

# Guidelines for Evaluation

## ERA-MarineBiotech (ERA-MBT) Third joint transnational call

**Link to the Evaluation Portal:**

<https://www.submission-marinebiotech.eu/>

For further information contact the Joint Call Secretariat:

Victoria Sanz

Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness

Spain

[era-mbt@aei.gob.es](mailto:era-mbt@aei.gob.es)

Tel.: +34 91 6037723

This document was especially prepared for the Peer Review & Panel (PRP) members and intends to support them in the evaluation of the proposals submitted to the ERA-MBT third Transnational Joint Call. It aims to provide clear instructions on how to evaluate the proposals. If there are still issues/questions do not hesitate to contact the Joint Call Secretariat. This document is also available at the internal evaluation Portal.

## **1. Aim of the call**

### **1.1. Background**

Previous ERA-MBT calls for research proposals presented the research community with considerable scope for innovative research designed to extract value from marine bioresources firstly by the development of biorefinery processes and more recently by promoting research on the discovery of bioactive materials from the marine environment.

### **1.2. General scope**

This call broadly targets the development and utilization of culture independent methods to study genetic material of marine, non-cultivable microbes (the microbiome). This is estimated to account for 90 percent of the total marine biomass. Even though the enormous potential of marine microorganisms as a source of novel enzymes and metabolites has been demonstrated, many challenges exist when aiming to explore and exploit this biomass. The greatest challenge facing the research community targeting the microbiome, concerns limitations associated with culturing marine microbes. However, recent advances in culture independent approaches resulting in the increased availability of metagenomic data have helped overcome these limitations, leading to the identification of novel biocatalysts and metabolites with biotechnological potential. Developments in “-omics” technologies have expanded the utility of sequence-based metagenomic analysis, making possible the comprehensive analysis of all genes in all organisms present in the most complex sample. It is expected that further successes will follow with ongoing technological developments that are set to enhance both the identification of novel biochemical entities within metagenomics datasets, and their expression in heterologous systems.

The focus of this call is to target research towards marine metagenomes and their microbes, with a view to identifying new enzymes, metabolites, and metabolic pathways with biotechnological potential. The uniqueness of marine environments in which marine microbes live, offers researchers with opportunities to explore their habitat and exploit the genetic properties in a wide range of product and process applications. The complexity of marine environments is reflected in the genetic diversity of the microbes that inhabit these ecosystems. Studying this diverse microbial resource relies heavily on multi- and interdisciplinary research teams and access to a range of tools and methodologies that are generally described as “-omics” technologies or “-omics” based approaches. The use of these tools to study and exploit the biotechnological potential of marine environments is not new; several EU funded projects including MicroB3, Pharmasea and MaCuMBA made extensive use of them. ERA-MBT's mission is to help develop these tools within projects willing to pursue both a scientific goal and an ambition to expand the toolbox, making it possible to gain new knowledge with potential for new innovations.

The demand for products to support environmental surveillance, the control of pathogens - in food, animals, aquaculture, humans, etc., - and new enzymes for use in a variety of industrial bioprocessing applications is rising, as it is the need for new sources of pharmaceutical, medical and food products. The attention of the enterprise and commercial sector has already

turned to marine microbial communities as a potential novel source in their search for new market opportunities.

### 1.3. Focus of the call

With reference to the "ERA-MBT Research and innovation Roadmap", this transversal topic is mentioned under theme 4: "Enabling technologies and infrastructures" and specifically in sub-theme 2: "Development of the marine biotech toolbox" where "**-omics based technologies**" "**bioinformatics**" & "**model organisms**" are included.

The suggested topic also includes the roadmap themes 1, 2 and 3 which lead to a large number of possible project configurations. By introducing the term "*metagenomics*" we focus the call to a yet uncovered area in the ERA-MBT calls, while at the same time, directing the applicants towards the future developments and integrative RTDI (Research, Technological Development and Innovation) landscape.

The goal of this call is to encourage researchers and enterprises to make use of and develop new approaches and tools (integrated, functional- and/or sequenced-based metagenomics) to explore the marine microbiomes in any part of the marine environment, being the free water column, specific habitats, host associated, etc. Typically, the starting point for such research will employ both functional-based and/or sequence-based approaches involving metagenomic DNA. The potential to detect very low abundance footprints of the microbial community and obtain high sequence coverage per sample, means that metagenomes will expand the source of potential novel materials.

