



M-ERA.NET Call 2024

Guide for Evaluators

Version 1.0

March 2024

Contents

1. Evaluation workflow - overview	3
2. Definitions	4
3. Background.....	5
4. Administrative structures	6
3.1 Call Consortium	6
3.2 Call Secretariat	6
5. Selection of Evaluators – Pre-/Full-Proposal Evaluation.....	7
6. Evaluation Procedure of Pre- and Full-Proposals	9
7. Financial Compensation	10
Appendix A. Evaluation criteria, scores, thresholds and evaluation reports	11
Appendix B. Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation	14
Appendix C. Conflict of Interest	15
Appendix D. Code of Conduct	16
Appendix E. Call schedule and evaluation timeline.....	17

1. Evaluation workflow - overview

This overall description of the evaluation workflow for each of the 2 stages of the centralized Evaluation (Pre- and Full-Proposal) contains links to the detailed explanations contained further in the document.

1. [Evaluators](#) are [appointed](#) to a number of proposals according to their expertise area and gain [access to the online evaluation platform](#).
 - a. Between 3 and 7 proposals per stage (might vary depending on the number of submitted proposals)
 - b. Please note: there is no guarantee that the expertise will be needed in both stages.
2. Evaluators verify the existence of any [Conflicts of Interest](#) for all assigned projects.
 - a. A redistribution of the concerned proposals will take place in case of Col.
3. Each Pre- or Full-Proposal is assessed by three evaluators. Each evaluator will prepare an [Individual Assessment Report](#) (IAR), via the online tool, according to the [Evaluation Criteria](#) and to the proposal's [Topic thematic priorities](#). The IAR does not contain scores.
 - a. IAR deadlines - **Stage 1:** 23 July 2024. **Stage 2:** 27 December 2024
4. Once the 3 IARs are submitted, the evaluators gain access to communication channels to discuss and come to an agreement about the Pre- or Full-Proposal.
5. One of the three evaluators (appointed as the [rapporteur](#) by the [Call Secretariat](#)) will prepare a [Peer Review Report](#) that reflects the consensus of the three evaluators, and attribute a [score](#) compatible with the comments.
 - a. PRR deadlines – **Stage 1:** 2 September 2024. **Stage 2:** 9 January 2025
6. The other two evaluators review the PRR (including scores) and accept it or object to it, indicating the necessary modifications to improve the PRR.
 - a. In case of an objection, a new version of the PRR will be made by the rapporteur and reviewed (and accepted/objected) by the other two evaluators.
7. Once the three evaluators have reached an agreement, the [Call Secretariat](#) performs a Quality Check of the PRR (compliance with the Call rules and evaluation criteria, coherence between comments and attributed scores).
8. If the PRR is objected by the Call Secretariat, a new version will be made by the rapporteur and reviewed by the other two evaluators and the Call Secretariat.
9. After the PRR is accepted by the Call Secretariat, the evaluation is finished for this individual Pre- or Full-Proposal and can no longer be modified.
10. Once an evaluator finishes the evaluation of all the proposals in the portfolio, the evaluator must send an invoice in order to receive their [financial compensation](#). This must be done at the end of stage 1 and stage 2 (if applicable).

This workflow is a general guide for both Pre- and Full-Proposal evaluation.

Please read carefully the detailed [timeline](#) and [description](#) of the evaluation process.

