



Guidelines for evaluators

**2013 SAF€RA joint call on
Human and organizational factors
including the value of industrial safety**

September 2013

SAF€RA is an ERA-NET on industrial safety funded by
the European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme

Grant agreement number 291812



Table of contents

1 Introduction.....	4
2 Call objectives.....	5
3 Call management.....	5
4 Evaluation process.....	6
5 Basic principles of evaluation.....	6
Annex 1: Evaluation criteria.....	8
Annex 2: Conflict of interest.....	10

1 Introduction

SAF€RA is an ERA-NET project titled “Coordination of European Research on Industrial Safety towards Smart and Sustainable Growth” funded for three years by the European Commission in the 7th Framework Programme. It was initiated by the European Technology Platform on Industrial Safety (ETPIS) and uses this platform to make its results available to stakeholders.

Under the ERA-NET scheme, SAF€RA aims to improve cooperation and coordination of national and regional research programmes addressing industrial safety, in order to improve the level of safety in European industry and to achieve sustainable growth and enhanced competitiveness.

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 brings dynamism to safety research in Europe by promoting collaboration in research programmes and by fostering lateral thinking as well as favouring innovations. The SAF€RA project contributes to the objectives of the European Commission’s FP7 work programme in the following ways:

- Building up sustainable channels for communication and effective instruments for collaboration between national programme owners and/or managers and promoting the creation of collective, strategic coalitions at a European level.
- Increasing awareness about the importance of research in the field of industrial safety as a major contributor to a dynamic knowledge-based economy as well as working to strengthen the impact of this research at the EU, national and international levels.
- Exploiting synergies and avoiding duplication of research and development among the partners of the Consortium and reducing fragmentation of the European Research Area by increased coordination.
- Establishing joint programmes of transnational research projects between the involved Member States, which will materialize in a pilot programme for collaborative research projects between the SAF€RA partners as a testbed for future joint programming.
- Developing and implementing joint strategic activities to establish a durable European network for cooperation between key actors in the field of industrial safety.

For more information:

- SAF€RA’s 2013 joint call > <http://call.safera.eu/>
- SAF€RA’s website > <http://safera.industrialsafety-tp.org/>
- European Commission information on the ERA-NET programme > <http://www.cordis.lu/coordination/home.html>

2 Call objectives

The objective of this joint call for proposals for research projects on *Human and organizational factors including the value of industrial safety* is to promote European 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 will involve the collaboration of at least two research teams in two different countries. Researchers requesting support for their proposal may either:

- submit a proposal as a pre-established consortium;
- submit a single-organization proposal in which they accept the principle of a collaboration with one or more other organizations. After project evaluation, the Call Steering Committee will then make proposals for grouping two or more single-organization proposals into a consortium, based on their thematic and methodological complementarities. Each potential partner of a proposed consortium then accepts or refuses their participation in the proposed consortium.

Most projects funded within this call will be relatively small (2 to 4 partners, duration between 12 and 36 months, funding between 40 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. **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.
- A single proposal may cover more than one of the topics listed in the thematic description.
- Projects should demonstrate that they can provide a European added value compared to strictly national or regional funding.
- 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 process includes the eligibility and relevance check of the proposals, the evaluation of the proposals, the final selection and award of research projects, monitoring project progress during the funding period, and final evaluation of the joint call.

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 submitted proposals. Evaluation Panel members will not submit or participate in proposals within this call, and must sign a confidentiality agreement and a statement to confirm that they do not

have any conflicts of interest.

The **Call Steering Committee** is composed of a representative from each SAF€RA 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 will also propose the grouping of individual proposals into consortia and coordinate subsequent negotiations. 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

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
- Degree of added value/innovation and European added value
- Expected outcomes (scientific & operational)
- Project implementation

Further comments on the evaluation process:

- Each project proposal will be reviewed by a minimum of three evaluators (one Evaluation Panel member and two external reviewers).
- 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 is 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

- All proposals are treated equally.

- Evaluators will only receive proposals whose eligibility has been checked by the Call Steering Committee.
- The evaluation of a proposal shall be based solely upon the information contained in the 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 in English language.

Each proposal will be allocated to at least two external reviewers and 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, together with information on the proposed groupings of single-organization projects into consortia.

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 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.

The Call Steering Committee will communicate the final decisions to all project coordinators, along with the comments of the anonymous reviewers.

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

Degree of added value/innovation with respect to the state of knowledge or of current practice and European added value:

- Novelty of the issue or of the research question
- Innovative methodology
- If the problem would benefit from a multidisciplinary approach, are the relevant disciplines represented?
- To what extent does the proposal demonstrate European added value, as compared with funding at a purely national or regional level?

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 project involves collaboration between several organizations, does this collaboration add value to the project? Is the work breakdown well balanced?

Meaning of numerical ranking

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

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;
5. Teacher/student relationship, unless a following 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.