



D4.19 Guidelines for evaluation of final Joint Integrative Project reports

WP4 Joint Integrative Projects

Responsible Partner: SVA

Contributing partners:

Sciensano, INSA



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	D4.19 Guidelines for evaluation of final Joint Integrative Project reports
WP and task	WP4, task 4.1.3
Author	SVA, Sciensano
Other contributors	INSA
Due month of the report	M34 (October 2020)
Actual submission month	M34
Type <i>R: Document, report</i> <i>DEC: Websites, patent filings, videos, etc.;</i> <i>OTHER</i>	R Save date: 26 Oct 2020
Dissemination level PU: Public (default) CO: confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	PU
Dissemination Author's suggestion to inform the following possible interested parties.	OHEJP WP 1 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 2 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 3 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 4 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 5 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 6 <input type="checkbox"/> OHEJP WP 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Project Management Team <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Communication Team <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific Steering Board <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> National Stakeholders/Program Owners Committee <input type="checkbox"/> EFSA <input type="checkbox"/> ECDC <input type="checkbox"/> Other international stakeholder(s): Social Media: Other recipient(s):



Guidelines for the evaluation of the final Joint Integrative Project (JIP) reports, based on D3.9

General information on the One Health European Joint Programme (EJP) is available on the website OneHealthEJP.eu.

For more insight in the guidelines for project leaders to report on their Joint Integrative Project (JIP), deliverables D4.1 “Instructions for Project Leaders’ reporting on Joint Integrative Projects (JIPs), excl. final reporting” and D4.12 “Instructions for final reporting of JIPs”, should be consulted. Guidance for the WP3 and WP4 Team to monitor the Joint Research Projects (JRPs) and JIPs, respectively, is described in deliverable D3.5 “Guidelines for WP3/WP4 to monitor projects (at start, periodic and end-term evaluations)” (all public deliverables are available on www.onehealthjep.eu/deliverables).

The current procedure details the evaluation process of the JIP final reports by evaluators external to the One Health EJP consortium. It is based on D3.9 “Guidelines for the evaluation of the final JRP reports” and the updated “Guidelines for the evaluation of the final JRP reports, based on D3.9” developed by WP3 in collaboration with WP4 and takes into account the final reports expected in June 2020.

	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 One Health EJP WP4 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 WP4 team.

- One Health EJP Support Team: Arnaud Callegari and Lucyna Haaso-Bastin, Email: ojejpcoord@anses.fr
- One Health EJP WP4 Team (Joint Integrative Projects): Karin Artursson, Email: karin.artursson@sva.se, ojejp@sva.se

Role of the One Health WP4 team

Project leaders submit their final reports according to the instructions laid out in D4.12 “Instructions for final reporting of JIPs”. The WP4 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 which will be sent out to PLs;



- 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 at ANSES;
- 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. Contact will be sought with at least one of the experts that evaluated the project's full proposal and with one additional expert, based on the existing list of experts (D3.6 "Updated guidelines for Evaluation of proposal + Selection of projects (JRP&JIP)", see [website](#)). The experts must not currently be engaged in or have had close collaboration with the project leader or deputy leader of the One Health EJP project in the past 5 years prior to the submission of the final report, i.e. as from June 2015 for reports submitted in June 2020.

In addition, one Programme Owner Committee (POC) representative (i.e. "end user", e.g. experts from ministries or regional food agencies) will be invited to assess the general outcome of the project, i.e. the integration among consortium partners, the One Health efforts and impact of the project, including on the longer term (project sustainability). POC members are per definition not independent from the One Health EJP beneficiaries and will therefore not be invited to sign a "No Conflict of Interest" document.

Scientific experts and Programme Owner Committee representatives will be contacted and invited to register through an online questionnaire (see further).

Each report will thus be evaluated by three experts (i.e. two scientific and one stakeholder expert).

Evaluation process

The WP4 team will invite the scientific experts and the Programme Owner representatives to the evaluation process. The email will include:

- a short description of the One Health EJP with a link to the website OneHealthEJP.eu
- the following information relevant for the assessment of the reports:
 - ✓ a hyperlink to the webpages of the projects for which the final report needs evaluation;
 - ✓ a hyperlink to the procedures for project leaders to report on JIP (D4.1 "Instructions for Project Leaders' reporting on Joint Integrative Projects (JIPs), excl. final reporting" and D4.12 "Instructions for final reporting of JIPs");
 - ✓ these guidelines for the evaluation of the final reports;
 - ✓ specifically for the external expert who initially assessed the project full proposal, that evaluation form will be attached to the mail;
- a hyperlink to an online registration form "Registration as evaluator of final reports for One Health EJP". This form includes a "Confidentiality Agreement" statement (Annex A) and information regarding protection of personal data, GDPR (Annex B).

The selected expert who has successfully registered online will receive digital copies of the following documents:

- the project final report(s);
- a confirmation of "No Conflict of Interest" (Annex C) (this does not apply to the POC representatives since they are end users of the One Health EJP outcomes and therefore not independent from the One Health EJP by definition); a template to mark the evaluation scores and comments (Annex D).



Each scientific expert will have to send a scanned copy of the signed “No Conflict of Interest” document (Annex C) to ohejp@sva.se 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 of the results 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 quality of the outcome: Did the project deliver sound and scientifically qualified results with progress beyond the state-of-the-art, following the proposal initially submitted? Did the multi-disciplinary, complementary approach between the consortium partners deliver successfully?
- Quality and efficiency of the implementation: In general, was the project management appropriate? Evaluation of the effectiveness of the measures taken to exploit and disseminate the project results, to communicate on the project, and to manage data.
- 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? Has sufficient attention been paid to cross-sector collaboration and alignment (One Health aspect)?
- 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? Are the project outputs of relevance for national and/or international stakeholders? Are the project outcomes likely to have positive secondary effects such as economic benefits, e.g. more efficient governing, facilitated communication between public health/ animal health/ food safety authorities?

The external evaluators will assess the report as follows:

1. To score all criteria providing whole numbers from 0 to 5, which leads to a maximum score of 30;
2. To comment 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 D) have to be sent back to ohejp@sva.se before the deadline.

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 evaluation reports (JIP)

WP4 team will present the evaluation reports to the Project Management Team including the OHEJP scientific leader, the Scientific Steering Board, the EC (REA), and to the External Scientific Advisory Board members who are in charge of the high-level follow up of the One Health EJP outcome.



Annexes

Annex A. Confidentiality Agreement

Although the final project reports are public deliverables, One Health EJP documents such as mails, letters, evaluation forms, etc. regarding the evaluation of the projects are confidential and should therefore be handled and stored with due care and confidentially.

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 the project) 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 ohelp@sva.se.

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



Annex B. Protection of personal data (GDPR regulation)

Information concerning the protection of the expert's personal data

The One Health EJP organises the online registration of evaluators at Sciensano, Brussels, ["Registration as evaluator of final reports for One Health 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 for One Health EJP"] is to facilitate the assignment of the experts to one or more reports for evaluation. Its outcome will only be used for this particular purpose.

Reimbursement

If the expert decides to review One Health EJP reports, he/she will be reimbursed a fee of €225 for evaluating 2 final reports (i.e. the actual fee for experts working for the EC, which equals €450 reimbursement for 1 working day). The actual fee to be paid will be calculated pro rata the number of reports read, i.e. €112.25 per report.

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 One Health EJP documents, which will be validated by the EC (Research Executive Agency) 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 (GDPR) 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.

The personal data Sciensano collects in the online registration tool is the following

- 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 in a defined period of time

Sharing the expert's data

The expert's data will be shared with Pikka Jokelainen (SSI, DK), Karin Artursson (SVA, SE), Manuela Caniça (INSA, PT) and Arnaud Callegari (ANSES, FR) who support and supervise the evaluation process of the project reports (JRP and JIP, 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 One Health EJP project, foreseen for 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 One Health 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 One Health EJP coordinator via email (ohnejp@sciensano.be) or telephone (+32 477 911 050).



Annex C. 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:
 - o was involved in the preparation of the final report that she/he is invited to evaluate;
 - o 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;
 - o is employed or contracted by one of the beneficiaries involved in the project;
 - o 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.);
 - o has (or has had during the last five years) a scientific collaboration with the project leader or deputy leader of the project;
 - o 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;
 - o 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 ohelp@sva.se 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: ohelp@sva.se



Annex D. Template for the evaluation of joint research project (JRP) and joint integrative project (JIP) reports

Project title or acronym:

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

Total score (max 30):

Remarks (please include at least one comment per criterion)

Alignment of the results with the project objectives as set out in the full proposal:

Scientific excellence and/or innovative approach:

Quality and efficiency of the implementation:



.....

Integration:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Sustainability:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Impact of the project:

.....

.....

.....

.....

Please send a scan of the duly filled in and signed document to: ohjep@sva.se