



GUIDE FOR EVALUATORS

Evaluation and selection process of GOT ENERGY TALENT
fellowship programme – Second call for fellowships

GOT ENERGY TALENT
GA number 754382
H2020 MGA MSCA-COFUND-Mono



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 754382.

TABLE OF CONTENT

DEFINITIONS AND LIST OF ACCRONYMS	3
DEFINITIONS.....	3
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	3
1 INTRODUCTION	4
2 SCOPE OF GOT ENERGY TALENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME	4
2.1 RESEARCH AREAS WITHIN GOT ENERGY TALENT	4
2.2 REGIONAL IMPACT: SMART ENERGY AND RIS3 IN THE REGION OF MADRID	5
3 SELECTION PROCESS	6
3.1 MANAGEMENT	6
3.2 SELECTION COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT OF EVALUATORS.....	7
3.3 SELECTION STAGES.....	7
3.3.1 FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS AND REDRESS.....	8
3.4 TIMELINE.....	9
4 GENERAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES	10
4.1 EVALUATION PRINCIPLES.....	10
4.1.1 CONFLICT OF INTEREST.....	10
4.1.2 CONFIDENTIALITY.....	11
4.1.3 GENDER EQUALITY	11
4.1.4 CAREER BREAKS AND VARIATIONS IN THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF CV	11
4.2 DO’S AND DON’T’S FOR EVALUATORS WHEN WRITING THE IER	12
5 ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORES	13
5.1 ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA	13
5.2 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	13
5.3 SCORING SYSTEM - EXAMPLE	16
5.4 ETHICS.....	18
6 GOT ENERGY TALENT CONTACT	18
ANNEXES	19
INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT.....	19

DEFINITIONS AND LIST OF ACRONYMS

DEFINITIONS

Host Institution means any of the institutions participating in GOT ENERGY TALENT programme potentially hosting fellows. It includes “academic host institutions” and “non-academic partner host institutions”.

Academic Host Institution refers to either University of Alcalá or Universidad Rey Juan Carlos.

Non-academic Partner Host Institution means any of the institutions participating in the programme that could host fellows that choose to pursue a 12-month applied research period after their advanced research period at the academic host institutions. The Non-academic Partner Host Institutions collaborating in GOT ENERGY TALENT second call for fellowships are: REPSOL S.A., CI3 (Centre for the Innovation of Smart Infrastructures), IMDEA Energy, IMDEA Water, CENER (National Renewable Energy Centre), ATOS SPAIN SAU, OPTIVA MEDIA S.L., ANOVA IT CONSULTING, Orion High Technologies S.L., SOTICOL Robotics Systems, ASTI Mobile Robotics, Nielsen, Pixcellence Technologies, CEPSA S.A.U. and Iberdrola.

Partner Organisations encompass any organisation collaborating with the project to achieve its maximum potential. GOT ENERGY TALENT partner organisations include innovation and entrepreneurship support centers, business associations, local and regional public administration and international partners. These organisations will support GOT ENERGY TALENT in disseminating the Programme and its results, putting in place a targeted agenda of training activities, as well as in providing expert advice about how to improve the implementation of the Programme.

LIST OF ACRONYMS

GET	Got Energy Talent
IER	Individual Evaluation Report
MB	Management Board
MSCA	Marie Skłodowska-Curie Actions
PM	Project Manager
SCE	Department for Coordination and Evaluation (<i>Subdivisión de Coordinación y Evaluación</i> , formerly known as ANEP) of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities
UAH	University of Alcalá
URJC	Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

1 INTRODUCTION

This guide describes the principles and procedures that will be used in the evaluation and selection process of research proposals under GOT ENERGY TALENT second call for fellowships. Before starting the evaluation of proposals, in addition to this guide, evaluators should have read the description of the Programme at gotenergytalent.uah.es and the Guide for Applicants. All these documents have been made available to them and can also be downloaded from the website. Applicants may use this guide and the evaluation criteria as a checklist to ensure the quality of their proposal.

2 SCOPE OF GOT ENERGY TALENT FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME

GOT ENERGY TALENT (GET) is a fellowship programme co-funded by the EU as part of the H2020-MSCA-COFUND programme (Grant Agreement number 754382). GET is run by the University of Alcalá (UAH¹) as beneficiary of the Action in collaboration with Universidad Rey Juan Carlos (URJC²).

GOT ENERGY TALENT is meant to be highly competitive, merit-based fellowship programme aimed at attracting postdoctoral talent in the field of smart energy. GET is an ambitious programme that aims not only to enable researchers to conduct their own excellent research project. It also intends to bring research closer to society and produce a positive effect, not only in terms of excellent science and talent attraction but also by strengthening the regional economy and promoting international networking. GET's field of action is one of the priorities of the Smart Specialisation Strategy (RIS3) of the region of Madrid³. Moreover, the topic responds to the long-term vision of the University of Alcalá and the Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, which together launched the project International Campus of Excellence "Smart Energy", focusing on clean energy technologies and smart infrastructures and smart cities⁴.

GOT ENERGY TALENT **will offer a total of 34 fellowships for experienced researchers⁵ to develop a 24-month stay through 2 open calls at international level**, over its 60 months of implementation. Fellows will have a full trans-national mobility experience. The two academic host institutions, the UAH and the URJC, will hire 17 fellows each over the lifetime of the fellowship programme. Fellows will freely decide whether to carry out a 24-month advanced research project or a 12-month advanced research combined with a 12-month period devoted to applied research in one of our non-academic partner host institutions⁶. This guide refers to the second call for research project proposals.

