



ATMO ACCESS
Access to Atmospheric Research Facilities

TNA General Evaluation Guidelines

v03

September 2023



This work has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme through the ATMO-ACCESS Integrating Activity under grant agreement No 101008004

atmo-access.eu

Table of content

1 Introduction	4
2 ATMO-ACCESS Evaluation Process	4
2.1 Eligibility check	4
2.2 Feasibility check	5
2.3 Independent Merit review and TNA selection	5
3 Roles and responsibilities	6
3.1 Access Evaluation Panel	6
3.1.1 Code of conduct	7
3.2 TNA providers	7
3.3 TNA Management Team	8
3.4 STVB/Coordination	8
4 General merit review criteria	8
4.1 Scoring system	9
4.2 Evaluation criteria for excellence-driven access	11
4.3 Evaluation criteria for market-driven access	13
4.4 Evaluation criteria for technical need-driven access	14
4.5 Evaluation criteria for training need-driven access	15
4.6 Bonus points	16
4.7 Ranking	17
4.8 Prioritization criteria	18
5 Reference documents	19
Annex 1 – Eligibility checklist (for the TNA Team only)	
Annex 2- TNA Feasibility checklist (for providers only)	
Annex 3 - TNA Merit review form for Excellence-driven access	
Annex 4- TNA Merit review form for Technical need-driven access	
Annex 5- TNA Merit review form for Market-driven access	
Annex 6- TNA Merit review form for Training need-driven access	

HISTORY OF CHANGES			
Version	Date	Prepared by / Modified by	Change
0.1	17/11/2021	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	First draft
0.2	25/11/2021	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Comments added by project coordination
1.0	1/12/2021	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Initial version following acknowledgment of the project coordination and the Scientific Steering Committee
1.1	18/05/2022	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Added training need-driven access mode with related evaluation criteria and review forms
1.2	21/06/2022	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Added input from project coordination about the 2 nd TNA call timeline and the need for a final selection of recommended TNA proposals by a joint Coordination/STVB/SAMU meeting
2.0	04/07/2022	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Second version, consolidating feedback and comments from discussion in the 2 nd TNA providers meeting (June 23, 2022)
3.0	08/09/2023	Rosa M. Petracca Altieri, WP9	Third version, incorporating input and suggestions from discussion in the ATMO-ACCESS Annual meeting in Valencia (March 29-30, 2023), SIAB advice, and further feedback and exchanges with reviewers and providers.

1 Introduction

These guidelines provide the criteria and procedures for evaluating the user TransNational Access (TNA) requests submitted under the ATMO-ACCESS project.

ATMO-ACCESS (Solutions for Sustainable Access to Atmospheric Research Facilities) is an Integrating Activity supported by the European Commission under the Horizon 2020 – Research and Innovation Framework Programme, H2020-INFRAIA-2020-3, Grant Agreement number 101008004.

The project offers unique opportunities for transnational access to state-of-the-art facilities belonging to the European research infrastructures Aerosol, Clouds and Trace Gases Research Infrastructure (ACTRIS), In-service Aircraft for a Global Observing System (IAGOS) and Integrated Carbon Observation System (ICOS).

The document describes the steps in the evaluation process, its inputs and outputs, the main general criteria and the responsibilities of the people participating in the process.

It is especially meant to guide members of the Access Evaluation Panel (AEP) in performing the fair merit review of user TNA proposals and to provide complete and transparent information to applicants on the selection process.

The Guidelines serve also as a primary point of reference for users requesting transnational access to understand the key questions they should address in their applications to prepare for evaluation properly.

The present version incorporates feedback received and results of the tests carried out with evaluations for the 2nd, 3rd, 4th TNA calls as well as the two special calls for Pilot AGORA Aerosol Training Course and for private access managed during the first half of the ATMO-ACCESS project.

The review of the Guidelines mainly focused on the following:

- 1) Addressing gender differently as a scoring criterion (see section 4.6),
- 2) Simplifying the evaluation process by exempting reviewers from non-merit assessments, such as user group compositions, new users, early career, and students (ibid)
- 3) Introducing ratings along with scoring (section 4.7).

2 ATMO-ACCESS Evaluation Process

Successful user TNA requests are established at the end of a multi-stage process that includes three main steps. Before undergoing actual merit evaluation - the third formal evaluation stage - the applications received are subject to two preliminary checks: eligibility and feasibility. Only proposals that successfully pass the eligibility and feasibility checks are retained for the independent review, which ascertains the scientific/technical merit or market relevance of the proposed access.

2.1 Eligibility check

The eligibility check is ensured by the TNA Management Team (WP9) using the checklist in Annex 1. TNA proposals must meet all the eligibility conditions set out for the access in the H2020 regulations, namely:

- **TransNationality:** the user group leader and the majority of the users must work in a country other than the country where the installation providing access is located (except for international organisations, an ERIC, the EC Joint Research Centre, or in case of remote access to a set of facilities in different countries offering the same type of service).
- **Affiliation:** applications from user groups with a majority of *users working outside EU* are eligible, though limits may be applied as TNA to users not working in an EU or associated country must be globally limited to max 20% of the total access units provided within the project.
- **Dissemination:** User groups shall be entitled to and willing to disseminate the knowledge they will generate under the project, unless they are working for private sector companies

If revisions are needed to make the proposal eligible, the user group leader is given details and asked to provide what needed by a fixed deadline.

Proposals and applicants shall remain eligible during the evaluation process as well as all throughout the actual provision of the granted TNA.

In the eligibility phase, the TNA Management Team also screens the proposals for the possible assignment of the bonus points referred to in section 4.6, which, however, are to be confirmed by the selection committee in the final selection meeting.

2.2 Feasibility check

The feasibility check aims to ascertain/confirm that the TNA requests can be dealt with successfully by the access provider, considering the facility calendar, the availability of logistical, human and financial resources to accommodate the access request, host users, provide on-site support, etc.

This step is minimized and only consists of completing a feasibility checklist (Annex 2) for Go/No-go when users and the facilities discuss the technical and scientific details before the formal submission of the application, as recommended in the TNA call.

If users and providers have not discussed the access project before submission, the feasibility check takes longer and covers the technical-scientific details. Interactions between providers and users can happen for that, in this phase, keeping always informed the TNA Team. During feasibility, the user can be asked, if needed, to amend the submitted proposal or submit a revised one.

2.3 Independent Merit review and TNA selection

The merit review and selection phase opens only for TNA proposals whose feasibility is confirmed by the TNA provider. Each TNA proposal is typically evaluated by an *ad-hoc panel* composed maximum of *three experts* from the Access Evaluation Panel (AEP, see section 3.1), identified based on their knowledge in the scientific or technical field that is the subject of the application to be reviewed. A *Rapporteur* is chosen¹ among the three to draw up a summary of the individual assessments.

¹ By the TNA Management Team at the moment of establishing the ad-hoc panel (see next section 3.3) and based on the independence criterion.

TNA requests only related to training, i.e. where training is not in connection to a wider scientific/technical project (for instance applications to participate to a scheduled training course, summer/winter school, or an online workshop, a conference, etc.) can be assigned to only one AEP expert for review.

