

CODE OF CONDUCT

1. PERFORMING THE WORK

1.1 The **EVALUATOR** must work independently, in a personal capacity and not on behalf of any organisation.

1.2 The **EVALUATOR** must:

- a) evaluate each proposal in a confidential and fair way, in accordance with the applicable rules;
- b) perform his/her work to the best of his/her abilities, professional skills, knowledge and applying the highest ethical and moral standards;
- c) follow the instructions and time-schedule given by **SPLORO**.

1.3 The **EVALUATOR** may not delegate the work to another person or be replaced by another person.

1.4 If a person or entity involved in a proposal(s) approaches the expert before or during the evaluation, s/he must immediately inform the **SPLORO** and the responsible project staff.

1.5 The **EVALUATOR** may not be (or become) involved in any of the actions resulting from the proposal(s) that s/he evaluated (at any stage of the procedure).

2. IMPARTIALITY

2.1 The **EVALUATOR** must perform his/her work impartially and take all measures to prevent any situation where the impartial and objective implementation of the work is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties or any other shared interest ('conflict of interests').

The following situations will automatically be considered as conflict of interest:

- a) **for a proposal(s) s/he is requested to evaluate**, if s/he:
 - I. was involved in the preparation of the proposal(s);
 - II. is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant (or linked
 - III. third party or other third party involved in the action);
 - IV. is employed or contracted by one of the applicants (or linked third parties, named subcontractors or other third parties involved in the action).

In this case, the expert must be excluded from the evaluation of the proposal(s) concerned (and may not take part in the consensus group, panel review or hearings when the proposal(s) is being discussed). Part(s) of an evaluation to which the **EVALUATOR** already participated must be declared void. Comments and scores already given must be discounted. If necessary, the expert must be replaced, and the proposal(s) concerned must be re-evaluated.

However, in exceptional and duly justified cases, the responsible **SPLORO** staff may decide to nevertheless invite the **EVALUATOR** to take part in the panel meeting, if:

- I. the **EVALUATOR** works in a different department/laboratory/institute from the one where the action is to be carried out and,
- II. the departments/laboratories/institutes within the organisation concerned operate with a high degree of autonomy and,
- III. the participation is justified by the requirement to appoint the best available experts and by the limited size of the pool of qualified experts.

In this case, the other **EVALUATORS** in the group of evaluators will be informed about the situation of the **EVALUATOR**.

- b) for a proposal(s) s/he is requested to evaluate **AND** for all proposal(s) competing for the same call budget-split, if s/he:
- I. was involved in the preparation of any proposal(s) submitted to the same topic/other topic within the same call budget-split;
 - II. would benefit if any proposal(s) submitted to the same topic/other topic within the same call budget split is accepted or rejected;
 - III. has close family ties (spouse, domestic or non-domestic partner, child, sibling, parent etc.) or other close personal relationship with a person (including linked third parties or other third parties) involved in the preparation of any proposal(s) submitted to the same topic/other topic within the same call budget-split, or with a person which would benefit if such a proposal(s) is accepted or rejected.

In this case, the **EVALUATOR** must be excluded from the evaluation of the proposal(s) concerned **AND** from all the proposal(s) competing for the same call budget-split. Part(s) of an evaluation to which the **EVALUATOR** already participated must be declared void. Comments and scores already given must be discounted. If necessary, the **EVALUATOR** must be replaced, and the proposal(s) concerned must be re-evaluated.

- c) The following situations may be considered as conflict of interest if **SPLORO's** staff so decides, in view of the objective circumstances, the available information and the potential risks:
- I. employment of the **EVALUATOR** by one of the applicants (or linked third parties or other third parties involved in the action) in the last year;
 - II. involvement of the **EVALUATOR** in a contract, grant, prize, or membership of management structures (e.g. member of management or advisory board etc.) or research collaboration with an applicant, linked third party or other third party involved in the action in the last year;
 - III. any other situation that could cast doubt on his/her ability to participate in the evaluation impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an outside third party.

In this case, the **SPLORO's** staff may decide to exclude the **EVALUATOR** from the evaluation (and on the scope, i.e. only for the proposal(s) concerned or also for competing proposal(s) or the entire call) and, if necessary, to replace him/her and organise a re-evaluation.

2.2 The **EVALUATOR** will be required to confirm — for each proposal(s) s/he is evaluating — that there is no conflict of interest, by signing a declaration in the **SPLORO PLATFORM**.