Lastly, it is worth noting that exploitation of research results will be of core importance under GET. GET will put in place a "Technology Transfer Mechanism", a service that will support fellows in the technology transfer process by assessing if research is producing exploitable results, evaluating the type of protection those results need and assisting fellows in the creation of spin-offs where it is relevant.

2.1 RESEARCH AREAS WITHIN GOT ENERGY TALENT

It is open to the fellows to freely define the subject area of the proposed research. However, their research should fall within one of the research lines offered by the host institutions. Fellows will be hosted and will develop their research within one of the research lines offered by the host institutions. On GET's website⁷, applicants and evaluators can find the complete list of research groups and research lines where fellows can develop their research. **Applicants must identify and choose**

¹ <https://www.uah.es/en/>

² <https://www.urjc.es>

³ <http://s3platform.jrc.ec.europa.eu/regions/ES30/tags/ES30>

⁴ <http://www.campusenergiainteligente.es/en/>

⁵ Applicants must be experience researchers as defined by MSCA rules, i.e. applicants must be in possession of a doctoral degree or have at least four years of full-time equivalent research experience by the date of the deadline.

⁶ <http://gotenergytalent.uah.es/partner-host-institutions/>

⁷ <http://gotenergytalent.uah.es/research-lines/>

the research line and group where they want to be integrated and develop their proposal within this framework. In their application, they must explain how and why their research fits into the research line and group that they have chosen.

In order to guarantee the highest quality of the fellowships, both the quality of the research group and the meaningfulness of the research project for the research line will be evaluated. These two elements are part of the evaluation criteria and will receive a score (see section 5.2 “Assessment Criteria”).

In addition to this, under specific research lines, applicants may choose to carry out a second year doing applied research in one of our partner host institutions from the non-academic sector. When applying, applicants must already choose if they want to carry out a 24-month advanced research project at the academic host institution or to carry out a 12-month advanced research combined with a 12-month period devoted to applied research. In their application form, applicants must explain the rationale and added value of spending a second year in the non-academic host partner institution. These elements are part of the evaluation criteria and will receive a score (see section 5.2 “Assessment Criteria”).

2.2 REGIONAL IMPACT: SMART ENERGY AND RIS3 IN THE REGION OF MADRID

As already stated, GET is a demand-driven fellowship programme and responds to the priorities of the region of Madrid. Key players in the region, including at institutional level, are involved in GET as partner organisations and will contribute to the programme in different ways. This includes organizing and offering trainings in soft skills (innovation, entrepreneurship, technology transfer) and participating in the Technology Transfer Mechanism. The complete list of partner organisations can be found on GET’s website⁸.

The link of the research project proposal with the priorities of the region is part of the evaluation criteria and will receive a score (see section 5.2 “Assessment Criteria”). Therefore, **evaluators are asked to positively take into account the alignment of the research proposals within Madrid’s RIS3 priority areas** in connection with smart energy, and the priorities in the 2014-2020 ERDF Operational Programme, as indicated herein:

SMART SPECIALISATION STRATEGY (RIS3) OF MADRID
Strategic area 2. Energy, Environment and Transport
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Smart Grids. - Sources of renewable and sustainable energy. - Technologies for sustainable use, restoration of natural environment and biodiversity conservation. - Waste, dumping and emissions management (includes micro pollutants, emerging contaminants, reuse, disposal of waste materials, energy recovery). - Navigation systems, traffic control and transport security. - Design, development and manufacture of propulsion systems and auxiliary systems of transport vehicles.
Strategic area 4. ICT and services of high value added (as a transversal area)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of applications and content. - Infrastructure, networks and advanced communications systems. - Computer systems and information processing. - Modelling and simulation applied. - Security software, networks and information systems. - Electronic equipment and microelectronics.

⁸ <http://gotenergytalent.uah.es/partners-organizations/>

Working areas of ICE (International Campus of Excellence) ‘Smart Energy’ focusing on Clean Energy Technologies and Smart Cities
--

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bioenergy - production of fuels from renewable resources without impacting on food markets: advanced generation biofuels. - Clean energy technologies. Promoting the use of low-carbon energy technologies. - Smart infrastructures - energy use in both transportation and buildings, development of infrastructures that optimise energy consumption as an essential for the saving of resources. |
|---|

2014-2020 ERDF OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR THE REGION OF MADRID
--

- | |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Axis 4 “Transition to a low-carbon economy”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Improving energy efficiency policies and the use of renewable energy sources in public buildings. o Investments in the generation of renewable energy in public buildings and public infrastructures. o Strengthening sustainable urban transport. |
|--|

3 SELECTION PROCESS

3.1 MANAGEMENT

The selection process will be organised under the supervision of GET’s Management Board (MB), particularly the Selection Manager and the Secretariat:

- The Selection Manager will act as the director of the selection process. He will ensure the overall coordination and transparency of the process. The Selection Manager will oversee that the standards and principles of the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers are complied with. During the consensus meeting, the Selection Manager will moderate the discussion with the other participants based on the scores of the Individual Evaluation Reports. The Selection Manager is Prof. Juan Antonio Melero, Vice-rector for Innovation and Transfer Technology at URJC.
- The Secretariat will provide operational support to the Selection Manager. The Secretariat will check the eligibility of the applications received as a first stage of the selection process. It will also make sure that all relevant players are timely provided with the necessary information, with the eligible applications and the evaluation forms. The Secretariat will also be the main contact point for applicants, answering doubts regarding the call and the selection process. The Secretariat functions are provided by the Universidad de Alcalá in-house resources led by GOT ENERGY TALENT technical project manager, Ms. Isabel Salgueiro.
- The Management Board⁹ will oversee the whole process. The MB will draw the ranking lists during the consensus meeting (see next section 3.3).

