



D3.9

Guidelines for the evaluation of the final Joint Research Project reports

WP3 Joint Research Projects

Responsible Partner: Sciensano

Contributing partners: SVA



GENERAL INFORMATION

European Joint Programme full title	Promoting One Health in Europe through joint actions on foodborne zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance and emerging microbiological hazards
European Joint Programme acronym	One Health EJP
Funding	This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 773830.
Grant Agreement	Grant agreement n° 773830
Starting Date	01/01/2018
Duration	60 Months

DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

Deliverable	D3.9 Guidelines for the evaluation of the final Joint Research Project reports
WP and Task	WP3; Task 3.2
Leader	Sciensano
Other contributors	SVA
Due month of the deliverable	M18
Actual submission month	M18
Type <i>R: Document, report DEC: Websites, patent filings, videos, etc. OTHER</i>	R
Dissemination level <i>PU: Public CO: confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)</i>	PU



Guidelines for the evaluation of the final Joint Research Project reports

General information on the OneHealth EJP is available on the website onehealthejp.eu.

For more insight in the guidelines for project leaders to report on their Joint Research Project, deliverable D3.1 should be consulted. Guidance for the WP3 and WP4 Teams to monitor the Joint Research and Integrative Projects is described in deliverable D3.5.

The current procedure details the evaluation process of the JRP final reports by evaluators external to the OneHealth EJP consortium.

	Proposal writing		Project		
	PL JRP	D3.3 Submission	D3.1 Reporting	D3.1 Reporting	D3.1 Reporting
PL JIP	D3.3 Submission		D4.1 Reporting	D4.1 Reporting	D4.12 Reporting
WP3 / WP4			D3.5 Monitoring	D3.5 Monitoring	D3.5 Monitoring
Experts		D3.6 Evaluation proposal			D3.9 D4.19 Evaluation final report

Contact details of the OneHealth EJP WP3 team and the Support Team

The Support Team may be contacted for general questions related to this procedure. Detailed research related questions should be forwarded to the WP3 team.

- OneHealth EJP Support Team: Arnaud Callegari, Lucyna Haaso-Bastin and Noëlie Colinet, Email: ohejpcord@anses.fr
- OneHealth EJP WP3 Team (Joint Research Projects): Hein Imberechts and Fanny Baudoin, Email: ohejp@sciensano.be

Role of the OneHealth WP3 team

Project leaders submit their final reports according to the instructions laid out in D3.1. The WP3 team will then administer their evaluation. Its role is as follows:

- To remind projects leaders to submit their final report according to the guidelines and using the appropriate template (D3.1);
- To verify that the self-assessment in which the project leader compares the project outcomes with the initial objectives as described in the full proposal (see further) has been appropriately dealt with;
- To contact external experts and stakeholders or end users for the evaluation of the final reports following the current procedure, and to collect the evaluation forms;
- To transfer the evaluated final reports and accompanying documents (e.g. evaluation sheets) to the Support Team;



- To disseminate the final reports to the Project Management Team, the Scientific Steering Board, the External Scientific Advisory Board and the Research Executive Agency.

Identification of External Experts for Evaluation

The final reports will be evaluated by external evaluators who are recognized experts in the fields of foodborne zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance and emerging threats. The experts must not currently be engaged in or have had close collaboration with any of the OneHealth EJP partner organisations or individual participants in the past 5 years prior to the submission of the final report, i.e. as from January 2015 for reports submitted in 2020 (see also further, Annex B). In addition, stakeholders and/or end users (e.g. experts from local or national ministries or food agencies) unrelated to the JRP consortium countries will be invited to the assessment of the final reports.

Project reports will be grouped according to the domain or topics and will as much as possible be assessed by the same evaluators. Each proposal should be evaluated by three to four experts (i.e. 2 scientific and at least one stakeholder expert).

The WP3 team has identified experts as described in D3.6 (Guidelines for the evaluation of proposals and for the selection of projects). As for stakeholder experts, the OneHealth EJP Programme Owners will be contacted. The list of external experts and the detailed expertise will be stored and made available for future consultation, if requested.