Reviewers perform the individual evaluation of assigned proposals remotely, assessing the main elements (research activity and user group) against the general criteria detailed in [section 4](#)², giving marks and completing synthetic individual assessment reports (Annexes 3 - 5).

Once complete, the *Rapporteur* receives the individual reports and prepares an evaluation summary report formulating recommendations for the selection. Only where needed, if the Rapporteur deems it necessary to produce recommendations, a remote meeting is directly arranged within the ad-hoc panel, if necessary. Finally, recommendations for selection are notified to the TNA Management Team.

The TNA management Team draws up the shortlist of TNA proposals that pass the required thresholds and are recommended for selection by Rapporteurs. The shortlist ranks TNA applications based on the marks received and any advice from the independent experts concerning the priority order for proposals.

The TNA management Team transmits the shortlist to the Project Coordination and the Strategic TNA/VA Board (STVB)³ for their final selection in a consensus meeting in the presence of the TNA Management Team/SAMU⁴.

During the consensus meeting, the Project Coordination and the STVB establish the final list of selected TNA/VA projects, applying the agreed proposal acceptance rate⁵ and/or priorities following principles set in section 4.8.

3 Roles and responsibilities

3.1 Access Evaluation Panel

The independent merit review of the user TNA feasible proposals is entrusted to the ATMO-ACCESS Access Evaluation Panel, the project's consolidated source of reviewers from which members are drawn to serve on ad-hoc review panels for TNA proposals based on their expertise.

The Access Evaluation Panel guarantees that the selection of TNA proposals submitted by users is based on an expert, sound, fair, and transparent assessment.

Composition, members profile, appointment, mandate and tasks of the AEP members are described in detail in the AEP Terms of Reference [REF 2]. The AEP code of conduct is reported for convenience in the following section, though already included in the ToR.

² Further specific criteria can be introduced to meet the particular objectives and types of the ATMO-ACCESS TNA calls.

³ The STVB is a panel of experts acting as supervising board of whole process of TNA/VA attribution.

⁴ SAMU is the Service and Access Management Unit of the ACTRIS Head Office, participating in the ATMO-ACCESS project as TNA management Team.

⁵ To be decided based on the number of received applications per TNA call.

3.1.1 Code of conduct

1. The AEP members serve in their personal and technical capacities and do not represent their employer, institution or any other entity.
2. The AEP members perform the assigned reviews in a confidential, impartial, fair, and equitable way.
3. Upon receiving a request to serve in an ad-hoc review panel, the expert shall report any conflict of interest (see point 4) or, in case, any temporary unavailability to take part in the review of the specific individual TNA proposal assigned.
4. The AEP members must disclose to the TNA Team any interest, affiliation, or different factor that may create an actual or perceived conflict of interest in assessing a specific proposal. The following situations are automatically considered as *conflict of interest*:
 - a. if the reviewer was involved in the preparation of the application
 - b. if s/he works in the same department/laboratory/institute of the user group leader/members of the proposal
 - c. if s/he has an ongoing scientific collaboration with the user group leader/members
 - d. if s/he has close family ties or other close personal relationship with a member of the user group.
5. AEP members must not communicate and discuss the assigned TNA proposal with any other AEP member except those in the same ad-hoc panel established for review of the said proposal.
6. Unless foreseen by the procedure, the AEP members reviewing a TNA proposal must not directly communicate with persons involved in the proposal, namely the principal investigator, any team members or any person linked to the users' affiliated entities.
7. The AEP members shall maintain the confidentiality of any documents or files received for the evaluation, deleting all copies of the files they may have stored on personal devices upon completion of the assignment.
8. The AEP members must not disclose the results of the evaluation outcome.

3.2 TNA providers

TNA providers are responsible for the feasibility check ([section 2.2](#)) of the TNA proposals that concern their Facility/installation/services, having to confirm the scientific, technical and logistical viability of the TNA proposal, and if it fits (for the proposed timing and requirements) in their availability, schedule and plans.

To avoid possible bias in the selection process, direct contacts between the applicants and TNA providers before the actual provision of the access can only take place for the feasibility check:

- Preliminarily if, as recommended, applicants discuss with facilities the technical and scientific details of the proposed TNA before the formal submission of the application, or
- After eligibility and before independent merit review.

Outside feasibility and until the end of the selection, the exchanges between applicants and providers can only happen through the TNA Team.

3.3 TNA Management Team

The TNA Management Team is the main interface between all key actors involved in the evaluation of TNA proposals (users, access providers, Access Evaluation Panel members, Project Coordination, STVB). The Team is largely made up of staff from the ACTRIS SAMU⁶ and is responsible for organizing, coordinating and supervising all the process.

In particular, the TNA Team is responsible for:

- Receiving all applications and performing the preliminary eligibility check
- Liaising with TNA providers, users and review experts and supporting their work
- Communicating eligible requests to providers for the feasibility check
- Coordinating the review and selection process, establishing and instructing the ad-hoc review panels, proposing the Rapporteurs, and supporting their work
- Notifying users any possible request for further information from the reviewers or the providers
- Receiving the individual and summary evaluation reports, and preparing the shortlist of recommended TNA proposals
- Transferring the shortlist to the Project Coordination and the STVB for final selection
- Animating the consensus meeting
- Officially communicating the final decision on the TNA to the selected users.

3.4 STVB/Coordination

The STVB and the Project Coordination take part in the final evaluation step and are responsible for establishing the final list of approved TNA projects for each TNA Call.

The Project Coordination decides a specific proposal acceptance rate based on the number of received/accepted applications per TNA call, before the launch of the new call or, at the latest, by its closure date.

The STVB and Coordination receive the shortlisted TNA proposals and meet in the presence of SAMU to discuss and decide by consensus applying the agreed priorities where needed. The TNA projects are selected following a joint decision for or against each proposal.

4 General merit review criteria

The general criteria for selecting users to any ATMO-ACCESS facilities stem from the EU Charter of access to research infrastructures [REF 5], the contractual and legal obligations under the Grant Agreement [REF 1], and acknowledge the different purposes of access. For this reason, the evaluation criteria vary according to the main characteristic of the requested access, considering the following access modes:

- **Excellence-driven access:** when the access to services shall depend on the scientific excellence, originality, quality and novelty of an application.

⁶ The Service and Access Management Unit of the ACTRIS Head Office.

- **Innovation and Market-driven access:** when the request to access services comes from private sector users. In this case, the innovation potential of TNA proposals, possible technological developments as well as market developments and impacts on the economy are principally considered.
- **Technical need-driven access:** when access to services is required to meet technical needs to ensure instrument quality (maintenance, calibration, QA), high performance measurements, and operator training.
- **Training need-driven access:** when access to services is required to meet the researchers/operator training needs.

Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5 describe the evaluation criteria for each of the above categories of access. For each category (access mode), specific sets of evaluation criteria (sections) reflect the main evaluation issues that reviewers have to consider when examining the TNA proposals that fall under the category. Each section has its own specified range of marks available for evaluating the criteria based on the level of achievement or performance demonstrated.