⁹ The Management Board is made of the following permanent members: Prof. Juan Antonio Melero Hernández, Vice-Rector for Innovation and Transfer Technology at URJC; Prof. Elena García Barriocanal, Academic Director of the European Projects Office at UAH; Ms. Rosa María Mesa Vélez, Chief Director of the European Projects Office at URJC; Ms. María del Mar Gómez Zamora, Chief Project Manager of the project International Campus of Excellence “Smart Energy”; Ms. Maria Antonia Rodríguez Tato, Officer at European Projects Office at URJC; Ms. Isabel Salgueiro, GET Technical Project Manager; Mr. Ángel Adell, CEO of Euradia, GET partner organisation and GET Dissemination Manager.

3.2 SELECTION COMMITTEE AND APPOINTMENT OF EVALUATORS

Each application will be independently and individually assessed by 3 international experts. Under GET, the evaluation and the selection of evaluators will be provided by the Department for Coordination and Evaluation (*Subdivisión de Coordinación y Evaluación*, SCE; formerly known as ANEP) of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities¹⁰. The Department for Coordination and Evaluation offers professional scientific evaluation services to both Spanish and international public and private organisations, guaranteeing a fully transparent, high-quality and independent service. The Department possesses a wide database of international expert evaluators, who are expert scientists, researchers or technologists in different fields. This Guide has been shared with the SCE, who will send it to the evaluators assessing the proposals. Evaluators will thus assess the proposals according to the principles, guidelines and forms herein.

3.3 SELECTION STAGES

The selection process is made of 5 stages:

Stage 1. Eligibility check

The Secretariat will gather the applications and carry out the basic eligibility check. The Secretariat will check that the basic eligibility criteria are fulfilled by applicants according to their declarations in the administrative form. The Secretariat will check that the application is complete and was submitted by the deadline. Once the first legibility check completed, the Secretariat will send the applications to the SCE. Applicants will be informed about the results of the eligibility check within a month after the closure of the call (see section 0 “Feedback to applicants and redress”).

Stage 2. Scientific Evaluation

Evaluators will assess each application individually according to the evaluation criteria, methodology and guidelines provided herein. Each application will be independently and individually assessed by 3 experts. The outcome of the evaluation will be the “Individual Evaluation Report” (see “Annexes”). SCE will provide GET with a single IER, which will merge the evaluations made by the three individual evaluators. The IER will assess the various evaluation criteria as set out below. The IER will be provided to the applicants so that they can be informed about the strengths and weaknesses of their application.

Stage 3. Consensus meeting and drawing of ranking lists

GET’s Management Board will rank the applications during a consensus meeting. Under Got Energy Talent second call for fellowships, **UAH will hire eight (8) fellows and URJC will hire thirteen (13) fellows. Applications to UAH and to URJC will be treated separately**, i.e. two separate raking lists will be drawn up: one for the applicants applying to UAH and one for the applicants applying to URJC.

GOT ENERGY TALENT secretariat will take all necessary measures to ensure that none of the members of the MB is in a situation of conflict of interest in relation with the proposals they are in charge of ranking, replacing members of the MB as necessary.

The ranking list will be made using the scores obtained in the IER. In case two applications get a similar score, the Management Board will apply the affirmative actions described in the Guide for Evaluators regarding gender and promotion of return to research activity (see Section 4.1 “Evaluation Principles”). The minutes of the meeting will include the two final ranking lists along with the corresponding reserve list of candidates. The Management Board will inform GET’s Steering Committee about the results and the ranking lists.

¹⁰ <http://www.ciencia.gob.es/portal/site/MICINN/>

Stage 4. Communication of results

Top candidates selected for the fellowship programme will be informed by e-mail and invited to start the negotiation. Applicants not selected will be also informed by e-mail. The results of the selection process will be notified to the applicants during the fourth quarter (Q4) of 2019 via e-mail. The preliminary as well as the final ranking lists will be published on GET's website. Candidates on the reserve list will also be informed accordingly. All applicants will receive their IER, therefore, being able to check the strengths and weaknesses of their applications.

Stage 5. Negotiation

The Secretariat will invite those candidates whose application successfully passed the evaluation to meet up for an interview where contracting details and a date to start the project will be set. Negotiations will take place online, via email or phone. Negotiations will start with top-ranked eligible applicants. In case of rejection of the fellowship, applicants from the reserve list will be contacted. If negotiations are successfully concluded, an employment contract between the fellow and the UAH or the URJC will be signed following standard Spanish and internal procedures.

3.3.1 FEEDBACK TO APPLICANTS AND REDRESS

Applicants will be contacted within a month after closure of the call to inform them about the results of the basic eligibility check (see above). In Q4 2019, they will be informed about the results of the scientific evaluation, as explained above. All applicants will receive their IER, so that they can be informed about the strengths and weaknesses of their application. The **provisional ranking and reserve lists** will be available online on GET's website.