Even though, in recent years, considerable progress has been made in the use of "-omics" technologies, efforts are needed to overcome key bottlenecks, and to promote further development of the marine biotech toolbox and the use of these approaches to make value from marine biological resources.

Projects submitted to this call are expected to:

- Maximise and develop the use of available technologies to generate new knowledge and innovation. In doing so, technological gaps or other barriers in exploring marine microbial communities of all types will be highlighted and will inform future developments of new research tools.
- Utilize all the relevant and necessary scientific disciplines and expertise, including knowledge of marine species being hosts to marine microbes. The metagenomics field is large and diverse. The call is therefore open and applicants are free to define which area to explore within the marine related microbiome, where metagenomics can be applied and developed.
- Develop and use culture independent methods to generate value from the unknown, non-cultivable footprint of the microbiome.
- Promote transdisciplinary and have one or more groundbreaking biotechnology component(s).
- Applications are required to focus on activities that fit within one or more of the Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) 1 to 4 (see definition below), and enterprises are

invited to participate and even apply, as long as the correspondent national/regional funder allows. Please check national regulations (ANNEX II of Call Text), as not all funders allow for this.

## 1.4. Exclusions

The call **excludes** the following activities:

- Projects cultivating microorganisms for further analysis
- Projects working with metagenomes from non-salt water habitats
- Projects in contravention with the Cartagena Protocol/Nagoya Protocol

The call **excludes** the costs associated with:

- The collection of materials from the high-seas, from the seabed or within seabed sediments or underlying geological features
- The collection or the access to any other material that is generally freely available, with the exception of samples purchased from biobanks or culture collections

---

**Technology readiness levels (TRL)** *Annex G European Commission Decision C (2014)4995 of 22 July 2014*  
([https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/doc/call/h2020/common/1617621-part\\_19\\_general\\_annexes\\_v.2.0\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/doc/call/h2020/common/1617621-part_19_general_annexes_v.2.0_en.pdf))

Where a topic description refers to a TRL, the following definitions apply, unless otherwise specified:

TRL 1 – basic principles observed

TRL 2 – technology concept formulated

TRL 3 – experimental proof of concept

TRL 4 – technology validated in lab

TRL 5 – technology validated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies)

TRL 6 – technology demonstrated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies)

TRL 7 – system prototype demonstration in operational environment

TRL 8 – system complete and qualified

TRL 9 – actual system proven in operational environment (competitive manufacturing in the case of key enabling technologies; or in space)

**The applications should follow:**

1. Specific **national/regional eligibility criteria** (see ANNEX II of the Call Text for specific funding organisations regulations). In order to comply with the eligibility criteria in the respective country/region it **is strongly recommended to contact the respective funding agency** (see contacts in the ANNEX I of Call Text) before submitting a proposal.

***Note: some topics may not be fundable by some funding organizations.  
Consult the specific national regulations in ANNEX II of the Call Text carefully.***

2. **Additionally, all applications should follow ERA-MBT eligibility criteria**, as described in the Guidelines for Applicants.

**Proposals not meeting national regulations and/or ERA-MBT eligibility criteria might be rejected before the evaluation phase.**

## **2. Call governance**

### **2.1. Call Steering Committee (CSC)**

The Call Steering Committee (CSC) is composed of representatives of those funding agencies participating in the call that have committed national/regional funds and that have signed the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). CSC members cannot apply to the call. If a CSC member representing a scientific research institution is also a researcher at this institution, he/she has to sign a Non-disclosure agreement to be allowed to participate in the CSC activities. Researchers from this research institute may apply to the call.

The CSC is the decision-making body of the ERA-MBT Joint Transnational Calls and is composed of one member from each funding organisation, participating in the call. Each member has a vote in decisions regarding the call. Each representative should name a substitute (incl. contact details in case he/she is unavailable for a meeting or urgent decision).

The CSC will be in charge of supervising the whole call process and to agree on the final list of proposals recommended for funding. During the CSC meetings all issues related to the ERA-MBT calls are discussed, and decisions are documented in minutes from the CSC meetings agreed by all the CSC members.

