



Guidelines for evaluators

2021 SAF€RA joint call

*Industrial safety in the context of
pandemics and exponential change*

December 2020

SAF€RA is a partnership between 19 research funding organizations from 10 European countries who collaborate on research programming and launch joint calls in the field of industrial safety. It prolongs the work developed in the SAF€RA ERA-NET, which was funded by the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration.

1 Introduction

SAF€RA is a partnership between research funding organizations working in the field of industrial safety in Europe. SAF€RA publishes joint calls for proposals on various topics related to industrial safety and organizes dissemination activities to ensure that research results lead to improvements in safety management. The **scope of SAF€RA** includes coordination of research on the prevention of major accidents, with off-site consequences and risks to the environment and society, and in particular the economic benefits of industrial safety solutions, safe innovative processes, preparedness and response as well as protection of the environment, new methods to enhance the creation of a safety culture and prudent attitudes, risk reduction strategies, reference technologies for life extension of aged and repaired structures, as well as products and systems required to improve industrial safety.

SAF€RA is a continuation from the ERA-NET project which was funded by the European Commission between 2012 and 2015. The SAF€RA ERA-NET coordinated research investment on industrial safety among a number of EU Member States. After the end of the support by the European Commission in 2015, 19 organizations decided to continue to invest jointly in research and founded SAF€RA.

In 2021, the SAF€RA joint call concerns *Industrial safety in the context of pandemics and exponential change*. The *Guidelines for proposers* document contains more detailed information on the call topic.

Scope of the call

The scope of the 2021 call includes research on the management of industrial risk, avoiding major impacts on the environment or society. The scope also includes research on products and systems required to improve safety in industrial settings.

Industries involved include, among others, the process industries, energy, dangerous goods transport, construction and operation of major infrastructure and the services industry.

The scope includes occupational safety as long as there is a relation with major accident hazards in industrial settings. For example, if research primarily with an occupational safety perspective aims to prevent an accident sequence which could also lead to off-site consequences, then it is included in the scope.

For more information:

- SAF€RA's 2021 joint call > <https://call.safera.eu/>
- SAF€RA's website > <https://www.safera.eu/>

2 Call objectives

The objective of this joint call for proposals for research and development projects is to promote European transnational research in this field taking a proactive, multidisciplinary and innovative approach to developing solutions for sustainable growth and enhanced competitiveness of European industry.

In order to foster transnational collaboration, projects funded within this joint call must involve the collaboration of at least two research teams in two different eligible countries. Furthermore, additional consortium partners, not eligible for SAFERA funding, may participate in the projects on the basis of self-financing. Such partners should state the source of funding for their contribution to the proposal and the conditions under which their funding will be available.

Most projects funded within this call will be relatively small (2 to 4 partners, duration between 12 and 24 months, funding between 20 and 150 k€ per project partner). The call aims to fund mainly **applied research** carried out in universities or research institutes, though proposals from industry are also eligible if their research content is high. **Interdisciplinary research** is encouraged. Cooperation and joint activities between different consortia funded within the call will be encouraged.

General remarks

- The research teams within a consortium should include investigators of complementary scientific disciplines and research areas necessary to address the proposed research aims.
- Given the applied nature of the topics, the participation of stakeholders within the project (either as subjects of investigation, or partners contributing to the work) is encouraged.
- Proposals should contain novel, ambitious aims and ideas, combined with well-structured work plans.
- Projects that contribute to standardization efforts are encouraged.

3 Call management

Two boards, the Call Steering Committee and the Evaluation Panel, will manage the evaluation process of the call with the support of the Call Secretariat.

The **Evaluation Panel** is a panel of internationally recognized scientific experts within the disciplines identified as being relevant for the call topic, responsible for the evaluation of proposals. Evaluation Panel members will not submit or participate in proposals within the call, and shall accept a confidentiality agreement and confirm that they do not have any conflicts of interest.

The **Call Steering Committee** is composed of a representative from each SAFERA funding organization participating in the joint call. All decisions concerning the call procedures will be made by the Call Steering Committee. It will supervise the progress of the joint call and the

evaluation of proposals. The Call Steering Committee will make the final funding recommendation to the national/regional funding organizations regarding the proposals to be funded, based on the final ranking list provided by the Evaluation Panel. It accompanies the entire lifespan of the call, evaluates the performance of the projects and resolves potential disagreements which may arise during the lifetime of the projects.

4 Evaluation process

The call will use a single-stage application process. A centralized evaluation will be performed by the Evaluation Panel and the Call Steering Committee. Based on the result of the evaluation, projects will be recommended (or not) for funding. Note that the national/regional organizations will make the final funding decision.

