



Grant Agreement Number: 821911

Project acronym: CoRDiNet

Project full title: Copernicus Relays for Digitalisation spanning a Network

## D5.1 – Evaluation package for the Evaluation Board



The CoRDiNet project is funded by the European Union under the Horizon 2020 programme, grant no. 821911

GRANT AGREEMENT N.	821911
PROJECT ACRONYM	CoRdiNet
PROJECT FULL NAME	Copernicus Relays for digitalisation spanning a Network
STARTING DATE (DUR.)	1 Oct. 2018
ENDING DATE	30 Sept. 2020
PROJECT WEBSITE	<a href="http://www.CoRdiNet.eu">www.CoRdiNet.eu</a>
COORDINATOR	Jürgen Vogel
ADDRESS	bavAIRIA e.V. Sonderflughafen Oberpaffenhofen, Friedrichshavener Strasse 1 D-82205 Gilching. Germany.
REPLY TO	<a href="mailto:vogel@bavAIRia.net">vogel@bavAIRia.net</a>
EU PROJECT OFFICER	Julia Simion, Research Executive Agency (REA), European Commission, BRU

Workpackage n.   title	Integration of other, associated Copernicus Relay partners external to the network
Workpackage leader	5-NEREUS (Network of European Regions Using Space Technologies)
Deliverable n.   title	Evaluation package for the Evaluation Board
Responsible author	Roya Ayazi
Reply to	
Version   status	
Nature	R (Report)
Due Date	31th January 2019
Delivery Date	31th January 2019
Dissemination level	PU
Authors (partner)	

VERSION	MODIFICATION(S)	DATE	AUTHOR(S)

## List of Acronyms

<b>CSO</b>	Copernicus Support Office
<b>CoRdiNet</b>	Copernicus Relays for digitalisation spanning a Network, an H2020 project as part of the “Space hubs for Copernicus” Call
<b>CopHub.AC</b>	CoRdiNet’s H2020 partner project of Copernicus Relays as part of the “Space hubs for Copernicus” Call
<b>CR</b>	Copernicus Relay
<b>ESA</b>	European Space Agency
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>FGG</b>	Austrian Research Promotion Agency
<b>NEREUS</b>	(Network of European Regions Using Space Technologies)

## Content

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>CoRdiNet Evaluation Board .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1	<i>Process to set up the CoRdiNet Evaluation Board.....</i>	<i>5</i>
2.1.1	<i>Call for Experts.....</i>	<i>5</i>
2.1.2	<i>Subchapter: Profile of experts.....</i>	<i>6</i>
2.1.3	<i>Subchapter: Candidates to be approached/invited for CoRdiNet's Evaluation Board .....</i>	<i>6</i>
2.2	<i>Guidance for Experts of the CoRdiNet's Evaluation Board.....</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.1	<i>Evaluators package.....</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.2	<i>Timing and Procedure.....</i>	<i>7</i>

## List of Annexes:

Annex 1: Call for Experts for the CoRdiNet Evaluation Board

Annex 2: Templates for Evaluation Report (sample)

Annex 3: CODE OF CONDUCT

## 1 Introduction

A budget of about 100 k€ for the project duration of 24 months has been dedicated to support initiatives proposed by parties outside the consortium, so called associate partners. Five calls (A-E) are previewed in the frame of the project (overview see table below, excerpt from Grant Agreement Part B page 51, table 5). The CoRDiNet-consortium will issue Calls for Expressions of Interest with which the consortium will invite project proposals relevant to the scope and objectives of the project activities. The projects to be selected will have a financial volume of 2000 EUR – max. 5000 EUR.

Reference	Description	Cost in € (ca. no. of 3 <sup>rd</sup> parties)	WP & WP-Partner involved
A	Regional/Local Analysis Copernicus	25.000 (5)	WP5 Nereus & WP2 ITeRN
B	Local transnational Info Events Copernicus	30.000 (6)	WP5 Nereus & WP3 ULEIC.
C	Business Creation Mechanism Copernicus	25.000 (5)	WP5 Nereus & WP4 GMV
D	Travel - Evaluation Board Copernicus Experts, 2 Mtgs.	5.000 (10)	WP5 Nereus
E	Travel/Subsistance Copernicus European Regional Strategy Board, 2 Mtgs.	15.000 (15)	WP5 Nereus & WP7 bav

Table 5: Financial support to Third Parties

## 2 CoRDiNet Evaluation Board

Within WP5 the lead partner NEREUS is tasked to set up and manage an Evaluation Board whose role is to evaluate the incoming applications for Calls for Expressions of Interest. The board comprises selected experts who evaluate on a voluntary base submitted project proposals. Based on a set of predefined criteria which are specific for each call, they assess and rank the submitted proposals and select the highest scored initiatives to be financed. The board brings into the initiative different perspectives, experiences and expertise. Further to this, NEREUS strives to ensure a fair geographic balance (focus Eastern Europe, Baltic States, Scandinavia) as well as a mix of different types of organisations.

