



Evaluation process

Evaluation process including timeline

Preliminary dates

Eligibility and completeness check	2 days, start when call closes	March 17-18
Communication of results to applicants		March 19
<i>Redress phase of Eligibility check</i>		
Matching applications to international evaluation panel	2 days	March 19-20
Evaluation of written applications	>2 weeks	March 20-April 9
Ranking of written applications and matching to evaluators for interview 1	4 days	April 10-15
Communication of results to applicants		April 13
<i>Redress phase of Written application evaluation step</i>		
Organisation of interview phase 1	2 weeks	April 16-30
Online interview, phase 1	5 days	May 4-8
Communication of results to applicants, interview phase 1		May 13
<i>Redress phase of Interview 1</i>		
Organisation of interview phase 2	>1 week	May 13-22
Online interview, phase 2		May 27-29
Communication of results to applicants, interview phase 2		June 2
<i>Redress phase of Interview 2</i>		
Final ranking of candidates	2 days	June 2-3
Award decision (main and reserve list)		June 9
Communication of results to applicants		June 12
<i>Redress phase of Award decision, initiated after communication, Buffer time</i>		
Ethics review and approval	According to established process/Swedish regulations	
Contracting procedures	Postdoc needs to accept a position within 2 weeks, and should start the fellowship on October 1, 2026. (Exception for e.g. visa issues)	Deadline June 26

Scoring

Each criterion will be scored 0–5. A threshold for shortlisting candidates will be set to a total weighted score of 4, which will be calculated based on the scores of all evaluation criteria. A minimum score of 4 is needed to move to the next step in the evaluation phase.

0	Insufficient. The proposal cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
1	Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
2	Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
3	Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
4	Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
5	Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion; shortcomings, if any, are minor.

How results will be communicated at each step of the selection and evaluation process

The applicant will be informed about each step of the evaluation process and, in written, also about the result of each selection step. The evaluation process is estimated to take 3 months.

Evaluation Criteria for written proposals (45% of total weighted score)

	Excellence 50%	Impact 30%	Implementation 20%
Researcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the candidate's research outputs/merits: publications, IP, data sets/tools etc. Research output to match time in science, e.g. related to if the candidate has just finished their PhD or if they have a few years of experience as a postdoc. Research experience and technical skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Postdoc will benefit from the PULSE training program and gain new scientific, entrepreneurial and transferable skills. Research project and program training will increase researcher's future career opportunities on international and across disciplines and sectors. Motivation for the chosen track (academic or entrepreneurial) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concrete and ambitious career goals.
Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of the project in terms of research and innovation – state of the art (quality/credibility). Timely for the field of research (original and innovative). The methodology is complete and appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear output and added value through interdisciplinary, intersectoral and international exchange. Proposal contains initial plan for dissemination of results. Impact on the scientific field with novelty and originality. The project will benefit the involved labs/institutes/ infrastructure/ organisations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project plan is feasible. The expertise and technology needed are available. The work plan is realistic (coherent/effective). The roles of the involved groups are clearly defined.

	<p>Suggested Project partners/ secondment will strengthen the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gender and diversity dimension. • Open Science. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Future potential (innovation and translational output). • Communication and outreach. • Motivation for the chosen track (academic or entrepreneurial). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project has access to the competence needed. • Project risks and how to address them
--	---	--	---

Evaluation Criteria for first interview with external panel, 45 minutes (35% of total weighted score)

Project and career (60%)	Transferable skills (40%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presentation of past research. • Presentation of proposed project. • Discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Academic track candidates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ preparedness for research questions proposed. ◦ Entrepreneurial track candidates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ innovation potential of proposed project. ▪ potential for advancing the proposed project from technical readiness level (TRL) 1-2 up to TRL 3-6 (exploitation of the DDD research infrastructure and partner testbeds) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation. • Leadership and problem-solving capacity. • Oral English language proficiency.

Evaluation Criteria for second interview with internal panel, 30 minutes (20% of total weighted score)

Project and career (66%)	Transferable skills (33%)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match between candidate's career goals, and suggested project with host group. • Justification to take part in the program at the host institution. • Understanding of proposed infrastructure. • Motivation for secondments and Associated Partners. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motivation. • Leadership and problem-solving capacity.

NOTE Priority in case of *ex aequo*: Excellence, Impact, Implementation. If a further tie between two candidates appears, the underrepresented gender will be preferred, and preference will also be given to candidates from the EU's widening countries and third countries.