2. Definitions

In the context of this document, the following terminology is used:

- **Call:** refers to the [M-ERA.NET Call 2024](#) published on March 5th 2024. The M-ERA.NET Call 2024 is implemented as a two-step application and evaluation procedure. **A centralised (online) evaluation of Pre-Proposals and Full-Proposals is carried out.**
- **FOs:** national or regional **funding organisations** participating in the joint Call 2024. ([Participating countries/regions Call 2024 - M-ERA.NET](#))
- **Consortium:** group of applicants submitting a proposal for a joint transnational collaborative project. **Coordinator:** one applicant appointed by the consortium that is the single point of contact for the FOs.
- **PI:** Principal Investigator, the leader of a research group within a department or institute.
- **Partners:** partners are researchers, research institutions, companies, etc., forming a consortium. A partner is usually the legal entity that will receive the grant. For some FOs, the partner is also the PI, for others, it might be the university. At the stage of proposal submission and evaluation, partners are **applicants**. After successful evaluation and national implementation (negotiation phase), they become **beneficiaries**. All partners have to sign a **Consortium Agreement** in due time.
- **Beneficiary:** Beneficiaries are researchers, institutions, etc., receiving a grant by the FOs.
- **Evaluation stages:** The Call 2024 is divided in two centralised evaluation stages (Pre-Proposal and Full-Proposal evaluation), and evaluators **must be available for both**, including their respective online discussions if applicable:
 - **Stage 1: Pre-Proposal evaluation.** Between 20 June 2024 and mid July 2024
 - Individual assessment report deadline: 23 July 2024
 - Peer review report deadline: 2 September 2024
 - **Stage 2: Full-Proposal evaluation.** Between 27 November 2024 and the end of December
 - Individual assessment report deadline: 27 December 2024
 - Peer review report deadline: 9 January 2025

3. Background

Technological innovation is a key dimension in efforts to achieve the environmental and growth objectives set by the United Nations general assembly in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Such degree of technological innovation requires research and development that is highly targeted at increasing the efficiency of the currently prevalent high-tech products and manufacturing processes (material use, recyclability, energy efficiency).

Likewise, the integration of renewable energy and its storage into end-use applications (construction, transport, industry) must be prioritized. The development and manufacturing of high-performance, reliable, safe and low-cost energy generating and storing elements is a key to sustainable mobility and energy supply. However, the prolific use of such energy storing elements across numerous fields of application leads to increased consumption of resources. Therefore, measures must be taken to conserve resources and increase the efficiency of their exploitation.

New materials are crucial for finding solutions for more efficient and sustainable energy generation and storing elements, reducing their weight and enhancing their durability. These materials must be part of resilient supply chains, and show improved performance in terms of energy generation (efficiency, stability) and storage (energy density, power delivery, ultrafast charge, cyclability), cost and safety. Additionally, new materials must also enable the 'recyclable by design' concept, minimizing the environmental impact of the manufacturing process and the associated greenhouse gas emissions and carbon footprint. This will be possible by replacing hazardous and/or minimally recyclable materials for counterparts that are safer and easier to process and recycle.

Within that context, the M-ERA.NET network aims to to develop a long-term cooperation between funding organisations (FOs) from countries and regions across Europe and beyond, by funding transnational Research and Technological Development (RTD) projects that combine materials research and technological industrial needs. This will promote the development of new products and production processes, fostering synergies that can be very effective in achieving industrial symbiosis, in particular with the aim of preventing by-products from becoming waste.

The M-ERA.NET network was established in 2012 under the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) scheme, and continues from 2016 to 2026 under the Horizon 2020 scheme. While proposals are submitted jointly by a consortium, the individual project partners are solely funded by the respective FO, i.e. each country or region finances the participation of its own researchers according to its rules, and the final funding decision remains with the corresponding FO.

In order to achieve maximum relevance and impact, M-ERA.NET set up a multiannual policy for launching joint programs that target the innovation cycle as a whole. M-ERA.NET has a clear ambition to mobilise very substantial national and regional resources.

The M-ERA.NET Call 2024 is implemented as a **two-step application and evaluation procedure for both (Pre-Proposals and Full-Proposals) stages**. For each step, a centralised evaluation is carried out as well as an eligibility checks of submitted proposals by FOs. Only eligible proposals are sent to central evaluation, organised by the M-ERA.NET call secretariat. The central evaluation is performed online by independent international evaluators, resulting in the M-ERA.NET ranking list of proposals. The ranking list of proposals is discussed by the FOs at the Selection Meeting.