### 2.1 Process to set up the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board

#### 2.1.1 Call for Experts (see Annex 1)

NEREUS is going to issue a call for experts (see Annex 1) with which it will invite candidacies from suitable experts. The call will be promoted on the NEREUS-platform (via website, newsflash, social

media) and via the CoRDiNet –community. Additionally NEREUS approached experts with whom the network has a long established collaboration and experts from organisations that supported the CoRDiNet bid and provided support letters. Most of the contacted experts already gave their consent to join the board.

The call contains a clear description of the profile of the experts that is explained in the following:

### 2.1.2 Subchapter: Profile of experts

- Candidates distinguish themselves through a **considerable involvement and expertise on the use of Copernicus** which is demonstrated through either/and their education, professional life, affiliation to relevant organisations, relevant project experiences.
- Candidates who have a **good overview** on the space community, user-community and needs of their respective region or respective European regions;
- Candidates from organisations that are close to the user or from organisations that supported the CoRDiNet-bid are welcome to join the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board.
- **Candidates who themselves or whose organisations participate in the respective Calls for Expressions of Interest are excluded to participate in the board.**
- Candidates are allowed to be member of the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board as well as the Regional Strategy Board.

### 2.1.3 Subchapter: Candidates to be approached/invited for CoRDiNet's Evaluation Board

The lead partner NEREUS has already approached a number of experts who gave their consent to join the board. In some cases the response is still pending.

- Peter Zeil, Co-Coordinator CopHub.AC-project
- Stéphane OUREVITCH, SpaceTec Partners, Copernicus Support Office (CSO)
- Jörn Hoffmann, DLR, Space Administration/Earth Observation - pending
- Geoff Sawyer, European Association of Remote Sensing Companies (EARSC)
- Thomas Geist, Austrian Research Promotion Agency (FGG)
- Representative from banking/investment sector
- Simon Jutz, Head of ESA-Copernicus Office
- Jean-Claude Benech, French Space Agency (CNES)- pending
- Walter Piperno, Italian Space Agency (ASI) - pending
- SME4Space – pending

## 2.2 Guidance for Experts of the CoRdiNet's Evaluation Board

Upon acceptance to evaluate project proposals within the CoRdiNet evaluation board experts will receive an Evaluators package containing all necessary information. In addition to that NEREUS will organize an initial meeting for the evaluation board to present the project, give an overview of all expected calls, explain the evaluation procedure.

### 2.2.1 Evaluators package

The evaluators package will provide the experts with all necessary information and support for the evaluation process.

a) **Template for evaluation report** (see Annex 2)

The Experts will receive an online template to compile the evaluation report. The template contains a series of general criteria as well as **a set of criteria and requirements specific for each call** (see page 52 grant agreement). A template as an sample is attached to this document.

b) **Code of Conduct** (see Annex 2)

The Code of Conduct shall give the evaluators some basic ethic guidance for the evaluation process. Prior to the evaluation process evaluators will be asked to sign the Code of Conduct.

The Code of Conduct(see Annex 1) which builds on the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation procedureers has been adapted to the needs of the CoRdiNet's Evaluation Board. The fair and unbiased selection procedure depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically. Therefore the basic principles and standards that are used for peer-reviewing were considered suitable to serve as a frame for the evaluation board.

### 2.2.2 Timing and Procedure

Upon closure of the each call NEREUS will allocate the received proposals according to the respective expertise to the experts (each proposal will be assessed by two experts). Then the experts will have one month to assess the proposals and compile their evaluation results.

Prior to the start of the evaluation NEREUS will organize a teleconference with the experts to present the scope and objectives of the call and see about open questions. Then the experts have a period of 4 weeks to complete their evaluation and submit their evaluation report.

Following receipt of the feed-back of the experts the lead partner NEREUS will analyse the evaluation results and compile a concerted overview on the evaluation and selected projects.



## Annex 1

## Call for Experts for the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board

In the frame of the Horizon2020-funded project “CoRDiNet” - *Copernicus Relays for digitalisation spanning a Network* NEREUS (Network of European Regions Using Space Technologies) invites suitable experts from relevant organisations to join the project’s Evaluation Board on a voluntary base.

