

Selection May 2011

EXPERT ASSESSMENT MANUAL

for the assessment of proposals for

**Erasmus Mundus
Promotion of European Higher
Education
(Action 3)**

submitted under the

Erasmus Mundus programme 2009-2013

Content

| | | |
|----|---|-------|
| 1. | Assessment and Selection Procedure | p. 1 |
| 2. | Description of the Action and relevant documentation | p. 5 |
| 3. | Eligibility Criteria | p. 7 |
| 4. | Award Criteria..... | p. 7 |
| 5. | Assessment of award criteria Checklists & guidance on evaluating the proposals | p. 8 |
| 6. | Using the online assessment tool | p. 11 |

1. Assessment and Selection Procedure

1.1. Introduction

The aim of the Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 programme is to promote European higher education, to help improve and enhance the career prospects of students and to promote intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries, in accordance with EU external policy objectives in order to contribute to the sustainable development of third countries in the field of higher education.

Proposals for Erasmus Mundus "Promotion of European Higher Education" projects (Action 3) were submitted by 29 April 2011 under the Call for Proposals EACEA/41/10. Selected projects will start in Autumn 2011 and will have a duration of minimum 12 and maximum 36 months.

1.2. Selection Procedure

Proposals are selected through a competitive system based on their quality from the content and organisational points of view and are all subject to the same application rules. The evaluation of the applications submitted under this call will undergo a five-step selection procedure:

1. Administrative eligibility check of the submitted applications;
2. Verification of the applicants and partners compliance with the Selection Criteria;
3. Assessment of the applications following the Award Criteria;
4. Proposal for a selection decision by the Evaluation Committee;
5. Adoption of the selection decision by the Authorising Officer.

The administrative eligibility check and the verification of the compliance with the Selection Criteria (step 1 and 2) will be performed by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (hereinafter "the Agency"). The quality assessment of each eligible application against a set of Award Criteria (step 3) will be performed by independent experts. The Evaluation Committee will be chaired by the Agency and will be composed of staff members from the Agency and the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture (step 4). The selection decision will be taken by the Agency's Director taking into account the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee.

1.3. Role of the Independent Experts

Independent experts have been appointed to assist the Agency in the assessment of proposals for the Erasmus Mundus "Promotion of European Higher Education" projects. This Manual describes the assessment process in practical detail and the tasks experts are invited to perform.

The role of the independent experts is twofold:

- to provide the Agency with an opinion on the proposals which have been submitted;
- to give comments and recommendations to the applicants.

Experts perform assessments on a personal basis, not as representatives of their employer, their country or any other entity. They must be independent, impartial and objective, and are expected to behave in a professional manner throughout the assessment process.

All the information made available to experts is to be treated as strictly confidential. No information on the proposals submitted or on the provisional results of the assessment or selection may be divulged to third parties. Experts may not photocopy anything without specific permission from the Agency. No documents or electronic data may be taken off the assessment premises. Any notes taken as a result of the experts' work must be deposited with the Agency at the end of the assessment process. Phone calls during the working day are not allowed in the reading and meeting room where the assessment takes place. Under no circumstances may experts contact an applicant on their own account.

Experts should check that they have no potential conflict of interest in any of the proposals they are invited to assess. Examples of conflicts of interest are: the expert is employed by the applicant or works in collaboration with the applicant; the expert is employed by the same institution as the applicant; the expert is involved in a contract or collaboration with the applicant; the expert was involved in the preparation of the proposal; the expert is personally related to the applicant (family or friendship relation) or is related to the applicant's work (professional relation); the expert would benefit directly from the proposal being funded or not funded. If experts have a conflict of interest, or in case of doubt, they have to inform one of the Agency's staff members without delay, so that the proposals concerned can be allocated to another expert.

Experts are requested to sign a declaration to certify that they have had no conflict of interest when assessing the proposals assigned to them.

Since the experts' comments and recommendations will be communicated to the applicant at the end of the selection process, experts have the obligation to provide complete, meaningful and useful comments. The comments will be communicated without revealing the experts' names.

The assessment process must be completed within the period which has been communicated to the experts. The timing has been carefully planned and the timetable must be adhered to by all persons concerned.