The Pre-Proposal stage will ensure that only high-quality proposals, which are in line with national/regional requirements, are invited to the Full-Proposal stage, targeting a reasonable balance between requested funding and available national/regional budgets.

In the Full-Proposal stage, the FOs will agree on a joint selection list based on the ranking list of evaluated Full-Proposals. **The final funding decisions will be made by the national/regional funding organisations.**

Each proposal is assessed by three different evaluators after the proposal deadline via the M-ERA.NET online evaluation tool according to the established evaluation criteria (see [Appendix A](#) and in the *Briefing of Evaluators* document that will be available in the online tool). The call secretariat will provide contact to an expert in responsible research and innovation (RRI) if needed.

The evaluation procedures for Pre- and Full-Proposals are described [further in the document](#).

4. Administrative structures

3.1 Call Consortium

The call consortium is composed of national and regional FOs participating in the M-ERA.NET Call 2024. It supervises the whole call procedure and agrees on the final list of proposals recommended for funding.

The call consortium is supported by the M-ERA.NET coordinator and the call secretariat. It accompanies the entire lifespan of the call, evaluates the performance of the projects and resolves potential disagreements that may arise during the lifetime of the projects. It supervises the activities of the call secretariat.

3.2 Call Secretariat

The call secretariat is the central basis for activities related to the implementation of the M-ERA.NET Call 2024. It is in charge of the operational implementation of the Call 2024, until the projects are selected. The call secretariat works under the supervision of the call consortium.

All proposals are submitted electronically via the M-ERA.NET submission tool, which registers and distributes them to the call consortium and evaluators (see below for details on the evaluation process).

The call secretariat has the following duties and is represented by the following organisations:

Duty	Responsible FO				
	FFG (Austria)	JÜLICH (Germany)	VDI/VE-IT (Germany)	UEFISCDI (Romania)	ANR (France)
Launch calls	✓	✓			
Provide comprehensive directory of national and regional contact points in participating countries/regions through website as decentralised helpdesk	✓	✓			
Provide a central service & contact point for all other interested parties	✓				
implement, run and maintain the online tool for submission & evaluation & monitoring	✓		✓		
Arrange for the maintenance & update of the database of proposals and projects	✓		✓	✓	
Select and appoint evaluators	*	✓			✓
Contact, invite & guide evaluators	✓	✓			✓
Collect individual evaluation results, ensure peer review reports and ranking of proposals	✓	✓			✓
Collect scanned copy of signed declarations, payment to evaluators	✓				
Prepare feedback emails to applicants	✓		✓		✓
Compile call results	✓	✓			

* additional support by other funding organisations of the call consortium
(Check marks in bold indicate the funding organisation leading a specific task)

5. Selection of Evaluators – Pre-/Full-Proposal Evaluation

1. A list of experts is compiled of recommendations by the FOs and experts that registered in the M-ERA.NET database to participate in the evaluation process for the Call 2024.
2. Experts must be available in both steps (Pre- and Full-Proposal phase). *Please note that there is no guarantee that the expertise will be needed in both stages.*
3. Experts are invited by the call secretariat based on the call topics.
4. For each step the call secretariat prepares a list of evaluators allocated to each Pre-/Full-Proposal.
 - a. Evaluators are selected according to different criteria: focus of research, expertise, academic/industrial background, geographical coverage and gender balance.
 - b. Evaluators with verified or potential conflicts of interest are excluded from that list.
 - c. The list of evaluators is endorsed by the FO.

5. The “[Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation](#)” is collected before access to the evaluation tool is granted, including:
 - a. A confidentiality declaration;
 - b. A commitment to notify M-ERA.NET of any conflict of interest;
 - c. A commitment to the M-ERA.NET code of conduct and to delivering the assessment(s) in due time.

