



Open Call for Contributing Members of the BRIDGE Knowledge and Community Hub

- Scorecard -

Two members of the BRIDGE consortium will independently assess each application. Where an assessor identifies a potential conflict of interest in relation to an application, they must notify the BRIDGE Hub Coordination Group through the designated call coordinator and must not assess that application. An alternative assessor will be appointed where required.

Each assessor will award whole-number scores against the assessment criteria set out below. The average score for each criterion will be used to determine whether the applicant meets the required thresholds. A threshold is met where the resulting average score is equal to or higher than the threshold specified in the table. Applicants who meet the threshold for each individual criterion will be accepted into the BRIDGE Knowledge and Community Hub contributor pool.

Admission to the contributor pool does not guarantee involvement in a specific BRIDGE activity. When external input is required, the Hub Coordination Group, in consultation with the work package lead responsible, will identify suitable contributors from the pool, considering their expertise, experience, stakeholder perspective, declared affiliations and interests, and availability relevant to the activity in question. Only those contributors selected for the activity will be invited to participate.

Assessment criterion	What it checks	Maximum points	Threshold
Relevance to BRIDGE scope	Whether the applicant's background fits the subject matter of BRIDGE	0–5	3
Applied expertise, experience or stakeholder perspective	Whether the applicant has relevant applied expertise, professional or lived experience, or stakeholder insight that could make their contribution helpful to BRIDGE	0-5	3
Transparency of affiliation and interests	Whether the applicant has made sufficiently clear whether any relevant affiliations or interests should be considered	0-2	1

The following scale applies to the 0–5-point criteria.

Score	Description
0	Insufficient (fails to address the criterion under examination or the criterion 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 or gaps in expected information)
2	Fair (while the criterion is broadly addressed, there are some weaknesses to it or gaps in expected information)
3	Good (the criterion is addressed well, although improvements or further information would have been highly desirable)
4	Very good (the criterion is addressed well, although certain improvements or additional information are still possible)
5	Excellent (all relevant aspects of the criterion are addressed in an excellent manner; any shortcomings are very minor)

The following scale applies to the 0–2 point transparency criterion.

Score	Description
0	The applicant's affiliation, role or stakeholder perspective is unclear or cannot be adequately assessed. Relevant information on interests or representative capacity is missing where applicable
1	The applicant's affiliation, role and stakeholder perspective are sufficiently clear. Information on relevant interests or representative capacity is provided where applicable, although minor clarification may still be required.
2	The applicant's affiliation, role and stakeholder perspective are very clear, including relevant interests and representative capacity where applicable