1.4. Assessment Procedure

Each expert will be allocated a number of proposals to assess. Proposals will be allocated in a way to match the content of the proposals with the experts' professional background, work experience and language knowledge.

The proposals will be assessed against a set of award criteria listed in the Call for Proposals (see Section 4). No other assessment criteria may be applied.

Experts are not obliged to visit web site references contained within proposals. The necessary information must be present in the proposal if it is to be taken into account. Experts may, of course, visit web sites in order to verify the legitimacy of claims within the proposal, but they

should not base their assessments on additional technical information found on a web site and not contained within the proposal.

1.4.1. Individual Assessments

During the assessment phase, experts are acting individually and independently. They do not discuss the proposals with their fellow experts. The experts record their individual assessments by using the online assessment tool (see Section 6).

The individual assessment will include

- an analysis of the proposal against the Erasmus Mundus award criteria, as indicated in the Programme Guide;
- individual scores per award criterion;
- the drafting of comments to the applicant;
- the drafting of comments to the Agency, if applicable;
- a recommendation concerning the selection of a proposal;
- a judgment on the applicant's technical capacity.

The global score (on a scale from 0 to 100) is calculated automatically by the online assessment tool.

1.4.2. Consensus Discussions

All proposals will be assessed by two experts. Once the two individual assessments of the same proposal have been finalised, the two experts will meet to discuss the proposal. Generally speaking, this consensus discussion serves the purpose of assuring that the experts have a common understanding of all aspects of the proposal and that their comments and scores provided to each individual award criteria are coherent.

In order to prepare this consensus discussion both experts are expected to read carefully each other's assessment in comparison with their own assessment. The following two situations can occur during the consensus discussions:

- A. There is **no significant divergence** in scores and comments between the individual assessments. In this case both experts will endorse their individual assessment in the online assessment tool. The two experts will then work together in order to draft a consolidated assessment that includes the most relevant/appropriate elements of both individual assessments.
- B. There is **a divergence of more than 20 points between the final scores** of the two individual assessments. In this case the consensus discussion will serve the purpose of clarifying the discrepancies/differences between the two assessments. The following two situations can occur:

B.1: **If both experts agree on solving these differences and reducing the divergence accordingly** between their scores they will have to adapt their individual assessment and scoring, before endorsing it in the online assessment tool. As from there the procedure described under A) above will apply.

B.2: If no common agreement can be reached, a third expert will be asked to assess the proposal. The two experts who have given the closest score will have to draft the consolidated assessment.

When drafting a consolidated assessment for the proposals with a significant divergence in the scoring, the experts may verify whether specific aspects of the award criteria have been misunderstood or if a particular aspect of the proposal was overlooked during the individual assessment.

Experts should make sure that all their comments are drafted with accuracy, care and courtesy to the applicant. The comments must relate to the award criteria and should contain qualitative judgements. They should not be simple summaries of the proposal. There must be coherence between the comments, the scoring and the selection recommendation. Finally, the comments should be helpful and clear to all applicants. For successful proposals the comments should be useful for the project implementation and in the case of unsuccessful proposals, the comments should be useful to the applicant when preparing another proposal.

1.4.3. Panel Discussion

All proposals scoring 70 points or above will be discussed by all experts in a panel discussion. The expert panel is chaired by an expert with longstanding experience in assessing European cooperation projects.

The purpose of the panel discussion is to ensure coherence and consistency across the expert assessments as well as to carry out an additional quality check on the proposals. As a result of the panel discussion, the panel can confirm the final score of the proposal or modify it by adding or deducting between 1 and 5 points. Decisions to alter the score of proposals have to be well justified and documented. They are taken by a simple majority vote of experts present in the panel.

The panel discussion will lead to a final score of each proposal discussed in the panel. The panel's proceedings will be laid down in the minutes which have to be signed by all present panel members.

1.5 Evaluation committee

On the basis of the experts' assessments the Evaluation Committee, chaired by the Agency and composed by Agency and Commission staff members, will present a recommendation to the Authorising Officer (the Agency Director) on the proposals to be selected.

The Evaluation Committee's recommendation will take into account the following criteria:

- the relative quality of a proposal in comparison with other proposals received (quality is the overriding factor for the selection recommendation) against the award criteria;
- the available budget.