The scanned copy of the originally signed “Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation” must be uploaded online at: <https://monitor.m-era.net/evaluator-registration>

6. For each step individual evaluators assess a maximum of 10 proposals and might be appointed by the call secretariat as rapporteur for some of them. On average, in past calls experts were appointed to 3-7 proposals as evaluator and to 1-3 proposals as a *rapporteur*. The call secretariat expects similar numbers for Call 2024.
7. All evaluators have access to the online evaluation tool:
 - a. Within about a month after the Pre-Proposal deadline and
 - b. Approximately 3 days after the Full-Proposal deadline, providing their expertise is needed for the second stage (the secretariat will notify them in that case).

Experts excluded from the evaluation process 2024 are:

- Applicants submitting a proposal to the Call 2024
- Participants of the Strategic Expert Group (SEG)
- Researchers affiliated to Russian entities and/or exercising in Russia

6. Evaluation Procedure of Pre- and Full-Proposals

Following the assignment of evaluators and *rapporteurs*, the evaluation proceeds as follows:

1. Access to Pre/Full-Proposals: For each step, the proposals are provided via the M-ERA.NET online evaluation tool to the evaluators and rapporteurs after they have signed and uploaded the “[Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation](#)”, declaring confidentiality, committing to notify the call secretariat in case of conflict of interest, and committing to provide the assessment in due time. Evaluators must verify the existence of Conflicts of Interest – for all of the Pre- or Full-Proposals in their portfolio – as soon as possible in order to ensure that an eventual redistribution of proposals can take place without delaying the evaluation procedure.

2. Individual assessment of Pre/Full-Proposals: For step 1 as for step 2, a proposal is assessed by three evaluators via the M-ERA.NET online evaluation tool, according to the evaluation criteria (see [Appendix A](#)). These three individual and independent assessments (Individual Assessment Report – IAR) are written statements for each criterion/sub-criterion. The structure of the statements should focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the Pre/Full-Proposal regarding the specific criterion. The comments in the evaluation tool have to be arranged accordingly. Each individual evaluation has to follow all requirements listed in [Appendix A](#) of this document and in the *Briefing of Evaluators* document. It is important that the written statements are sufficiently detailed and that they properly justify the assessments for each criterion/sub criterion. After IARs are submitted, evaluators will have the possibility to exchange opinions. Contact data of the three evaluators will be provided via M-ERA.NET online evaluation tool to enable an online discussion.

3. Compilation/Peer Review Report of Pre/Full-Proposals: The *rapporteur* (one of the three evaluators, selected/appointed by the call secretariat) compiles the 3 individual assessment reports and considers the online discussion with the other evaluators. The compilation consists of the peer review report and scoring. The peer review report has to fulfil all requirements listed in the Appendix A and in the *Briefing of Evaluators* document, and must reflect the consensus reached by the three evaluators. The rapporteur ensures that the awarded scores are in line with the comments in the peer review report. All experts who provided individual written assessments read and validate the compilation and consistency of peer review report and scoring. If there are objections to the proposed peer review report and/or scores, a new version is provided by the rapporteur, addressing the improvement points raised in the objection. The new version of the PRR is then verified by the other evaluators. As soon as the peer review report is accepted by all 3 evaluators, the quality of peer review reports is verified by the call secretariat for compliance with the Call rules and evaluation criteria, coherence between comments and attributed scores.

Additional information and guidelines for the evaluation of the proposals and the elaboration of the PRR will be available in the online evaluation platform.

4. Ranking list: The ranking list of recommended Pre/Full-Proposals is based on the scoring proposed by the *rapporteur* and agreed upon by all 3 evaluators, for both stages. The ranking list will be discussed during the selection meetings to elaborate the selection list of recommended projects.

5. Information availability: The three individual assessments, the peer review report, the scoring and the ranking list will be available for the whole call consortium.

The peer review report (without the scores) is also provided to the applicants!

6. Selection list: After each central evaluation step, a selection meeting is organised to discuss the ranking list and elaborate a selection list recommending projects for:

- a. Full-Proposal submission at the end of stage 1, or
- b. Funding at the end of stage 2.

