

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

Overall comments:

The proposal is very fair on this criterion. The proposal presents an advancement in the related areas. The proposal has a multidisciplinary and innovative approach to science and technology but **underestimates the complexity of the problems**. Project objectives are overstretched. There is no explanation why it is necessary to work at the nano length scale.

Strengths of the proposal:

- Well-formulated, clearly presented with multidisciplinary approach.
- Industry participation is at the highest level.
- The scientists from different disciplines, specifically in complex composites based on nano-fillers and polymers from renewable resources work together.
- Required knowledge and experience in various complementary fields and their implementation is shown. **Advance in the state of the art** is adequately presented.
- The **methods and methodology** that will be used for the purposes of the research program are **presented**.

Coordination and management of all activities described in WPs prove the clear planning of activities and sensible management.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- **The proposal underestimates the complexity of the problem** (such as in the case of lignin conversion to useful ABB monomers and producing cellulose fibers below 50nm by electrospinning).
- Project objectives are overstretched, fall-back scenarios are lacking.
- There is no explanation why it is necessary to work at the nano length scale and what are the expectations from that.

=3,7

Criterion 2 – TRAINING (Paragrafo B.4)

Overall comments:

The proposal is good regarding this criterion. The training program is in consistency with the research program. The overview of the content of the training program which comprises good training elements is given. **Training-through-research is highlighted.**

Strength of the proposal:

- The training program is in consistency with the research program.
- **Multidisciplinary approach.**
- The **role and engagement of industrial partners is clearly demonstrated** in the proposal by participating as full network partners.
- The overview of the content of the training program which comprises various training elements is given.
- **Joint training program is a very strong point of this proposal and is very well specified.**
- The personal career development program is presented.
- The structure of training and courses is clearly presented by giving a clear indication of groups of the network.
- Activities of organizing seminars and conferences, and the role of external experts are listed and clearly described.
- Proposal displays clearly the future skills gained by the ESRs taking part in other courses.

Weaknesses of the proposal:

- The explanation for an **excessive request for 50 visiting scientist** is missing.
- Training in the complementary skills is not enough defined.
- Active participation of early stage researchers (ESRs) in the supervisory board and management is overestimated.

=4,3

Criterion 3 – IMPLEMENTATION (Paragraph B.5)

Overall comments:

The implementation plans are of high quality and well in-line with the training program
The work plan is very well structured and it precisely specifies what each ESR will do.

Strengths of the proposal

- Adequate management structure, plan and responsibilities.
- Appointment of innovations, IPR and exploitation committee.
- All of the participants are very competent to join in the proposed project, bearing in mind their host capacities, facilities and human resources. They have demonstrated high professional level and experience in similar network projects.
- Key-scientific people presented in the proposal demonstrate a high level of experience in the field.
- The proposal demonstrates a good and strong balance between the scientific partners and industry.
- The proposal presents a clear recruitment strategy especially by including communications to European universities where the greatest amount of potential future researchers can be involved in the ITN activity.
- Resources in WPs are linked to each other and show a realistic complexity of the activity proposed.

Weakness of the proposal:

- Insufficient insights in the methodology that will be used.

=4,4

Criterion 4 – IMPACT (Paragraph B.6)

Overall comments:

The impact of the proposal is expected to be of high value to the environment, community, human health. Possibility for further development of researchers' careers in Europe.

The impact is precisely specified and is credible.

Strength of the proposal

- Impact expected to be achieved in the proposal for the environment, community, and to human health is adequately presented with details.
- Mutual recognition of the training is planned 50/50 at two partners in different countries.
- Very good opportunities for building long lasting collaborations among the partners. Multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary and intersectorial collaboration.
- Management of IP and exploitation of results are clearly addressed.

Career prospects of the fellows.

- The impact on the whole environment and the EU research community, social (health and human resources) and economy.
- The proposal declares in a convincing way the consideration on gender issues and the participating of handicapped and disabled people.
- Developing novel biobased, biorenewable nanocomposite.
- Moving boundaries of nano-materials and bio-based materials.

Weakness of the proposal:

- The role of visiting scientists is not crucial in the project.

Proposta n.3

=4,3