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Седьмая Рамочная программа по научным исследованиям и технологическому развитию Европейского Союза

• Направление «Люди» (People)
• Initial Training Networks

Возможность включения ученых из стран СНГ в Программу в качестве ЭКСПЕРТА

Необходимые условия:
• Квалификация и опыт работы в соответствующей научной области
• Активное владение английским языком
• Мобильность

Не обязательное, но полезное:
• Предшествующий опыт эксперта: удаленная экспертиза проектов INTAS и др.

Первый шаг:

Регистрация на веб-странице интернет- портала 7 РП
Registration of Experts for Research Activities

The call for experts for the seventh framework programme has been launched. Please see the EC Official Journal 2006/C 305/16 (for individuals) and 2006/C 305/17 (for organisations) for further information.

The personal data collected in the context of the present call will be processed in accordance with the Regulation (EC) n° 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000 on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data by the Community institutions and bodies on the free movement of such data. Click here to view the privacy statement.

For further information and help, please look at our Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ Last Update: 2008-07-09) or contact the Helpdesk for expert registration if the FAQ does not provide the answer.

Register

- New Expert
  Click here to register for FP7 / non-FP activities
- New Organisation
  Click here to register as an organisation

Existing Expert / Organisation / Member State

If you are already registered as an FP6 / FP7 / Non-FP expert, organisation or member state please log in here. Existing FP6 experts wishing to register for FP7 activities also log in here.

Entering a wrong password three times will block your account; hence please use the password reminder facility if you are unsure of your password.

Username * :
Password * :

Forgot password Login
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expert Details</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Username and password</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of Expert</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal Details</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Linguistic Skills</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Activities and Keywords</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Educational background</td>
<td>No mandatory fields</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Experience</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Employment History</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interests</td>
<td>Mandatory fields completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. View the C.V.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Additional data quality checking tool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FP Activities

- FP6 Activity Codes
- FP7 Themes

Keywords

- Optical and dielectric properties
- Photonic components
- Computational physics
- Applied optics
- Optronics

после регистрации потенциальный эксперт получает E-mail с запросом подтверждения возможности участия в ряде мероприятий
Dear expert,
We are contacting you for the FP7 Initial Training Network (ITN) Marie Curie Action in order to ask you about your interest and availability to act as an expert evaluator.

The ITN call will be evaluated in a single step and will involve the complete proposal (maximum 30 pages).
For the evaluation we foresee the following steps:
Initial phase of remote evaluation, where the first reading and initial marking will be carried out at the location of the expert (via a dedicated internet link)
Consensus phase and panel meetings, in Brussels, where the experts will be requested to attend. Furthermore, we have foreseen a briefing meeting in Brussels for experts who have not participated to the evaluation of the 1st ITN call in 2007. This meeting will provide a better understanding of the ITN scheme, the evaluation process and criteria before remote evaluation.

The tentative dates (to be confirmed) for the various steps of the evaluation process are summarized below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>ITN Date/Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITN call proposals submission deadline</td>
<td>2 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts sent to experts who indicate their preferred proposals to</td>
<td>5 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluate &amp; identify any conflict of interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for choices and conflict of interest</td>
<td>12 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of proposals to experts</td>
<td>19 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert briefing meeting in Brussels</td>
<td>26 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start of remote evaluation</td>
<td>26 September 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote evaluation deadline</td>
<td>17 October 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus &amp; Panel meetings in Brussels</td>
<td>27 to 30 October 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An expert is deemed to have a **DISQUALIFYING** conflict of interest when any of the following circumstances apply. S/he:

- was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- stands to benefit directly should the proposal be accepted
- has a close **family relationship** with any person representing an applicant organisation in the proposal
- is a director, trustee or partner of an applicant organisation
- is **employed** by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal
- is a member of one of the fifteen **Advisory Groups** set up by the Commission to provide advice on the preparation of the annual work programmes of FP7.
- is in any other situation that compromises his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially.

