

Proposal Evaluation Form



Research Executive Agency

7th Framework Programme for Research

**EVALUATION
SUMMARY
REPORT**

Call : FP7-PEOPLE-2011-IEF
Funding Scheme : MC-IEF Intra-European Fellowships (IEF)
Proposal number : 298333
Proposal acronym : MEDALEX
Duration (month) : 24
Proposal title : Cooperating in Complex Environments: Cross-cultural Trade, Commercial Networks and Notarial Culture in Alexandria (Egypt) : 1360-1450

N.	Proposer name	Country	Type	Total cost (€)	%	Grant requested (€)	%
1	EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE	IT					
Total :							

Abstract :

In the late Middle Ages a constellation of groups shared the commercial spaces of Mediterranean cities. These groups were either formally defined (as the trading nations of Venice, Genoa, Catalonia, Ancona, Naples, Florence, Montpellier, etc.), or were based on ethnic and religious affiliation (as Copts, Cretan Jews, Greek Orthodox, Jacobites, or Mudéjar Muslims). In either case, to different degrees, these groups cooperated with each other by working together in commonly shared networks. By monitoring a whole merchant community instead of single groups through a serial, homogeneous documentation and a coherent methodology, this project will produce a comprehensive and consistent research of the generally accepted social norms and institutional forces that governed business cooperation in a Mediterranean complex environment (Alexandria, Egypt), and accompanied its major transformations. These dynamic and complex relations will be addressed in an empirical manner, by observing the economic networks encoded in one of the by-products of Mediterranean commercial culture: the outre-mer notaries and their registers. Unlike most documentary evidence from European archives, overseas notaries provide a multi-lateral picture of the activities of this heterogeneous community, and particularly, show cooperation and interaction between individuals of different origins. This is a history project with an important technology dimension, and notarial data will be analysed through a pioneering database model and its web-based application.

Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowships (IEF)

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Decimal marks may be given.

Interpretation of the score:

0- The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information.

1- Poor. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2- Fair. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses.

3- Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary.

4- Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible.

5- Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

Criterion 1. S&T QUALITY (award)

(Threshold 3.00/5.00)

Mark: 4.90

Strengths

This is a very strong proposal that intends both to build on and to develop a conceptual alternative to most research in the field: focussing on cooperation in heterogeneous networks, using a well-chosen empirical base.

The project is clearly multidisciplinary as it borrows ideas and approaches from history, economics and sociology.

The state of the art is well described.

The methodology is well explained, a network approach forming the heart of the approach.

The originality lies in the attempt a redirecting the research in the field that is clearly visible in the concept of transcultural strategies and the emphasis on cooperation rather than rivalry.

The project is very timely and relevant, as it will contribute to major reorientations that can be observed in recent historical social sciences and related parts of the historical profession.

The supervisor and the host institution are among the best hosts that could have been chosen for this project. The supervisor is experienced in the kind of empirical work that will be done.

Weakness

The question of the possible existence of relevant material kept in Alexandria corresponding to the Venetian documents is not detailed.

Overall Comment

The weakness is minor

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Research/technological quality, including any interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary aspects of the proposal
- Appropriateness of research methodology and approach
- Originality and innovative nature of the project, and relationship to the 'state of the art' of research in the field
- Timeliness and relevance of the project
- Host research expertise in the field
- Quality of the group/supervisors

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (bullet point structure):
 - Weaknesses of the proposal (bullet point structure):
 - Overall comments:
- (reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)
(copy the text above in the comment box)

Criterion 2. TRAINING (award) (Threshold 3.00/5.00)

Mark: 4.50

Weight: 0.15

Strengths

The reserach training objectives are presented in a very systematic and cogent way. They are presented in an attractive way, related to the research experience and prospects of the applicant.

The relevant expertise of the host is very high.

Weaknesses

The presentation of additional research training lacks some clarity for example where it refers to training of reading abilities or to paleographical skills.

Overall comments

This part of the proposal very well adresses the criteria. It shows highly relevant research training objectives. There is also an outstanding host with relevant expertise in hosting and tutoring.

There are some weaknesses in the additional training.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Clarity and quality of the research training objectives for the researcher
- Relevance and quality of additional research training as well as of transferable skills offered, with special attention to exposure to the industry sector, where appropriate.*
- Host expertise in training experienced researchers in the field and capacity to provide mentoring/tutoring

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Overall comments:
(reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)
(copy the text above in the comment box)

Criterion 3. RESEARCHER (award) (Threshold 4.00/5.00)

Mark: 4.80

Weight: 0.25

Strengths

The applicant is clearly specialised in the area of research. Previous work in a way adds up to the present proposal.

Independent thinking and leadership qualities have been demonstrated beyond any doubt. The international experience was skillfully used to apply independent thinking.

Leadership qualities have been shown in teaching and in leading a team for data entry and web documentation.

The potential to acquire new knowledge is very good as can be seen from the very varied knowledge shown in the proposal and previous work.

The match between the fellow's profile and the project is very close as the project is a clear continuation of previous work.

The potential to reach a position of professional maturity is present.

Weakness

In view of the long research experience, the list of peer reviewed publication appears to be rather short.

Overall comment

The researcher shows a rich scientific experience at the international level and testifies to a variety of academic activities.

The proposed research work matches these qualities.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Research experience
- Research results including patents, publications, teaching etc, taking into account the level of experience
- Independent thinking and leadership qualities
- Match between the fellow's profile and project
- Potential for reaching a position of professional maturity*
- Potential to acquire new knowledge

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Overall comments:
(reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)
(copy the text above in the comment box)

Criterion 4. IMPLEMENTATION (selection) (Threshold 0.00/5.00)

Mark: 4.80

Weight: 0.15

Strengths

The facilities of the host as well as its international collaborations are very good.

The same is true for the practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the scientific project, and for the practical and administrative arrangements.

The practical arrangements are well cared for, e.g. the support for settling in, visa, accommodation, language courses, childcare etc.

A specialised unit at the host takes care of these forms of support.

The elaborate work plan is clear, well detailed and very promising.

Weakness

The description of the support for the hosting of the fellow description lacks detail.

Overall Comment

This is a very feasible and credible proposal.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Quality of infrastructure / facilities and International collaborations of host
- Practical arrangements for the implementation and management of the research project*
- Feasibility and credibility of the project, including work plan
- Practical and administrative arrangements, and support for the hosting of the fellow*

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Overall comments:
(reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)
(copy the text above in the comment box)

Criterion 5. IMPACT (award)

(Threshold 3.50/5.00)

Mark: 4.80

Weight: 0.20

Strengths

The applicant explains convincingly in what ways the project will bring the goal of maturity and independence, in addition to diversity, closer.

A decisive contribution to the career is expected. The career goals are clearly and convincingly explained.

Given the quality of the previous work and the relevance of the proposed project, positive contributions to the following issues are also expected:

- Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness
- Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area. The applicant is already fairly active in the ERA.

Weakness

The expected change of the view on the history of commerce following this project is not sufficiently clarified.

Issues to be addressed when assigning an overall mark for this criterion:

- Potential of acquiring competencies during the fellowship to improve the prospects of reaching and/or reinforcing a position of professional maturity, diversity and independence, in particular through exposure to transferable skills training with special attention to exposure to the industry sector, where appropriate*
- Contribution to career development or re-establishment where relevant*
- Contribution to European excellence and European competitiveness
- Benefit of the mobility to the European Research Area
- Impact of the proposed outreach activities*

Please use the following structure in your comments to this criterion:

- Strengths of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Weaknesses of the proposal (bullet point structure):
- Overall comments:
(reflecting the relative importance of the strengths and weaknesses above mentioned)
(copy the text above in the comment box)

***Sub-criteria to be evaluated in the light of the principles of the 'European Charter for Researchers' and the 'Code of Conduct for the Recruitment of Researchers'.**

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEGOTIATION AND/OR INDICATORS TO MONITOR PROGRESS OF PROJECT:

TOTAL SCORE

(Threshold 70.00/100.00)

Total: 95.60

Ethical Issues