

Evaluation criteria for the programmes and projects in the Fram centre call for cooperation published in spring 2026

Sections 1 and 2 refer to the workshop process for the programmes and section 3 is relevant for all evaluations (programmes and projects) by external experts.

Section 1

These are the criteria for guidance in advance of the workshop each criterion will be given a score out of 5 following the “score” description at the end of this document. Each research group/draft/letter of intent will receive a total score out of 20.

- 1.1 Relevance to the programme text described in the call
- 1.2. Potential for an inter- and transdisciplinary approach
- 1.3 Potential relevance for management needs in the High North and arctic regions
- 1.4 Potential for unique collaboration to arise from the idea/group

Section 2

These are the criteria which will be used to select the group who will be invited to establish a consortium following the workshop. Each criterion will be given a score out of 5 following the “score” description at the end of this document. Each consortium/draft/letter of intent will receive a score out of 30.

- 2.1 Relevance to the programme text described in the call
- 2.2 Potential for an inter- and transdisciplinary approach
- 2.3 Potential relevance for management needs in the high north and arctic regions
- 2.4 Potential for unique collaboration to arise from the idea/group
- 2.5 Potential for excellence in the scientific output
- 2.6 Potential for production of knowledge relevant for management of the high north and arctic.

Section 3

These are the criteria and instructions to the international evaluators.

Instructions to evaluators:

- **Evaluation documentation**, all parts should be taken into consideration when carrying out the evaluation, and consist of:
 - Proposal (s)
 - Assessment Criteria which can be found under (this document)
 - Fram Centre Strategy
- **What to do** - please answer each of the questions 1-5 to the best of your ability. We expect your review to be no longer than 2 A4 pages.

Q1. Will this proposal contribute to achieving the goals outlined in the project/programme description and the Fram Centre goals?

Q2. Can you highlight some strengths of the proposal?

Q3. Can you highlight some weaknesses of the proposal?

Q4. Can you suggest areas for improvement?

The following sections (Q 5.1, 5.2, 5.3) require both a written and a score out 5. For scoring criteria please see the end of this document. The total score will be the sum of these i.e.. a score between 0-15

Q5. Excellence, Impact and Implementation

We expect a short paragraph under each of the following headings, the text in the box underneath the headings are the points we would expect to be addressed.

Q 5.1 Excellence

The extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, novel, and goes beyond the state-of-the-art

- *Scientific creativity and originality.*
- *Novelty and boldness of hypotheses or research questions.*
- *Potential for development of new knowledge beyond the current state-of-the-art, including significant theoretical, methodological, experimental or empirical advancement.*

The quality of the proposed R&D activities

- *Quality of the research questions, hypotheses and project objectives, and the extent to which they are clearly and adequately specified.*
- *Credibility and appropriateness of the theoretical approach, research design and use of scientific methods. Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches.*
- *The extent to which appropriate consideration has been given to ethical issues, safety issues, gender dimension in research content, and use of stakeholder/user knowledge if appropriate.*

Q5.2. Impact

Potential impact of the proposed research

- *Potential for societal impact:*
 - *The extent the planned outputs will be useful for the management of the Norwegian High North.*
- *Potential for academic impact:*

The extent to which the planned outputs of the project address important present and/or future scientific challenges.
- *Appropriate cooperation within the Fram Centre.*

Communication and exploitation

- *Quality and scope of communication and engagement activities with different target audiences, including relevant stakeholders/users.*

Q5.3. Implementation

The quality of the project manager and project group

- *The extent to which the project manager and project leader group has relevant expertise and experience to perform the research as described.*
- *The degree of complementarity of the participants and the extent to which the project group has the necessary expertise needed to undertake the research effectively.*

The quality of the project organisation and management

- *Effectiveness of the project organisation, including the extent to which resources assigned to work packages are aligned with project objectives and deliverables.*
- *Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.*
- *Appropriateness of the proposed management structures and governance.*
- *Is the suggested budget realistic?*

Scoring

Interpretation of the score:

- **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. (*ref. beskrivelser EU*)