An expert is deemed to have a **POTENTIAL** conflict of interest when none of the cases indicated above applies and any of the following applies. S/he:

- was employed by one of the applicant organisations in a proposal within the previous **three years**
- is involved in a contract or research **collaboration** with an applicant organisation, or had been so in the previous three years
- is in any other situation that could cast doubt on his or her ability to evaluate the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.
Indicate your availability

The Marie Curie Actions evaluations in the past have benefited from the contribution of many of you and of course we are always pleased to welcome new experts. We hope that we can count on your support.

If you are willing to act as an expert evaluator for the ITN evaluation rounds in year 2008, please confirm by replying to this message, as soon as possible and at the latest by Wednesday 23 April 2008.

Critically if you are willing to evaluate you must be able to attend the consensus and panel meetings in Brussels the last week of October and it is strongly desirable that you are able to attend the briefing meeting in September (if you did not attend to the one organized last year).

We would like to remind you that this is not an official invitation to participate in the evaluation. After compiling the availability of each expert and taking into account the research expertise of those available, a list of potential experts will be established by the Commission services.

We thank you in advance for your co-operation and we look forward to receiving information on your availability.

FP7 ITN EVALUATION – 2008 call

Expert Name: - - - - - - -
FP7 Expert Number - - - - - - -

I have a Conflict of Interest YES/NO
I will be able to attend the briefing meeting in Brussels on 26 September 2008 YES/NO
I will have time to evaluate remotely proposals between 26 September 2008 and 17 October 2008. YES/NO
I will be able to attend the Consensus / Panel Meetings in Brussels from 27 October to 30 October 2008. YES/NO
I cannot participate but I would like to recommend the participation of Name: Email:
Описание работы в качестве эксперта изложено в Приложении 1 данного письма.
После того, как Вы подпишете это письмо, вступит в силу соглашение между Вами и Европейской Комиссией, представляющее Европейской Комиссией, содействовать оценке проектов, представленных на рассмотрение Комиссии. Сроки и условия изложены в приложениях к данному письму.

Длительность соглашения…
Мероприятия для сессий по оценке проектов….

Исполнено в двух оригиналах

Со стороны Комиссии
Подпись …… Брюссель * июль 2008
Для принятия
Подпись …… Минск * август 2008

Приложения.
Схемы расчета выплат:
Гонорары;
Возмещения расходов на дорогу, проживание и содержание.
Этап 1. Дистанционное рецензирование.

Фаза 1:

• Просмотреть множество резюме и выбрать заявки, наиболее близкие к области знаний эксперта (1 нед.);

• Определить, нет ли конфликта интересов;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstracts sent to experts who indicate their preferred proposals to evaluate &amp; identify any conflict of interest</th>
<th>5 September 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for choices and conflict of interest</td>
<td>12 September 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Фаза 2:

• Принять либо отклонить предложенные для рецензирования проекты (1 нед.);

• Провести дистанционную оценку выбранных проектов (2-3 недели);

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start of remote evaluation</th>
<th>26 September 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remote evaluation deadline</td>
<td>17 October 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remote evaluation:
In order to access the application, open up the internet browser and access the ESS web page using following link: ....
Accept to evaluate the proposal.

Links to read the proposal are here.

Proposal Submission Forms

General Information (A1)
Information on Participants

Part B

- PARTB_FRM_1_400250.PDF (PartB_FRM) 81kb
- PARTA_400250.PDF (PartA_PDF) 123kb

Evaluation Status

- Individual Assessment Report
- Accept to evaluate

I cannot evaluate this proposal

Proposal Submission Forms

General Information (A1)
Information on Participants

Part B

- PARTA_400250.PDF (PartA_PDF) 122kb
- PARTB_FRM_1_400250.PDF (PartB_FRM) 179kb
Record IER (Individual Evaluation Report)

Click on Record my scores to open the Individual Evaluation Report.

Enter scores and comments

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT
Evaluator: Expert 1 Call
Panel: Panel 1
Proposal: 400251-Itu553
Date: 30/04/2007

Adjust textbox size: [ - Default + ]

Individual Assessment Form Training

CRITERIA 1
SUBCRITERIA 1
SUBCRITERIA 2

Type comments below:

Overall score (Threshold: 3/5, Weight: [ ]

- I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest

Save your changes now as draft. You will be required to complete this form at a later date.