1.6. Selection decision

Following the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee the Authorising Officer adopts the selection decision.

2. Description of the Action and relevant documentation

The description below consists of excerpts from the Call for Proposals EACEA/41/10 and the Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 Programme Guide

The Erasmus Mundus programme's overall aim is to promote European higher education, to help improve and enhance the career prospects of students and to promote intercultural understanding through cooperation with third countries, in accordance with EU external policy objectives in order to contribute to sustainable development of third countries in the field of higher education.

The Erasmus Mundus programme comprises three actions:

- **Action 1:** Implementation of Joint Programmes at Masters (Action 1A) and Doctorate (Action 1B) levels and award of individual scholarships/fellowships to participate in these programmes;
- **Action 2:** Erasmus Mundus Partnerships;
- **Action 3:** Promotion of European Higher Education.

ACTION 3 – PROMOTION OF EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Action 3 provides support to transnational initiatives, studies, projects, events and other activities that aim to enhance the attractiveness, profile, image and visibility of, and accessibility to, European higher education in the world. Action 3 activities relate to the international dimension of all aspects of higher education such as promotion, accessibility, quality assurance, credit recognition, recognition of European qualifications abroad and mutual recognition of qualifications with third countries, curriculum development, mobility, quality of services, etc.

Action 3 projects should contribute to the promotion and awareness raising of the European higher education sector as well as the relevant cooperation programmes and funding schemes, the dissemination of the programme's results and examples of good practice and the exploitation and mainstreaming of these results at institutional and individual level.

Action 3 activities can be implemented by mixed consortia of European and third-country organisations active in the field of higher education. Furthermore, they may take various forms (conferences, seminars, workshops, studies, analyses, pilot projects, prizes, international networks, production of material for publication, development of information, communication and technology tools) and may take place anywhere in the world.

As specified in the call for proposals, projects must address one or more of the following priorities :

- projects dealing with promotion of European higher education in certain geographical areas (priority will be given to areas which so far have been less represented in Erasmus Mundus projects: e.g. Africa and industrialised countries);

- projects that aim to improve services for international students and doctoral candidates;
- projects addressing the international dimension of Quality Assurance;
- projects that aim to strengthen relations between European higher education and research;
- projects promoting European study opportunities for doctoral candidates;
- projects promoting the Erasmus Mundus programme towards European students.

Other conditions

As a general rule, Action 3 projects must have a clear European dimension and a wide geographical scope. In addition they must have a clear international (third-country dimension) and contribute to fostering intercultural dialogue and mutual understanding between cultures.

The applicants should ensure that the projects do not overlap with other European programmes in the field of higher education; projects falling primarily within the scope of other Community programmes (e.g. Lifelong Learning, Tempus, Youth in Action, Citizens for Europe, etc.) will not be funded.

Each proposal must have clear objectives responding to demonstrated needs, clearly defined outputs and expected outcomes and include a plan to ensure the sustainability of the project and its results beyond the period of funding. Projects may last between 12 and 36 months and begin their activities in Autumn 2011.

Grant applications must include a detailed estimated budget in which all prices are given in euro. Applicants from countries outside the euro zone must use the conversion rates published in the Official Journal of the European Union, series C, on the date of publication of the call for proposals EACEA/41/10.

The EU grant will not cover more than 75% of the eligible costs. The estimated budget for the action attached to the application must have revenue and expenditure in balance and show clearly the costs which are eligible for financing from the European budget. The applicant must indicate the sources and amounts of any other funding received or applied for in the same project.