All applicants to Got Energy Fellowship programme have a right to a redress procedure if they feel that there has been a shortcoming in the way their proposal was evaluated and that this shortcoming may affect the final decision on whether to fund it or not. Those applicants who wish to appeal the decision of the scientific evaluation will have 10 working days from the day of the communication of the results to issue a formal claim to the Project Manager, whose e-mail address will be provided in the rejection letter.

To avail of the redress procedure, a request for redress must be submitted within 10 working days from receiving feedback of the proposal evaluation. Redress requests must be:

- Related to the Individual Evaluation Report (IER);
- Completed using the official redress form, including a clear description of the grounds for complaint;
- Submitted personally by the interested applicant;
- Sent by email in PDF format to tecnico.cofund@uah.es

The Project Manager will transfer the claim to the SCE, whose services will review the IER accordingly. Applicants will be informed about the results of their appeal within a month after the closing of the redress period.

After the redress period, GET's Management Board will approve the **final ranking lists**. The final ranking and reserve lists will be available online on GET's website. Applicants will be notified via email of any changes in their position on their ranking lists.

3.4 TIMELINE

Launch of the call:

- 2nd call open: 3th April (2019)
- **Call deadline: 2nd July (2019), 12:00 Spanish Time**
- Candidates will receive a confirmation email upon submission of their application.

Selection process:

- Within one month after deadline, applicants will be informed about the results of the basic eligibility check.
- Consensus meeting: December 2019.
- Communication of preliminary results after scientific evaluation: December 2019.
- Redress procedure: December 2019 to February 2020, around one month and a half since communication of preliminary results.
- Communication of final results after redress period: February 2020.

Start of the fellowship:

- Negotiation period: February 2020.
- Approximate start of the fellowships: as soon as possible after the negotiation period and **no later than May 2020**.



4 GENERAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES AND PRINCIPLES

GOT ENERGY TALENT is fully committed with the principles set by the European Charter for Researchers' and the Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers¹¹, which are also fully complied with by the Department for Coordination and Evaluation (*Subdivisión de Coordinación y Evaluación*, SCE) of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities. Evaluators participating in the evaluation process will comply with the principles described in the following sections.

In accordance with the Charter, the evaluation and selection process is based on a number of well-established principles:

- (i) Excellence. Projects selected for funding must demonstrate high-technical and managerial quality in the context of the objectives of the GOT ENERGY TALENT call.
- (ii) Transparency. In order to provide a clear framework for the preparation of proposals for funding, and for the evaluation of proposals, the process for applying for funding is clearly described on GET's website, GET's Guide for Applicants and this document, which are all available to any interested party. In addition to this, adequate feedback will be provided to applicants on the outcome of the evaluation of their proposals.
- (iii) Fairness and impartiality. All proposals will be treated equally and evaluated impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants.
- (iv) Efficiency and speed. Procedures have been designed to be as swiftly as possible, commensurate with maintaining the quality of the evaluation, making appropriate use of public funds and respecting the legal framework within which the work programme is managed.
- (v) Data protection and confidentiality. Evaluators will respect the confidentiality of the information, including any personal data contained in the proposals that they evaluate and of the evaluation process and its outcomes.

GET's secretariat will ensure that the evaluation process is fair and in line with the requirements and principles of the European Code and Conduct for the Requirements of Researchers. To guarantee transparency and equality, proposals will be evaluated by three international independent evaluators provided by the SCE.

4.1 EVALUATION PRINCIPLES

Evaluators will conduct the evaluations on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They are required to be independent, impartial and objective, and to behave throughout the whole process in a professional manner. Evaluators will possess a high-level of professional experience in the public or private sector in one or more of the areas being evaluated. Evaluators will also possess the appropriate language skills required for the proposals to be evaluated (English language).

4.1.1 CONFLICT OF INTEREST

GOT ENERGY TALENT secretariat¹² will take all reasonable steps to ensure that evaluators are NOT in a situation of conflict of interest in relation with the proposals they are in charge of evaluating, including but not limited to:

- The evaluator participates in the proposal.
- The evaluator has family connections with the applicant or the members of research group.
- The evaluator has been the director of the doctoral thesis of the applicant (thesis submitted in the last 10 years).
- The evaluator has collaborated in the production of publications and/or patents together with the applicant or the research group in the last 5 years.

¹¹ <https://euraxess.ec.europa.eu/jobs/charter>

¹² When selecting evaluators, the SCE applies the aforementioned principles regarding conflict of interest.

- The evaluator has or had a contractual relationship or shares or shared funds or research projects with the applicant or the research group in the last 3 years.
- The evaluator is in any of the situations described above regarding financial or scientific-technological activities.
- The evaluator has been accused of holding a friendship relationship with or showing a clear hostility against any of the applicants.

The evaluator must immediately inform the SCE if a conflict of interest becomes apparent during the course of the evaluation.

4.1.2 CONFIDENTIALITY

GOT ENERGY TALENT regards the lawful and correct treatment of personal data as fundamental and to this end it is fully committed to the principles of data protection. Evaluators will act with strict impartiality. They will respect the confidentiality of the information, including any personal data contained in the proposals that they evaluate and of the evaluation process and its outcomes¹³. The evaluation and selection process will respect data protection principles and rules as stated in UAH's Privacy policy¹⁴.

