

# CZ-SK infodeň k výzve ERA 2024

## Komentáre hodnotiteľov



EURÓPSKA ÚNIA  
Európsky fond regionálneho rozvoja  
OP Integrovaná infraštruktúra 2014 – 2020



MINISTERSTVO  
ŠKOLSTVA, VEDY,  
VÝSKUMU A ŠPORTU  
SLOVENSKEJ REPUBLIKY



Investícia do Vašej budúcnosti

# Kapitola EXCELLENCE

## **Hodnotiace kritériá v hodnotiacom hárku:**

- Clarity of the project's objectives
- Pertinence of the project's objectives

# Kapitola EXCELLENCE - objectives

+ The proposal excellently **supports the rationale for the work proposed** and the **associated objectives are outlined very clearly**. Their pertinence to the topic is demonstrated very well. The proposal summarizes clearly that the overall aim of the project is set on **three concrete objectives** that complement well in a cohesive way.

+ The proposal shows systematically **how the objectives are achievable**, verifiable and measurable.

- Objectives **do not convincingly demonstrate** how the project will change the capacity of the partners to effectively work together.

- While the objectives are broadly pertinent and achievable, **their description is not exhaustively detailed**.

<https://horizoneuropencpportal.eu/search?search=annotated+template>

# Kapitola EXCELLENCE - methodology

- + The suggested methodology **is justified credibly, including sound measures and KPIs**. The methodological approach is well considered.
- + Challenges in the **chosen methodology, for each of the project objectives**, are identified and addressed very well. For example, the “need of a wide range of interesting careers” is addressed in order to raise interest in science studies and careers.
- Although the methodology for achieving the proposal’s goals is well presented, it **lacks detailed analysis**.
- The proposal **clearly sets the theoretical and practical roadmap** for the implementation and success of the extensive and challenging set of methodological approaches.

# Kapitola EXCELLENCE – research data management/open science

- + Open science practices **are realistically and appropriately implemented** as an integral part of the proposed methodology. For example, all project's materials and foreground will be shared without any limitations on their use and will be made available open access. Data management is appropriately considered.
- + The proposal includes a **relevant overview of how it will include open science** principles as an integral part of the proposed methodology.
- The data management plan **does not provide sufficient information** in terms of its functionality and execution.
- The proposal **does not provide sufficiently adequate information on its data management approach**. While the proposal has provided an open science strategy, **it has not fully taken into account the concept of the FAIR criteria**. Open science practices **are weakly addressed** as the proposal does not provide information on respective measures to ensure the implementation and the quality of these practices.

# Kapitola IMPACT

## **Hodnotiace kritériá v hodnotiacom hárku:**

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions due to the project
- Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities

# Kapitola IMPACT – pathways

- + The proposal shows **credibly, with well- designed activities, the pathways** to achieve all the expected outcomes, for instance how all the relevant stakeholders in the community will be engaged in a meaningful way. The pathways to impacts are credible and established in a convincing way.
- + The proposal clearly demonstrates the **pathways towards the specific outcomes of the work programme** in the medium-term. The credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected long-term outcomes and impacts are **well described and they are convincing**.
- The proposal **does not provide sufficient evidence of how it will create pathways** to the expected impacts foreseen by the programme, such as deepening the European Research Area and creating opportunities for researchers to achieve attractive careers.
- The **information on the pathways to achieve them is limited** and the credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work program is not adequately justified, as the proposal defines some of them too broadly.

# Kapitola IMPACT – measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts

+ The **dissemination activities** are credibly discussed in the proposal and well tailored to specific well defined groups, such as community members in the partner regions, students, teachers, teacher educators, media, schools, community institutions, non-formal education providers, enterprises, key actors in science education and policy makers.

The **planned communication** activities are suitable and well supported including meaningful communication messages targeting relevant stakeholders.

- The foreseen **dissemination activities are not fully convincing** to support the targeted impact, because the description of recipients is very general. **Communication activities are not convincingly substantiated** to maximise the expected outcomes and impacts. For instance a biannual newsletter is not a strong communication activity considering the richness of the pursued outcomes. In terms of the exploitation of the results, the proposed vision of 'windows of opportunity' does not properly support the targeted impact of the project.



# Kapitola IMPACT – barriers

- + The proposal **addresses well the barriers** and discusses credibly the proposed mitigations measures. Some potential barriers to the expected outcomes are well identified and suitable mitigation actions are proposed.
- However, some potential barriers and mitigation measures arising from the wider regulatory environment are insufficiently presented.
- **Not enough detail** is given to certain barriers and how they would be overcome. Furthermore, the proposal does not sufficiently take into account specific barriers in some science research disciplines.

# Kapitola IMPLEMENTATION

## Hodnotiace kritériá v hodnotiacom hárku:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall
- Capacity and role of each participant, and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise

# Kapitola IMPLEMENTATION – work plan, assigned effort

- + - The work plan, which is developed around a soundly interconnected small number of work packages in a logical structure, **is coherent, ambitious, logical and effective**. However, as a minor shortcoming, **not all work packages are discussed with the same high level detail** and the timing of some of the deliverables is not fully justified. The resources allocated to WPs are in line with the project's objectives and deliverables.
- + - The **work plan provides a suitable timeline** and the **deliverables overall provide an appropriate mechanism to monitor the progress** of the project. However, it is not clear that the linear and cycling structure of the Pert chart is adequate to support the project execution. The planning and presentation of some results anticipated in the work plan are not sufficiently developed.
- A number of **key milestones** are defined, but inadequately distributed along the proposal timeline **to facilitate adequate monitoring and progress** control to be employed.
- Provided information on **deliverables and milestones is not fully adequate to monitor** the progress.

# Kapitola IMPLEMENTATION – assessment of risks

- + The identified critical risks for the project implementation and the formulated risk mitigation measures are credible and well presented.
- + The risks are generally well presented, including mitigation measures.
- The risk assessment plan lacks enough details and does not properly identify potential risks. For instance, the risk of low uptake of the programmes and training is not properly foreseen.

# Kapitola IMPLEMENTATION – role of each participant, consortium

- + The proposal shows clearly **the complementarity** of the partners and how they can effectively contribute to the activities. Project's partners represent entities of different profiles, experience and know-how.
- + The consortium **brings together the necessary disciplinary and inter-disciplinary** knowledge covering all required expertise, including open science practices and gender. The team and most partners have previous experience in relevant cooperation projects. It is credibly **shown that the partners have the operational capacity and sufficient infrastructure** to support the project activities.
- + The consortium and its participants demonstrate **relevant experience** and serve well the overall objective of the proposal. There is satisfactory **complementarity** of the partners and all partners have a valid role. They have sufficient **operational capacity to fulfil their respective roles**. The consortium has demonstrated experience in international cooperation as well as **gender aspects of R&I**.

## Kontakt:

Kveta Papanová

Tel.: 0917 733 509

E-mail: [kvetoslava.papanova@cvtisr.sk](mailto:kvetoslava.papanova@cvtisr.sk)



Web: [www.horizont-europa.sk](http://www.horizont-europa.sk)

Mail: [horizont@cvtisr.sk](mailto:horizont@cvtisr.sk)