Save your changes now as final. Note: you will not be able to make any further changes to the document.

FINALISE
Save report

1. Declaration of no conflict of interest

Click here to declare that you have no conflict of interest for this proposal

Save as draft or as final

Click on the box to declare that you have no conflict of interest for this proposal

I declare that my evaluation of this proposal creates no conflict of interest
2. Save as draft

Save as draft if you want to bring some changes to your report later on.

Save your changes now as **draft**. You will be required to complete this form at a later date.

Save your changes now as **final**. Note: you will not be able to make any further changes to the document.

3. Finalise

Save as final in order to confirm that your work has been completed.

Save your changes now as **draft**. You will be required to complete this form at a later date.

Save your changes now as **final**. Note: you will not be able to make any further changes to the document.
Распределение заявок для экспертов:

• Для каждой заявки назначается 3 эксперта (4-5 в обоснованном случае при высокой степени междисциплинарности);
• Один из них назначается докладчиком (Rapporteur);
• Среднее число заявок на одного эксперта 9-10 (м.б. 1-12);

Comments are:
- confined to only the criterion concerned
- clear, substantial and of adequate length (NOT just one sentence, NOT a book(let)!)  
- facts NOT opinions: « We think that … » « This proposal is … »
- consistent with the marks: balance between strengths and weaknesses in relation to the scores
- Comments judge the proposal, they don’t summarize it
- Comments describe the final, concerted view on the proposal
- No advice concerning the improvement of the proposal for resubmission

- Poor comments are ambiguous
- Poor comments are vague, subject to interpretation
- Poor comments provide an opening for a complaint
- Good comments are clear
- Good comments are precise and final
- Good comments close the question
Check your work!

- Have you fully explained the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal on this criterion?
- Do comments match scores (high scores = positive comments, low scores = negative comments)?
- Pay special attention to NEGATIVE comments!
- Have you highlighted any points needing special attention?
- Have you double-checked for any factual errors?
- Can your comment be considered as discriminatory?
- Have you written at adequate length? (NOT too short, NOT too long)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cannot be improved</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High degree of agreement among evaluators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some very good points, Good overall with respect to the criteria, certain improvement possible</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some good points and some weaknesses. Fair overall with respect to criteria</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable weaknesses in relation to the criterion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poorly presented, confusing information or poor technical content</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to address criteria or missing information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before Starting remote evaluation strongly recommended to read:

- Work Programme
- The Guide for applicants
- The Rules for submission of proposals, and the related evaluation, selection and award procedure

What the experts say about?
Сразу после Finalise доступны комментарии остальных экспертов

IAR = Individual assessment report
CR = Consensus Report
Individual Assessment Report

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:
- S&T objectives of the research programme, including in terms of inter/multi-disciplinary, intersectorial and/or newly emerging supra-disciplinary fields.
- Scientific quality of the research programme.
- Appropriateness of research methodology.
- Originality and innovative aspect of the research programme. Knowledge of the state-of-the-art.

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:
- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Overall comments:
  (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses mentioned above)
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:
-- Quality of the training programme. Consistency with the research programme.
Complementary skills offered: Management, Communication, IPR, Ethics, Grant writing, Commercial exploitation of results, Research policy, Entrepreneurship, etc.

- Importance and timeliness of the training needs (e.g. multidisciplinary, intersectorial and newly emerging supra-disciplinary fields).
a) For multi-site proposals: Adequate combination of local specialist training with network-wide training activities.
b) For mono-site proposals: Adequate exploitation of the international network of the participants for the training programme.
- Appropriateness of the size of the requested training programme with respect to the capacity of the host.

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format): 
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format): 
- Overall comments:
  (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses mentioned above )
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:
- Capacities (expertise / human resources/ facilities /infrastructures) to achieve the research, and adequate task distribution and schedule.
- Appropriateness of industry involvement.
- Adequate exploitation of complementarities and synergies among partners in terms of research and training.

- How essential is non-ICPC Third Country participation, if any, to the objectives of the research training programme.
- Appropriateness of the plans for the overall management of the training programme (demarcation of responsibilities, rules for decision making, recruitment strategy etc.).
- Networking and dissemination of best practice among partners. Clarity of the plan for organizing training events (workshops, conferences, training courses).