### **2.2 Joint Call Secretariat (JCS)**

The Joint Call Secretariat (JCS) is responsible for the operational management of the call and the actual implementation of the processes which will be organized centrally, including reception of the applications, organization of the evaluation and communication with both the reviewers, the project coordinator and the CSC. The JCS serves as contact office for any internal and external request concerning the joint call, except for national/regional consultation which will be carried out by the respective National/Regional Contact Persons. The JCS is chairing the CSC and reporting to the ERA-MBT Coordinator.

### 3. Evaluation of proposals

#### 3.1. The Peer Review Panel (PRP)

The Peer Review Panel (PRP) members are constituted by international scientific experts from both the academic and the industrial sectors that will evaluate the submitted proposals as remote reviewers, **and subsequently, a subset of those, will be invited to participate in the Consensus Meeting (CM) finalizing the evaluation process.** The PRP members are selected by the JCS based on the number of submitted proposals and the topics that they are addressing. All ERA-MBT partners and IAG members (International Advisory Group members) may contribute to this task by sending names and profiles of potential reviewers to the JCS. Applicants to the call can also suggest up to three potential evaluators each.

#### **Conflict of interest**

The PRP members will be selected carefully in order to avoid potential Conflicts of Interest (CoI). The PRP members will stay anonymous to the applicants. PRP members will not submit or participate in proposals and must sign a confidentiality agreement and declare any conflict of interest they may have (**ANNEX II**). A conflict of interest exists when a PRP member has a real or apparent interest in the outcome of a proposal such that he/she is in a position to gain financially, professionally or personally from either a positive or negative evaluation of the proposal. The impartiality rules of The Research Council of Norway\* will be used.

\*<http://www.forskningradet.no/servlet/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheader=application%2Fpdf&blobheadertype=Content-Disposition%3A&blobheadervalue1=+attachment%3B+filename%3D%2220120911Bestemmels+eromhabilitetogtillitKortversjonEN.pdf%22&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1274506710188&ssbinary=true>

#### **The most general situations are the following:**

- is consulting / advising the same institution as any of the applicants
- is employed / was employed within the last 12 months/ is considered to be employed at the same institution as any of the applicants
- is a mentor at one of the applicant's institution
- is a relative or collaborator (within the last 4 years) of one of the applicants
- has published with any of the applicants within the last 4 years (check Web of Knowledge/PubMed/Oasis)
- has declared that he/she holds a position on a governing body or an honorary position at an applicant's institution
- gains a financial advantage from the acceptance of the proposal
- receives personal remuneration of the applicant's institution (e.g. External Examiner, Teaching Position)
- is a major scientific/industrial competitor in the field of the application
- is a IAG member of ERA-MBT

See also **ANNEX II: Declaration of Confidentiality and Conflict of interest** and **ANNEX III: Code of conduct**.

### ***3.2. The Evaluation Process***

An internal evaluation portal will be the central tool for the evaluation process. Detailed instructions will guide the evaluators through the electronic evaluation system.

#### ***Assignment of reviewers to proposals***

Allocation of reviewers to proposals is the responsibility of the JCS. The CSC members and other members of the ERA-MBT consortium are welcomed to support the JCS. Each proposal will be reviewed by 3 PRP members and each PRP member is ideally expected to review 5 to 6 proposals in an online evaluation system.

#### ***On line evaluation - Individual written evaluation***

After having signed a non-disclosure agreement, and after the JCS manual check, the reviewer will have access to the on-line evaluation system. For each proposal the system displays the following information: summary of the proposal, team members and subcontractors and corresponding affiliations.

To access the full proposals, the reviewer has to declare a non-conflict of interest for a specific proposal. If ok, the system will give access to the full proposal. The evaluation form will be displayed only for those evaluators assigned to review a certain proposal.

Reviewers will evaluate a proposal according to the “Guidelines for Evaluation”. The reviewer will be asked to score and comment the three evaluation criteria as detailed in **ANNEX I - Evaluation criteria and scores**. It is important that the written statements are sufficiently detailed and that they are in line with the description of the evaluation criteria.

If a report is unclear, the JCS will consult the CSC and the reviewer can be asked to improve the report. If the reviewer declines to do so, a new expert is asked to review the proposal, until a minimum of three acceptable reports have been reached.