The recommended M-ERA.NET selection list will be forwarded to the involved programme owners who will be in charge of the final funding decisions.

7. Financial Compensation

Evaluators are entitled to financial compensation for their efforts. After completing their evaluation duties, they will receive from the M-ERA.NET call secretariat 50€ per evaluated Pre-Proposal and 200€ per evaluated Full-Proposal (the *rapporteur* tasks and efforts for elaborating the PRR are included in this fee).

The M-ERA.NET call secretariat reserves the right to refuse payment in case of non-performance or poor performance, or breach of any substantial obligation, including the obligation of confidentiality and any obligation described in the Code of Conduct ([Appendix D](#) of this document) and in the [Declaration for the M-ERA.NET evaluation](#).

Should a claim for payment not have been supplied by the evaluator until 30 days after evaluation, the M-ERA.NET call secretariat reserves the right to refuse the reimbursement.

Appendix A. Evaluation criteria, scores, thresholds and evaluation reports

• EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criteria for Pre and Full-Proposal evaluation are predefined by the EC for ERA-NET Cofund:

- 1) Excellence
- 2) Impact
- 3) Implementation

Sub-criteria, scoring and thresholds are defined by the call consortium.

1. Pre-Proposal evaluation criteria

<i>Main Criteria</i>	<i>Sub Criteria</i>	<i>Max. Score (points)</i>
<i>Excellence</i>	Clarity and pertinence of research objectives and hypotheses	1.5
	Novelty, originality, position of concepts and approaches in relation to the state of the art (ambition, innovation potential, ground-breaking objectives)	2.0
	Appropriateness of the methodology, credibility of the proposed approach and soundness of the concept, including TRL and the approach to RRI	1.5
<i>Impact</i>	Ability of the project to address the research issues covered by the chosen research theme: relevance to the topic addressed by the call	2.0
	Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the Guide for Proposers under the relevant topic	2.0
	Engagement of the proposed research with circularity, environmental as well as ethical, political, social and/or cultural dimensions	1.0
<i>Implementation</i>	Competences, experience and complementarity of each of the consortium members and the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance, inter- or transdisciplinarity)	2.0
	Quality of the collaboration (added value of the transnational cooperation)	
	Quality and effectiveness of the work plan (work packages and tasks distribution among partners)	2.0
	Organisation and overall management of the project	
	Overall appropriateness of the proposal budget and other resources to be committed by individual partners (overall person month balance)	1.0

- **Ethical issues:** Pre-Proposals include HEU “Ethical Issues Table”. In case ethical issues apply (applicants mark respective issues in the table) M-ERA.NET recommends that the national/regional organisations observe these issues (e.g. post-evaluation review) for their respective funded projects.
- **Gender aspect** is not an evaluation criterion. It is only used for M-ERA.NET internal purpose.

2. Full-Proposal evaluation criteria

<i>Main Criteria</i>	<i>Sub Criteria</i>	<i>Max. Score (points)</i>
Excellence	Clarity and pertinence of research objectives and hypotheses	1.5
	Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches)	1.5
	Credibility of the proposed approach and soundness of the concept. including approach to RRI	2.0
Impact	Contribution at the European or international level to the expected impacts listed in the Guide for Proposers under the relevant topic	1.5
	Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge	1.0
	Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs and values of European and global markets; and, where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets	
	Engagement of the proposed research with circularity, environmental as well as ethical, political, social and/or cultural dimensions	1.0
	Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, engage with stakeholders and user groups, and to manage research data where relevant	1.5
Implementation	Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall	1.0
	Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures	1.0
	Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants	1.0
	Quality of the consortium as a whole including complementarity, balance, inter- or transdisciplinarity	1.0
	Appropriate of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and allocation and justification of the resources to fulfil that role (including overall person month balance)	1.0

- **Ethical issues:** Full-Proposals include HEU “Ethical Issues Table”. In case ethical issues apply (applicants mark respective issues in the table) M-ERA.NET recommends that the national/regional organisations observe these issues (e.g. post-evaluation review) for their respective funded projects.
- **Gender aspect** is not an evaluation criterion. It is only used for M-ERA.NET internal purpose.