Relevant documentation

The Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 Programme Decision:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/about_erasmus_mundus_en.php

The Erasmus Mundus 2009-2013 Programme Guide which constitutes the basis for the submission and implementation of proposals. Chapters 1-3 are applicable to all programme actions, Chapter 7 is exclusively devoted to Action 3. The Programme Guide contains information on the award criteria. It is the experts' duty to master the relevant sections of this document and to refer to its specific elements when assessing proposals:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/programme/programme_guide_en.php

The Call for Proposals (EACEA/41/10) which contains a specific section on Action 3 (Section C) that describes the priorities that the proposals must address:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/higher_education_institutions_en.php

The Action 3 application form and complementary documents:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/higher_education_institutions_en.php

The Administrative and Financial Handbook which contains further details on the financial and administrative management of projects (e.g. eligible costs):

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/funding/higher_education_institutions_en.php

The Frequently Asked Questions concerning Action 3:

http://eacea.ec.europa.eu/erasmus_mundus/tools/faq_action_3_en.php

3. Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility criteria have been checked by the Agency before the start of the assessment exercise. Therefore, experts should receive only eligible proposals. However, in case of doubts whether some of the following eligibility criteria are not fulfilled, experts are requested to inform the Agency (but should continue their assessment):

1. Applicants must use the official application form (deadline 29 April 2011);
2. The application form must be signed by the legal representative of the applying organisation;
3. All aspects of the application form (Parts A to L and Annexes) must be addressed;
4. The applicant/coordinating institution must be an organisation located in an eligible applicant country (i.e: a Member State of the European Union, an EEA-EFTA State).
5. The minimum consortium must consist of eligible participating organisations coming from at least 3 eligible applicant countries and from at least 1 third country.

4. Award Criteria

The selection of projects will be a competitive process based on the assessment of the quality of the proposals from the content and organisational point of view against the background of eligible activities and the priorities specified in the Call for Proposals (see section 2).

The project proposals will be assessed against the following award criteria:

- a) relevance of the project to the Erasmus Mundus Programme (25%);
- b) expected impact of the project to help enhance the attractiveness of European higher education worldwide (25%);
- c) arrangements for dissemination of project results and experiences, quality assurance and plans for sustainability and the long term exploitation of results (15%);
- d) consortium composition and co-operation mechanisms (15%);
- e) work plan and budget (20%).

5. Assessment of the award criteria Checklists & guidance on evaluating the proposals

5.1. Checklists

The following checklists are intended to assist experts arriving at a final score for each award criterion and to ensure that no element of an award criterion is overlooked. The scores for each award criterion must be registered in the online assessment tool together with the expert's comments.

| Criterion 1 RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT TO THE ERASMUS MUNDUS PROGRAMME | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Check-list: | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Weak | Poor |
| <u>Rationale</u> and <u>background</u> of the project including <u>needs analysis</u> from European and non-European point of view | | | | | | |
| Overall <u>aims</u> and specific <u>objectives</u> | | | | | | |
| <u>Project's European</u> and <u>international dimension</u> and <u>European added value</u> in comparison with existing projects | | | | | | |
| Overall score out of 25: | | | | | | |

| Criterion 2 THE EXPECTED IMPACT OF THE PROJECT TO HELP ENHANCE THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF EUROPEAN HIGHER EDUCATION WORLDWIDE | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Check-list: | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Weak | Poor |
| Specific <u>activities proposed</u> to enhance the <u>attractiveness</u> of European higher education | | | | | | |
| <u>Appropriateness</u> and <u>quality of outputs foreseen</u> | | | | | | |
| <u>Impact</u> of the main activities and <u>outputs</u> on the <u>attractiveness</u> of European higher education and on the <u>target groups</u> | | | | | | |
| Overall score out of 25: | | | | | | |

| Criterion 3 ARRANGEMENTS FOR DISSEMINATION OF PROJECT RESULTS AND EXPERIENCES, QUALITY ASSURANCE AND PLANS FOR SUSTAINABILITY AND THE LONG TERM EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Check-list: | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Weak | Poor |
| <u>Measures</u> proposed to ensure <u>visibility and worldwide promotion</u> of the project outputs and experiences | | | | | | |
| <u>Quality</u> of the <u>sustainability plan</u> for the long term exploitation of results (involving the participating organisations and other relevant organisations) | | | | | | |
| Quality assurance mechanisms | | | | | | |
| Overall score out of 15: | | | | | | |

| Criterion 4 CONSORTIUM COMPOSITION AND COOPERATION MECHANISMS | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Check-list: | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Weak | Poor |
| <u>Consortium composition</u> in terms of <u>diversity</u> , demonstrated <u>expertise and complementarity</u> | | | | | | |
| <u>Role and level of involvement</u> of each European and <u>third-country partner</u> | | | | | | |
| <u>Quality</u> and <u>reliability</u> of the <u>cooperation mechanisms</u> defined between the participating organisations | | | | | | |
| Overall score out of 15: | | | | | | |