Evaluation process

The WP3 team will invite the experts to the evaluation process. The email will include:

- a short description of the OneHealth EJP with a link to the site web OneHealthEJP.eu
- digital copies (or hyperlink to them) of the following documents relevant for the assessment of the reports:
 - ✓ the procedure for project leaders to report on JRP (D3.1);
 - ✓ the guidance for the WP3 and WP4 Teams to monitor the Joint Research and Integrative Projects (D3.5);
 - ✓ this procedure for the evaluation of the final reports;
- the hyperlink to an online registration (“Registration as evaluator of final JRP reports for OneHealth EJP”) allowing evaluators to record their commitment as an evaluator and to specify her/his preference for one or more domains or field of expertise.

Before receiving the reports for evaluation, the expert must agree on the terms as set out in the “Confidentiality Agreement” and “Protection of personal data (GDPR regulation)” (Annex A, form available on [the OneHealth EJP website](#)). **Duly signed agreements will have to be sent back to ohejp@sciensano.be.** A Sciensano collaborator will sign the agreement and mail it back to the expert.

The expert who accepts the confidentiality and data protection agreement-will receive digital copies of the following documents:

- the project report(s);
- the full proposal;
- a confirmation of “No Conflict of Interest” (Annex B, form available on [the OneHealth EJP website](#)): based on the identity of the consortium members mentioned in the report, each expert should first assess her/his possible conflict of interest;
- a template to mark the evaluation scores and comments (Annex C, form available on [the OneHealth EJP website](#)).



Each expert will have to send a scanned copy of the signed “No Conflict of Interest” document (Annex B) to oheip@sciensano.be prior to evaluating the report. In case of a conflict of interest, the external expert is excluded from the evaluation process and she/he will be asked to destroy the documents.

Criteria for evaluation

For the report evaluation, the following criteria will have to be assessed according to the scoring scheme below. The criteria are:

- Alignment with the project objectives as set out in the full proposal: How well do the project outcomes meet the initial objectives of the project? Is any deviation justified?
- Scientific excellence and/or innovative approach: Did the project deliver sound and scientifically qualified results with progress beyond the state-of-the-art? Were the scientific, technological and integrative methodologies used innovative to reach the objectives? Did the multi-disciplinary, complementary approach between the consortium partners deliver successfully?
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation: In general, was the management appropriate? Also the effectiveness of the measures taken to exploit and disseminate the project results, to communicate the project, and to manage research data should be evaluated.
- Integration: Was the project successful in achieving relevant integrative activities (i.e. improved capacity building, development of harmonised protocols, joint strains and biobank collections, joint databases, harmonised surveillance strategies, addressing legal aspects of general interest) that will allow partner organisations to further improve harmonization or alignment in order to better support their prevent-detect-response tasks?
- Sustainability: Will developments achieved by the project be maintained within the organisations of the consortium (procedures as well as capacities, collections or databases, etc.)? Will other institutes be able to take on board (some of) the results?
- Impact of the project: Will the impact of the project last over a long period of time or is it likely to generate a more limited effect (e.g. for national and/or international stakeholders)? Is the project outcome likely to have positive secondary effects such as a positive impact on the economy (free travel over borders, trade of animals and food, recall of contaminated food stuffs etc.) or the environment (impact of preventive and mitigating measures, reduce transportation, etc.)?



The external evaluators will assess the report as follows:

1. scoring all criteria providing whole numbers from 0 to 5, which leads to a maximum score of 25; an aid to fill in the evaluation form is provided in Annex D, form available on [the OneHealth EJP website](#);
2. commenting on each criterion in a few lines; this will help to give feedback to both the project leaders and the Scientific Steering Board.

The duly filled in evaluation forms (Annex C) have to be sent back to ohejp@sciensano.be.

0	Weak	The report shows severe imperfections for the criterion under examination. The criterion is not addressed or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor	The results show that insufficient progress was made for the criterion under examination or it was addressed in an inadequate manner. The report shows serious weaknesses for this criterion.
2	Good	The report broadly addresses the criterion under examination; however, the outcome is moderate. The results are rather average of what could have been expected.
3	Very good	The report addresses most of the criterion under examination well; however, the expected outcome could be better.
4	Excellent	The outcome of the criterion under examination is of high quality or the results related to that criterion are excellent.
5	Outstanding	The outcome of the criterion under examination stands out with exceptional novelty, innovation or progress of science at a global level.