4.1.3 GENDER EQUALITY

GOT ENERGY TALENT is fully committed to achieve gender equality. To this end, and as stated in the GET's Gender Action Plan, GET secretariat and GET's Selection Manager will take all reasonable measures to ensure that the selection committee shows a balanced representation of men and women. GET secretariat will collect and report on the number of women and men participating in the selection committee. Moreover, GET secretariat will ask the Gender Equality Unit of the UAH to participate in the selection process checking that equality measures are properly applied. GET secretariat will take into account any recommendations issued by the Gender Equality Unit on the selection process.

Regarding the final decision, whereas excellence will be the main selection criterion and assessment will be irrespective of gender, when a male and a female researcher get the same evaluation results, the selection will be based on a gender mix at the host organisation.

4.1.4 CAREER BREAKS AND VARIATIONS IN THE CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER OF CV

Career breaks or variations in the chronological order of CVs should not be penalised, but regarded as an evolution of a career, and consequently, as a potentially valuable contribution to the professional development of researchers towards a multidimensional career track.

Therefore, under GOT ENERGY TALENT, candidates with a career break are allowed to submit evidence-based CVs, reflecting a representative array of achievements and qualifications appropriate to the project. Candidates with a career break are allowed to submit non-academic reference letters as a proof of their qualifications. In addition to this, the application form includes a specific section where applicants should account for their periods of leave.

Whereas excellence will be the main selection criterion, if two applications receive the same evaluation results, difficult personal circumstances (career breaks, family issues, lack of opportunities in the country of origin) will be positively taken into account.

¹³ The SCE selects the evaluators taking into account their knowledge and expertise on the topic, as well as considering all the criteria mentioned in this Guide: fairness and impartiality, conflict of interest, and confidentiality. Only evaluators that accept these principles can participate in SCE evaluations. SCE evaluators are asked to sign a confidentiality agreement.

¹⁴ <https://www.uah.es/es/conoce-la-uah/organizacion-y-gobierno/equipo-de-direccion/secretaria-general/proteccion-de-datos-de-caracter-personal/>

4.2 DO'S AND DON'T'S FOR EVALUATORS WHEN WRITING THE IER

This section of the Guide for Evaluators focuses on each expert's – your – individual evaluation. We ask evaluators reading this Guide to form an opinion based on their own expertise. Please do not consult with other evaluators and do not, under any circumstances, contact the applicant.

If you are asked to evaluate more than one application, it is advisable that you evaluate all applications first, before finalising your scores and specific comments. This will enable you to see the full spectrum of applications allocated to you.

Many evaluators find it useful to make comments highlighting what they perceive as weak and strong points for each criterion and then use this to form their judgement and assign the grade.

The exact meaning of the grades 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0 (excellent, very good, good, insufficient, weak) is described in section 5.2 "Assessment criteria". Therefore, the question is which of these grades best describes the application. Note however that the grade alone is not enough for your evaluation to be well understood and you must also write the IER. Do not be afraid to give your true opinion with an open and constructive spirit, and support it with an appropriate grade.

"Do's and Don'ts"

- Do write your comments using full and clear sentences.
- Do avoid summarising the application. The applicant knows what the application is about.
- Do avoid blow-by-blow accounts, but do focus on strong and weak points based on the given criteria; everything that is included in the report must be briefly justified. Do not use general statements such as: "The research could have been better described".
- Do avoid generalisations such as "Country X is weak in this area!" If you need to make such a comment, it is better to say, for instance, that "It has not been demonstrated in the application that the host has the capacity to run this project".
- Do not assume or anticipate the quality of a group (even a prestigious one): it must be clearly detailed and demonstrated in the application.
- Do avoid statements such as "the candidate has few publications for his/her age". Publication rates vary widely across disciplines and age is not a criterion. If you believe the track record of any participant to be inadequate then, again, include a comment such as "It has not been demonstrated in the application that the proposed fellow has a strong enough track record to carry out this project". Please consider the possibility that the applicant has resumed a research career and assess the total time spent on research.
- Above all, do avoid writing personal comments and insults.
- **Do check the consistency of grades and comments. Remember that a grade below 4/5 for a criterion (1.1) and a grade below 3/5 for a criterion (1.2, 1.3 and criterion 2), leads to the rejection of the application.**
- Do only consider the material included in the application and in this Guide.
- Ethical issues are of considerable concern and you should make a note of those raised by the proposed project. Ethical issues should not affect your evaluation but will need to be managed by the Ethics Committee.

5 ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA, EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORES

GOT ENERGY TALENT fellowships are available to researchers regardless of their nationality. Fellows must fulfill the basic eligibility criteria and quality criteria as explained in the following sections.

5.1 ELEGIBILITY CRITERIA

The eligibility criteria are also clearly outlined in the call and in the Guide for Applicants.

- Nationality: GET fellowships are open to applicants of any nationality.
- Experienced Researchers: applicants must be experienced researchers as defined by MSCA rules, i.e. applicants must be in possession of a doctoral degree or have at least four years of full-time equivalent research experience immediately prior to the date of the call deadline. Full-time equivalent research experience is measured from the date when a researcher obtained the degree which would formally entitle him/her to embark on a doctorate, either in the country in which the degree was obtained or in the country in which the researcher is recruited, irrespective of whether or not a doctorate is or was ever envisaged.
- Mobility Rule: the mobility rule of Marie Skłodowska-Curie programme applies, i.e. applicants must not have resided, or conducted their main activity (work, studies, etc.), in Spain for over 12 months in the 3 years immediately prior to the date of the call deadline. In this regard, compulsory national service, short stays such as holidays and time spent as part of a procedure for obtaining refugee status under the Geneva Convention are not taken into account. Applications can be made by Spanish researchers as far as they comply with the MSCA mobility rule just described.