| Criterion 5 WORK PLAN AND BUDGET | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|------|------|------|------|
| Check-list: | Excellent | Very good | Good | Fair | Weak | Poor |
| <u>Relevance</u> , <u>feasibility</u> and <u>planning</u> of the activities in order to achieve the outputs / products foreseen | | | | | | |
| Coherence and <u>appropriateness</u> of the <u>budget</u> and <u>staffing</u> in relation to the <u>activities</u> planned and the expected <u>outputs</u> | | | | | | |
| Overall score out of 20: | | | | | | |

5.2. Guidance on evaluating the proposals

Each award criterion has a relative weight as indicated earlier in this section. The score of each of the five award criteria will be calculated on the basis of the relative weight of the criterion. The total score will be a figure between 0 and 100. It will be automatically calculated on the basis of the individual scores provided by the experts.

When evaluating the proposals and especially during the assessment of the award criteria, the experts should apply the following guidelines:

| Assessment | Guidance |
|------------|---|
| Poor | 'Poor' should be given for a criterion if the information detailed in the Call for Proposals would reasonably have been expected by the expert and is not present in the proposal. The specific information missing should be entered in the comments' section. |
| Weak | 'Weak' should be awarded if the proposal is lacking quality for the criterion in question. This may be because information is incomplete in the view of the expert, not clear or not convincing. Assessment comments for proposals in this category should indicate the areas where the proposal is lacking quality and could be improved if subsequently re-submitted. |
| Fair | A criterion should be assessed as 'fair' where the content of the criterion in question is at a level consistent with that routinely produced by the universities across Europe. There may be some strong and relevant points within the proposal, but there may also be weaknesses and in particular there may be no specific details brought out which singles out the proposal from others. Assessment comments for proposals awarded scores in this range should indicate the areas where the proposal could be improved if subsequently re-submitted. |
| Good | 'Good' reflects that the proposal demonstrates overall good features with regard to the award criterion in question (even though it may contain some notable weaknesses) or does not contain exceptional features that set it apart from many other good proposals being assessed. |
| Very good | 'Very good' should reflect that the criterion in question has identifiable features which demonstrate that it is of a high quality. There should be features that set the proposal apart from other good quality proposals within the assessment. |
| Excellent | 'Excellent' can be given to proposals that are outstanding on the criterion in question. In general, experts should not assess a criterion as 'excellent' unless they feel that the content of the proposal could not be improved. In cases where 'excellent' is awarded, the expert should feel confident that there would be a high level of consensus from all experts. |

6. Using the online assessment tool

6.1. General remarks

- In order perform their assessment work on the online assessment tool each expert will be given access via a personal login and a password. The link to the online assessment tool as well as specific instructions on how to use it will be provided to the experts in the context of the briefing meeting organised by the Agency at the beginning of the assessment period.
- Experts should not forget to print, sign and date the final version of their individual and consolidated assessment forms. The signed assessments must be handed over to the Agency representatives.

6.2. Structure of the online assessment tool

After accessing the online tool, experts will be able to view a list of projects allocated to them for assessment. A hyperlink named "Access" opens the individual screens for the proposals concerned.

In the first screen of the assessment form (General screen), experts will find some key features on the proposal such as its title and the contact details of the legal representative and project coordinator. In this screen experts should indicate their final decision on the proposal by clicking one of the appropriate boxes: "highly recommended"; "recommended", "not recommended".

The menu displayed on the left hand of the screen gives access to the other sections of the assessment form. This menu guides the experts through the necessary fields to be completed in order to finalise the assessment. There are "save" and "print" buttons at the bottom of each page. Experts are advised to save their work frequently in order to avoid any loss of data.

6.3. Assessment of the typology of the proposal ("Typology" screen)

Experts are advised to start their assessment in the "Typology" screen. Under this section, experts must indicate whether the proposal addresses any of the priorities of the Call for Proposals. They are further invited to indicate whether the topic of the proposal is related to a "European Year" or touches upon aspects of "equal opportunities". They can select more than one field. On the basis of this information, the Agency will be able to draw up statistics on the identified number of projects covering the specific listed themes.