#### ***Assignment of Rapporteurs***

After the evaluation deadline, and sufficiently in advance to the PRP meeting (preferably one month in advance), reviewers will be assigned as rapporteur for one or more proposals, ideally a maximum of three proposals. The duties of the rapporteurs are further detailed in **ANNEX IV**. At this stage, all reviewers will have access to all proposals as long as they declare there is no conflict of interest for each proposal. **The reviewers will be strongly encouraged to read all proposals.**

### ***Scientific chair and ERA-MBT co- chair***

Additionally, a scientific chair and an ERA-MBT chair will be nominated to support the JCS in the whole evaluation process, including the organization and moderation of the CM.

The **scientific chair** is expected to collaborate in the following tasks:

- Co-organize the procedures for the Consensus Meeting (CM)
- Moderate scientifically the CM discussion and for each proposal secure a final consensual scoring without recourse to a vote
- Remind the PRP about the meaning of the scores and secure that scoring numbers and evaluations are in agreement
- Check the consensus reports for quality

The **ERA-MBT co-chair** will collaborate in the same tasks described above. In the CM he/she is expected to moderate formally the meeting, assuring a smooth and organized discussion, where all formal requirements are fulfilled:

- Validate the pool of experts
- Support the allocation of proposals to the PRP
- During the CM:
  - Make sure the role of conduct is observed
  - Announce the conflicts of interest in the room
  - Assure the discussion is fair and addresses all evaluation criteria
  - Make sure the discussion stays on time, etc.

### ***Consensus Meeting (CM)***

The JCS will organize a meeting for consensus discussions, together with the scientific chair and ERA-MBT co-chair.

The CSC members are invited to attend the CM as **observers**. They participate in a passive way and are not allowed to influence the meeting or the PRP members in their decisions. If a CSC member is approached directly by the PRP during the meeting session, the CSC member may provide the information asked for. An attempt to influence a reviewer or the process before, during or besides the meeting, from an observer or other third person, will be regarded as grave.

For a number of approximately 40 proposals, a time frame of two days is planned for the meeting. For each strong proposal 15 minutes is envisaged, to provide sufficient consideration. Less time is expected for the weak ones.

### ***Procedures for the Consensus Meeting***

The coordinator will give a short introduction to the ERA-MBT and specificities of the call. The JCS together with the ERA-MBT co-chair will remind all participants about the evaluation process, procedures and code of conduct. The JCS will then give the word to the scientific chair that will lead the session.

A complete overview of the proposals showing the three scores will be presented, following the ID number ascending order. For each proposal, the respective rapporteur will be in charge of presenting a short summary of the proposal, as well as arguments for his/her particular evaluation. The other two PRP members will then present their respective evaluations and provide further comments and considerations. The remaining PRP members are encouraged to objectively and based on concrete knowledge of the application or subject area, comment and participate in the discussion. The outcome of the discussion for each proposal will be an overall score that reflects the consensus of the PRP. In the case that CM participation needs to be restricted, the rapporteurs need to present a "consensus" from the three reviewers and point out possible disagreements for discussion in the CM.

One threshold will be defined by the PRP to separate the ranking list into two containers: "Recommended for funding" and "Not recommended for funding".

For all proposals at and above the threshold, a ranking list is established in an iterative process. If two or more proposals have the same scoring, they will be further discussed and scored again on each single evaluation criteria. The ranking in this group will be established according to the following prioritization order: Scientific and technical excellence with emphasis on the novelty of the biotech component > Potential impact > Quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.

→For further details on Roles & Code of conduct see ANNEX III and IV

### ***Consensus reports***

The rapporteurs will be responsible for writing the **consensus reports** for each proposal. These reports are intended for the project coordinators and funding agencies requiring this document for their national procedures, and should only include comments to each of the three evaluation criteria and finally an overall conclusion highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal – a template will be available in the "Guidelines for Evaluation".

A time frame of two hours will be scheduled after the panel meeting such that the rapporteurs can deliver their consensus reports before leaving the meeting. It will be strongly encouraged that they will do so. If this is not possible a deadline of five working days will be set. A consensus report should be prepared, for all proposals, and particularly well argued for those that will not be funded.

The JCS supported by the scientific chair should check the consensus reports for quality. Only in exceptional cases, the JCS will ask the rapporteur to edit the report. The chairs will have to approve this change. Moreover this should be done as soon as possible, preferably within one week after the JCS receives the report.