1. The role of the members of the evaluation board is to evaluate the received proposals in response to (five) Calls for Expressions of Interest that are addressed to interested parties outside the project consortium. The evaluators will receive an evaluators package with information guiding them through the evaluation process. They will evaluate the received proposals on the base of predefined criteria and by ranking the proposals select the most suitable initiatives. Reviewers play a fundamental role to ensure a high quality and sustainability of the selected initiatives.
2. Profile of experts:
  - a) Candidates distinguish themselves through a **considerable involvement and expertise on the use of Copernicus** which is demonstrated through either/and their education, professional life, affiliation to relevant organisations, relevant project experiences.
  - b) Candidates have a **good overview** on the space community, user-community and needs of their respective region or respective European regions;
  - c) Candidates from organisations that are **close to the user or from organisations that supported the CoRDiNet-bid** are welcome to join the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board.
  - d) **Please note: Candidates who themselves or whose organisations participate in the respective Calls for Expressions of Interest are excluded to participate in the board.**
  - e) Candidates are allowed to be member of the CoRDiNet Evaluation Board as well as the Regional Strategy Board.
  - f) The composition of the Evaluation Board should ensure a well balanced geographic coverage, well balance of type of organisation and closeness to the users.
3. The summary and analysis of the feed-back and evaluation results of the CoRDiNet-evaluation board will compose the evaluation report at the end of the evaluation procedure. For each proposal two evaluators will be appointed in order to ensure a robust and fair review process. In case of major conflicting evaluations NEREUS will enhance the interaction amongst the evaluators with the objective to seek a compromise solution.
4. Evaluators **voluntarily** commit to support the initiative and adhere to the Code of Conduct (Annex 3). (If needed travel expenses might be covered by project funds.)

5. The composition of the evaluation board will be **public**. However, the information about who reviewed which proposal will not be disclosed.
6. The evaluation process will be **online** and evaluators will receive a **standart template** for their evaluation report based on the predefined criteria.
7. The quality of the evaluation process depends considerably on the responsiveness of the evaluators. Therefore the evaluators should agree to submit their evaluation and scoring results **latest 4 weeks after being assigned for a proposal as evaluator**.

Annex 2:  
**Templates for Evaluation Report (sample)**

Criterion	Score (1-5)	Comments
<b>Call A: A Regional/Local Analysis Copernicus Capabilities</b>		
Legal entity entitled to bear the Copernicus Relay logo or - At least a <b>five years' track record</b> in coordinating, supporting directly or indirectly EO/Copernicus business activities in its target region.		
Applicant/organisation of application has a coordinating role in its region; has a mandate by the region; demonstrates to have a good knowledge and overview of Copernicus-related information/player etc. in its region;		
<b>Innovativeness</b> of approach, e.g. activities contributed to identify new user-communities; better assess relevant non-space community, new findings for Copernicus-uptake;		
Findings of project contribute to learn more about Up-take situation amongst <b>EO/Copernicus newcomers</b> ;		
Link to digitalisation, Internet of Things, stimulates new topics and trends		
Regional Support: proposed project activities contribute to identify new examples/findings how Copernicus has effectively contributed to improve the administration processes and to increase its performances;		
The involvement/interest of the target group of the call is apparent		
Relevance for society and public user: e.g. proposed project activities addresses a concrete		

need/important subject of regional policy making and/or enforcement, e.g. EU directives, public policy responsibilities etc;		
Relevance for commercial use: e.g. proposed project activities contribute to gain a better market understanding,		

### Annex 3

## CODE OF CONDUCT

A fair and unbiased evaluation process depends to a large extent on trust, and requires that everyone involved behaves responsibly and ethically.

Adapting the COPE Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation procedureers serves as a base to set out the basic principles and standards of the evaluation process in the frame of the CoRdiNet-project.

Evaluating experts should:

- only agree to evaluate project proposals for which they have the **subject expertise required** to carry out a proper assessment and which they can assess in a timely manner; should they during the evaluation process realize they miss expertise in the required field to fully assess the proposal they are asked to seek advice by the lead partner NEREUS;
- respect the **confidentiality** of the evaluation process and not reveal any details of a project proposal or the evaluaton/selection process neither before, during or after the evaluation process;
- not use information obtained during the evaluation process for their own or any other person's or organization's **advantage, or to disadvantage** or discredit others, neither before, during or after the evaluation process;
- in all stages of the evaluation process **declare all potential conflicting interests**, seeking advice from the lead partner NEREUS if they are unsure whether something constitutes a relevant interest;
- respond in a reasonable time-frame, especially if they cannot do the evaluation, and without intentional delay; only agree to evaluate a project proposal if they are fairly confident they can return the evaluaton results within the proposed or mutually agreed time-frame, informing the lead partner NEREUS promptly if they require an extension. Experts have to be aware that the evaluation process has to be realized in a set **time frame**.
- decline to evaluate if they feel unable to provide a fair and unbiased evaluation outcome; not allow their assessment to be influenced by the origins of a project proposal, by the nationality, religious or political beliefs, gender or other characteristics of the proposers, or by commercial considerations;
- be objective and constructive in their assessment, refraining from being hostile or inflammatory and from making libelous or derogatory personal comments;
- acknowledge that evaluation procedure is largely a reciprocal endeavor and undertake to carry out their fair share of evaluating projects and in a timely manner;

- not agree to assess a project proposal just to gain sight of it with no intention of submitting the evaluation results;
- decline to evaluate a project proposal if **they have been involved with any of the work in the initiative**;
- **read the project proposal and accompanying material thoroughly**, getting back to the lead partner NEREUS if anything is not clear and requesting any missing or incomplete items they need to carry out a proper evaluation;
- not to involve **anyone else** in the evaluation of the project proposal;
- not to contact the applicants directly;