6.4. Assessment of the proposal against the award criteria ("Scoring" screen)

Under the section "scoring", experts should indicate their score for each of the award criteria and insert a relevant comment. Their scoring must be a full or half point from 0 to 15 or 20 or 25 depending on the relative weight of each award criterion. The scores must be justified and the comments should be consistent with the score given for each criterion. There need to be comments on each award criterion (see Section 5 for guidance).

6.5. Global comments to the applicants ("Overall comments" screen)

In this section, experts should write their overall comments about the proposal. Comments should relate to the experts' assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the proposal, relative to the award criteria.

6.6. Additional comments to the Agency ("Comments to the Agency" screen)

The online assessment tool contains a comments section in which the experts will be able to bring to the attention of the Agency and /or Evaluation Committee issues or aspects of the application that may be used during the selection process or the monitoring of the project, once approved. The comments introduced in this section will not be communicated to the applicant.

6.7. Assessment Conclusion ("General" screen)

Experts should indicate their recommendation decision on the proposal by ticking the appropriate box that appears on the first screen of the assessment form ("General" screen). There are the following options: "highly recommended", "recommended" and "not recommended".

The expert decision must be in accordance with the total score given to the proposal and the comments of the experts. It is therefore advisable that experts insert their decision upon completion of the assessment of the proposal.

6.8. Scoring Summary ("General" screen)

The total score of the assessment appears on the first screen of the assessment form ("General") and is calculated automatically by the online tool. It is the total of the scores for the five award criteria. The total score will be a figure between 0 and 100.

Example of an assessment:

| Criteria | Score | Weight |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| 1. Relevance of the project to the Erasmus Mundus Programme | 20 | 25% |
| 2. Expected impact of the project to help enhance the attractiveness of European higher education worldwide | 19 | 25% |
| 3. Arrangements for dissemination of project results and experiences, quality assurance and plans for sustainability and the long term exploitation of results | 10 | 15% |
| 4. Consortium composition and cooperation mechanisms | 12 | 15% |
| 5. Work plan and budget | 10 | 20% |
| Total score | 71 | 100% |

6.9. Assessment of the technical capacity of the applying consortium ("General" screen)

Experts should indicate their final decision on the technical capacity of the proposal by ticking the appropriate box that appears in the first screen of the assessment form (in the section "General"). There are the following possibilities:

- to accept;
- to reject (an explanation for rejection must be given);
- to request further clarifications (an explanation must be given).

In the case of "rejection" and "further clarification" the explanation must be provided in the box on "Technical Capacity Comment". There is also a possibility to insert an additional comment on the technical capacity in this box.

The following documents submitted together with the application form, may help the experts draw general conclusions on the technical of the applying consortium:

- a) the CVs of the persons responsible in each partner organisation;
- b) the list of projects already undertaken in the relevant field by the applicant and the other participating organisations (if included in the proposal);
- c) for those organisations active in the field of higher education but which are not higher education institutions, the description of their main higher education activities.

6.10. Endorsement of the proposal

The button "endorsement" that appears at the top of the screen in the assessment form performs an electronic submission of the assessment of the proposal.

A distinction should be made between:

- the endorsement of the individual assessment;
- the endorsement of the consolidated assessment.

The individual assessment has to be endorsed after the bilateral discussion, taking into account the procedure described in Section 1.4.2.

Following the endorsements of the two individual assessments the consolidated assessment form is automatically generated by the online tool. The consolidated assessment will only be displayed to "expert 1". The indications "expert 1 comment" "expert 2 comment" that appear in the consolidated assessment should be deleted when preparing the final version of the consolidated assessment.

After the endorsement of the consolidated assessment the scores, comments and selection recommendations of the experts can not longer be modified.

The comments appearing in the consolidated assessment will be sent to the applicants together with the notification of the selection results. As already indicated, the comments should be drafted with care (see Section 1.4.2 for more details).

The experts' comments will be taken into accounts by the Evaluation Committee for the selection decision to be proposed to the Authorising Officer.