The minutes of the CM together with the consensus reports of all proposals will be sent to CSC members.

## ***ANNEX I: Evaluation criteria & scores***

The PRP members will receive the “Guidelines for Evaluation” providing a clear understanding on the scoring system, specific evaluation criterion and the evaluation procedures. Reviewers will be asked to evaluate the scientific relevance to the call - Scope check - which will be a “yes or no” answer. Independently of the answer, the reviewers will be asked to evaluate the proposals, using a common Evaluation Form, according to the criteria detailed below:

### **Criterion 1: Scientific and technological excellence**

- Progress beyond the current state of the art (innovative potential, novelty, originality) with specific emphasis on the novelty of the biotech component
- Clarity and relevance of the objectives
- Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology

### **Criterion 2: Potential Impact**

- How well does the proposal contribute to the aims of the call
- What are the economic advantages and potential for commercialization
- Transnational benefit and added value for the joint collaboration
- What is the societal impact
- Plan for output of research results: Promotion and communication activities

### **Criterion 3: Implementation and Management**

- Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures including risk and innovation management
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants

Each of the three criteria will be scored using a 1-10 scale, with whole numbers only (table 1). A score of 10 indicates an exceptionally strong application with no weaknesses. A score of 1 indicates an application with serious and substantive weaknesses. Reviewers have to identify strengths and weaknesses for each criterion and should provide context for their comments.

Additionally, reviewers will be asked to give an overall score to the proposal which is based on their own judgment of the merit of the overall application. The overall rating should reflect the reviewer’s overall evaluation, and should not be a numerical average of the individual criterion scores. Reviewers should provide a written paragraph summarizing the factors that informed their overall rating.

**Table 1: The scoring system on the three criteria and overall uses a 1-10 scale**

Score	Definition
10: Excellent	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Exceptionally strong with no weaknesses</p> <p><b>Overall proposal:</b> Issues under assessment are comprehensively covered. The work is of a high international standard, addresses and meets the assessment criteria to a very high level and will answer important questions in the field.</p>
8-9: Very good	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Very strong with minor weaknesses</p> <p><b>Overall proposal:</b> Issues under assessment are well covered, with minor suggestions being put forward to enhance the project's chances of success. The work is internationally competitive and meets the majority of the assessment criteria to a high level. Will advance the field.</p>
6-7: Good	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Strong but with at least one moderate weakness</p> <p><b>Overall proposal</b> Issues under assessment are adequately covered, but the proposal shows weakness in some specific assessment criteria. Enhancing the project's chances of success may require significant additions or changes to specific parts of the proposal. The work has merit and meets the majority of the assessment criteria to an adequate level. Likely to advance the field.</p>
4-5: Fair	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Some strengths but with a least one major weakness</p> <p><b>Overall proposal</b> Most of the assessment criteria are inadequately covered, and proper evidence of the project's chances of success is lacking or omitted. Greater chance of successful outcome(s) will require significant and major additions or changes. The work is potentially of some merit, and meets some of the assessment criteria to an adequate level, but is not internationally competitive. Unlikely to advance the field more than incrementally.</p>
1-3: Poor	<p><b>Criteria:</b> Few strengths and more than one major weaknesses</p> <p><b>Overall proposal</b> The work is of no significant scientific merit, flawed, or duplicative of other research, or the applicants do not present evidence of a satisfactory track record, and it does not meet the assessment criteria to an adequate level. Unlikely to advance the field.</p>

### **Evaluation criteria correspondence to the fields in the application form:**

The application form was elaborated such that there is an easy correspondence between the evaluation criteria and the fields in the application form of the proposal.

#### **Criterion 1: Scientific and technological excellence**

- Progress beyond the current state of the art (innovative potential, novelty, originality) with specific emphasis on the novelty of the biotech component
- Clarity and relevance of the objectives
- Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology

#### In the proposal:

- **Summary**
- **Description of background and state of the art**
- **Description of the work plan** (Describe the contents of the individual work packages, the results expected within the duration of the project, the deliverables and milestones; Methodological approaches must be clearly and consistently defined and described)
- **Degree of innovation** (Please describe here the technical-scientific quality of your approach, especially the degree of innovation:
  - Innovation in the approach and its advantages over existing solutions
  - Discussion of disadvantages
  - Degree of novelty and the added value of the project with respect to the state of the art/knowledge)