- **EVALUATION REPORTS, THRESHOLDS and SCORES**

Individual assessment report (IAR): No scores are awarded for the IAR. Evaluators only provide comments, grouped by strengths and weaknesses for each sub-criterion.

Peer review report (PRR): As soon as all three IARs are submitted, the rapporteur compiles a peer review report, to be agreed upon by all three evaluators. The rapporteur ensures an agreement on the PRR and that comments are in line with the attributed scores.

Each of the three criteria will be scored between 0.0 and 5.0, as a result of the sum of the scoring attributed to each of the individual sub-criteria. Sub-criteria have individual maximum scores, with a **resolution of 0.5 points**.

Threshold: In order to be eligible for recommendation (for proceeding to stage 2 or for funding), the Pre-/Full-Proposal must be above the threshold of:

- 3.0 points for individual criteria and
- 10.0 points overall (sum of the individual scores).

Scores: The scores indicate the following with respect to the criterion under examination (definition of scores taken from the Horizon Europe guidelines to applicants):

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

1 - Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 - Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

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

Appendix B. Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation

Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation

- Please read the following declaration carefully and sign it to express your acceptance of the document.
- Please upload a scanned copy of the originally signed document at <https://monitor.m-era.net/evaluator-registration>.

NON-DISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

I hereby undertake to treat as confidential all and any information that I receive while participating in the work of evaluating M-ERA.NET project proposals, to use this information solely for the purpose of evaluation of the proposals, not to disclose it to any third party and not to make it publicly available or accessible in any way, except with the prior written consent of the company or other entity submitting the project proposal in question and the M-ERA.NET consortium.

I understand that this non-disclosure agreement is binding towards M-ERA.NET who has proposed me as an evaluator/rapporteur and towards (and for the benefit of) any applicant submitting the project proposal to the M-ERA.NET joint calls for proposals. Furthermore, I understand that this non-disclosure agreement concerns all and any information in any form that comes to my knowledge during my participation in the work of evaluating M-ERA.NET project proposals.

I understand that I shall be bound by this non-disclosure agreement as of the date of my signature of this obligation and that I shall be bound by it even after my participation in the work of the M-ERA.NET evaluation has ended.

Notification in case of Conflict of Interest

I declare that I have not submitted, nor am I, to my knowledge, involved in any proposal currently under evaluation or submitted for evaluation, under the M-ERA.NET Call 2024.

I declare that my participation in the evaluation of the following proposal(s) could not create a conflict of interest (see Appendix C in the M-ERA.NET “Guide for Evaluators” for explanation).

I hereby declare that I will instantly contact M-ERA.NET in case a conflict of interest arises:

Contact: Gabriella ALBERT (email: gabriella.albert@ffg.at [mailto:](mailto:gabriella.albert@ffg.at) phone: +43 57755-5056)

Code of Conduct and availability of assessments

I undertake to abide by the Code of Conduct for evaluators/rapporteurs covered in Appendix D in the M-ERA.NET “Guide for Evaluators” (“Code of conduct”).

I hereby declare that I will finish the evaluation in due time and accept the deadlines set by the M-ERA.NET call secretariat. This includes:

- My availability during pre-proposal evaluation phase (June – September 2024)
- My availability during full-proposal evaluation phase (November 2024 – January 2025)
- I am available for online discussions for the compilation of the individual assessments and agree that my contact details are provided to other M-ERA.NET evaluators after the individual written assessment is finished.
- I understand that the discussions and potential revisions of the Peer Review Report are an integral part of the evaluation process
- I am committed to having a respectful and constructive discussion, aiming to find common ground and reach an agreement, even if some opinions might diverge.