In addition to this:

- Applicants cannot be permanent employees of UAH or URJC, or any of the organisations participating in the programme (host institutions or partner organisations).
- Applicants must possess a fluent knowledge of English.
- Returnees from phases of international, intersectoral and/or non-academic mobility (such as research stays outside Spain, a period working for the industry or a career break due to family or health reasons) are especially encouraged to apply.
- Applicants must submit the complete application package by the specified deadline. Incomplete or late applications will not be considered.

The eligibility criteria will have been checked by the secretariat prior to scientific evaluation. **Therefore, evaluators must assume that all the applications that he/she must evaluate have gone through the eligibility check and that are eligible.** If something seems to be wrong, the evaluator should inform the SCE about the problem. Doubts regarding eligibility should not affect his/her grades, as evaluation criteria are completely independent from eligibility criteria.

5.2 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The evaluation, and therefore the individual evaluation report, will consist of two parts (please check Annexes):

Part A) Quality of the applicant and of the research group	Overall weight: 70%
Part B) Scientific quality of the project	Overall weight: 30%

Each part will consist of a series of criteria as indicated below. As a general rule, each criterion will be **scored out of 5, with a resolution of two decimal points**, and refers to:

Score	Description
0	Fails. The application fails to address the criterion, information is missing or incomplete.
1	Poor. The application meets the evaluation criterion in a superficial way.
2	Fair. The application shows weaknesses related to the criterion in question.
3	Good. The application broadly satisfies the criterion, but raises some points for discussion.
4	Very good. The application satisfies the criterion in an appropriate manner, even though some improvements are still possible.
5	Excellent. The application fully meets or excels all of the relevant aspects of the criterion in question.

The proposal will be scored out of 5. Therefore, the maximum possible score for a research project proposal is 5. An overall threshold of 75% will be applied to the total weighted score, i.e. a threshold of 3.75 applies. Every candidate's merits will be assessed quantitatively as well as qualitatively based on a comprehensive set of criteria and subcriteria, as described below.

PART A - Quality of the applicant and of the research group

When evaluating the research project proposals, evaluators are asked to use the following criteria and subcriteria.

For criteria 1.1., 1.2. and 1.3 evaluators are asked to score each criterion, which are: 1.1 Quality of the applicant, 1.2. Impact and benefit of the fellowship for the fellow's career considering GET context, 1.3 Quality of the hosting research group. When doing so, **evaluators are asked to take into account the subcriteria but they do not have to score each subcriterion.**

The final score for Part A will be calculated by adding the scores given to each criteria, duly weighed. The overall weight of Part A on the proposal is 70%, as already indicated. Therefore, the maximum potential score of Part A will be 3.5.

Criterion 1.1. Quality of the applicant

Evaluation of the CV of the researcher and research profile – **Overall weight 30% / Threshold 4**

Under this criteria, the following sub-criteria will be taken into account:

- Biographical sketch, including list of publications, congress, communications, patents and impact factor evolution.
- Scientific skills and competences: knowledge areas, acquisition of new knowledge/skills throughout the career, teaching experience, soft skills.
- Complementary skills and competences: project/team management/leadership experience, change of sector, and exploitation of results.
- Letters of interest, references, and academic awards/honours received.
- Postdoctoral experience, locations, role, responsibilities.
- Research groups and collaborative projects, considering degree of participation/responsibility.

Criterion 1.2. Impact and benefit of the fellowship in his/her research career

This criterion includes elements such as employment perspectives and growth potential for the fellow – **Overall weight 25% / Threshold 3.**

Under this criteria, the following sub-criteria will be taken into account:

- Independent thinking and leadership qualities. Candidate's capacities to propose new research lines and to create networking for his/her research activity.
- Match between the applicant's profile and the research proposal, i.e. if the candidate has based his/her career development as a researcher on the scientific area proposed in the research proposal.
- Potential to acquire new knowledge. Candidate's capacities to diverse and enrich his/her research activity within the interaction with other research players in the UAH/URJC network.

Criterion 1.3 Quality of the hosting research group

Evaluation of the research group of the host institution proposed by the candidate to implement his/her research and the candidate's contribution to it – **Overall weight 15% / Threshold 3**

Under this criteria, the following sub-criteria will be taken into account:

- CV of the hosting research group.
- Research results including patents, publications, teaching, etc. of the hosting research group. Synergies with the applicant's ones.
- Capacity of the hosting research group to host the fellow, contribution of the hosting research group to his/her career development, contribution of the fellow to the hosting research group.
- Complementarities between candidate experience and hosting research group.
- Complementarities and relevance of the proposal regarding the host institution from the non-academic sector (if applicable). *Please consider this sub-criteria only if the proposal includes a one-year secondment in one of the host institutions from the non-academic sector.*
- Infrastructures provided by the hosting research group, and (if applicable) of the host institution from the non-academic sector. Please take into account the Appropriate Technical Condition Form provided by the candidate.

