisation, or had been so in the previous three years.
- Is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

8. Confidentiality

Referees must treat the proposals, results of the evaluation, and the identity of other Referees, in the strictest of confidence. Each Referee must sign the *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* prior to beginning evaluation; otherwise they will not be allowed to act as a Referee.

- Referees are not allowed to disclose the names of other Referees participating in the evaluation. The European Commission may be informed of the names of the Referees who evaluated each JRP and REG, along with the list of selected JRPs and REGs, and they may choose to publish the names of the Referees, or require EURAMET to do so. If the European Commission (or EURAMET) publishes, the names will be disclosed as a block and will not identify the individual Referees against assigned evaluations, and Referees must not disclose the assigned evaluations.
- Referees may not show the contents of proposals or information on proposers to third parties (e.g. colleagues, students, etc.) without prior written agreement of the EMRP Chair.
- Referees will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents, copies or notes, either on paper or in electronic form, relating to the evaluation of proposals or proposers. These should be returned, erased or destroyed upon completing the evaluation, unless otherwise instructed. The Referees' advice to the EMRP Committee is confidential and may not be communicated to the proposers or to any other person.

9. 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 Community legislation and this Code of Conduct.

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

10. Other Conditions

Any results obtained by the independent Referee in performance of the evaluation shall be 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 the Referees during the performance of the evaluation.

The provisions of the Code of Conduct, including the *Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest* do not constitute an employment agreement and EURAMET is not liable to provide the Referees with any compensation or coverage in the event of injury or illness.

Annex 2: Declaration of Confidentiality and No Conflict of Interest

I, the undersigned, confirm that I have read, understood and accepted the above Code of Conduct for Referees relating to the performance of the evaluation tasks for Article 169 based EMRP.

Tick the appropriate box:

- I declare that I have not submitted a proposal, nor am I to my knowledge, directly or indirectly involved in any proposal submitted for evaluation under the EMRP Call 2009-Energy.
- I declare that my participation in the evaluation of the following proposal(s) or area(s) listed below could create a conflict of interest (complete as applicable):

Acronym Title / Area

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

In particular, I undertake to inform EURAMET (the EMRP-MSU) immediately if I discover any conflict of interest, direct or indirect, with any proposal that I am asked to evaluate or which is the subject of discussion in any evaluation meeting at which I am present.

I also declare that I will not reveal any detail of the evaluation process and its outcomes, or of any proposal submitted for evaluation, the other Referees identities, without the express written approval of the EMRP Chair. I understand that I will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files upon completing the evaluation, unless otherwise instructed.

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.....

Place & Date.....

Annex 3: Consensus Evaluation and Marking Sheet (for JRP and REG)

The Referees must complete and sign the following form(s) at the Review Conference, to record their consensus opinion of each JRP proposal, and any associated REG application(s). One form is required per JRP proposal and one form per REG application.

Each JRP proposal must be examined for its conformity to the relevant supporting documents, and the appropriate area of the 'JRP Evaluation & Marking Sheet' completed.

Referees then mark the JRP proposals and REG applications against each of the evaluation criteria detailed in the Evaluation & Marking Sheets. Marks are given on a six-point scale from 0 to 5, with one mark against each evaluation criterion.

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 things*" 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.

Evaluation Marking for REGs

- There are four evaluation criteria for REGs.
- Each criterion is to be marked out of 5, giving a maximum score of 20.
- There are no minimum scores for REGs.
- The Referees should simply recommend funding, recommend minor amendments, or recommend that the REG is reapplied for at Stage 3.

Marking Guidance for Referees:

- 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.

JRP EVALUATION & MARKING SHEET



Call	EMRP Call 2009-Energy
JRP name & version number:	
JRP mark	/20
JRP recommendation	Fund / Do Not fund

CONFORMITY WITH THE SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS:	
<i>Tick the correct 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 QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION AND MANAGEMENT:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Quality: Do the proposed participants bring high quality and relevant experience to the project? Critical mass: Does this Consortia bring critical mass and a balance of skills to the project, is the quality of the consortium high? Balance: Are the tasks suitably assigned between partners, exploiting complementarity, balance and expertise? Resource: Overall does the JRP have adequate resources and justification to deliver the objectives? (staff, equipment etc) Note if too much or too little. Planning: Is their evidence of project plans, including clear deliverables, integration of resources and use of common resources? Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures?	
	Mark (out of 5)

RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE EMRP:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does the JRP address a need in the Call as identified in the relevant supporting document? Does JRP address a need stated in the EMRP Outline 2008? Is this a sound concept?	
	Mark (out of 5)

SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNICAL EXCELLENCE:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things?</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does this JRP facilitate progress beyond the state-of-the-art? Are the objectives of sufficient quality, and sound concept as well as sufficiently clear and ambitious for this JRP to warrant funding? Is the method of achieving the objective based on sound scientific and/or technological methodology? Quality of the work plan; Does successful delivery of the objectives require critical mass to be assembled in this technical area?	
	Mark (out of 5)

POTENTIAL IMPACT THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT, DISSEMINATION AND USE OF THE PROJECT RESULTS:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does this JRP contain a workpackage addressing impact? Does the impact workpackage address: Knowledge Transfer/ Dissemination; Training; and exploitation? Is the impact workpackage fit for purpose? Are the activities in this workpackage appropriate? Does the JRP contribute at the European and or International level to the expected impacts listed in the FP7 work programme, and the EMRP Outline 2008 (for this technical area)?	
	Mark (out of 5)

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

REG EVALUATION & MARKING SHEET



Call	EMRP Call 2009-Energy		
JRP name & version number:			
REG mark	_____/20		
REG recommendation	<input type="checkbox"/> Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Request amendments <input type="checkbox"/> Reapply at Stage 3	Comments: <i>Required where amendments are requested</i>	

SCIENTIFIC AND/OR TECHNOLOGICAL EXCELLENCE:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does this REG facilitate progress beyond the state-of-the-art? Are the objectives of sufficient quality, and sound concept as well as sufficiently clear and ambitious for this REG to warrant funding? Is the method of achieving the objectives based on sound scientific and/or technological methodology? Is the proposed research going to benefit Europe?	
	Mark (out of 5)

RELEVANCE TO THE OBJECTIVES OF THE JRP:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does the REG support the JRP objectives? Does the REG support the objectives of the EMRP Outline 2008 via the REG? Is the REG integral to the JRP? If the REG were not funded would the JRP fail? If a mobility grant is requested does this a) add value to the JRP, and b) is this essential to the success of the activities?	
	Mark (out of 5)

QUALITY AND IMPLEMENTATION CAPACITY OF THE APPLICANT AND HIS/HER POTENTIAL FOR FURTHER PROGRESS:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Are the REG-Researcher and the home organisation of sufficient quality? Does the REG-Researcher have sufficient experience? Are there any concerns about the proposed REG-Researcher's suitability or ability to fruitfully engage in collaboration? Does the REG-Researcher have potential to progress further, via the proposed REG activities? If the REG-Researcher is not yet known, do you have confidence that a suitable candidate can be found? If the home organisation is not yet known, do you have confidence that a suitable organisation can be found? Does the REG offer value for money? (Is the number of months requested realistic to produce the deliverable)	
	Mark (out of 5)

QUALITY OF THE PROPOSED ACTIVITY IN SCIENTIFIC TRAINING AND/OR TRANSFER OF KNOWLEDGE:	
<i>Referees may wish to consider the following things</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Does the proposed REG offer opportunity to transfer knowledge between the REG-Researcher, home organisation, and the wider JRP-Participants? Is any training activity planned for the REG-Researcher, or organised by the REG-Researcher? Could further training activities be incorporated that would add further value to this REG?	
	Mark (out of 5)

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

Annex 4: Payment of Referees

1. Scope

This Annex offers guidance to Referees on how to claim expenses and honorarium incurred at the Review Conference. The proposers of Joint Research Projects (JRPs) and/or Researcher Excellence Grants (REGs) are not eligible to claim any expenses.

2. Eligible Claims

Referees are not remunerated but will be entitled to an honorarium for attending the Review Conference. 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

Referees can claim an honorarium for attending the Review Conference, which is an ex-gratia payment, not a payment for the supply of services to EURAMET.

The honorarium is a fixed amount of 900 € for attending the Review Conference, and is only paid to Referees who satisfactorily complete the evaluation for the entire duration of the Review Conference. No payment is made for any preparatory reviewing.

The honorarium is offered to all Referees as recognition of your expertise, reward for your 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.), 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).
- 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 a cheaper travel fare (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.

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 (Annex 5) 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 (Annex 5), 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: emrpA169@npl.co.uk

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

Annex 5: Referee Claim Form for Review Conference

MEETING DETAILS:

Review Conference	25-th 26 th November 2009. Berlin, Germany.
-------------------	--

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 Review Conference	Referee/employer
Hotel costs		Yes/No			Referee/employer
Economy plane/train ticket (non-flexible)		Yes/No			Referee/employer
Total.		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		