Discussion of the reports (JRP & JIP)

Evaluation reports will be discussed at the Project management Team level, then at the Scientific Steering Board level which will give its consent for validating them, and finally reviewed a last time by the External Scientific Advisory Board, for any further comment, noticeably on valorisation of research outcomes.



Annexes

Annex A

Part 1. Confidentiality Agreement

OneHealth EJP project documents as well as documents such as mails, letters, etc. regarding the evaluation of the projects are confidential and should therefore be handled and stored with due care and confidentiality.

Experts are therefore not allowed to disclose any information concerning project documents or evaluations to outsiders, nor are they allowed to use this confidential information to their own benefit or anyone else's benefit or disadvantage. In addition, they may not reveal to outsiders (including the partners of project proposals) that they are assessing reports of a particular researcher. Anyone who has questions about the project documents or evaluation reports shall be advised to contact ohejp@sciensano.be.

Once the evaluation has been completed, experts are requested to destroy all project documents and any copies made of them. Confidentiality must also be maintained until all valorisations of the outcomes are completed (e.g. publications).

Part 2. Protection of personal data (GDPR regulation)

Information concerning the protection of the expert's personal data

The One Health European Joint Programme organises the online registration of evaluators at Sciensano, Brussels, ("Registration as evaluator of final reports (JRP & JIP) for OneHealth EJP") to identify experts in the field of the One Health EJP and to facilitate their assignment to a reading panel that will evaluate reports.

The online tool collects personal data of candidate experts and includes questions on their availability and their expertise.

If the expert agrees to participate in the evaluation process, he/she needs to sign the consent form.

Objective of the registration tool

The aim of this online tool ("Registration as evaluator of final reports (JRP & JIP) for OneHealth EJP") is to facilitate the assignment of the experts to a reading panel of reviewers. Its outcome will only be used for this particular purpose.

Reimbursement

If the expert decides to review OneHealth EJP reports, he/she will be reimbursed a fee of €450 euros for evaluating 4 proposals (i.e. the actual fee for experts working for the EC, which equals reimbursement for 1 working day). The actual fee to be paid will be calculated pro rata the number of reports read, i.e. €225 in case of reading 2 reports.

Confidentiality

The expert's data will be stored for use by Sciensano. The expert's identity who has participated in the evaluation may also appear in official OneHealth EJP documents, which will be validated by the EC and become public. Sciensano will not reveal the identity of the experts per project. This process is conducted in accordance with the European General Data Protection Regulation of May 25, 2018. The expert can access he/she collected data at any time.



Concerning the protection of the expert's personal data

The information requested will be used in accordance to the permission the expert has given to the Belgian law of 30 July 2018 concerning the protection of individuals in relation to the use of personalized data and the European regulation 2016/679 of the European Parliament and the Council of 27 April 2016 (in place since 25 May 2018) concerning the protection of people in relation to the use of personalized data and the free flow of data (GDPR).

If the expert decides to fill in his/her personalized data in the online tool, he/she confirms to have gone through these privacy conditions.

Which personal data Sciensano collects in the online registration tool?

- The expert's first name and family name
- The organisation for which the expert works
- The country where the expert works
- The expert's professional e-mail
- The expert's availability to be a reviewer
- The expert's field of expertise

Sharing the expert's data

The expert's data will be shared with Ann Lindberg (SVA, SE), Manuela Caniça (INSA, PT) and Arnaud Callegari (ANSES, FR) who support and supervise the evaluation process of the project reports (joint research and joint integrative projects, see www.OneHealthEJP.eu for details).

Saving and protecting the expert's personal data

The expert's data will be saved in electronic form (LymeSurvey, csv table).

Sciensano will save the expert's personal data until the end of the OneHealth EJP project, i.e. until December 2022.

The expert's choice regarding his/her personal data

The expert has the right to ask Sciensano whether his/her data were used. He/she may ask to rectify and delete the data, he/she can oppose the further use of the data or limit the use of the data. All requests have to be motivated.

To do this, the expert will have to write a formal request in which is specified what he/she wants to know, rectify or delete. This request has to be dated, signed and accompanied by a copy recto-verso of the expert's ID-card, together with contacting details. If the conditions are fulfilled, Sciensano will in the shortest delays honour the request and inform the expert about it.

How can the expert contact us?