PART B - Scientific quality of the project

Under Part B, evaluators are asked to score and comment on each sub-criterion. Each sub-criterion has to be scored out of 5. The weights indicated for the subcriteria refer to their weight on Part B (not on the whole proposal). The final score for Part B will be calculated by adding the scores given to each subcriterion, duly weighed.

The overall weight of Part B on the proposal is 30% (threshold 3), as already indicated. The final score for Part B will be calculated by applying the 30% weighting. Therefore, the maximum potential score of Part B will be 1.5.

Under this criteria, the following sub-criteria will be taken into account:

- Scientific/technological quality including any inter- and multi-disciplinary aspects of the proposal – Weight 25% (on part B)
- Research methodology – Weight 20% (on part B)
 - o Methodology, appropriateness of the scientific and technical approach.
 - o Feasibility, project implementation plan (resources, milestones, etc.).
 - o Resources to be committed.
 - o Plan for further funding to apply.
- Originality and innovative character of the project, relations with and contributions to the state of the art in the field – Weight 20% (on part B)

- Expertise - Weight 15% (on part B)
 - o Required expertise and ability of the applicant to conduct the proposed research project.
 - o Capacity of the host institution (research group and its facilities) and in particular, the scientific/ technical competence and expertise of the host institution / research group in the research field of the proposal.
- Timelines and relevance (impact) of the project in the specified research areas and the regional context - Weight 20% (on part B)
 - o Long-term career goals and possible exploitation plan of the acquired results: patents, spinoffs, etc.
 - o Impact in science and technology fields, and the state of the art.
 - o Impact of the project on the industry: applications in the industry sector, capacity to improve the industrial network, impact in the private sector and in the hosting institutions work, relation with RIS3 and with the industry in the region. *Please use the description provided in section 2.2 to check if the proposal fits within the priorities of the RIS3 and the ERDF Operational Programme.*

5.3 SCORING SYSTEM - EXAMPLE

For clarification reasons, here below you will find an example of the scoring system with the maximum scores that the different criteria, and the application as a whole, can obtain. **The weightings will be calculated automatically by the system.** Evaluators are only asked to score (out of 5, with a resolution of two decimal points) criterion 1.1, criterion 1.2 and criterion 1.3 under Part A, and the subcriteria under Part B. Please check the templates of the Individual Evaluation Report in “Annexes”.

PART A (overall weight 70%)	
Quality of the applicant and of the research group	
Criterion 1.1. Quality of the applicant (overall weight: 30%)	
Score:	5 (out of 5)
Threshold: 4	
Comments	
Criterion 1.2. Impact and benefit of the fellowship in his/her research career (overall weight: 25%)	
Score:	5 (out of 5)
Threshold: 3	
Comments	
Criterion 1.3. Quality of the hosting research group (overall weight: 15%)	
Score:	5 (out of 5)
Threshold: 3	
Comments	
Overall score PART A, weighted:	3.5¹⁵ (out of 3.5)

¹⁵ Automatically calculated by the system.

PART B (overall weight 30%) Scientific Quality of the Project	
Scientific/technological quality including any inter- and multi-disciplinary aspects of the proposal (weight on Part B: 25%)	
Score	5 (out of 5)
Comments	
Research methodology (weight on Part B: 20%)	
Score	5 (out of 5)
Comments	
Originality and innovative character of the project, relations with the state of the art in the field (weight on Part B: 20%)	
Score	5 (out of 5)
Comments	
Expertise (weight on Part B: 15%)	
Score	5 (out of 5)
Comments	
Timelines and relevance (impact) of the project in the specified research areas and the regional context (weight on Part B: 20%)	
Score	5 (out of 5)
Comments	
Score Part B:	5 (out of 5)
<i>Threshold: 3</i>	
Overall score PART B, weighted:	1.5 (out of 1.5)
PROPOSAL FINAL SCORE	5 (out of 5)

5.4 ETHICS

Proposals will not be evaluated on ethics issues. Therefore, evaluators are not asked to evaluate the ethical dimension at this stage. **If the evaluator considers that the proposal might raise ethical issues, he/she should inform the project manager¹⁶, who will take the necessary steps and trigger the ethics assessment procedure.** For information purposes, the general guidelines of the ethics assessment are described below.

Following H2020's procedure, applicants will make their own ethics self-assessment via the application package. The application package will include an ethic self-assessment form made of two parts:

- Part A) Ethics issues table: this will consist on the completion of an ethical issues table (tick-box model similar to the one used in H2020) with the following aspects (1. Human embryos/fetuses; 2. Humans; 3. Human cells/tissues; 4. Personal data; 5. Animals; 6. Third countries; 7. Environment & Health and Safety; 8. Dual use; 9. Exclusive focus on civil applications; 10. Misuse; 11. Other). The aim of this is to determine whether or not the proposed project arises any ethical issues.
- Part B) In case an applicant identifies an ethical issue in part A), he/she will fill in a part B, where he/she will: explain how the identified ethical issue/s will be addressed in particular with relation to the research objectives, research methodology and the potential impact of the research; demonstrate the compliance with ethical and legal requirements; and provide the required evidence documents.

Research proposals selected for funding and having identified ethical issues will go through an Ethical Assessment by Got Energy Talent Ethics Committee. The Ethics Committee is made of both Ethics Committees in URJC and UAH. The Ethics Committee of the host academic institution the candidate applied for —either UAH or URJC— will be the competent body evaluating the ethical issues in the proposal.