The **evaluation criteria** (further detailed in Annex 1) are:

- Compatibility with the call topics
- Scientific or technological excellence
- Expected outcomes (scientific & operational)
- Project implementation

Further comments on the evaluation process:

- Each project proposal will be reviewed by a minimum of three evaluators, including at least one Evaluation Panel member.
- A review report consists of written remarks and a numerical score per review criterion.
- Technical support to evaluators is provided by the Call Secretariat. Evaluators communicate only with the Call Secretariat.
- The names of the evaluators will not be disclosed publicly, either during or after the review process. An exception may be made in countries where disclosure of the reviewers' name is legally obliged upon request of the applicant.
- Evaluators can come from any country.
- Evaluators refrain from reviewing a proposal in case of a conflict of interest that was not detected by the Call Secretariat beforehand. Criteria for conflict of interest are listed in Annex 2.

5 Basic principles of evaluation

- Evaluators will only receive proposals whose eligibility and relevance have been checked by the Call Steering Committee.
- The evaluation of a proposal shall be based solely upon the information contained in the full proposal.
- Evaluators shall evaluate proposals belonging to their broader domain of expertise.
- All proposals are assessed only on the basis of given evaluation criteria (see Annex 1).
- In case of conflict of interest (see Annex 2), the proposal will be returned to the Call Secretariat for referral.
- Proposals and review reports are written in English.

Each proposal will be allocated to three reviewers, including at least one Evaluation Panel member, who fit the profile of the application. Based on the proposals' ranking established by the Evaluation Panel and on available funding, the Call Steering Committee will suggest the projects to be funded to the national/regional funding organizations.

Only proposals judged to be of high quality will be funded. If the number of proposals considered to be of high quality, as judged by the Evaluation Panel, corresponds to a total requested funding which is smaller than the available budget, only a part of the funds will be used.

Projects not recommended for funding by the Call Steering Committee will not be funded in the context of this SAFERA call (but may be funded directly by one or more of the funding organizations, outside of the scope of SAFERA).

For each project, the Call Secretariat will communicate the final decision along with the comments of the anonymous reviewers to the project coordinator.

Annex 1: Evaluation criteria

Compatibility with the call topics

Scientific or technological excellence:

- Soundness of the concept
- Quality of the objectives
- Quality and effectiveness of the scientific methodology
- Contribution to the development of the respective research field

Value of the expected outcomes (scientific & operational):

- To what extent do you expect that the project will improve scientific knowledge, or lead to improvements in operational practice which lead to safety improvements, or contribute to standardization, and increase the competitiveness of European industry in general?
- Are the dissemination activities planned suitable for their purpose?
- What are the prospects for establishing effective and sustainable partnership within the consortium, including transfer of knowledge and experience?

Project implementation:

- To what extent are the project objectives feasible?
- Are the methodology, work plan and time-frame likely to lead to the expected outcomes?
- Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment).
- Does the research team have the necessary competencies/experience to address the issues raised (previous scientific track record, publications in scientific journals, etc.)? If the problem would benefit from a multidisciplinary approach, are the relevant disciplines represented?
- Does the collaboration between research teams add value to the project? Is the work breakdown well balanced?

Meaning of numerical rankings

Ranking		
0	Fails	
1	Poor	The proposal shows serious weaknesses in relation to the criterion
2	Fair	The proposal generally addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses that need corrections
3	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion in question well but certain improvements are necessary
4	Very good	The proposal addresses the criterion very well but small improvements are possible
5	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all aspects of the criterion

6 Annex 2: Conflict of interest

A conflict of interest in evaluating a proposal exists if one or more of the following criteria apply to the evaluator (Evaluation Panel member or external reviewer) and at least one of the researchers involved with the proposal:

1. Relatives, personal ties or conflicts;
2. Close scientific collaboration, *e.g.* implementation of joint projects or joint publications within the past three years;
3. Direct scientific competition with personal projects or plans;
4. Close proximity, *e.g.* member of the same scientific institution or impending change of the reviewer to the institution of the applicant or *vice versa*. An exception is made for large scientific institutions (more than 50 research staff) where the two people are not involved in regular collaborations.
5. Teacher/student relationship, unless a subsequent independent scientific activity of more than 10 years exists;
6. Dependent relationship in employment during the past three years;
7. Participation in current or recently concluded professorial appointment proceedings;
8. Current or prior activity in advisory bodies of the applicant's institution, *e.g.* scientific advisory boards;
9. Personal economic interests in the funding decision.