

COST OFFICE Open Call

[Back to main menu](#)

Assessment for:



COST Domain Materials, Physical and Nanosciences

Proposal Reference oc-2008-2-2715

Title: Safe Steel Structures in Changing Climate Conditions (acronym: SSS-CCC)

	Evaluator		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Sum	Comments
1.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	4	2	3	2	15.00	
2.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	2	2	2	2	3	11.00	The proposal mentioned EU platforms in the area and thus COST is not needed for networking. The scientific quality seems rather low.
3.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	3	3	4	4	3	17.00	
4.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	3	3	4	4	18.00	
5.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	3	3	3	4	17.00	
6.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	4	3	3	3	17.00	
7.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	3	3	3	3	4	16.00	
8.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	3	3	2	3	3	14.00	This proposal is focused on the research areas of steel construction as element. The scientific programme is poorly written. It looks that research is not related with properties of steels.
9.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	4	2	4	3	17.00	
10.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	4	3	3	3	2	15.00	There is a clear need for sharpening the work plan! The applicants want to cover too much within the scope of one COST Action!
11.	Anonimaged	Anonimaged	3	2	3	4	3	15.00	
Average Votes:			3.45	3.09	2.73	3.27	3.09	15.64	

List of questions

RIGHT FOR COST?

Is COST the best mechanism for achieving the Action's objectives?

4. Meets all the criteria for COST; no other suitable funding instrument for this proposal.

3. Generally matches COST criteria, but some changes needed in Full Proposal (to be specified to Applicants)

Q.1 2. Not really for COST; another funding instrument would be more suitable (to be specified to Applicants).

1. Completely unsuitable for COST.

A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 AUTOMATICALLY TRIGGERS LOW SCORES IN THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

SCIENCE

Does the proposed Action address real current problems/ scientific issues?

4: Highly exciting and interesting proposal on a very important and/or timely topic

Q.2 3. Interesting proposal on an important topic.

2. Some interesting aspects, but lacks clarity and/or coherence.

1. Serious lack of substance and/or relevance.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)



INNOVATION**Is the proposed Action innovative?**

- Q.3
4. Highly innovative: identifies a significant new problem and/or a significant new approach.
 3. Some notable innovative aspects.
 2. Not very innovative: the topic is already well-studied and/or the proposal largely follows a well-trodden approach
 1. Not at all innovative.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

IMPACT**Would the proposed network make a significant difference in terms of knowledge, capacity building, social impacts, etc?**

- Q.4
4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
 3. Some notable impacts likely.
 2. May be some minor impacts.
 1. Unlikely to make any significant impacts.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

PRESENTATION**Is the proposed Action presented in a clear and understandable way?**

- Q.5
4. Very clearly written; well argued; makes a compelling case.
 3. Well written; the argument is easy to follow.
 2. Poorly written, but with some effort the argument is clear enough
 1. Poorly written, many errors, disorganised, hard to follow the argument.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

[disclaimer](#) | [data protection](#) | © 2008 COST Office

Brussels Thu 27 Nov 2008 16:55



Open Call

[Back to main menu](#)

Assessment for:



COST Domain Materials, Physical and Nanosciences

Proposal Reference oc-2008-2-2715

Title: Safe Steel Structures in Changing Climate Conditions (acronym: SSS-CCC)

Evaluator	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Sum	Comments
1. Anonimated	4	4	2	3	2	15.00	
2. Anonimated	2	2	2	2	3	11.00	The proposal mentioned EU platforms in the area and thus COST is not needed for networking. The scientific quality seems rather low.
3. Anonimated	3	3	4	4	3	17.00	
4. Anonimated	4	3	3	4	4	18.00	
5. Anonimated	4	3	3	3	4	17.00	
6. Anonimated	4	4	3	3	3	17.00	
7. Anonimated	3	3	3	3	4	16.00	
8. Anonimated	3	3	2	3	3	14.00	This proposal is focused on the research areas of steel construction as element. The scientific programme is poorly written. It looks that research is not related with properties of steels.
9. Anonimated	4	4	2	4	3	17.00	
10. Anonimated	4	3	3	3	2	15.00	There is a clear need for sharpening the work plan! The applicants want to cover too much within the scope of one COST Action!
11. Anonimated	3	2	3	4	3	15.00	
Average Votes:							3.45 3.09 2.73 3.27 3.09 15.64

List of questions

RIGHT FOR COST?

Is COST the best mechanism for achieving the Action's objectives?

4. Meets all the criteria for COST; no other suitable funding instrument for this

- proposal.
3. Generally matches COST criteria, but some changes needed in Full Proposal (to be specified to Applicants)
 2. Not really for COST; another funding instrument would be more suitable (to be specified to Applicants).
 1. Completely unsuitable for COST.
- A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 AUTOMATICALLY TRIGGERS LOW SCORES IN THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

- Q:1**
- SCIENCE**
Does the proposed Action address real current problems/ scientific issues?
- 4: Highly exciting and interesting proposal on a very important and/or timely topic
 - 3: Interesting proposal on an important topic.
 - 2: Some interesting aspects, but lacks clarity and/or coherence.
 - 1: Serious lack of substance and/or relevance.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

- Q:2**
- INNOVATION**
Is the proposed Action innovative?
- 4: Highly innovative: identifies a significant new problem and/or a significant new approach.
 - 3: Some notable innovative aspects.
 - 2: Not very innovative: the topic is already well-studied and/or the proposal largely follows a well-trodden approach
 - 1: Not at all innovative.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

- Q:3**
- IMPACT**
Would the proposed network make a significant difference in terms of knowledge, capacity building, social impacts, etc?
- 4: Important impacts very likely in several respects.
 - 3: Some notable impacts likely.
 - 2: May be some minor impacts.
 - 1: Unlikely to make any significant impacts.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

- Q:4**
- PRESENTATION**
Is the proposed Action presented in a clear and understandable way?
- 4: Very clearly written; well argued; makes a compelling case.
 - 3: Well written; the argument is easy to follow.
 - 2: Poorly written, but with some effort the argument is clear enough
 - 1: Poorly written, many errors, disorganised, hard to follow the argument.

(Answered by a value from 1 to 4)

disclaimer | data protection | © 2008 COST Office