For questions regarding the use of personal data by Sciensano in the framework of the OneHealth EJP tool, the expert can contact us:

Sciensano
Juliette Wytsmanstraat 14
1050 Elsene
Belgium
T. : +32 2 642 51 11
F. : +32 2 642 50 01
info@sciensano.be
www.sciensano.be



The Sciensano service Data Protection and the Officer for Data Protection can be contacted by email at dpo@sciensano.be.

The expert also has the right to file a complaint about how his/her data have been handled to the Belgian supervising authorities responsible for the legal aspects regarding the protection of personal data. This service can be contacted at:

Data protection authority

Rue de la Presse 35
1000 Brussels
Belgium
T. : + 32 (0)2 274 48 00
F. : +32 (0)2 274 48 35
contact@apd-gba.be

Additional information

Additional information about this study can be obtained from the scientific OHEJP coordinator via email (ohejp@sciensano.be) or telephone (+32 474 989 843).



Consent Form

I agree with the Confidentiality Agreement regarding the content of the project document

Yes No

I have read, understood and approved the information form regarding the protection of my personal data. I have had enough time to think and I have been able to ask all the questions that have come to mind. I understand that if I have more questions or concerns about the use of my personal data, I can contact Sciensano (details mentioned above).

Yes No

I understand that my online registration ("Registration as evaluator of final reports (JRP & JIP) for OneHealth EJP") is voluntary and that by signing the form I will commit to reading and assessing the project proposals (up to four).

Yes No

I agree with the regulations concerning the protection of personal data as explained above, the fact that my personal data as expert who has participated in the evaluation of project report will be used by Sciensano and that my identity may also appear in official OneHealth EJP documents, which will be validated by the EC and eventually become public. Sciensano will not reveal the identity of the experts per project.

Yes No

Name of expert:

Date:

Signature:

Please send a scan of the duly filled in and signed document to: ohejp@sciensano.be

To be completed by Sciensano's collaborators Hein Imberechts or Fanny Baudoin, for OneHealth EJP

I informed the external expert / evaluator about the content of the online registration tool and the confidentiality of the data collection. I have answered all the questions raised about this survey.

Name and first name:

Date

Signature



Annex B – Confirmation of No Conflict of Interest

External Experts are requested to declare any actual or potential conflict of interest towards the project documents. Disqualification may be essential for a number of reasons:

- If the expert:
 - was involved in the preparation of the proposal that she/he is invited to evaluate;
 - is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of the project(s) she/he is requested to evaluate;
 - is employed or contracted by one of the beneficiaries involved in the project;
 - has close family ties or other close personal relationship with the leadership of the project (the project leader or deputy leader of the project, WP Leaders, etc.);
 - has (or has had during the last five years) a scientific collaboration with the project leader or deputy leader of the project;
 - has (or has had) a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional hostility with the leadership of the project (the project leader or deputy leader of the project, WP Leaders, etc.) for a period of three years;
 - has (or has had), a mentor/mentee relationship with the leadership of the project (the project leader or deputy leader of the project, WP Leaders, etc.);
- If the approval or rejection of the project report may in any way benefit or harm the expert personally.

Disqualification will also be inevitable if their impartiality may otherwise be endangered, or if they feel that they have a conflict of interest.

In case of a possible conflict of interest the person must notify [ohejp @sciensano.be](mailto:ohejp@sciensano.be) without any delay.

I hereby confirm that I do not have a conflict of interest.

Name of expert:

Date:

Signature:

Please send a scan of the duly filled in and signed document to: [ohejp @sciensano.be](mailto:ohejp@sciensano.be)



Annex C - Template for the evaluation of joint research and integrative project reports

Project title or acronym:

.....

	0 Weak	1 Poor	2 Good	3 Very good	4 Excel- lent	5 Out- standing
Alignment with the project objectives as set out in the project's full proposal						
Scientific excellence and/or innovative approach						
Quality and efficiency of the implementation						
Integration						
Sustainability						
Impact						

Total score (max 30):

Remarks (please include at least one comment per criterion)

Ability to align with call text and the project objectives as set out in the project's full proposal:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Scientific excellence and/or innovative approach:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Quality and efficiency of the implementation:

.....

.....

.....

.....



Integration:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Sustainability:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Impact:

.....
.....
.....
.....

Please do not sign or indicate your name. Send a scan of the duly filled in document to: [ohejp @sciensano.be](mailto:ohejp@sciensano.be).