

## Eracobuild program VDP

### Value Driven Processes for the construction and operation of buildings

<b>Evaluation criteria applicable to Collaborative project proposals</b>		
<b>Quality and Relevance</b> “Scientific and innovative excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)”	<b>Project implementation</b> “Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management”	<b>Impact</b> “Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results”
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives</li> <li>• Progress beyond the state-of-the-art</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the scientific methodology and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures</li> <li>• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants</li> <li>• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance)</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution, at the national and European level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic/activity</li> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property</li> </ul>

## Guidelines for project evaluation - Criteria

Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the criteria, and not for the sub-criteria. The sub-criteria are issues which the expert should consider in the assessment of that criterion. They also act as reminders of issues to be raised later during the discussions of the proposal.

The relevance of a proposal will be considered in relation to the topic(s) of the given call, and to the objectives of a call. These aspects will be integrated in the application of the criterion "Scientific quality". When a proposal is partially relevant because it only marginally addresses the topic(s) of the call, or if only part of the proposal addresses the topic(s), this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected.

Each criterion will be scored out of 5. Half marks can be given.

The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination:

*0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information*

*1 - Very poor. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.*

*2 - Poor. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.*

*3 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.*

*4 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.*

*5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.*