

National Agency for Research and Development		
EVALUATION FORM		
bilateral Moldovan-Turkish project proposals		
Acronym of the Project		
Project title		
Organisation applicant from Moldova		
Name / surname of the project manager from Moldova		
Related specific thematic area of the call		
Reviewers have to select only one score for each section from 1 to 6 and justify the reasons of given scores. (Please consult Annex 1 Explanations on assessment criteria)		

The conclusion should response to the question if the project proposal is recommended for funding from the state budget or not

No. crt.	Evaluation criteria	Questions for evaluators	Score
1.	Scientific-Technological Excellence Threshold 4,5 points	a) Comment on whether the aims and scientific/technical objectives of the project are well-described, and the objectives are measurable, realistic and achievable within the duration of project. (p.1.1 from the project proposal)	0,0
		b) Comment on whether the current national and international state of the art in the domain addressed by the project is clearly defined by conducting literature review/patent/utility model/market surveys, described in section 7 of the application form. (1.2)	
		c) Comment on the scientific quality, innovation potential and scientific and technological contribution of the project, highlighting the advances beyond the state of the art claimed. Comment on the extent to which these advances are convincing/realistic/significant. (1.3)	
Comments on the strengths of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c) (mandatory)			
Comments on the weaknesses of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c) (mandatory)			
2.	Methodology Threshold 4,5 points	a) Comment on the credibility and feasibility of the methods and techniques to achieve the objectives of the project (including data collection tools and analysis methods) (2)	0,0
Comments on the strengths of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a) (mandatory)			
Comments on the weaknesses of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a) (mandatory)			
3	Project Management Threshold 4 points	a) Are the work plan and management structure for carrying out the proposed activities well-reasoned, well-organized, and based on a sound rationale? (3.1)	0,0
		b) State on the extent to which the work packages are in line with the objectives and deliverables. (3.2)	
		c) Comment on the appropriateness of milestones, success criteria and risk analysis. (3.3)	
Comments on the strengths of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c) (mandatory)			
Comments on the weaknesses of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c) (mandatory)			
4	Importance of international collaboration Threshold 4 points	a) Comment on the balance of distribution of roles, allocated tasks and responsibilities between the partners and whether the project team has the right skills and experience to deliver the project successfully. (4.1)	0,0
		b) Comment on the added value of collaboration. (4.2)	
		c) Explain whether each partner has sufficient facilities and infrastructure to carry out its activities and fulfill its role successfully. (4.3)	
		d) Comment on the quality of management of intellectual property. (4.4)	
		e) State on the extent to which the financial plan is in line with the objectives and deliverables. (Please complete Annex 2: Budget Request Form)	
Comments on the strengths of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c), d), e) (mandatory)			
Comments on the weaknesses of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b), c), d), e) (mandatory)			

5	Impact Threshold 4 points	a) How complete and realistic are the impacts identified? Are there any outputs/impacts that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, replace an imported product, strengthen competitiveness of the partners or bring other benefits for society/environment? (5.1)	0,0
		b) Comment on quality and ambition of dissemination and exploitation plan for the project results all along the project duration by the consortium as a whole and for individual partners. (5.2)	
Comments on the strengths of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b) (mandatory)			
Comments on the weaknesses of the project proposal in the size assessed on each criterion: a), b) (mandatory)			
CONCLUSION on recommendation for funding from the state budget: yes/no, with reasons why the project proposal is recommended for funding or not (mandatory)			
Total score (is calculated automaticly) Threshold 21 points			0,0

I declare, on my own responsibility, that I am not directly or indirectly involved in conflicts of interest in the evaluation of this project proposal.

Expert: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

ANNEX 1 EXPLANATIONS ON ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following table provides the definitions of evaluation scores.

Score	Definition
6	The project proposal meets the relevant criteria in all dimensions. There are scarcely no shortcomings in the proposal.
5	The project proposal meets the relevant criteria well. There are acceptable shortcomings in the proposal.
4	The project proposal meets the relevant criteria in general, however; there are still some points that are open to improvement in the proposal.
3	The project proposal meets the relevant criteria at a moderate level, however; there are still important points that need to be improved in the proposal.
2	The project proposal does not adequately meet the relevant criteria. There are important shortcomings in the proposal.
1	The proposal does not meet the relevant criteria. There are significant weaknesses or shortcomings in the proposal.

ANNEX 2 REQUESTED BUDGET

Please evaluate if the requested budget is appropriate to support the proposed project and if it is realistic and well-justified based on the following criteria. You are expected to recommend that the budget remains as requested or recommend a reduction. If you suggest an adjustment to the budget, you are required to provide comments in this section to justify your recommendation.

1. The appropriateness of personnel expenses, taking into account the competence of the project personnel and their current workload:

2. Travel Expenses (those directly related to R&D activities should be indicated):

3. Device / Equipment / Software / Publication Purchases (Specify the instrument / equipment / software / publication to be used in production or in the routine analysis of production):

4. Consultancy Services and Other Service Procurements (Content of project consultancy and service procurement and their contributions to the project should be examined.):

5. Appropriateness of material purchases and quantities for the R&D work:

PROPOSED DURATION OF THE PROJECT

Please indicate your feedback on the appropriateness of the proposed duration of the project.

OTHER

Please share your suggestions to improve the quality and effectiveness of the project.