4.1 Scoring system

For each access mode, evaluators assign points to individual criteria in the sections using whole numbers, ranging from 0 to 10 (Sections 1 of each access mode), from 0 to 5 (Sections 2), and from 0-3 (Section 3 in the excellence-driven access).

Table 1 below provides the scoring scheme and explanations:

SECTION 1			SECTION 2			SECTION 3 (where present)		
Score	Performance indicator	Descriptor	Score	Performance indicator	Descriptor	Score	Performance indicator	Descriptor
0	Inadequate	the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.	0	Inadequate	the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.	0	Inadequate	the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor	The TNA proposal is significantly deficient and lacks key elements required for a satisfactory	1	Poor	The TNA proposal is not very convincing, and presents numerous weaknesses.	1	Poor	The TNA proposal is not very convincing, and presents numerous weaknesses.

		evaluation against the specific criterion.						
2	Low	The proposal falls short of expectations and demonstrates limited elaboration or effectiveness.	2	Fair	The TNA proposal is moderately convincing on how it addresses the criterion, and presents some important inadequacies.	2	Good	The TNA proposal is good at addressing the criterion but presents some moderate shortcomings.
3	Weak	The proposal is below average and exhibits notable weaknesses or inadequacies.	3	Good	The TNA proposal is good at addressing the criterion but presents some moderate shortcomings	3	Very good	The TNA proposal is strong and addresses most aspects of the criterion convincingly, with minor weaknesses.
4	Fair	The proposal meets the basic requirements but lacks elements of strength or excellence.	4	Very good	The TNA proposal is strong and addresses most aspects of the criterion convincingly, with minor weaknesses.			
5	Average	The proposal is satisfactory and meets the standard expectations without standing out positively or negatively.	5	Excellent	The TNA proposal is fully convincing, without weaknesses.			
6	Sufficient	The proposal meets the requirements and expectations at a basic level without any notable strengths.						

7	Good	The proposal is above average, demonstrating proficiency and effectiveness with some strengths						
8	Very good	The proposal is strong and exhibits notable proficiency and effectiveness with several strengths						
9	Excellent	The proposal is outstanding and demonstrates exceptional competence, effectiveness, and numerous strengths						
10	Outstanding	The proposal is exceptional in all aspects, exceeding expectations and setting a high standard for evaluation						

Table 1 - TNA proposal marking scheme

With this scoring system, different sections of the evaluation can be weighted differently, reflecting their relative importance and complexity of the review. This approach offers flexibility to assess diverse aspects of the application, ensuring that each section is appropriately weighted and contributing to the overall assessment accurately.

4.2 Evaluation criteria for excellence-driven access

The peer-review of excellence-driven TNA projects considers the evaluation criteria in the following three sections:

1. Scientific and technical value
2. Novelty and innovation
3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Table 2 below describes each group, detailing the criteria, related explanation and maximum points that can be scored in the different sections.

Criterion	Explanation	Score / Points available
1 - Scientific and technical value		30
a) Scientific and technical quality	Clarity and pertinence of the scientific objectives. Appropriateness and rationale of the proposed scientific work. Degree to which it is based on sound scientific and technical principles.	0-10
b) Impact on science	Degree to which results and the new knowledge are useful and may have a significant impact on the academic community, exploring creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts. Potential of the research project to go beyond the state of the art and open new scientific, technological or scholarly horizons.	0-10
c) X-disciplinarity	Degree to which the proposed work identifies and builds/enables X-disciplinary developments beyond atmospheric science. Are there any research projects in Europe or internationally related to the proposal? Are possible synergies and interactions described?	0-10
2 - Novelty and innovation		15
a) Use of new technology, methodology, or innovative approaches in data interpretation	Degree to which the proposed work makes use of new technologies, methodologies or explores innovative measurement / data evaluation approaches.	0-5
b) Potential for seeding links with industry and innovation	Degree to which the proposed work shows potential for industrial applications, for contributing to new technology development, for prototype testing.	0-5
c) Novel or unconventional access approaches	Degree to which the TNA request proposes novel forms of access (combinations of remote and physical access; simultaneous, hybrid or sequential access to multiple facilities; use of facilities for novel purposes).	0-5
3 -Quality and efficiency of the implementation		6
a) Quality of the workplan and dissemination plan	Quality and effectiveness of the work plan. Feasibility of the approach and activities to be developed.	0-3

	Recipients of dissemination clearly identified (stakeholders that could uptake and make use of results) and activities carefully planned.	
b) Scientific qualification/ track-record of the user group	Research track-record, professional background, references, capabilities and experience of the user group leader and members. Degree to which the group presents a balanced participation of experienced and non-experienced users, who have the chance to learn from the others and be trained.	0-3

Table 2 - Evaluation criteria for excellence-driven access

4.3 Evaluation criteria for market-driven access

The assessment of market-driven TNA requests considers the following groups of evaluation criteria:

1. Scientific/technical value and Innovation
2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Table 3 below describes each group, detailing the criteria, related meaning and maximum points that can be scored.

Criterion	Explanation	Score / Points available
1 - Scientific/Technical value and Innovation		30
a) Scientific and technical quality	Is the proposed work based on a sound knowledge of the state of the art? Is the realization of the proposed solution/work realistic, considering the available knowledge, technical resources and expertise?	0-10
b) Likelihood of developing a new successful technology / product	The extent to which the proposed project will lead to new/improved products, processes or services with clear market potential.	0-10
c) Market potential (Anticipated benefits of the proposed work in comparison to current commercial and emerging technologies)	Is the solution a significant improvement over previous/other ongoing alternatives? Has it some potential to change the dynamic of the market and possibly to address a societal challenge?	0-10
2 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation		15

a) Quality of the workplan and exploitation plan	Appropriateness and rationale of the proposed scientific work. Does the proposed work include a credible path to deliver the (innovative) solution to the market? (i.e. adequacy of plans for commercialization and utilization of the proposed solution). Is there a clear future strategy for knowledge management and protection (IP strategy)?	0-5
b) References, capabilities and experience of the user group/company	Technical/scientific knowledge and experience of the team. Company profile and track-record.	0-5
c) Novel or unconventional access approaches	Degree to which the TNA request proposes novel forms of access (combinations of remote and physical access; simultaneous, hybrid or sequential access to multiple facilities; use of facilities for novel purposes)	0-5

Table 3 - Evaluation criteria for market-driven access

4.4 Evaluation criteria for technical need-driven access

The assessment of technical need-driven TNA requests considers evaluation criteria in the following two groups:

1. Scientific relevance
2. Technical need

Table 4 below describes each group, detailing the criteria, related explanation and maximum points that can be scored.

