

ANNEX III. Evaluation Guidelines

Evaluation of each Project Proposal (PP) is carried out by the respective regional/national programmes involved in the Joint Call for Proposals (JCP), following the good practice model “Decentralized evaluation carried out by national programmes”¹, in cooperation with the Joint Call Steering Committee (JCSC) and with the Joint Call Secretariat (JCS)².

The ‘decentralized evaluation’ implies that the regional funding agencies involved must integrate evaluation of ERA-Net level full proposals and evaluation of regional funding applications. This means the evaluators of the regional funding agencies are asked to evaluate the regional-level proposals (according to the regional programme rules) and also the transnational proposals (according to this Evaluation Guidelines)

Evaluators will use a Common Evaluation Form and give a global score of 1-5 or 1-3 for each PP, depending on criterion listed.

COMMON EVALUATION FORM

Project Name:

Project Acronym:

STEP 1 – Decentralized Evaluation – by the regional/national programme

1.1 REGIONAL/NATIONAL ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Does the proposal meet the regional/national eligibility criteria?

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
No	<input type="checkbox"/>

¹ Details of the model are contained in netwatch web site:
http://netwatch.jrc.ec.europa.eu/nw/index.cfm/static/eralearn/evaluation/eval_3_scenario_b.html
² both described in the INSERT FULL TITLE -MoU

1.2 ERNEST ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Does the proposal meet the ERNEST eligibility criteria?

Note: ALL the eligibility criteria must be met in order for the proposal to be accepted for subsequent evaluation.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	YES	NO
1. Consortium composed of eligible beneficiaries, with a minimum of two independent eligible beneficiaries belonging to two different ERNEST regions participating to the ERNEST JC ³ from different EU member states	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Thematic focus of the proposal is within the scope of the JCP	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Proposal submitted by project coordinator on behalf of the CRP's partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Proposal written in the English language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Proposal submitted in time	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Proposal follows the prescribed format and is complete	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1.3 GENERAL EVALUATION

³ (see list of participating regions in call text Chapter 3)



GENERAL EVALUATION CRITERION	SCORE
1. TECHNICAL RELEVANCE (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
2. ADDED VALUE OF INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
3. QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
4. RELEVANCE TO THE THEME OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
5. EXPECTED IMPACT (5 points, threshold 3/5) (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
6. DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES (3 points, threshold 1/3)	
7. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES (5 points, threshold 3/5)	
8. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY (3 points, threshold 1/3)	
9. ETHICAL ISSUES RESPECTED? (3 points, threshold 1/3)	
TOTAL SCORE	

The total score of each PP is derived from the sum of the scores obtained for each criterion.

PPs whose total score at the end of Step 1.3 is below 21 points are rejected.

PPs whose total score at the end of Step 1.3 is equal to 21 points or superior are considered admissible and, if applicable⁴, will proceed to Step 1.4 for the awarding of the additional priority points.

1.4 ADDITIONAL PRIORITY EVALUATION

In order to be admitted for evaluation of additional priority criteria the projects must include the appropriate 'additional priority declaration' in the PP, as outlines in the ????. The evaluation and awarding of additional priority scores is made following the criteria below:

ADDITIONAL PRIORITY EVALUATION CRITERION (each criterion can get a maximum of 5 points)	SCORE
INTEGRATION & INTERDISCIPLINARITY	
INNOVATION IN PRACTICE/MODELLING	
TOURIST PRODUCT/CLUSTERING & REPLICABILITY	
RESEARCH BEYOND ACADEMIA	
TOTAL SCORE	

⁴ If applicable = if the applicants included in the projects the appropriate 'additional priority declaration'

1.5 FIRST DECISION TO END STEP 1

	SCORE
GENERAL EVALUATION	
ADDITIONAL PRIORITY EVALUATION	
TOTAL SCORE	

Following the evaluation in Step 1, each regional/national programme involved,⁵ in the JCP will produce a *provisional ranking list* of all those PPs reputed to be admissible.

The results of all the decentralized evaluations will then be collected by the JSC and will advance to Step 2, an examination of all PPs in a consensus meeting of the ERNEST JCSC.