The ethical report arising from the Ethical Committee will be reported to the fellow during the negotiation phase. If the Ethics Committee finds that ethic issues are insufficiently addressed, the applicant will be asked to review his/her approach and solve these issues in order to have a favorable report by the Ethics Committee. If, after this review, the Ethics Committee considers that the project proposal does not comply with ethics provisions and with the applicable legislation, the project proposal might be rejected.

More information: <http://gotenergytalent.uah.es/ethics/>

6 GOT ENERGY TALENT CONTACT

Isabel Salgueiro Corrales

Project Manager COFUND – Got Energy Talent

Universidad de Alcalá

Research Management Unit

European Projects Management

C/ Libreros, 21

28801 Alcalá de Henares

Madrid-España

Tel.: +34 91 885 43 71

Fax: +34 91 885 43 70

E-mail: tecnico.cofund@uah.es

¹⁶ In this case, you should the relevant contact in the Department for Coordination and Evaluation of the Spanish Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities.

ANNEXES

INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT

INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)

<p>PART A (overall weight 70%) QUALITY OF THE APPLICANT AND OF THE RESEARCH GROUP</p>
--

[0 = Fails, missing or incomplete; 1 = Poor; 2 = Fair; 3 = Good; 4 = Very good; 5 = Excellent]

<p>Criterion 1.1. Quality of the applicant (overall weight 30%)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biographical sketch, including list of publications, congress communications, patents and impact factor evolution. - Scientific skills and competences: knowledge areas, acquisition of new knowledge/skills throughout the career, teaching experience, soft skills. - Complementary skills and competences: project/team management/leadership experience, change of sector, and exploitation of results. - Letters of interest, references, and academic awards/honours received. - Postdoctoral experience, locations, role, responsibilities. - Research groups and collaborative projects, considering degree of participation/responsibility.
<p>Score:</p>	<p>_____ (out of 5)</p>
<p>Threshold: 4</p>	
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>Criterion 1.2. Impact and benefit of the fellowship in his/her research career (overall weight: 25%)</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Independent thinking and leadership qualities. Candidate's capacities to propose new research lines and to create networking for his/her research activity. - Match between the applicant's profile and the research proposal, i.e. if the candidate has based his/her career development as a researcher on the scientific area proposed in the research proposal. - Potential to acquire new knowledge. Candidate's capacities to diverse and enrich his/her research activity within the interaction with other research players in the UAH/URJC network.
<p>Score:</p>	<p>_____ (out of 5)</p>
<p>Threshold: 3</p>	
<p>Comments:</p>	

Criterion 1.3. Quality of the hosting research group (overall weight: 15%)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CV of the hosting research group. - Research results including patents, publications, teaching, etc. of the hosting research group. Synergies with the applicant's ones. - Capacity of the hosting research group to host the fellow, contribution of the hosting research group to his/her career development, contribution of the fellow to the hosting research group. - Complementarities between candidate experience and hosting research group. - Complementarities and relevance of the proposal regarding the host institution from the non-academic sector (if applicable). <i>Please consider this sub-criteria only if the proposal includes a one-year secondment in one of the host institutions from the non-academic sector.</i> - Infrastructures provided by the hosting research group, and (if applicable) of the host institution from the non-academic sector. Please take into account the Appropriate Technical Condition Form provided by the candidate. 	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Threshold: 3	
Comments:	

Overall score for Part A, weighted:	_____ (out of 3.5)
--	--------------------

**PART B (overall weight 30%)
SCIENTIFIC QUALITY OF THE PROJECT**

[0 = Fails, missing or incomplete; 1 = Poor; 2 = Fair; 3 = Good; 4 = Very good; 5 = Excellent]

Scientific/technological quality including any inter- and multi-disciplinary aspects of the proposal (weight on Part B: 25%)	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Comments:	
Research methodology (weight on Part B: 20%)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodology, appropriateness of the scientific and technical approach. - Feasibility, project implementation plan (resources, milestones, etc.). - Resources to be committed. - Plan for further funding to apply. 	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Comments:	
Originality and innovative character of the project, relations with and contributions to the state of the art in the field (weight on Part B: 20%)	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Comments:	
Expertise (weight on Part B: 15%)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Required expertise and ability of the applicant to conduct the proposed research project - Capacity of the host institution (research group and its facilities) and in particular, the scientific/ technical competence and expertise of the host institution / research group in the research field of the proposal. 	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Comments:	

Timelines and relevance (impact) of the project in the specified research areas and the regional context- Weight 20% (on part B)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Long-term career goals and possible exploitation plan of the acquired results: patents, spinoffs, etc. - Impact in science and technology fields, and the state of the art. - Impact of the project on the industry: applications in the industry sector, capacity to improve the industrial network, impact in the private sector and in the hosting institutions work, relation with RIS3 and with the industry in the region. <i>Please use the description provided in section 2.2 to check if the proposal fits within the priorities of the RIS3 and the ERDF Operational Programme.</i> 	
Score:	_____ (out of 5)
Comments:	

Score Part B:	_____ (out of 5)
Threshold: 3	
Overall score for Part B, weighted:	_____ (out of 1.5)

PROPOSAL FINAL SCORE	_____ (out of 5)
-----------------------------	------------------