## Criterion 2: Potential Impact

- How well does the proposal contribute to the aims of the call
- What are the economic advantages and potential for commercialization
- Transnational benefit and added value for the joint collaboration
- What is the societal impact
- Output of research results: Exploitation and communication activities

---

### In the proposal:

- **Contribution to the goals** (How does the project fit the aim of the call? How does the planned research contribute to, or meets a specific market application? Describe the Technology Readiness Levels (TRL 1-5) the project aims at)
- **Added value of Transnational collaboration** (Describe the European and/or international dimension of the research ; Describe the complementarity of the research groups from the different countries; Describe mid- and long-term benefits of this collaborative effort)
- **Dissemination** (How will the results be disseminated scientifically and to the general public? Describe the strategy for exploiting the project results – including strategies at an international level; Describe the processes that enable commercialisation within approximately 5 years following the completion of the project)
- **Pertinent legal, ethical, societal aspects:** (Compliance with national/EU regulations; Outline the societal impacts of the project; Description of ethical, legal or social issues, e.g. informed consent, ethical permits, data protection, use of animals, etc.)

### Criterion 3: Implementation and Management

- Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures including risk and innovation management
- Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants

---

In the proposal:

- **Description of the work plan** (strategy and synergies between work packages; Describe the contents of the individual work packages, the results expected within the duration of the project, the deliverables and milestones; Methodological approaches must be clearly and consistently defined and described)
- Description of the Implementation and management structures
- Budget description and justification (budget figures; brief description regarding costs: personnel, consumables, equipment, travel and other)
- **Partner data** (CV, expertise of the group and its contribution to the goals of the project)
- Risks and contingency plan (describe possible risks and/or bottlenecks and corresponding contingency plans)

## ***ANNEX II: Declaration of Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest***

### ***Confidentiality***

I hereby undertake to treat as confidential all and any information that I receive while participating in the work of the ERA-MBT Peer Review Panel. I will use this information solely for the purpose of evaluation of the proposals; I will not disclose it to any third party and I will not make it publicly available or accessible in any way, except with the prior written consent of the ERA-MBT consortium.

I understand that I shall be bound by this confidentiality disclosure agreement as of the date of my signature of this obligation, and that this confidentiality should be maintained even after the ERA-MBT Evaluation Panel has performed its duties or after my participation in the work of the ERA-MBT Evaluation Panel has ended.

I will not identify myself as a reviewer to the applicant(s) or to any third party, while the ERA-MBT Call Secretariat will ensure confidentiality concerning my role as reviewer as well.

I will only address any questions concerning a proposal to the Call secretariat and not to the applicant(s).

I agree to the rules of this Declaration of Confidentiality

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Conflict of Interest***

I will refrain from reviewing the proposal if a conflict of interest exists\* or could be perceived to exist. I understand that there is a conflict of interest if I stand to profit professionally, financially or personally from approval or rejection of the proposal; or if in the past five years I have published with, cooperated with or worked at the same research institution as the applicant or any of the project workers; If I have fundamental differences of scientific opinion with any applicant; or if I have close links with the applicant or any of the co-workers, either professional or private. If any such conflict of interest exists or arises, I will inform the Joint Call Secretariat ([era-mbt@aei.gob.es](mailto:era-mbt@aei.gob.es)).

Name	Date
Signature	

The ERA-MBT project adheres to the impartiality rules of The Research Council of Norway:

\*<http://www.forskingsradet.no/servlet/Satellite?blobcol=urldata&blobheader=application%2Fpdf&blobheadername1=Content-Disposition%3A&blobheadervalue1=+attachment%3B+filename%3D%2220120911Bestemmelse+rom+habilitetogtillitKortversionEN.pdf%22&blobkey=id&blobtable=MungoBlobs&blobwhere=1274506710188&ssbinary=true>

## ***ANNEX III: Code of conduct***

All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must ensure the transparency of the process and ensure that the evaluation criteria publicised in the “Guidelines for Applicants” are respected for all proposals such that public funds are well used

