

**Joint Research Fund between Taiwan, Latvia and Lithuania
Peer Review Report**

Project title: _____

No	Criteria:	Score (1-5)
1.	Excellence: Quality and if appropriate innovative aspects of the research; clarity and pertinence of the objectives; soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology; extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art and if appropriate demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organizational models), appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches.	
	Comment	
2.	Impact: The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to the development of corresponding research field, research and innovation related human resources and their skills, involvement of young scientists; any substantial impact that would enhance innovation capacity, or bring important benefits for society and economy; quality of the proposed measures to communicate, exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR if applicable); plans for further development of cooperation through EU research and innovation programs.	
	Comment	
3.	Quality and efficiency of the implementation: Competences, experience and complementarity of the participating organizations and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise; feasibility of the project; overall coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management if applicable; appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role in the project to fulfil the role.	
	Comment	

Expert's name:

Signature:

Date:

The scoring scale.

For each criterion under examination, score values indicate the following assessments:

Score	Grade	Description
1	Poor	The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair	The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but 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 fully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Experts examine the issues to be considered comprising each evaluation criterion, and score these on a scale from 1 to 5. The assessment can be expressed in whole numbers with one digit after the decimal point. Half point scores may be given.

The half point scores will be presented as follows:

Score	Grade
1	Poor
1,5	Poor – Fair
2	Fair
2,5	Fair – Good
3	Good
3,5	Good - Very good
4	Very good
4,5	Very good – Excellent
5	Excellent

All scores must be substantiated by comments.