

Criterion 1 - S&T QUALITY (Paragrafo B.3)

Overall comment: This **research field is competitive and relevant** and can provide added value to the European industry as it deals with timely environmental issues in a multi-disciplinary fashion.

Strengths of the proposal:

- The **industry involvement of level 1** is suitable for fostering industrial applications and commercial exploitability.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The proposal fails in explaining the reason behind **addressing two very different application areas** of polymers in a single ITN.
- The description of the **state-of-the-art is very limited**. The proposers do not fully provide feasible examples achieved in this broad research field.
- The methodology lacks quality as it does **not provide clear objectives and scopes for the individual tasks**. Documentation to highlight innovation has not been duly provided, e.g. it is not evident why selected membranes are a good alternative for ceramic membranes, and also the requirement of biodegradability of the packaging material is not specified.
- Although the project work plan is broken down into work-packages, it **fails in appropriately allocating** the different tasks of the recruited fellows.

=3,4

Criterion n.2 – TRAINING (Paragraph B.4)

Overall comment: The overall training is well structured and will take advantage of the scientific background of partners from both academia and industry. However, the task differentiation between ESRs and ERs has not been properly addressed.

Strengths of the proposal:

- The design of the training is directly related to the scientific topic, having the highest level of industrial commitment among full partners.
- A PhD award is foreseen for each ESR.
- The partners will grant mutual recognition of courses and training programmes.
- There is a clear use of Individual Career Development Plans.
- The consortium will provide complementary training skills on Commercialization and Entrepreneurship.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The scientific specific role of partners (from both academia and industry) in the training focused on nanomaterials has not been clearly addressed.
- Complementary training (i.e. the organizer, location, duration and scientific content) is not clearly structured.

Criterion n.3 – IMPLEMENTATION (Paragraph B.5)

Overall comment: Plans for the overall implementation of the project include appropriate **industry participation**. There is evidence that the implementation assigns the most suitable experts for the relevant tasks.

Strengths of the proposal:

- The **industrial involvement is at the highest level**.
- The project management structure is clear and appropriate, and provides a correct demarcation of responsibilities and clear rules of decision making.
- The working programme is well structured, and gives an explicit list of deliverables and milestones.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The **complementarities between participants** have not been properly presented. It is not clear what infrastructures will be required for the research and where these will be available.
- It is not clear how **ESRs**, who have home institutions in industry, are going to be monitored and to have access to formal training.
- Networking and dissemination of the results are not in line** with the size of the scientific proposal.
- The recruitment policy is not properly addressed.**

=3,6

Criterion n. 4 – IMPACT(Paragrafo B.6)

Overall comment: The former **history of long-term collaboration between partners** is expected to provide support to fellows, who will clearly benefit from their direct exposure to applied research at the industrial partners.

Strengths of the proposal:

- **Well structured seminars and conferences** which are also opened to the general public.
- The consortium will provide **good career prospects** to the fellows.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- **Competitiveness** has not been properly addressed.
- It is questionable whether there is any value in obtaining advanced **research training in two very different research fields**.
- There is **no justification of the participation of external researchers** in the training events.
- Since synergies and complementarities between partners have not been fully clarified, a positive impact among the partners will be **difficult to achieve**.

=3,6