1. PRP members are chosen for their technical or scientific expertise and in a manner to ensure that decisions taken by the PRP reflect a broad range of opinions. The role of the PRP is to ensure that consortia submitting proposals of a similar quality have an equal chance of success.
2. All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must act objectively, with no self-interested motives. They do not represent their company, organisation or establishment.
3. The PRP members shall evaluate the proposals based solely upon the information contained in the proposals.
4. Decisions must be taken collectively by the PRP after all arguments have been heard. Furthermore, decisions must be substantiated.
5. Opinions expressed during the CM as well as information which parties are the first to obtain have to be kept confidential. The substance of the CM debates must remain secret and the individual positions must not be divulged.
6. Minutes will be kept for those meetings during which decisions are reached. These minutes will be circulated to participants for verification. These minutes should not contain any information which could directly or indirectly identify which parties put forward which arguments.
7. PRP members should refrain in all cases from identifying external experts to third parties, and from divulging any other element which could compromise their anonymity. Likewise, PRP members must not contact applicants directly.
8. If any member is the object of any pressure whatsoever from a project applicant, she or he must notify immediately the Call Secretariat.
9. If there is a conflict of interest, the concerned person must inform the Call Secretariat as soon as finding that a conflict exists. The necessary measures are taken to ensure that the related decision and discussion will not be biased, or suspected to be so (e.g. in requesting the concerned person to leave the room when the project in question is being discussed).
10. The scientific chair or the ERA-MBT chair may, on own initiative; consult the Call Secretariat in respect to a real or possible conflict of interests, which has been brought to the attention of the chair by any means whatsoever.
11. Conflicts of interests as well as the methods used to handle these situations should be included in the CM minutes.

## ***ANNEX IV: Roles in the evaluation procedure***

### **Peer Reviewers**

- Write evaluation reports for the assigned proposals employing the on-line evaluation template according to the evaluation criteria published in the Guidelines for Applicants. It is important that the written statements are sufficiently detailed and that they are in line with the score.
- If a report is unclear and/or not detailed enough, the reviewer can be asked to amend the report by the Call Secretariat.
- For the purpose of discussing an agreed rating of each proposal, the peer reviewers are requested to read all other proposals and make private notes of discussion points to bring up during the CM.

### **Rapporteurs**

- Rapporteurs are the reviewers having been assigned to write the consensus report based on the individual reviews for each proposal, also taking into account relevant arguments coming up during the CM. At the CM, the rapporteur will briefly summarise the content of the proposal and the individual evaluations received. To reach a consensus, the two other evaluators are given the floor to make comments and input to the discussions. If an evaluator should not be able to be present, the rapporteur is responsible for making the written evaluation from this evaluator heard.
- After the CM, the rapporteur will draft the consensus report, in collaboration with the two other reviewers.

### **Scientific chair and the ERA-MBT co-chair**

The two chairs will have roles and assignments as described in the main document.

### **Joint Call Secretariat (JCS)**

- Guarantee that principles and procedures laid down by the ERA-MBT are fulfilled.
- Handle all communication between PRP members, the CSC and (potential) beneficiaries.
- Ensure that work meets functional requirements, especially concerning access to the ERA-MBT Electronic Proposal Submission System and to the practical organisation of the CM.
- Draft the agenda and the minutes of the meetings.
- Observe and take notes of the panel discussion but shall not participate in the debates.

### **Observers**

CSC Members are invited to participate as observers at the CM but shall not participate in the debates.

## **ANNEX V: Consensus report**

### Marine Biotechnology ERA-NET Consensus Report

#### **PROPOSAL ACRONYM:**

#### **Instructions**

**Consensus report:** The consensus report is intended exclusively for the project coordinators and their partners and should include a summary of the preliminary written evaluation reports plus a summary of new arguments provided at the CM (when there is any new argument).

Please follow the 3 criteria to structure your report (about 1 page total for each project):

**Scientific and/or technological excellence** (1.Clarity and relevance of the objectives; 2.Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology; 3.Progress beyond the current state of the art (innovative potential, novelty, originality) with specific emphasis on the novelty of the biotech component)

**Criterion 2: Potential Impact** (1.How well does the proposal contribute to the aims of the call; 2.What is the economic advantages and potential for commercialization; 3.What is the societal impact; 4.Transnational benefit and added value for the joint collaboration; 5.Output of research results: Exploitation and communication activities)

**Criterion 3: Quality and efficiency of the Implementation and Management** (1.Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants; 2. Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance); 3.Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures including risk and innovation management)

**Overall summary:** Please provide an overall conclusion highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal