

Evaluation Criteria and Process for IRDR Pilot Study

The IRDR Pilot Study (PS) is a research project focusing on the research priorities proposed in the IRDR Action Plan, and supported by the operational funding of IRDR International Programme Office (IPO). Upon approval, a formal contract will be established between the host institute of IRDR IPO and the host institute of the successful applicant. Consequently, the evaluation process and criteria are designed to reflect the requirements of the IRDR scientific merits and the administrative rules of the host institute of IRDR IPO.

Evaluation Process

I. **Establishment of Evaluation Committee**

An evaluation committee is established by the IRDR IPO for this purpose. The committee will comprise four experts from the IRDR Scientific Committee (SC) members, IRDR Fellows, partners with expertise directly relevant to the themes of the research proposals, and one IPO staff member. Separate committees may be established to evaluate applicants from distinct thematic areas.

II. **Scoring Procedure**

The members of the evaluation committee will evaluate each application using a standardized form provided by the IRDR IPO. They are required to provide a score for each criterion, as well as an overall final, weighted score for the application. The IRDR IPO will compile all the scores and calculate the average final score for each application. The methodology is stated in the section “Calculation of Scores”.

III. **Decision-Making and Announcement**

The IRDR IPO will review the results and make the final decisions. An official announcement of the results will be disseminated by the IRDR IPO via email to all applicants and published on the IRDR website to ensure transparency.

Evaluation Criteria

Criterion 1: Capability of Principal Investigator (PI) and the research team

- **Weight: 20%**
- **Score: 1 (Poor) - 5 (Excellent)**

- **Guiding Questions:**
 - Does the PI and team have a proven track record and demonstrated expertise in the proposed research area?
 - Is there evidence of the team's ability to successfully manage projects and deliver on proposed objectives?
 - Does the team show a capacity for building collaborative networks and securing future research funding?

Criterion 2: Scientific Quality, Novelty, and Innovation

- **Weight: 30%**
- **Score: 1 (Poor) - 5 (Excellent)**
- **Guiding Questions:**
 - Does the proposal address a clearly defined and important knowledge gap in disaster risk reduction?
 - Is the research question original, and does the approach demonstrate significant innovation over existing methods?
 - Does the proposal employ novel methodologies, technologies, especially integrated approaches?

Criterion 3: Clarity of Objectives, Deliverables, and Budget

- **Weight: 30%**
- **Score: 1 (Unclear / Inadequate) - 5 (Very Clear / Excellent)**
- **Guiding Questions:**
 - Are the project's objectives and final deliverables specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant?
 - Is the budget justification clear, appropriate, and directly aligned with the proposed activities?

Criterion 4: Feasibility and Risk Management

- **Weight: 10%**
- **Score: 1 (High Risk / Not Feasible) - 5 (Low Risk / Highly Feasible)**
- **Guiding Questions:**

- Is the research design and methodology realistic within the proposed timeline and budget?
- Has the team identified potential scientific, logistical, or ethical risks, and proposed adequate mitigation strategies?

Criterion 5: Potential for International Application and Upscaling

- **Weight: 10%**
- **Score: 1 (Limited) - 5 (High)**
- **Guiding Questions:**
 - Are the expected outcomes designed for transferability to diverse geographic, cultural, or socio-economic contexts?
 - Does the proposal consider pathways for the adoption of its results by policymakers or practitioners in different countries?

Calculation of Scores

I. Individual Weighted Score (S_n)

For each applicant, the score from a single committee member (n) is calculated as follows:

$$S_n = S(\text{criterion 1}) * 20\% + S(\text{criterion 2}) * 30\% + S(\text{criterion 3}) * 30\% + S(\text{criterion 4}) * 10\% + S(\text{criterion 5}) * 10\%$$

II. Final score for each applicant

The overall score for each applicant is the arithmetic mean of the Individual Weighted Scores from all committee members:

$$S_f = \text{Average}(S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4, S_5)$$