Criterion	Explanation	Score / Points available
1- Scientific relevance		30
a) Relevance of the instrument	Measurement needs served by the instrument and/or geographical pertinence.	0-10
b) Interest to the scientific community	Degree to which the requested service is useful to meet the quality expectations of a particular science community and/or end-users for the exploitation of data.	0-10
c) Availability and use of data (Dissemination plan)	Are the plans for a high-level exploitation of the instrument adequate? Is there any plan to make data and measurements supported by the instrument openly available through deposition in trusted repositories?	0-10

2 - Technical need		15
a) Frequency of the technical need	Is the requested service scheduled, required or recommended to continue ensure quality measurements?	0-5
b) Training for the staff using the instrument	Is training for the staff planned? Are proposals for such training innovative (i.e., remote training while the service occurs, etc.)?	0-5
c) References and experience of the user group	Research/measurements track-record and professional background	0-5

Table 4 - Evaluation criteria for technical need-driven access

4.5 Evaluation criteria for training need-driven access

The peer-review of training need-driven TNA applications considers the evaluation criteria in the following two groups:

1. Scientific/learning objectives and motivation
2. Quality of the applicant

Table 5 below describes each group, detailing the criteria, description and maximum points that can be scored.

Criterion	Explanation	Score / Points available
1 - Scientific/learning objectives and motivation		30
a) Relevance of the scientific and training objectives	Appropriateness, motivation, and completeness of the objectives of the proposed training.	0-10
b) Relevance of the training for the user current/future position	Degree to which the training is needed/useful and may have a significant impact on the applicants' career path. Would the applicants utilize knowledge and expertise gained regularly? How are the plans for exploiting the knowledge and skills acquired?	0-10
c) Relevance of the training for the belonging organization (multiplier effect of the training)	Degree to which the training is needed/useful for the operations/developments of the organization the users belong to. Degree to which the applicant could be counted on to further	0-10

	disseminate the knowledge and expertise gained (train the trainer).	
2 - Quality of the applicant		10
a) Academic achievement	Evidence from CV or references of higher degrees, publications, honors, awards and scholarships, research experience. Knowledge and expertise	0-5
b) Research potential	Applicant's ability to conduct independent research and contribute to the field. This can be evaluated based on their research interests, previous research experience, and any publications or conference presentations.	0-5

Table 5 - Evaluation criteria for training need-driven access

4.6 Bonus points

Bonus points up to a maximum of 3 are added by SAMU to the average scores obtained after review, and prior to final ranking, to ensure a comprehensive evaluation taking consideration also of non-purely merit-related aspects of the proposals. Bonus points are assigned for:

1. Gender empowerment: Using gender as a criterion for scoring project proposals has proved to be a complex and sensitive issue, as it involves potential biases and discrimination, even though it aims to help promote gender equality and diversity in research. There are two possible ways to use gender as a criterion:
 - a) Evaluate how proposals address gender issues and include a gender perspective in their research design (done by assessing the proposal's methodology, objectives, and expected outcomes).
 - b) Evaluate proposals based on the gender representation of the research team, assessing the distribution of leadership positions and decision-making roles (done by considering the user group and the distribution of tasks in the work plan).

Following advice from the SIAB, it was decided to concentrate on aspects sub b).

2. Collaboration and access to new users: to promote/favour the access to facilities to users that have never used the facility services before, or working in countries where no similar facilities exist.
3. Involvement of students / young scientists: to promote/favour access to facilities to students, post-graduates, and young researchers

Table 6 below provides the explanation and rules for assigning bonus points to the TNA proposals.

BONUS POINT	Explanation	Score / Points available	Rule for scoring
-------------	-------------	--------------------------	------------------

		3	
a) For Gender empowerment	In case of: a) female/non-binary leadership of the user group b) user groups composed of the majority of women c) 50%-50% gender balance in the user group	1	If at least one of a), b), c) is YES then score 1 Otherwise no score
b) For collaboration and access to new Users	In case of: a) users who have not made previous use of the facilities; b) users working in countries where facilities similar to those requested do not exist. c) users from non-atmospheric/non-academic domains	1	If at least one of a), b), c) is YES then score 1 Otherwise no score.
c) For involvement of students / young scientists	In case of early career scientists and students at PhD level and below involved in the project	1	If YES then score 1 Otherwise no score.

Table 6 - Bonus points, Explanation and rules for scoring

4.7 Ranking

After scoring and based on the scores obtained, TNA applications are classified based on the range of scores achieved, receiving specific grade labels.

The score thresholds are predetermined per each access mode according to the maximum scores available, considering the specific evaluation criteria and their scoring. **Table 7** reports the specific ranking scheme used in the different mode for evaluation.

EXCELLENCE-DRIVEN ACCESS					MARKET-DRIVEN ACCESS				
Max score (including bonus points): 54					Max score (including bonus points): 48				
Accepted	A	Excellent	A+	51.x-54	Accepted	A	Excellent	A+	40.x-48
			A	48.x-51				A	38.x-40
			A-	45.x-48				A-	36.x-38
Accepted	B	Good	B+	42.x-45	Accepted	B	Good	B+	34.x-36
			B	39.x-42				B	32.x-34
			B-	36.x-39				B-	30.x-32
accepted or rejected, for discussion	C	Average	C+	33.x-36	accepted or rejected, for discussion	C	Average	C+	28.x-30
			C	30.x-33				C	26.x-28
			C-	27.x-30				C-	24.x-26
Rejected	D	Poor	D	<27	Rejected	D	Poor	D	<24
(or for revision)	E	Rejected or not eligible	E		(or for revision)	E	Rejected or not eligible	E	

TECHNICAL NEED-DRIVEN ACCESS					TRAINING NEED-DRIVEN ACCESS				
Max score (including bonus points): 48					Max score (including bonus points): 43				
Accepted	A	Excellent	A+	40.x-48	Accepted	A	Excellent	A+	37.x-43
			A	38.x-40				A	35.x-37
			A-	36.x-38				A-	33.x-35
Accepted	B	Good	B+	34.x-36	Accepted	B	Good	B+	31.x-33
			B	32.x-34				B	29.x-31
			B-	30.x-32				B-	27.x-29
accepted or rejected, for discussion	C	Average	C+	28.x-30	accepted or rejected, for discussion	C	Average	C+	25.x-27
			C	26.x-28				C	23.x-25
			C-	24.x-26				C-	21.x-23
Rejected	D	Poor	D	<24	Rejected	D	Poor	D	<21
(or for revision)	E	Rejected or not eligible	E		(or for revision)	E	Rejected or not eligible	E	

Table 7 - Ranking schemes by access mode

4.8 Prioritization criteria

In case of need, when some TNA requests rank equally after merit review and there is a necessity to discriminate/restrict the number of TNA, the TNA management Team applies the prioritization criteria described in Table 5 in preparing the final list of recommended proposals. Priority will be given to TNA requests that obtained higher marks in the criteria reported in the table, where applicable and in order of importance:

Source of priority	#	Prioritization criteria	Excellence-driven	Technical need-driven	Market-driven	Training need-driven
H2020	1	Collaboration and access to new Users, considering in particular: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> users who have not previously used the installation and are working in countries where no equivalent research infrastructure exists users from new/relevant regions or from less-favoured regions users from non-academic / non-atmospheric domains. 	X	X	X	X
H2020, ATMO-ACCESS	2	Gender balance	X	X	X	X