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Overall comments:
(Reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses mentioned above)
Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:
- Contribution of the proposed training programme to improvement of the career prospects of the fellows.
- Provision to and/or lasting structured training programme between the partners' organizations, establishing longer term collaborations including between private and academic partners.
- Where appropriate, justification of the training events open to external participants and their integration in the training programme.
- Where appropriate, mutual recognition of the training acquired by multi-partner hosts.
- Where applicable, relevance of the role of visiting scientist with respect to the training programme.

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (in bullet point format):
- Overall comments:
  (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses mentioned above)

Overall score (Threshold: No threshold, Weight: 0.2)  4.7
TOTAL (Threshold: 70/100)  95.2
Does this proposal raise ethical issues?
Please refer to the list of issues in the Ethical Issues Report (EIR)  NO
Этап 2. Централизованное рецензирование.

Consensus & Panel meetings in Brussels
27 to 30 October 2008

DRAFT
CR
Rapporteur

Consensus meeting

3 experts, including 1 rapporteur + (Vice)Chair and/or EC representative (optional)

DRAFT
CR
Rapporteur

Includes comments of each expert

Consensus on comments + final scores
Схема работы во время централизованного рецензирования (ЦР)

- Собрания по согласованию оценок «Consensus meetings» для всех экспертов;
- 45 минут на каждый проект;
- Проводится одним из экспертов, назначенных Докладчиком «Rapporteur»;
- Присутствуют:
  - Все эксперты по данной заявке;
  - Один из членов Комиссии - Председатель -The Chair (Vice-Chairs);
- Создание общего отчета “Consensus Report” (CR) с комментариями и замечаниями по ходу дискуссии на собрании;
- Председатель: помощь в подготовке CR, формулировках; в оценке проектов не участвует;
- Мониторинг процесса оценки осуществляется в течение всего времени ЦР

Каждый эксперт получает индивидуальное расписание работы (8.30-13.00,14.00-19.30)
Включает: фиксированное время Consensus meetings по каждому рецензируемому проекту
Остальное время эксперт работает на индивидуальном рабочем месте (корректировка CRs)
Некоторые характерные замечания:

- несоответствие цели и задач работы;
- недостаточная связанность отдельных составляющих (теории и эксперимента, распределения задач по институтам и др.);
- недостаток инновационности или междисциплинарности;
- недостаточно четкий рабочий план;
- несоизмеримое финансирование или число планируемых мероприятий;
- недостаточно ясное обоснование участия третьих стран или привлеченных исследователей;
- не в полной мере привлечено участие индустрии;

Необходимо учитывать:
- code of conduct (кодекс)
- gender issue

Из 6 рецензированных проектов (суммарные баллы от 73 до 94) поддержку получил 1

Чем полезна работа эксперта?

1. Более детальное понимание требований Еврокомиссии к проектам 7 РП;
2. Возможность ознакомиться с некоторыми проектами;
3. Увидеть различие между хорошими и очень хорошими проектами;
4. Возможность установить научные контакты;
5. Дополнительная к конференциям и стажировкам практика дискуссий на английском языке;
6. Повышение кругозора и новые перспективы.
WORK PROGRAMME 2008

PEOPLE


How to use the Work Programme (WP)
The WP is to be read in association with the Framework Programme and People Specific Programme decisions, and with the relevant Guides for Applicants. The most current Guides and other documents are available on CORDIS under www.cordis.europa.eu/pep/PEOPLE.
Part I describes the background to the WP and the broad policy objectives. Part II gives details of the 2008 Actions, while Part III gives the corresponding information, in overview form, of the relevant calls. The Annexes contain reference material.
GUIDE FOR APPLICANTS

Marie Curie Actions

People

Marie Curie Initial Training Networks

Call identifier FP7-PEOPLE-ITN-2008
Closure Date: 2 September 2008 at 17:00:00
(Brussels local time)

Edition: April 2008
Thank You for Your Attention!

Danke für Ihre Aufmerksamkeit!

Спасибо за внимание!

Merci beaucoup!