STEP 2 – Consensus Meeting

A consensus meeting of the ERNEST Joint Call Steering Committee is scheduled, at which time the funding bodies of each regional/national programme will meet and agree if a PP should be rejected or recommended for funding. The outcome is a list of recommendations for funding, where proposals are categorized by means of a colour code:

SECOND DECISION TO END STEP 2

⁵ performed according to regional criteria and to the ERNEST criteria specified above

A	RECOMMENDED for funding	<input type="checkbox"/>
B	RECOMMENDED for funding WITH PRESCRIPTIONS - TO BE DISCUSSED	<input type="checkbox"/>
C	NOT RECOMMENDED for funding	<input type="checkbox"/>

If PP is “Recommended for funding with Prescriptions”, please elaborate on which are the issues to be addressed by the PP applicant:

Additional Comments:

STEP 3 – Final Decision of Regional/National Funding Bodies

THIRD (FINAL) DECISION TO END STEP 3

The list of PPs which are Recommended for Funding and Recommended for Funding with Prescriptions is transmitted by the JCS to the ERNEST JCP Partners which, taking into account both the results of the provisional national/regional ranking list and of the list produced by the JCSC as an outcome to Step 2 of evaluation, take the ultimate national/regional funding decisions. Following this ultimate decision, separate contracts to proceed with a project are then concluded directly between the consortia and their relevant regional/national funding bodies.

Ranking in Common Evaluation Form

The evaluation is performed assigning a score for each of the above listed 9 criterion⁶. Thresholds will be applied to the scores. Half marks can be given.

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination (respectively, for the ranges of scores 0-5 and 0-3):

0	very poor	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information
1	Poor	The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses

⁶ the subcriteria provided in Annex (#?) serve as a guide under which the evaluators should consider those aspects in the assessment of that criterion.

2	Fair	While the proposal broadly addressed the criterion, there are significant weaknesses
3	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary
4	Very Good	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible
5	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor

0	Very Poor	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information
1	Poor	The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses
2	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary
3	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor

Concise but explicit justifications can be given for each score.

Recommendations for improvements will be given, if needed (e.g. Recommended for funding with Prescriptions)

The total score of each PP IS derived from the sum of the scores obtained for each criterion.

PPs whose total score at the end of Step 1.3 is below 21 points are rejected.

PPs whose total score at the end of Step 1.3 is equal to 21 points or superior are considered admissible and, if applicable⁷, will proceed to Step 1.4 for the awarding of the additional priority points.

⁷If applicable = if the applicants included in the projects the appropriate 'additional priority declaration'

Definitions in Common Evaluation Form

COMMON EVALUATION: GENERAL

1. TECHNICAL RELEVANCE (5 points, threshold 3/5)

The extent to which the proposal demonstrates:

Technological and scientific quality of the proposal: a sound concept and quality of objectives;

Are the project objectives realistic and clearly expressed?;

Innovation potential, progress beyond the state of the art = product or service innovation vs. state of the art.

To what extent will the result lead to a new product or service (rate of innovation)?

A new product or service must be scored higher than an improvement of an existing product or service;

Novelty and originality of the approach.

To what extent is the approach new or special? For this criterion the methodology of the project is measured, compared to existing, competing and parallel developments. A new or a special approach will score high. It should be measured relating to the relevant sector.

Production of new knowledge;

Market needs addressed: Is the new product/service capable of developing a relevant market or the market niche?;

Relevance to the EU and FP7 objectives.

Comments:

2. ADDED VALUE OF INTERREGIONAL COOPERATION (5 points, threshold 3/5)

The added value of the interregional cooperation is a central component of transnational projects. It refers to the enhanced level of collaborative interaction between the various organizations participating in the project, and to the added value generated by the roles and expertise composing a particular transnational consortium.

The European dimension of the CRP proposed should provide *added value* to regional/national research efforts in the area of sustainability and competitiveness of the tourism sector. The collaboration of enterprises and or local administrations and researchers from across Europe should build new expertise and produce new knowledge, which will strengthen European competitiveness in this area.

European added value is not only about "European" (vs. local or global) topics, but about the expectation of



better research that emerges from European research collaboration.

Evaluate the *added value* of the CRP proposed on the extent to which it brings added value as an international cooperation.

Specifically, in terms of:

knowledge transfer, future market potential, etc.

is there a wider geographical potential of the expected results?

does the project success require the presence of international cooperation?

Comments:

3. QUALITY OF PARTNERSHIP (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Evaluate the *quality of partnerships* of the CRP proposed on how all involved partners can achieve together the goals of the foreseen project (concerning the scientific / technological aspects) and if the degree of involvement of the various partners in CRP activities is adequate and fair.

