

Annex 1

Evaluation and selection process

Each eligible proposal will be assigned to three external expert reviewers by the Department of Grant Management based on their selected discipline(s) and keywords. External expert reviewers will assess the applications via the electronic portal. Evaluation will be done independently and anonymously, and the reviewers will be blind to each other's reports.

Reviewers will score each application assigned to them according to the evaluation criteria and elaborate their Individual Assessment Reports (IAR). In their descriptive assessment, reviewers must declare if they recommend the application for funding or not. In case of a significant difference of opinions, an additional external expert reviewer will be invited to evaluate the application.

Evaluation criteria for proposals:

| Criteria | Sub-criteria | Score | Weight | Threshold |
|---|--|-------|--------|-----------|
| Quality of the Applicant | | | | |
| Track record | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic records • Scientific results in the past 5 years (incl. publications, patents, grants, awards, conference participations, etc.) • Teaching, supervision, knowledge transfer activities (in the past 5 years) • International mobility experiences, project participations in the past 5 years • Intersectoral experiences (if relevant) | 0-5 | 35% | 3 |
| Potential for career development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the project on the career development of the researcher: short-, medium- and long-term career perspectives | 0-5 | 15% | - |
| Quality of the Research Proposal | | | | |
| Excellence | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious and go beyond the state of the art) • Clarity of the research methodology • Quality, originality, innovative aspects and interdisciplinarity (if relevant) of the research project | 0-5 | 30% | 3 |
| Dissemination and Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned communication and dissemination activities; • Scientific, societal, economic/ technological impact of the project | 0-5 | 10% | - |
| Implementation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality and effectiveness of the workplan; • Feasibility; • Match between the project and the selected host(s) | 0-5 | 10% | - |

Following the evaluation by external expert reviewers, each eligible proposal will be referred to one of the three Evaluation Panels (Panel 1: Humanities and Social Sciences, Panel 2: Life Sciences, Panel 3: Mathematics and Natural Sciences) according to the field of science indicated by the applicant. In case

the fields of science indicated by the applicant require more than one Panel's expertise, all the Panels concerned will carry out the evaluation of the application in question. Each Evaluation Panel will discuss the proposals, make a decision based on a consensus, and draw up a ranking list of its own.

As a next step, the Momentum Jury will be convened to establish the shortlist for the interviews based on the ranking lists of the Evaluation Panels.

Proposals involving ethical issues will be sent to the Ethics Committee for review.

All short-listed applicants will be invited to an online interview. Each interview will last up to 45 minutes, containing: the applicant's presentation, project-related questions and questions on the applicant's motivations, future plans, etc. .

Evaluation criteria for interviews

| Criteria | Sub-criteria | Score | Weight |
|-------------------------------|--|--------------|---------------|
| Project presentation | Clarity of the presentation, objectives, methodology | 0-5 | 45% |
| Expected career impact | Motivation, career development plan | 0-5 | 45% |
| Soft skills | Communication, presentation skills, etc. | 0-5 | 10% |

The Momentum MSCA Committee shall make the final formal decision.