

Slovenian Research Agency

Call for proposals for an increase in research programme funding related to the COVID-19 pandemic

Evaluation form – PRELIMINARY REPORT

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

Application number:

Research topic:

Code of the programme:

Title of the programme:

Programme leader:

Annual amount of additional funding:

I, the undersigned, declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal in accordance with the »Statement on a conflict of interest and confidentiality« form signed.

Panelist:

Date:

1. Scientific, technological or innovative excellence	
--	--

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- appropriateness of addressing important research challenges,
To what extent is the proposed additional content of the research programme consistent with the chosen research topic as defined in the proposal? To what extent are important research challenges appropriately addressed in respect with the research topic as defined in the proposal?
- clarity of the concept, including the interdisciplinary aspect and relevance of the objectives
Is the concept of the research programme, including the interdisciplinary aspect and relevance of the objectives, clearly formulated?
- originality of the ideas,
To what extent are the ideas original?

Data source:

- **PDF ATTACHMENT – WORK PROGRAMME FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING – ITEM 7**

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on assessment elements under the criterion. All aspects should be commented. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

2. Potential impact achieved by the development, dissemination and use of the expected research results	
--	--

The following aspects will be taken into account:

- importance for the development of science or profession

What is the potential significance of the proposal for the development of science and profession in respect with the research topic as defined in the proposal?

- potential impact on economic, social and cultural development

What is the potential impact on economic, social and cultural development in respect with the research topic as defined in the proposal?

Data source:

- **PDF ATTACHMENT – WORK PROGRAMME FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING – ITEM 8**

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on assessment elements under the criterion. All aspects should be commented. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given:

--

3. Quality and efficiency of implementation and management	
---	--

The following aspect will be taken into account:

- feasibility of the scientific approach

To what extent the proposed work programme for additional funding feasible in respect with the research topic as defined in the proposal?

To what extent the proposed work programme for additional funding feasible according to past performance (achievements/results) of the programme group?

Data source:

- **PDF ATTACHMENT – WORK PROGRAMME FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING – ITEMS 1 - 8**

Each criterion is evaluated on a scale from zero to five. Half point scores may be given (0, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.5, 4, 4.5, 5).

Interpretation of the scores:

- 0 (Noncompetitive): The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information,
- 1 (Poor): The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses,
- 2 (Fair): The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses,
- 3 (Good): The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present,
- 4 (Very good): The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present,
- 5 (Excellent): The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

A written comment on assessment elements under the criterion. All aspects should be commented. The comment is obligatory and must be consistent with the score given: