European partnership for a sustainable Future of Food Systems

First Joint Transnational Co-funded Call

FutureFoodS Call 2024

Transforming Food Systems - reshaping food system interactions, fostering food innovations and empowering sustainable food choices

Evaluation Guidelines

V02 - 28 July 2025

Submission & Evaluation platform: https://futurefoods.ptj.de

Call Announcement:
https://futurefoods.ptj.de/call1?genericModule=callDocuments&action=download&id=276

Annex A Impact Plan:
https://futurefoods.ptj.de/call1?genericModule=callDocuments&action=download&id=268

Co-funded by the European Union

Co-funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Research Executive Agency (REA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Outline

Definitions

Call Board (CB):	the decision making body consisting of one representative of each funding body participating to the Joint Call.
Evaluation Office (EO):	central contact point for all issues around the evaluation procedures of the Joint Call.
IEP Chair:	IEP person, nominated by the CB and EO among the experts, who will assist the experts, in case of need, all along the evaluation period. S/he has a sound background understanding of all Call topics. S/he will chair the full proposals' evaluation meeting of the IEP and could be invited to attend the final CB selection meeting.
International Expert Panel (IEP):	group of experts who will peer-review the submitted proposals in the framework of the Joint Call. The IEP will be composed of international experts based on their acknowledged expertise in the research areas covered by the submitted proposals.
Rapporteur:	member of the IEP who will be responsible to report the evaluation results of a proposal (by writing an evaluation summary of the three evaluators and by presenting the evaluation results during the evaluation meeting) and to finalise the Evaluation report after the IEP Meeting.

1. General information and background of the Joint Call

The European Partnership for a sustainable Future of Food Systems (FutureFoodS) is a co-funded Horizon Europe partnership, bringing together 86 partners from 29 countries to drive green and digital transitions with a focus on food post-harvest. FutureFoodS is thereby contributing to the European Green Deal, the UN´s Sustainable Development Goals and the Farm to Fork Strategy with its vision to collectively achieve environmentally friendly, socially secure and fair, economically viable, healthy and safe food systems in Europe by 2050.

FutureFoodS partnership is planning to launch 6 co-funded calls, first of which was launched on 6th of November 2024. This call brings together 36 funding organizations from 19 countries and the European Commission, jointly committing up to 40 million Euros to support innovative research and development projects focused on creating a sustainable food future (see Call Announcement for more info).

Background Information about the International Expert Panel Assignment

The International Expert Panel (IEP) will be constituted by assigning 3 experts per proposal from the overall pool of experts. One of these three experts will act as a rapporteur. The Evaluation Office (EO) will inform all selected experts (based on the proposal numbers and subjects). Members of consortia submitting proposals must not be evaluators to avoid conflict of interest.

The pool of experts was established using an online survey (incl. the uploaded CV) and all expert candidates were reviewed by the EO, assigned to the proposals and approved by the Call Board. The assignment and selection of expert candidates is based on the expert´s profile fitting to the scope, guiding principles and topics of this call and the necessary expertise with regard to the content of the submitted proposals. A sound balance considering aspects of geography, gender and expert´s background was aimed for to the best extent possible.

Scope of the co-funded call

In its Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda[1] (SRIA), FutureFoodS has identified four thematic areas for which better knowledge, advanced know-how and more scalable, innovative solutions can be determinant to fulfil food system transformations: (i) change the way we eat, (ii) change the way we process and supply food, (iii) change the way we connect, and (iv) change the way we govern food systems.

Within these four thematic R&I Areas, the partnership has identified a subset of high priority topics, with regards to the need for new knowledge and innovations in society and the food sector, that require specific attention within the framework of this first call.

The objective of this call is to fund transnational research and/or innovation projects addressing one of the following call topics.

Topic 1: The way towards sustainable and resilient food systems
Topic 2: New foods – Fostering innovations in food design, processing and supply via demand-and-supply reorientation

[1] Sustainable Food Systems Partnership for People, Planet and Climate: STRATEGIC RESEARCH AND INNOVATION AGENDA (SRIA) https://scar-europe.org/food-main-actions/food-systems-partnership

Topic 3: Empowering sustainable food choices – Enabling food environments and dietary shifts

Special attention is given to a food systems approach and the following guiding elements are essential for FutureFoodS projects and will thus be part of the evaluation:

- **Transformative perspective**
- **Inter- and transdisciplinarity**
- **Multi-stakeholder engagement**
- **Sustainability**

Proposals will be required to provide an **Impact Plan** towards food systems transformation:

- **Pre-proposal:** applicants are asked to perform a problem analysis. Based on this problem analysis, the proposal should clearly identify potential solutions and interventions.
- **Full proposal:** applicants will need to provide a complete Impact Plan, including impact pathways, effective outreach and application-driven interactions and strategic planning of scientific and innovation activities. Detailed information about food system approach and impact plan is provided in the Call Announcement and Annex A.

2. Time schedule

The call involves a 2-step procedure with submission and selection of pre-proposals and, subsequently, invitation of shortlisted consortia to submit full proposals. Experts should be available for evaluation, according to the following timeline.

First step: submission and evaluation of PRE-proposals	
06 November 2024 – 15 January 2025	Submission of pre-proposals
Until beginning of February 2025	Call eligibility and national/regional eligibility checks
December 2024 – January 2025	IEP assembly
Beginning of February 2025	Start of pre-proposal evaluation (online)
PRE-proposal EVALUATION	
17 February – 28 March 2025	Pre-proposal evaluation
24 February 2025	Confirmation of No Conflict of Interest by experts for assigned proposals
20 February 2025 (12-13 CET) **21 February 2025 (14-15 CET)** **24 February 2025 (13-14 CET)**	IEP webinar (1 hour tutorial, optional but recommended to join once if possible)
21 March 2025	Deadline for single pre-proposal evaluations (online)
28 March 2025	Deadline for rapporteur summaries
~02 April 2025	IEP meeting step 1 (online)
April	Selection meeting (CB), info to applicants and redress period

Second step: submission and evaluation of FULL-proposals	
05 May – 09 July 2025	Submission of full-proposals
Until end of July	Call eligibility and national/regional eligibility checks for step 2
End of July	Start of full proposal evaluations (online)
FULL-proposal EVALUATION	
28 July – 19 September 2025	Full proposal evaluations by experts (online)
06 August 2025	Confirmation of No Conflict of Interest by experts for assigned proposals
05 September 2025	Deadline for single full-proposal evaluations (online)
17 September 2025	Deadline for rapporteur summaries
25-26 September 2025	IEP meeting step 2 in Berlin (DE): ranking of full proposals (in person)
13-14 October 2025	Selection meeting (CB), info to applicants and redress period
November 2025 – March 2026	Start of the selected projects

3. Evaluation Office

The Evaluation Office (EO) will provide administrative and technical (online platform) support to the experts during the evaluation process. It is the primary point of contact for all general matters in relation to the peer-review evaluation. The EO will be performed jointly by JUELICH and TAGEM.

EO contacts:

Name	E-Mail	Phone
EO	ptj-futurefoods@fz-juelich.de	N/A
Ilkem Demirkesen	ilkem.mert@tarimorman.gov.tr	
Ahmet Budaklier	ahmet.budaklier@tarimorman.gov.tr	
Emilie Gätje	e.gaetje@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 61 96367
Frank Hensgen	f.hensgen@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 6185443
Nikola Hassan	n.hassan@ptj.de	+49 (0) 2461 61 96787

4. The Evaluation procedure after submission of research proposals

The co-funded call will follow a two-step submission procedure. The assessment of the submitted pre- and full-proposals (eligibility checks by the call office and the funding bodies, evaluation by the IEP members) will be carried out using the online Call submission platform https://futurefoods.ptj.de. The submission platform is the entry point for applicants, funders and evaluators. It offers a section named “Call Documents”, where you can find all published documents.

Submitted research proposals follow a certain outline (see also Annex C: Pre-proposal template or Example pre-proposal available in the Call Document section).

All eligible proposals in terms of general and national/regional eligibility criteria will be peer-reviewed by 3 experts selected from the IEP. The outcome of the experts' evaluation will be a ranking list of projects with scores and a written evaluation report. IEP members will meet (online for pre-proposal, envisioned on ~2nd of April 2025) in order to share and discuss their reports and to find a common agreement on a ranking list. The IEP chair(s) will facilitate the discussion. The evaluation outputs, finalized after the meeting, will be used by the CB for the final funding decision.

5. International Expert Panel and its constitution

The EO will establish an IEP. The IEP will be endorsed by the CB and has the following mandate:

- Provide a peer review of proposals, on the basis of the evaluation criteria outlined in section 6.4;
- Provide a written evaluation summary for each proposal (rapporteur) to explain the evaluation result to the CB. The evaluation summary will be provided to the Coordinator of each proposal;
- Provide a ranking list of proposals based on the evaluation scores.

A chair and co-chair(s) of the IEP will coordinate the work of the IEP with the support of the EO. The IEP members will be independent of the FOs and applicants involved in this co-funded call. The EO will ensure that no CoI exists concerning the IEP members and the proposals evaluated by them. The IEP members will be required to sign a declaration stating the lack of any CoI and a declaration of confidentiality. The online evaluation tool will include a feature that will prevent access to a proposal where a CoI is declared by an IEP member.

Throughout the entire procedure, strict confidentiality will be ensured with respect to the identities of the applicants and the contents of the proposals, unless disclosure of information is required by national law. Proposals will be accessible to the CB, the IEP members involved and the EO. The full-proposals will also be read by the FutureFoodS Ethics Advisory Board in order to fulfil the obligations outlined in section 6.6. All collected data will be handled in accordance with the GDPR.

Each proposal will be evaluated by a minimum of three IEP members. They will apply evaluation criteria and score the pre-proposals and full-proposals as described in 6.4 and 6.5, respectively. They will prepare individual written evaluation reports, in advance of the IEP meeting. An average score will be formed for each proposal (automatically by the online system). Following the individual evaluation, a rapporteur (one of the three evaluators will be assigned as rapporteur) will summarise the individual evaluation report and write a draft summary report, which will be used to present the proposal at the IEP meeting and initiate the discussions of the IEP members. During the IEP meeting, all proposals will be introduced and evaluations presented by evaluators, with the rapporteur being the first to present the proposal. The IEP members will discuss each proposal and give feedback on the scores and reports given for each proposal. If necessary, the three evaluators assigned to a proposal can adjust their individual scores. In case of disagreements among the three evaluators assigned and high deviations in scoring, a fourth evaluator might be consulted. Based on the final average scores, a ranking list of proposals will be compiled.

After the IEP meeting, the rapporteur will finalize the summary report and validate with the involved evaluators. The summary reports shall reflect the discussions by the IEP and should be in line with the score. They will be shared with the applicants.

The ranking list and the summary evaluation reports will be shared with the CB.

An Independent Observer (IO) will oversee the entire evaluation procedure in terms of compliance with the Horizon Europe regulations for co-funded calls and will prepare a report.

The International Expert Panel (IEP) for evaluation is constituted of internationally recognised experts chosen for their scientific / technical expertise and knowledge of the sectors covered in the Call. Attention will be paid to attain a balanced participation of experts from academia, stakeholder organisations and industry, an equitable geographic representation and gender balance.

The members of the IEP have been proposed and nominated by the CB members and the EO, thereby, existing contacts have been taken into account. In addition, experts voluntarily applied to be an evaluator following the invitation published on the FutureFoodS website. The pool of experts was established using an online survey (including upload of a short CV), which was mandatory to be filled and all expert candidates were reviewed by the EO, assigned to the proposals and approved by the Call Board.

Experts have been contacted by the EO for confirmation of availability and the assignment of proposals. An expert can only become a member of the IEP if s/he has no Conflict of Interest and is available during the evaluation process. The final number of experts to build the IEP depends on the number of proposals submitted, the topics addressed and the expertise of the evaluators. Experts are asked to contact the Evaluation Office in case they do not feel their area of expertise matches the assigned proposals.

The names of IEP members will be kept anonymous for the applicants through the whole procedure.

6. Performing the evaluation

6.1 The online evaluation tool

The evaluation of the call can only be done using the online evaluation tool, accessible under https://futurefoods.ptj.de. All assigned experts will receive an e-mail invitation with log-in details and instructions how to access the tool. All experts are requested to register to the tool until latest February 24th 2025. There will be no restriction regarding the download of all submitted proposals (when no Conflict of Interest is declared).

6.2 Confidentiality, Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct Agreement

Before performing an evaluation, an agreement on confidentiality, Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct (Annex C) need to be downloaded, signed (digital signature, if feasible) and uploaded once. For each proposal, the assigned expert will then need to decide on a possible Conflict of Interest, based on a visible summary and research consortium information of the proposal. Full access to a proposal will only be granted when **no** Conflict of Interest exists.

6.3 Tasks of the IEP

The IEP shall peer review proposals and provide consolidated evaluation feedback considering the given timeframes (see timeline). Each proposal is evaluated by three experts. In case of highly contradictory evaluations an additional expert or the IEP chair could be invited to do a further evaluation.

It is suggested (but not required) that experts read more than the assigned proposals in order to have a more complete overview of the applications (not assigned proposals are accessible in a reading mode).

One of the 3 experts evaluating a proposal will be appointed as rapporteur, which means s/he will prepare an evaluation summary report based on the single evaluations. All experts will be required to act as rapporteur in 2-5 proposals, prepare and submit an evaluation summary report and present the proposal and evaluation results during the evaluation meeting. In case of strong disagreement on the evaluation, the rapporteur should inform the EO to seek a solution (e.g. involving an additional expert or the IEP chair).

An overall IEP chair person will be nominated among the experts (by the CB and EO). Tasks of the chair include assistance in case of disagreements among experts, chairing of the evaluation meeting of the IEP and to attend the CB selection meeting to explain the evaluation results if needed.

6.4 Evaluation criteria

All eligible proposals will be evaluated according to the following three criteria (and additional subcriteria) given below. In the evaluation of pre-proposals the first two of these criteria will be taken into consideration. A detailed description of each criterion (including subcriteria and supportive questions) is provided in table 1 below.

Excellence (threshold 3/5)

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives to the aims of the partnership and the call priorities;
- Extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art, as well as degree of innovation;
- Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end-users where appropriate.

Impact (threshold 3/5)

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts in light of a food systems approach and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from the project;
- Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the Impact Plan and the DEC plan *(full-proposal only);*
- The added value of adopting a European transnational cooperation and networking approach in the context of the proposed project.

Quality and efficiency of the implementation (threshold 3/5; full-proposal only)

- Quality and consistency of the work plan, assessment of risks, appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall*;*
- Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

The criteria are equally weighted and will be scored independently. The result of the evaluation will be one ranking list based on the final scores, resulting from the sum of the mean scores for each criterion.

Table 1 Evaluation criteria, subcriteria and supportive questions

EXCELLENCE	
Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives to the aims of the partnership and the call priorities.	– *To what extent will the proposed project contribute to tackle the challenges at hand (question of relevance)?* – *How well does the proposed project fit the overall scope of the call?* – *To what extent are the proposed objectives and research questions adequate to contribute to the thematic priorities of the call?*
Extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art, as well as degree of innovation.	– *How /innovative is the proposed work?* – *What is the degree of innovation? (i.e. is the proposed product, process or service state of the art? Is there sufficient technological maturity and risk?)* – *Are knowledge gaps clearly identified and described?* – *To what extent is the proposal contributing to and/or increasing the advancement of its field and across different fields (inter- and transdisciplinarity)?* – *Does the proposal offer a potential breakthrough or have significant leverage points been identified?*
Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end-users where appropriate.	– *To what extent are the methods and research design clear, feasible and suitable to answer the identified knowledge gaps and/or achieve the proposed objectives?* – *To what extent does the proposed activity suggest and explore creative, original concepts that support a systems approach (see section 2)?* – *Does the consortium show an inter- or transdisciplinarity character and involvement of a diversity of actors?* – *Is the involvement of social sciences and humanities convincingly integrated?* – *Does the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-and transdisciplinary approaches, appropriately consider ethical issues according to the EU "Do no significant harm" principle (DNSH), gender dimension in research and innovation content?* – *Does the proposed methodology address, when appropriate, the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of stakeholders and diversity of food system actors (e.g. citizens, civil society and end users)?*
IMPACT	
Credibility of pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts in light of a food systems approach and the likely scale and significance of the con-tributions from the project.	– *Is the project´s Impact Plan (including the problem analysis at pre-proposal level and the impact pathway at full-proposal level) clear and does it follow logically from the expected results of the project?* – *Is the Impact Plan both suitably ambitious and actionable and to what extent does it follow FutureFoodS guiding elements (transformative perspective, inter-and transdisciplinarity, multi-stakeholder engagement and sustainability)?* – *Is there a strategic impact in terms of solving sustainability-related (environmental, economic and social) food system challenges at different scales (local to global)?*

	– *Can contribution to sustainable developement and Agenda 2030 including gender equality be expected?*
Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the Impact Plan and the DEC plan *(full-proposal only)*	– *Is there a feasible plan for the exploitation and dissemination of the project´s scientific results (including management of intellectual property rights - IPR)* – *Are the expected results or the knowledge acquired of importance for economic/ societal sectors and for future development?* – *Are the plans for strategic activities clear and appropriate, including communication, stakeholder engagement, monitoring, evaluation and learning and capacity building?*
The added value of adopting a European transnational cooperation and networking approach in the context of the proposed project.	– *To what extent is the benefit from a transnational approach clearly argued and addresseed in comparison with a regional/ national one?* – *Is the transnational collaboration well balanced in the consortium?* – *To which extent are interactions with / exchange and transfer of results within the consortium, to stakeholders, other EU initiatives or civil society clearly thought through and described?*
QUALITY AND EFFICIENCY OF THE IMPLEMENTATION (full-proposal only)	
Quality and consistency of the work plan, assessment of risks, appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall	– *Is the proposed organisation and management of the scientific project adequate to achieve the proposed objectives?* – *Are the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management properly developed and laid out?* – *Is the estimated effort/ allocation of resources appropriate?* – *Are the resources assigned to the work packages in line with their objectives and deliverables?* – *Is the planned work feasible in terms of workload allocation (time/ person months)?* – *Is the project inherently coherent and do the individual workpackages interlink well with one other?*
Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise	– *Do participants in the proposal have the required competences to carry out the tasks assigned to them (necessary expertise)?* – *Is their role clearly defined and do they complement each other well?* – *Is the scientific workload and financial burden balanced among the partners and countries (e.g. distribution of person months, equipment and facilities, involvement of young researchers to be trained)?* – *Is gender equality sufficiently integrated in the consortia as well as the work plan, including the distribution of power and influence?*

6.5 Evaluation scores

Individual scores will be attributed only to the main criteria (two for pre-proposals/ three for full-proposals).

For both pre- and full-proposal evaluation, each criterion will be scored out of five (no half marks allowed) based on the following scoring system. The threshold for each criterion is three out of five. Any

project with a lower score for one of the main criteria or an overall score lower than 10 at Step 2 (full-proposal) will not be considered for funding.

IEP members will identify strengths and weaknesses (if any) and provide context for their comments based on the application, i.e., IEP members will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an IEP member identifies substantial shortcomings, they must reflected by awarding a lower score for the criterions concerned. There should be consistency between the numerical scores and the written comments.

The 0-5 scoring system for each criterion indicates the following assessment:

Table 2 Scoring system

0		The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor	The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair	The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
3	Good	The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
4	Very good	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
5	Excellent	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

An average score is agreed upon for each criterion by minimum of the three IEP members who evaluated the proposal. The agreement on the score will be obtained during the IEP meeting. A threshold of three out of five will be applied for each criterion for both pre-proposals and full-proposals; i.e. pre-proposals with an average score less than 3.0 in any of the two criteria will not be recommended for invitation to submit a full-proposal, and full-proposals with a mean score less than 3.0 for any of the three criteria will not be recommended for funding. For full-proposals, a second threshold of 10/15 will be applied with respect to the total score (sum of the three average scores per criterion); i.e., proposals with a total score under 10 will not be selected for funding. All proposals will be ranked according to the final scores agreed during the IEP meeting. The outcome of the joint evaluation is irrevocable.

6.6 Ethics assessment

It is mandatory for applicants to fill an ethics self-assessment and provide respective statements following the Horizon Europe standard procedure. The ethics assessment will be evaluated separately by the FutureFoodS Ethical Board during the full-proposal step. Evaluation of ethical issues is therefore not part of the IEP tasks, but all evaluators can pose relevant comments with regard to ethics if deemed relevant. Any proposal which contravenes fundamental ethical principles will be excluded from selection.

6.7 Evaluation reports

All experts will provide an online evaluation consisting of 4 questions (see Annex A) including a general comment on the transformative potential, the excellence and impact and an overall summary on strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. The report has to be sufficiently detailed and in line with

the given scores.In case of a proposal failing to reach the threshold, a clear and consistent justification should be given.

Rapporteurs will write a summary evaluation report (approx. half a page) for the proposals assigned. In case of strongly contradictory reviews among the 3 evaluators, the rapporteur should contact the Call Office and an additional expert or the Chair might be involved. Proposal summary evaluation reports will be discussed during the evaluation meeting, and finalized without further delay after the meeting by the rapporteur. They will be communicated to the applicants as part of the notification letter.

7. Evaluation meetings

An online IEP meeting covering all topics will take place around 2nd of April 2025 for the first step evaluation and a physical IEP meeting will be held around end of September/ beginning of October 2025 for full-proposal evaluation (further details will be communicated in due time). All experts will receive the evaluation summary reports before the meeting.

All International Expert Panel members are welcome to take part in the discussions during the Panel meeting, if they have not declared any Conflict of Interest.

The IEP will a) discuss projects where scores between experts are still diverging, b) align the scoring and recommendations between proposals and c) agree on a ranking list.

The International Expert Panel will be chaired by the IEP chair(s), who will moderate the discussion but will not influence the evaluation.

The meeting will start by taking one project at a time, and will be followed by a general discussion:

1. Each project will be introduced and commented on by the assigned rapporteur (one expert per proposal). In case a proposal fails the threshold, the draft evaluation report will have to be agreed upon and will be shortly discussed, unless there are strong objections against the presented overall score.

2. The Panel Experts will discuss each project and agree on a score per criterion and an overall score and the evaluation report. The overall score shall have one decimal behind the separator (min 0.0, max 10.0 for pre or 15.0 for full-proposal).

3. The proposals will be ranked in **one** list. A discussion among all the experts will ensure that the ranking list reflects a linear progression of quality among all proposals. Scores may be modified in this process with due justification and in case of unanimous decision.

4. Full-proposal step only: in addition, evaluators will be asked to give a clear recommendation for funding (A = highly recommended for funding / B = recommended for funding /C = not recommended for funding).

After the meeting the Expert Panel members will finalize the evaluation reports as soon as possible. The IEP's ranking and recommendations will form the basis for the CB final funding decision.

8. Compensation

IEP members will be reimbursed for their evaluation, meeting attendance and travels costs as given in the table 3 below.

Table 3 Compensation of expert evaluators

Item	Reimbursement
Pre-proposal evaluation	50 € per proposal
Attendance to online evaluation meeting	150 €
Full-proposal evaluation	100 € per proposal
Attendance to physical evaluation meeting	200 €
Chair*	1000 €
Travel costs	Based on actual costs (travel and accommodation)

Proposal volume:

Pre-proposals: approx. 25 pages with 5 pages of project description
approx. 5-12 pre-proposals per expert
Full-proposals: approx. 35 pages with 15 pages of project description
approx. 4-8 full-proposals per expert

Special roles:

**Chair*

The CB and EO will nominate one or more chair persons among the experts, who needs to be available during the whole time of evaluation process and will be reimbursed with 1000 €. Besides the overall tasks of evaluators, the chair has the following special tasks:

- Support in case of unclear evaluation results (disagreement among the 3 experts assigned)
- Chairing the evaluation meeting
- Guiding the overall evaluation of proposals with the goal to receive a sound ranking list
- Attending the selection meeting to provide additional information to funders (if needed)

Rapporteurs

Each proposal will have a rapporteur appointed from among the experts who were assigned to it. All experts will be required to act as rapporteur in 2-5 proposals and attend the evaluation meeting to present the proposal and the online evaluation results. The rapporteur is also responsible for summarising the joint evaluation result including comments or conditions, which will be passed to the applicants.

ANNEX A: Outline of the online evaluation form

Outline of the online evaluation form

For the pre-proposal evaluation, experts are asked to answer the following 4 mandatory questions:

Transformative potential

Does the project contribute to the Transformation of Food Systems? *Comment field, max. 2000 characters*

Excellence

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives to the aims of the partnership and the call priorities;
- Extent to which the proposed work is ambitious and goes beyond the state of the art, as well as degree of innovation;
- Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter- and transdisciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end-users where appropriate

Rating (0-5)
Comment field, max. 2000 characters

Impact

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts in light of a food systems approach and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from the project;
- The added value of adopting a European transnational cooperation and networking approach in the context of the proposed project.

Rating (0-5)
Comment field, max. 2000 characters

Summary

Please write a short summary of your evaluation incl. Strength and Weaknesses of the proposal
Comment field, max. 1500 characters

ANNEX B: Quick Starting Guide

FutureFoodS

FutureFoodS Call 2024

EVALUATION - QUICK STARTING GUIDE

(1) **Activate your evaluator account**:
An automatic email is sent to all assigned experts (please also check your spam folder)
> follow the link to set your personal password

(2) The system will ask you to **Login to the online platform** (https://futurefoods.ptj.de)

(3) **Upload Agreement letter**:
Please download and read the *"Confidentiality, Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct Agreement"*
> please sign (electronically if possible) and upload

(4) The Evaluation Office will check your Agreement letter and release your full access

(5) **Login and CoI check**:
After login you will see the proposals assigned to you (and also all other proposals in reading mode)
> please check whether a Conflict of Interest exists for any of the proposals assigned to you (to do so you must click on each proposal to see a short summary of the consortium)

a. **NO CoI:** you will get full access to the proposal
b. **CoI:** the proposal will be blocked

DEADLINE for CoI check: 24th of February 2025

(6) **Start Evaluation**:
Please download the assigned proposals and start with the evaluation following the procedure, explanations, criteria and scores defined in the Evaluation Guidelines

(7) **Finalize the evaluation** (once finalized you cannot go back to introduce changes)

DEADLINE for pre-proposal evaluation: 21st of March 2025

ANNEX C: Confidentiality, Conflict of Interest and Code of Conduct Agreement

EVALUATOR:	**EVALUATOR´S DATA**
EVALUATION OFFICE	**N. HASSAN, F. HENSGEN, E. GÄTJE** Project Management Juelich GmbH 52425 Juelich, Germany Email: ptj-futurefoods@fz-juelich.de

FUTUREFOODS CALL 2024: TRANSFORMING FOOD SYSTEMS
CONFLICT OF INTEREST & CONFIDENTIALITY & CODE OF CONDUCT AGREEMENT

DATE (set placeholder, position must not be changed)

Conflict of Interest

FutureFoodS is committed to avoid any Conflict of Interest (CoI) and to safeguard good scientific practices.

The following situations will be considered as CoI:

- Being involved in (the preparation of) any pre- and/or full-proposal.

- Having submitted a proposal as a principal investigator or a team member, under the call.

- Being director, trustee or partner or in any way involved in the management of an applicant.

- Being employed or contracted by one of the applicants.

- Having close professional proximity, e.g. being a member of the same scientific institution with a hierarchical or department relation or impending change of the IEP member to the institution of the applicant in a position with a hierarchical or department relation or vice versa;

- Having close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent, etc.) or other close personal relationship with the applicants of the proposal.

- Having (or having had during the last five years) a close scientific collaboration with an applicant of the proposal.

- Having (or having had) a relationship of scientific rivalry or professional hostility with an applicant of the proposal.

- Having (or having had), a mentor/mentee relationship with the principal investigator of the proposal.

- Having a current or prior (past 5 years) activity in advisory bodies of the applicant's institution, e.g. scientific advisory boards.

- Having direct or indirect benefit if any proposal submitted is accepted or rejected.

- Having personal economic interests in the funding decision.

Other situations preventing the IEP members to participate in the evaluation impartially could be considered as CoI and should be reported as such by the IEP members to the Evaluation office.

Confidentiality Agreement

I hereby undertake to treat as confidential all and any information that I receive while participating in the work of the International Expert Panel (IEP) and evaluating project proposals, to use this information solely for the purpose of evaluation of the proposals, not to disclose it to any third party and not to make it publicly available or accessible in any way, except with the prior written consent of the joint call consortium.

I understand that this confidentiality disclosure agreement is binding towards the European partnership for a sustainable Future of Food Systems (FutureFoodS) who has appointed me as an evaluator and towards (and for the benefit of) any applicant submitting the project proposal to the call. Furthermore, I understand that this confidentiality disclosure agreement concerns all and any information in any form that comes to my knowledge during my participation in the work of the IEP and evaluating respective project proposals.

I understand that I shall be bound by this confidentiality disclosure agreement as on the date of receipt of this signed letter by the Evaluation Office, and that this confidentialy should be maintained even after the IEP has performed its duties or after my participation in the work of the IEP has ended.

I will not identify myself as a reviewer to the applicant(s) or to any third party, while the Evaluation Office will ensure confidentiality concerning my role as reviewer as well.

I will only address any questions concerning a proposal to the Evaluation Office and not to the applicant(s).

Code of Conduct Agreement

Fundamental principles of good research practice and peer-review are essential for research integrity. All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must ensure the transparency and fairness of the process:

1. Experts as members of the IEP are chosen for their technical or scientific or industrial expertise to cover the topics addressed by the submitted proposals. They should perform their work to the best of their abilities, professional skills, knowledge and applying the highest ethical and moral standards.

2. All parties involved directly or indirectly in the evaluation must act objectively, with no self-interested motives. They do not represent their company, organisation or establishment.

3. The reviewers shall evaluate the proposals based solely upon the information contained in the proposals and in accordance with the Evaluation Guidelines.

4. The experts must immediately inform the Evaluation Office if they cannot fulfill their obligations.

5. The reviewers shall finish the individual written assessment for pre-proposals by 21.03.2025, at the latest and by 10.09.2025 for full-proposals; shall be available for discussions with other evaluators for the consolidation of the consensus report and agree to provide contact details to other evaluators.

6. The rapporteurs shall finish the consensus pre-proposals evaluation reports by 28.03.2025, at the latest and by 19.09.2025 for draft consensus full-proposals evaluation reports; they shall be available to moderate the discussions; they shall finish the final consensus evaluation reports after the EP meeting.

7. At the IEP meeting, decisions must be taken collectively by the IEP members after all arguments have been heard. Furthermore, decisions must be substantiated.

8. Opinions expressed during IEP meetings as well as information which parties are the first to obtain have to be kept confidential. The substance of the IEP debates must remain secret and the individual positions must not be divulged.

9. IEP members should refrain in all cases from identifying external experts to third parties, and from divulging any other information that could compromise their anonymity. Likewise, reviewers cannot contact the applicants nor the other reviewers during the individual evaluation of proposals.

10. If any reviewer is subject to any pressure whatsoever from a project partner, she or he must immediately notify the Evaluation Office.

11. If there is a conflict of interest, the concerned person must inform the Evaluation Office as soon as finding that a conflict exists. The necessary measures will be taken to ensure that the related decision and discussion will not be biased, or suspected to be so (e.g. in requesting the concerned person to leave the room when the project in question is being discussed during the IEP meeting).

12. The chairperson may, on his or her own initiative, consult the Evaluation Office in respect to a real or possible conflict of interest, which has been brought to his or her attention by any means whatsoever.

13. Compensations will be paid only if tasks were accomplished in accordance with the provisions of the Evaluation guidelines, within the given deadlines and in high quality after approval by the Call Board. Compensations may not be payed in case of breach of obligations relating to this Code of Conduct.

I agree to the rules of the confidentiality disclosure agreement,

I undertake to abide by the Code of Conduct:

☐ No ☐ Yes

Signature	

This agreement enters into force on the date of receipt of this signed letter by the Evaluation Office.