ATMO-ACCESS	3	Novel or unconventional access approaches	X	X	X	
ATMO-ACCESS	4	X-disciplinarity	X			X
ATMO-ACCESS	5	Involvement of students / young scientists	X	X		X
ATMO-ACCESS	6	Potential for seeding links with industry and innovation	X			X
ATMO-ACCESS	7	Likelihood of developing a new successful technology/product with market potential			X	

Table 8 - Prioritization criteria

5 Reference documents

- REF 1. ATMO-ACCESS Grant Agreement (ID: 101008004)
- REF 2. [ATMO-ACCESS Terms Of Reference for the Access Evaluation Panel – AEP](#)
- REF 3. [ATMO-ACCESS Milestone 9.1: Description of application, review and selection process for TNA to ATMO-ACCESS facilities](#)
- REF 4. [European Commission \(2023\), HORIZON EUROPE Proposal Evaluation - Standard Briefing for Experts](#)
- REF 5. [European Commission \(2016\), European Charter for Access to Research Infrastructures: Principles and guidelines for access and related services](#). Publications Office of the European Union, 2015. ISBN: 978-92-79-45600-8, doi: 10.2777/524573, KI-04-15-085-EN-N.

Annex 1 – Eligibility checklist (for the TNA Team only)

Annex 2- TNA Feasibility checklist (for providers only)

Annex 3- TNA Merit review form for Excellence-driven access

Annex 4- TNA Merit review form for Technical need-driven access

Annex 5- TNA Merit review form for Market-driven access

Annex 6- TNA Merit review form for Training need-driven access

Annex 1- Eligibility checklist (for the TNA Team only)

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G--00000000...

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

Eligibility Review round (SAMU)

TNA Eligibility Checklist

ELIGIBILITY issues

Highlight of the application for the eligibility:

end date:

start date:

flexibility of dates:

host facility/ies (in case more than one send manually the feasibility to the second facility):

Do the user group leader and the majority of the users work in a country other than the country where the installation providing access is located? (TRANSNATIONALITY)

(No response)

How many Non-EU users in the group? (TRANSNATIONALITY)

(No response)

How many national users in the group? (TRANSNATIONALITY)

National users are users working in the same country where the requested facility is located

(No response)

Will data from measurements at ATMO-ACCESS facilities be provided for long term storage and access?

(DISSEMINATION)

(No response)

Is the information provided for dissemination plans complete and clear? (DISSEMINATION)

(No response)

Are the reasons for not disseminating valid (i.e. private sector users)

(No response)

Entity of the financial support requested by the user to ATMO-ACCESS

(No response)

Is the requested financial support reasonable?

Is it based on accurate, reliable cost estimates? Is the co-financing requested to ATMO-ACCESS reasonable?

(No response)

Entity of the financial support proposed to the TNA provider

(in case the support requested by the user is too high)

(No response)

Is the information provided in the mandatory fields complete and clear?

In case you answer NO or PARTIALLY, please provide explanations in the following question

(No response)

Compliance with applicable national legislations, health and safety regulations at the research facility concerned? (FINAL DECLARATIONS)

(No response)

Confirmation that each user group member has appropriate personal insurance during the (physical/combined) access? (FINAL DECLARATIONS)

(No response)

Information for TNA Reporting

Data and info collected for reporting to EU and KPIs monitoring

Number of users

(No response)

Number of female users

(No response)

Number of new users

cross-checked with the Provider

(No response)

Number of students

(No response)

Number of Early career scientists

(No response)

Bonus points

Gender empowerment	(No response)
New Users	(No response)
Students/Young Scientists	(No response)

Number of Private sector users

(No response)

Number of "internal" users (users and teams from teams from a ATMO facility/partner)

(No response)

Proposed form of access

(No response)

X-disciplinary access?

Ex. atmospheric - health - life science - social science domains

(No response)

Cross-sector access?

Ex. academic-private-public users

(No response)

Is the choice of the service type correct?

(No response)

Access mode (for EVALUATION)

(No response)

Comments, Remarks and proposed follow-up

(No response)

Remarks to the TNA provider (optional)

(No response)

Do you deem this proposal to be eligible or not?

(No response)

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G-00000000..

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

Feasibility Review Round (Service Provider)

TNA Feasibility checklist (For the ATMO ACCESS TNA Providers only)

The feasibility check aims to ascertain/confirm that the TNA requests can be dealt with successfully by the access provider, considering requirements from the users, facility calendar, the availability of logistical, human, and financial resources to accommodate the access request, host users, provide on-site support, etc.

Completing this checklist is particularly important when the TNA proposal was not discussed with the user before its submission.

In these cases, please highlight in the comments the issues that will need to be reconsidered in the following exchanges with the user group leader, which can be initiated by the TNA management Team and then managed directly between the user and provider. TNA Providers have to keep the TNA management Team always informed of developments in the contacts with users to evaluate any possible needed re-submission of the amended proposal before the merit review.

The only personal details we ask you to provide with this form will be your name, your facility, and the name of the user group leader.

No sensitive data are collected. All gathered information will be grouped at the ATMO ACCESS consortium level and used only for the TNA evaluation process. The individual answers and informed consent forms will be stored at the CNR until the end of the project. All information and responses to the questionnaire will be restricted to the participants in the individual TNA proposal evaluation.

For more information, please read our privacy notice <https://www.atmo-access.eu/atmo-access-privacy-policy/>.

By submitting the form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the above information.

Is the user group leader a previous user of the facility?

(No response)

Did other users from the same institution of the user group leader access your facility in the past?

(No response)

Did other users from the same country of the user group leader access your facility in the past?

(No response)

Have you discussed the proposal with the user before it submission?

(No response)

FEASIBILITY issues

Is your facility suitable for the given project?

(No response)

Are the proposed workplan, experimental setup and duration of the access project suitable?

(No response)

Do you have sufficient capacity/resources to support the project in the proposed period? (instrumentation, logistics, staff)?

(No response)

Estimated quantity of access to be allocated (indicate units of access)

Please provide an estimation of the number of expected units of access to provide the service.

(No response)

Entity of the financial support requested to ATMO-ACCESS by the user:

(€)

(€) *pre-populated field*

(€)

Entity of the financial proposed to the TNA provider by TNA coordination:

€ *pre-populated field*

Please provide here the amount of the travel and subsistence contribution you would like to grant to the user.

(The final amount of T&S contribution will be agreed in cooperation with TNA coordination after the selection of the application and before award communication to the user)

(No response)

In general, would you recommend the proposal for further selection?

(No response)

Overall assessment and final comments

Please describe your overall assessment of the proposal highlighting reasons for selection/rejection or any other issue not covered before.

(No response)

Required areas of expertise (to reviewers)

Please, indicate here the suitable areas of expertise that the reviewers shall have for a proper review of the TNA application.

(No response)

Please consider the following remarks from the TNA coordination:

- *pre-populated field*

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G--00000000....

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

TNA Merit Review Form (Excellence driven access)

Thank you for agreeing to contribute your expert opinion to the merit review of this TransNational Access (TNA) application.