Name (in CAPITAL LETTERS):

Date and Signature:

Appendix C. Conflict of Interest

Definition of the conflict of interest: for a given proposal, a conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- (a) is a member of the Strategic Expert Group of the Call 2024
- (b) was involved in the preparation of any proposal of the M-ERA.NET Call 2024
- (c) is affiliated to Russian entities and/or exercising in Russia
- (d) stands to benefit directly or indirectly if the proposal is accepted
- (e) has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant legal entity
- (f) is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant legal entity
- (g) is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities or any named subcontractors
- (h) is employed by an applicant or sub-contractor in the last 3 years
- (i) is involved in a grant agreement/decision, the membership of management structures or a research collaboration with an applicant in the last 3 years
- (j) is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially

Appendix D. Code of Conduct

Fundamental principles of good research practice and peer-review are essential for research integrity. All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must ensure the transparency of the process as well as that the evaluation criteria published in the *Guide for Proposers* are respected equally for all proposals and that public funds are well used:

1. Evaluators are chosen for their technical or scientific or industrial expertise.
2. All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must act objectively, with no self-interested motives. They do not represent their company, organisation or establishment.
3. The evaluators shall evaluate the proposals based solely upon the information contained in the proposals.
4. Minutes will be kept for those meetings during which decisions are reached. These minutes will be circulated to participants for verification.
5. Evaluators should refrain in all cases from identifying external experts to third parties, and from divulging any other element which could compromise their anonymity. Likewise, evaluators should not contact applicants directly.
6. If any evaluator is the object of any pressure whatsoever from a project applicant, she or he must notify immediately the call secretariat.
7. If there is a conflict of interest (see Appendix C), the concerned person must inform the call secretariat as soon as finding that a conflict exists.

The M-ERA.NET call secretariat reserves the right to refuse to provide a financial contribution in case of non-performance or poor performance or breach of any substantial obligation, including the obligation of confidentiality and any obligation described in the Code of Conduct (Appendix in *Guide for Evaluators*) and in the Declaration for M-ERA.NET evaluation.

Appendix E. Call schedule and evaluation timeline

Date	Action	Actor
05 March 2024	Publication of the joint call	Call secretariat
	Start identification of evaluators	
14 May 2024 12:00 noon Brussels time	Deadline for submission of a) Pre-Proposals and b) National/Regional funding applications, if necessary*	Applicants
	Invitation and registration of evaluators	Evaluators/ Call secretariat
04 June 2024	National/Regional Pre-Proposal checks completed	National/Regional FOs
20 June 2024	Access to online evaluation tool for evaluators	Call secretariat
23 July 2024	Individual written assessments finished	Evaluators
02 September 2024	Deadline for compilation of consensus report (online discussions and peer review report finished)	Evaluators
end September 2024	Pre-Proposal Selection meeting (SB)	National/Regional FOs
End September 2024	Feedback to applicants (recommended/not recommended for Full-Proposal submission)	Call secretariat
20 November 2024	Deadline for submission of: a) Full-Proposals and b) National/Regional funding applications, if necessary*	Applicants
25 November 2024	National/Regional Full-Proposal checks completed	National/Regional FOs
27 November 2024	Access to online evaluation tool for evaluators	Call secretariat
27 December 2024	Individual written assessments finished	Evaluators
09 January 2025	Deadline for compilation of consensus report (online discussions and peer review report finished)	Evaluators
16 January 2025	Peer review reports & ranking lists to agencies	Call Secretariat
End January 2025	Selection meeting (SB)	National/Regional FOs
February 2025	Reimbursement of evaluators	Call secretariat
Early February 2025	M-ERA.NET feedback to applicants (result of selection meeting, peer review reports and scoring)	Call secretariat
From February 2025	Contract negotiations for selected proposals	National/Regional FOs
From February 2025	Start of funded projects	Partners

For further information on M-ERA.NET: please visit <http://www.m-era.net>