**Review of Call [year]**

**Country & Funding organisation (*please select*)**

**[list Countries and organisations]**

**Type of Organisation (*please select*)**

-- Please, select –

This organisation has applied to [Name Initivative] calls in previous years. (***please select***)

* Yes
* No

This organisation is frequently using other transnational funding schemes. (***please select***)

* Yes
* No

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stratus of the project** | **YES** | **NO** |
| Proposal is funded |  |  |
| Proposal was rejected |  |  |
| Project is carried out even without funding |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Consortium** |

Number of partners in your project consortium

Did you already know all partners in the consortium from previous project cooperation?

(***please select***)

* Yes
* No

If no, how many new partners did you have in this particular consortium?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **International Collaboration** | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| The [Name Initivative] Transnational Call is a funding instrument which is complementary to other funding instruments |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compared to pure national funding schemes, [Name Initivative] offers an attractive alternative of setting up transnational collaboration |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compared to other European funding sources, [Name Initivative] offers an attractive alternative of setting up transnational collaboration |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Call procedure** | **Strongly agree** | **Agree** | **Neutral** | **Disagree** | **Strongly disagree** |
| The application procedure / workflow was clear and transparent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Call website was clear and transparent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Guide for proposers was clear and transparent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal forms were clear and transparent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Submission of proposals was straight and  unbureaucratic |  |  |  |  |  |
| The funding process (contract negotiation, conditions, transfer of the first funding rate) was efficient and adequate in time |  |  |  |  |  |
| The funding process (contract negotiation, conditions, transfer of the first funding rate) was efficient and adequate in effort |  |  |  |  |  |
| [Name Initivative] feedback during the evaluation phase was clear |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Interaction with the National Agency |

Interaction with the national agency was constructive and efficient (Required)

* Strongly Agree
* Agree
* Neutral
* Disagree
* Strongly Disagree

Your advice for future [Name Initivative] calls

Please add your comments