The merit review is the third phase of the ATMO-ACCESS evaluation process, aimed at ascertaining the scientific/technical merit or market relevance of the proposed project and establishing the TNA proposals recommended for access.

Each TNA proposal is evaluated by an ad-hoc panel composed of a maximum of 3 members of the ATMO-ACCESS Access Evaluation Panel (AEP), identified based on their knowledge in the relevant scientific or technical field. A Rapporteur is chosen among the three to draw up a summary of the individual assessments.

Individual review of the proposals consists of:

- Reading and examining the assigned proposal, evaluating its main elements against the general criteria and weights detailed in the ATMO-ACCESS TNA Evaluation Guidelines.
- Assigning scores for each criterion.
- Providing brief explanatory comments sustaining the scores given.

This form is for the individual evaluation of TNA proposals for Excellence-driven access, that is access depending on the scientific excellence, quality and novelty of an application. As you evaluate the proposal, consider whether it satisfies the ATMO-ACCESS criteria for selection. Please, consult the ATMO-ACCESS TNA General Evaluation Guidelines for additional information.

Please note that the ATMO-ACCESS TNA programme is a competitive process with an **average 60% success rate**. If you want to see a proposal approved, show your preference with high scores.

The only personal details we ask you to provide with this form will be your name, your facility, and the name of the user group leader.

No sensitive data are collected. All gathered information will be grouped at the ATMO ACCESS consortium level and used only for the TNA evaluation process. The individual answers and informed consent forms will be stored at the CNR until the end of the project. All information and responses to the questionnaire will be restricted to the participants in the individual TNA proposal evaluation.

For more information, please read our privacy notice https://www.atmo-access.eu/atmo_access-privacy-policy/.

By submitting the form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the above information.

TNA proposal acronym

..... *(pre-populated field)*

User group leader name

..... *(pre-populated field)*

Facility requested

(pre-populated field)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 1: Scientific and technical value

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the scientific and technical value of the proposed access. Please give points to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 10 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate): the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (Poor): the TNA proposal is significantly deficient and lacks key elements required for a satisfactory evaluation against the specific criterion.

2 (Low): the proposal falls short of expectations and demonstrates limited elaboration or effectiveness.

3 (Weak): the proposal is below average and exhibits notable weaknesses or inadequacies.

4 (Fair): the proposal meets the basic requirements but lacks elements of strength or excellence.

5 (Average): the proposal is satisfactory and meets the standard expectations without standing out positively or negatively.

6 (Sufficient): the proposal meets the requirements and expectations at a basic level without any notable strengths.

7 (Good): the proposal is above average, demonstrating proficiency and effectiveness with some strengths

8 (Very good): the proposal is strong and exhibits notable proficiency and effectiveness with several strengths

9 (Excellent): the proposal is outstanding and demonstrates exceptional competence, effectiveness, and numerous strengths

10 (Outstanding): The proposal is exceptional in all aspects, exceeding expectations and setting a high standard for evaluation

Scientific and technical quality

Please, consider and rate the clarity and pertinence of the scientific objectives. Appropriateness and rationale of the proposed scientific work. The degree to which the proposal builds on sound scientific and technical principles.

(No response)

Impact on science

Please, rate the degree to which results and new knowledge are useful and may have a significant impact on the academic community, exploring creative, original, or potentially transformative concepts.

Potential of the research project to go beyond the state of the art and open new scientific, technological or scholarly horizons.

(No response)

X-disciplinarity

Please, rate the degree to which the proposed work identifies and builds/enables X-disciplinary developments beyond atmospheric science. Are there any research projects in Europe or internationally related to the proposal? Are possible synergies and interactions described?

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 1: Scientific and technical value

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 2: Novelty and innovation

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the novelty and innovation of the proposed access. Please give a mark to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 5 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate/inapplicable): the proposal fails to address the criterion or provides insufficient information to judge);

1 (Poor): the proposal is not very convincing, with numerous weaknesses;

2 (Fair): the proposal is moderately convincing, though it presents some important inadequacies;

3 (Good): the proposal is good at addressing the criterion, with moderate shortcomings;

4 (Very Good): the proposal is strong, with minor weaknesses;

5 (Excellent): the proposal is fully convincing.

Use of new technology, methodology, or innovative approaches in data interpretation

Please, rate the degree to which the proposed work makes use of new technologies, and methodologies or explores innovative measurement/data evaluation approaches. ?

(No response)

Potential for seeding links with industry and innovation

Please, rate the degree to which the proposed work shows potential for industrial applications, for contributing to new technology development, for prototype testing.

(No response)

Novel or unconventional access approaches

Please, rate the degree to which the TNA request proposes novel forms of access (combinations of remote and physical access; simultaneous, hybrid or sequential access to multiple facilities; use of facilities for novel purposes).

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 2: Novelty and Innovation

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 3: Quality and efficiency of the implementation

This section considers 2 main criteria for evaluating the quality and effectiveness of the proposed implementation.

Please give a mark to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 3 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate): the proposal fails to address the criterion or provides insufficient information to judge;

1 (Poor): the proposal is not very convincing, with numerous weaknesses;

2 (Good): the proposal is good at addressing the criterion but presents some moderate shortcomings.;

3 (Very Good): the proposal is strong and addresses most aspects of the criterion convincingly.

Quality of the work plan and dissemination plan

Please, rate the quality and effectiveness of the work plan. Feasibility of the approach and activities to be developed.

Recipients of dissemination clearly identified (stakeholders that could uptake and make use of results) and activities are carefully planned.

(No response)

Scientific qualification / track-record of the user group

Please, rate the research track record, professional background, references, capabilities, and experience of the user group leader and members. Also consider the degree to which the group presents a balanced participation of experienced and non-experienced users, who have the chance to learn from the others.

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 3: Quality of the applicant.

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Final comments

(No response)

Would you select this TNA for acceptance

(No response)

You can download and save your review before submitting it.

Click on the 3 dots in the right upper corner to select "Download my review"

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G--00000000...

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

TNA Merit Review Form (Technical need-driven access)

Thank you for agreeing to contribute your expert opinion to the merit review of this TransNational Access (TNA) application.

The merit review is the third phase of the ATMO-ACCESS evaluation process, aimed at ascertaining the scientific/technical merit or market relevance of the proposed project and establishing the TNA proposals recommended for access.

Each TNA proposal is evaluated by an ad-hoc panel composed of a maximum of 3 members of the ATMO-ACCESS Access Evaluation Panel (AEP), identified based on their knowledge in the relevant scientific or technical field. A Rapporteur is chosen among the three to draw up a summary of the individual assessments.

Individual review of the proposals consists of the following:

- Reading and examining the assigned proposal, evaluating its main elements against the general criteria and weights detailed in the ATMO-ACCESS TNA Evaluation Guidelines.
- Assigning scores for each criterion.
- Providing brief explanatory comments sustaining the scores given.

This form is for the individual evaluation of TNA proposals for Technical need-driven access, that is access depending on the scientific excellence, quality, and novelty of an application. As you evaluate the proposal, consider whether it satisfies the ATMO-ACCESS criteria for selection. Please, consult the ATMO-ACCESS TNA General Evaluation Guidelines for additional information.

Please note that the ATMO-ACCESS TNA programme is a competitive process with an **average 60% success rate**. **If you want to see a proposal approved, show your preference with high scores.**

No sensitive data are collected. All gathered information will be grouped at the ATMO ACCESS consortium level and used only for the TNA evaluation process. The individual answers and informed consent forms will be stored at the CNR until the end of the project. All information and responses to the questionnaire will be restricted to the participants in the individual TNA proposal evaluation.

For more information, please read our privacy notice https://www.atmo-access.eu/atmo_access-privacy-policy/

By submitting the form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the above information.

TNA proposal acronym

.... *(pre-populated field)*

User group leader name

..... *(pre-populated field)*

Facility requested

... *(pre-populated field)*

Evaluation Criteria - Section 1: Scientific relevance

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the technical and scientific relevance of the proposed access.

Please give points to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 10 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate): the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (Poor): the TNA proposal is significantly deficient and lacks key elements required for a satisfactory evaluation against the specific criterion.

2 (Low): the proposal falls short of expectations and demonstrates limited elaboration or effectiveness.

3 (Weak): the proposal is below average and exhibits notable weaknesses or inadequacies.

4 (Fair): the proposal meets the basic requirements but lacks elements of strength or excellence.

5 (Average): the proposal is satisfactory and meets the standard expectations without standing out positively or negatively.

6 (Sufficient): the proposal meets the requirements and expectations at a basic level without any notable strengths.

7 (Good): the proposal is above average, demonstrating proficiency and effectiveness with some strengths

8 (Very good): the proposal is strong and exhibits notable proficiency and effectiveness with several strengths

9 (Excellent): the proposal is outstanding and demonstrates exceptional competence, effectiveness, and numerous strengths

10 (Outstanding): The proposal is exceptional in all aspects, exceeding expectations and setting a high standard for evaluation.

Relevance of the instrument

Please assess the measurement needs served by the instrument and/or geographical pertinence.

(No response)

Interest to the scientific community

Please, rate the degree to which the requested service is useful to meet the quality expectations of a particular science community and/or end-users for the exploitation of data.

(No response)

Availability and use of data (Dissemination plan)

Please, rate the degree to which the plans for high-level exploitation of the instrument are adequate. Is there any plan to make data and measurements supported by the instrument openly available through deposition in trusted repositories?

(No response)

Please shortly comment on the scores given in Section 1: Scientific relevance

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 2: Technical need

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the quality and characteristics of the user group. Please give a mark to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 5 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate/inapplicable): the proposal fails to address the criterion or provides insufficient information to judge);

1 (Poor): the proposal is not very convincing, with numerous weaknesses;

2 (Fair): the proposal is moderately convincing, though it presents some important inadequacies;

3 (Good): the proposal is good at addressing the criterion, with moderate shortcomings;

4 (Very Good): the proposal is strong, with minor weaknesses;

5 (Excellent): the proposal is fully convincing.

Frequency of the technical need

Please, rate the degree to which the requested service is scheduled, required or recommended to continue to ensure quality measurements.

(No response)

Training for the staff using the instrument

Please, rate the degree to which training for the staff is planned. Are proposals for such training innovative (i.e., remote training while the service occurs, etc.)?

(No response)

References and experience of the user group

Please, rate the research/measurements track-record and professional background.

(No response)

Please shortly comment on the scores given in Section 2: Technical need

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Final comments

(No response)

Would you select this TNA for acceptance?

(No response)

You can download and save your review before submitting

Click on the 3 dots on the right upper corner to select "Download my review"

Annex 5- TNA Merit review form for Market-driven access

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G--00000000...

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

TNA Merit Review Form (Market-driven access)

Thank you for agreeing to contribute your expert opinion to the merit review of this TransNational Access (TNA) application.

The merit review is the third phase of the ATMO-ACCESS evaluation process, aimed at ascertaining the scientific/technical merit or market relevance of the proposed project and establishing the TNA proposals recommended for access.

Each TNA proposal is evaluated by an ad-hoc panel composed of a maximum of 3 members of the ATMO-ACCESS Access Evaluation Panel (AEP), identified based on their knowledge in the relevant scientific or technical field. A Rapporteur is chosen among the three to draw up a summary of the individual assessments.

Individual review of the proposals consists of:

- Reading and examining the assigned proposal, evaluating its main elements against the general criteria and weights detailed in the ATMO-ACCESS TNA Evaluation Guidelines.
- Assigning scores for each criterion.
- Providing brief explanatory comments sustaining the scores given.

This form is for the individual evaluation of TNA proposals for Market-driven access, that is access involving users from the private sector. As you evaluate the proposal, consider whether it satisfies the ATMO-ACCESS criteria for selection. Please, consult the ATMO ACCESS TNA General Evaluation Guidelines for additional information.

Please note that the ATMO-ACCESS TNA programme is a competitive process with an **average 60% success rate**. **If you want to see a proposal approved, show your preference with high scores.**

No sensitive data are collected. All gathered information will be grouped at the ATMO ACCESS consortium level and used only for the TNA evaluation process. The individual answers and informed consent forms will be stored at the CNR until the end of the project. All information and responses to the questionnaire will be restricted to the participants in the individual TNA proposal evaluation.

For more information, please read our privacy notice https://www.atmo-access.eu/atmo_access-privacy-policy/

By submitting the form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the above information.

TNA proposal acronym

...

(pre-populated field)

User group leader name

.....

(pre-populated field)

Facility requested

.....

(pre-populated field)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 1: Scientific/technical value and Innovation

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the scientific and technical value of the proposed access. Please give points to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 10 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate): the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (Poor): the TNA proposal is significantly deficient and lacks key elements required for a satisfactory evaluation against the specific criterion.

2 (Low): the proposal falls short of expectations and demonstrates limited elaboration or effectiveness.

3 (Weak): the proposal is below average and exhibits notable weaknesses or inadequacies.

4 (Fair): the proposal meets the basic requirements but lacks elements of strength or excellence.

5 (Average): the proposal is satisfactory and meets the standard expectations without standing out positively or negatively.

6 (Sufficient): the proposal meets the requirements and expectations at a basic level without any notable strengths.

7 (Good): the proposal is above average, demonstrating proficiency and effectiveness with some strengths

8 (Very good): the proposal is strong and exhibits notable proficiency and effectiveness with several strengths

9 (Excellent): the proposal is outstanding and demonstrates exceptional competence, effectiveness, and numerous strengths

10 (Outstanding): The proposal is exceptional in all aspects, exceeding expectations and setting a high standard for evaluation.

Scientific and technical quality

Please, rate the degree to which the proposed work is based on a sound knowledge of the state of the art, and the realization of the proposed solution/work is realistic, considering the available knowledge, technical resources, and expertise.

(No response)

Likelihood of developing a new successful technology/product

Please, rate the extent to which the proposed project will lead to new and improved products, processes or services with clear market potential.

(No response)

Market Potential (anticipated benefits of the proposed work in comparison to current commercial and emerging technologies)

Please, rate the degree to which the solution is a significant improvement over previous/other ongoing alternatives, and its potential to change the dynamic of the market and possibly to address a societal challenge.

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 1: Scientific/technical value and Innovation

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 2: Quality and efficiency of the implementation

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the novelty and innovation of the proposed access. Please give a mark to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 5 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate/inapplicable): the proposal fails to address the criterion or provides insufficient information to judge);

1 (Poor): the proposal is not very convincing, with numerous weaknesses;

2 (Fair): the proposal is moderately convincing, though it presents some important inadequacies;

3 (Good): the proposal is good at addressing the criterion, with moderate shortcomings;

4 (Very Good): the proposal is strong, with minor weaknesses;

5 (Excellent): the proposal is fully convincing.

Quality of the work plan and exploitation plan

Appropriateness, rationale, and completeness of the proposed scientific work. Does the proposed work include a credible path to deliver the (innovative) solution to the market? (i.e. adequacy of plans for commercialization and utilization of the proposed solution). Is there a clear future strategy for knowledge management and protection (IP strategy)?

(No response)

References, capabilities and experience of the user group/company

Please, rate the technical/scientific knowledge and experience of the team, considering the company profile if provided.

(No response)

Novel or unconventional access approaches

Please, rate the degree to which the TNA request proposes novel forms of access (combinations of remote and physical access; simultaneous, hybrid or sequential access to multiple facilities; use of facilities for novel purposes).

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 2: Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Final comments

(No response)

Would you select this TNA for acceptance?

(No response)

You can download and save your review before submitting

Click on the 3 dots on the right upper corner to select "Download my review"

Application: ATMO-TNA-5G--0000000015

ATMO-ACCESS 5th Call for Transnational Access

TNA Merit Review Form (Training need-driven access)

Thank you for agreeing to contribute your expert opinion to the merit review of this TransNational Access (TNA) application.

The merit review is the third phase of the ATMO-ACCESS evaluation process, aimed at ascertaining the scientific/technical merit or market relevance of the proposed project and establishing the TNA proposals recommended for access.

Each TNA proposal is evaluated by an ad-hoc panel composed of a maximum of 3 members of the ATMO-ACCESS Access Evaluation Panel (AEP), identified based on their knowledge in the relevant scientific or technical field. A Rapporteur is chosen among the three to draw up a summary of the individual assessments.

Individual review of the proposals consists of:

- Reading and examining the assigned proposal, evaluating its main elements against the general criteria and weights detailed in the ATMO-ACCESS TNA Evaluation Guidelines.
- Assigning scores for each criterion.
- Providing brief explanatory comments sustaining the scores given.

This form is for the individual evaluation of TNA proposals for Training need-driven access, that is access required to ensure users advanced or technical training. As you evaluate the proposal, consider whether it satisfies the ATMO-ACCESS criteria for selection. Please, consult the ATMO-ACCESS TNA General Evaluation Guidelines for additional information.

Please note that the ATMO-ACCESS TNA programme is a competitive process with an **average 60% success rate**.

If you want to see a proposal approved, show your preference with high scores.

No sensitive data are collected. All gathered information will be grouped at the ATMO ACCESS consortium level and used only for the TNA evaluation process. The individual answers and informed consent forms will be stored at the CNR until the end of the project. All information and responses to the questionnaire will be restricted to the participants in the individual TNA proposal evaluation.

For more information, please read our privacy notice https://www.atmo-access.eu/atmo_access-privacy-policy/.

By submitting the form, you acknowledge that you have read and understood the above information.

TNA proposal acronym

..... *(pre-populated field)*

User group leader name

..... *(pre-populated field)*

Facility requested

..... *(pre-populated field)*

Evaluation Criteria - Section 1: Scientific/learning objectives and motivation

This section considers 3 main criteria for evaluating the technical and scientific relevance of the proposed access.

Please give points to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 10 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate): the proposal fails to address the issue under examination or cannot be judged against the criterion due to missing or incomplete information.

1 (Poor): the TNA proposal is significantly deficient and lacks key elements required for a satisfactory evaluation against the specific criterion.

2 (Low): the proposal falls short of expectations and demonstrates limited elaboration or effectiveness.

3 (Weak): the proposal is below average and exhibits notable weaknesses or inadequacies.

4 (Fair): the proposal meets the basic requirements but lacks elements of strength or excellence.

5 (Average): the proposal is satisfactory and meets the standard expectations without standing out positively or negatively.

6 (Sufficient): the proposal meets the requirements and expectations at a basic level without any notable strengths.

7 (Good): the proposal is above average, demonstrating proficiency and effectiveness with some strengths

8 (Very good): the proposal is strong and exhibits notable proficiency and effectiveness with several strengths

9 (Excellent): the proposal is outstanding and demonstrates exceptional competence, effectiveness, and numerous strengths

10 (Outstanding): The proposal is exceptional in all aspects, exceeding expectations and setting a high standard for evaluation.

Relevance of the scientific and training objectives

Appropriateness, motivation, and completeness of the objectives of the proposed training.

(No response)

Relevance of the training for the user current/future position

Degree to which the training is needed/useful and may have a significant impact on the applicants' career path. Would the applicants utilize the knowledge and expertise gained regularly? How are the plans for exploiting the knowledge and skills acquired?

(No response)

Relevance of the training for the belonging organization (multiplier effect of the training)

Degree to which the training is needed/useful for the operations/developments of the organization the users belong to.

Degree to which the applicants could be counted on to further disseminate the knowledge and expertise gained (train the trainer).

(No response)

Please shortly comment the scores given in Section 1: Scientific/Learning objectives and motivation.

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Evaluation Criteria - Section 2: Quality of the applicant

This section considers 2 main criteria for evaluating the quality and characteristics of the user group. Please give a mark to each of the criteria, using whole numbers ranging from 0 to 5 following this scheme:

0 (Inadequate/inapplicable): the proposal fails to address the criterion or provides insufficient information to judge);

1 (Poor): the proposal is not very convincing, with numerous weaknesses;

2 (Fair): the proposal is moderately convincing, though it presents some important inadequacies;

3 (Good): the proposal is good at addressing the criterion, with moderate shortcomings;

4 (Very Good): the proposal is strong, with minor weaknesses; 5 (Excellent): the proposal is fully convincing.

Academic achievement

Based on evidence from CV or references of higher degrees, publications, honours, awards and scholarships, research experience.

(No response)

Research potential

Applicant's ability to conduct independent research and contribute to the field. This can be evaluated based on their research interests, previous research experience, and any publications or conference presentations.

(No response)

Please shortly comment on the scores given in Section 2: Quality of the applicant

Please highlight the main reasons for the marks given to questions in the present section.

(No response)

Final comments

(No response)

Would you select this TNA for acceptance?

(No response)

You can download and save your review before submitting

Click on the 3 dots on the right upper corner to select "Download my review"