Specifically, the extent to which the CRP demonstrates:

quality, relevant experience and/or expertise of individual participants in the fields;

quality of consortium as a whole:

appropriate balance of partners (SMEs, RTOs, Large Corporations, etc.)

good division of work among partners;

good level of integration and collaboration;

appropriate complementarities of partners (countries/regions, areas of expertise, etc).

Comments:

4. RELEVANCE TO THE THEME OF SUSTAINABLE TOURISM (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Evaluate the *relevance* of the CRP proposed,

Specifically in relation to:

the topic of the call: 'sustainable and competitive tourism';

the objectives of the call – see call text;

the strategic value of the proposal. Does the project take into account and tackle adequately the following aspects:

competitiveness (will the project address market needs, is the new product/service capable of developing a relevant market or the market niche?)

environmental sustainability (will the project improve the environmental performance? Are there eco-innovation aspects?)

social dialogue (will the project put in place participative processes?)

Comments:

5. EXPECTED IMPACT (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Evaluate the *expected impact* of the CRP proposed to the extent to which it demonstrates:

an expected regional/national impact (well balanced) in terms of increased competitiveness and innovation;

potential economic impact and commercialization of results;

potential success of the project will impact the CRP partners in terms of increased competitiveness, revenues increase and number of employees;

tourism industry needs and potential market: Is the project success impacting significantly on partners, matching some specific needs? Is there a significant potential market for the new product/service? Is the new product/service competitive with respect to existing ones in the market?

has an exploitation plan and market accessibility been addressed?;

does the description of the exploitation plan illustrate adequately the steps that the project partners intend to follow in order to bring the product/service to the market?

Comments:

6. DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES (3 points, threshold 1/3)

Evaluate the *dissemination activities* of the CRP proposed to the extent to which they demonstrate:
appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of transnational projects results;
proper management of intellectual property/IPR concept.

Comments:

7. MANAGEMENT STRUCTURES (3 points, threshold 1/3)

Evaluate the *management structures* of the CRP proposed to the extent to which they demonstrate appropriateness of the management structure and its procedures,
Specifically, in terms of,
project structure, division of work packages, and contributions of various partners to CRP activities;
clarity: Is the project plan comprehensible and feasible? Are there meaningful work packages and deliverables?;
feasibility: are adequate resources allocated to the project (budget, personnel, equipment)? Is the time schedule adequate?;
is the achievement of the project objectives verifiable within the progress of the project?

Comments:

8. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY (3 points, threshold 1/3)

Evaluate the *potential sustainability* of the CRP proposed to the extent to which it demonstrates:
the CRP is expected to have a lasting impact in economic, environmental or social terms
the project takes into account the limits of relying on regional funding for short-term sustainability and possibly include economic feasibility analyses including all potential stakeholders as to how to ensure

sustainability when the ERNEST JC financial contribution comes to an end;

the cooperation partnership developed provides reliable indications that it could continue beyond the funding provided by the regions within the ERNEST JC.

Comments:

COMMON EVALUATION: ADDITIONAL PRIORITY

1. INTEGRATION & INTERDISCIPLINARITY (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Does this CRP proposed demonstrate an *integration and interdisciplinarity approach* (i.e. to address multiple research themes)?

Comments:

2. INNOVATION IN PRACTICE/MODELLING (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Does this CRP proposed demonstrate *innovation in practice/modelling*?

Specifically, either through,

development of operative models for the implementation of sustainable tourism in tourism SMEs;

enterprises being invited to research into appropriate comparative, interdisciplinary and practical models of how tourism sustainability comes into being and how it operates, with a specifically practical and empirical focus;

particular emphasis being placed on interregional comparisons with a view to offering models of successful practice, and that consider the conditions which make them possible, or which make them difficult.

Comments:

3. TOURIST PRODUCT/CLUSTERING & REPLICABILITY (5 points, threshold 3/5)

A key issue in tourist development is the management of the tourist destinations and of the tourist products. Every tourist product has its own supply chain, its own stakeholders and its own markets. Similar tourist products face similar challenges and for therefore it is interesting to promote a common transnational approach

Typical tourist products are art & culture destinations, seaside resorts, mountain resorts, countryside, Spas, meeting & incentives destinations, cultural itineraries, etc

Does this CRP proposed demonstrate a tourist product approach, clustering and/or replicability?

Comments:

4. RESEARCH BEYOND ACADEMIA (5 points, threshold 3/5)

Does this CRP proposed demonstrate the application of *research beyond academia*?

Specifically

the potential impact of the research, in environmental, economic, social or cultural terms.

Comments: