

Universitetet i Bergen - UiB  
Postboks 7800  
5020 BERGEN



Ane Landøy

*Our ref:*  
17/00228-55

*Your ref:*

*Date:*  
29.11.2017

## **Decision concerning your application – Application granted - Eurasia 2017 Two-year funding - CPEA-ST/10055**

The Norwegian Centre for International Cooperation in Education (SIU) refers to your application for the Eurasia Programme 2017, CPEA-ST/10055.

SIU received 11 eligible applications from nine higher education institutions in Norway within the deadline for the Eurasia 2017 Call for Applications two-year project funding 22 September 2017. 11 applications were granted support by SIU on 17 November 2017.

Each application has been assessed by two reviewers from SIU and discussed in plenum sessions with three reviewers. The applications have been assessed using a scale ranging from 1 (weak) to 5 (excellent). Please see the attached file for more details.

**Decision:** The application is supported.

Your application has been granted, and you have been awarded a preliminary allocation of maximum NOK 275 240.

The final allocation is contingent on necessary adjustments to the project following SIU's consideration of the application.

Please see the attached assessment for further details.

The University of Bergen is responsible for informing the other partner institutions about the decision.

You can request further information about the processing of applications by contacting SIU.

### **Project document and contract**

The institutions, represented by the Norwegian project coordinator, will, in dialogue with SIU, prepare a project document based on the project application, with necessary

NORWEGIAN CENTRE FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN EDUCATION

*Postal address*  
P.O. Box 1093  
5809 Bergen  
post@siu.no

*Visiting address*  
Fortunen 1  
Home page  
<http://www.siu.no>

*Phone*  
+47 55 30 38 00  
*Enterprise register*  
986 339 523

*Executive officer*  
Benedicte Einarsen  
[benedicte.einarsen@siu.no](mailto:benedicte.einarsen@siu.no)  
+47 476 36 694



adjustments to the project following SIU's consideration of the application. The project document will be prepared using SIU's application and reporting system Espresso in accordance with more detailed instructions from SIU. SIU will contact the Norwegian project coordinator shortly with further details on the process and deadlines.

Once SIU has approved the project document the allocation will be final, and the University of Bergen will receive a contract to be signed by the institution and SIU. SIU will then pay the project grants in accordance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

### **Right of appeal**

You can appeal the decision within three weeks of receipt of this letter. The appeal must be submitted to SIU in writing. It must refer to the decision the appeal concerns by quoting the project number, and give grounds for the requested changes to the decision. You should also include any other information that can have a bearing on our consideration of the appeal.

You can read more about the right of appeal at <http://siu.no/eng/About-SIU/Guidelines/Complaint-regulations> and in the Norwegian Public Administration Act Chapter VI.

### **Other information**

Further information about the Eurasia Programme is available on our website [www.siu.no](http://www.siu.no). Please send an e-mail to [eurasia@siu.no](mailto:eurasia@siu.no) or contact Benedicte Einarsen 476 36 694 or Hege Toje 908 20 773 if you have any questions.

Please quote the project number when you contact SIU.

We look forward to cooperating with you and wish you the best of luck with the implementation of the project.

Yours sincerely

Else Kathrine Nesmoen  
Head of Department

Benedicte Einarsen  
Adviser

*The document is digitally signed and has no signatures.*

Attachments:

Internal evaluation - CPEA-ST/10055

Grading scale 2017

# Eurasia 2017 - Two-year funding

## SIU's assessment

### Project identification

<b>Title</b>	Developing a sustainable platform for open access publishing in Armenia
<b>Project number</b>	CPEA-ST/10055
<b>Discipline areas</b>	Educational sciences, pedagogy and didactics (207)
<b>Institution outside Norway</b>	American University of Armenia
<b>Institution in Norway</b>	University of Bergen
<b>Network partners</b>	Public Administration Academy of the Republic of Armenia

## A - Relevance

### A.1 Relevance to the aims and objectives of the programme

The partnership between UiB and American University in Armenia is centered on library services and the development of the necessary framework for the establishment of Open Access Publishing. The project covers mainly objective 6 centered on improvement in university management and objective 4, to strengthen more research based and internationally orientated education. The project is relevant to the overall programme goal of "contributing to renewal and internationalization of higher education in cooperating countries". Based on former projects aimed at improving Library services in the Eurasia programme, the project has good capacity to reach its targets.

### A.2 Relevance to the participating institutions/organisations and target group(s)

Relevance to the participating institutions is adequately addressed by the applicant. The project will contribute to increase the visibility of Armenian research as well as improve access to relevant research literature for the institution. Relevance to UiB is not entirely clear, except it makes it possible to spread and extend the knowledge generated in former similar projects in other countries. It also falls under the the strategy of UiB to promote global library development.

### A.3 Complementarity to other project/initiatives

UiB has generated quite extensive experience from similar projects. The LNSS project listed also includes Armenia, but it is not described in the application whether the participation in this project includes the institutional partner (IoN) and what this project includes.

### A.4 Score - Relevance

4 - good

## B - Quality of project design and implementation

### B.1 Quality of project goals and expected results

The programme goals and the expected results are clearly stated and realistic. The expected results are in line with the goals of the project and they are easily derived from the proposed activities.

### B.2 Quality of project plans and activities

The project plan is well designed and will facilitate the implementation of the proposed activities and the achievement of the expected project results. The risk assessment is well conceived, but lacks a plan to mitigate these risks as part of the project. This is a weakness. The project should include plans on how it will work to avoid the pitfalls of the project.

### B.3 Assessment of budget

The proposed activities are in line with the budget allocations. The budget is detailed and provides a good overview of the costs. The cost-efficiency in the project is good.

### B.4 Score - Quality of project design and implementation

4 - good

## **C - Quality of the partnership and cooperation arrangements**

### **C.1 Quality of the project team and cooperation arrangements**

The capacity of the partners to achieve the project results is good. UiB's experience from similar projects has already been commented. The letter of commitment from the Armenian partner is detailed and shows institutional dedication and support to the project. The specification of needs and competence is well described, and the project is excellently equipped to reach its goals.

### **C.2 Sustainability**

This is mainly a project that aims at capacity building in library services, and the sustainability of the partnership beyond the project is somewhat uncertain. In the section on sustainability, the applicant focuses on the enduring effects of the project in a very convincing way. The work plan does include an planned element of exploring further areas of collaborations. .

### **C.3 Added value from cooperation with non-academic partners (when relevant)**

Not relevant.

### **C.4 Score - Partnership and cooperation arrangements**

4 - good

## **D - Overall assessment**

### **D.1 Overall assessment of the project proposal**

The project proposal is well conceived, the goals are clearly defined and the expected results are in line with its overall project aim. The work plan is well structured and the capacity of the partners to carry through the project successfully is also very good. The weak spot is merely the lacking mitigations in the risk assessment of the project, alongside with a description on what UiB might get out of this collaboration in the longer run. This could have strengthened the assessment of sustainability in the partnership.

### **D.2 Overall project score**

4 - good

### **D.3 Confirmation of impartiality and confidentiality**

Upon submittal of this evaluation, I confirm that I have abided by the requirements regarding impartiality/ conflicts of interest and the regulations regarding confidentiality.

## Scale

Applications are evaluated on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

### **5 (Excellent)**

The application addresses all relevant aspects of the criteria in question in an excellent manner, with no or only minor concerns or areas of improvement. The information provided is also fully documented or otherwise substantiated (where relevant). «As described, the proposed project is likely to deliver excellent value with regard to the criteria in question»

### **4 (Good)**

The application addresses all relevant aspects of the criteria in question in a convincing manner, with few concerns or areas of improvement. The information provided is also well documented or otherwise substantiated (where relevant). «As described, the proposed project is likely to deliver good value with regard to the criteria in question»

### **3 (Adequate)**

The application addresses all the relevant aspects of the criteria in question in an adequate manner, albeit with some concerns or areas of improvement. The information provided is also adequately documented or otherwise substantiated (where relevant). «As described, the proposed project is likely to deliver adequate value with regard to the criteria in question»

### **2 (Lacking)**

The application addresses one or more of the relevant aspects of the criteria in question in a lacking manner, resulting in one or more significant concerns or areas of improvement; and/or the information provided is inadequately documented or otherwise substantiated (where relevant). «As described, the proposed project is seen as less than likely to deliver good value with regard to the criteria in question»

### **1 (Weak)**

The application addresses several of the relevant aspects of the criteria in question in an incomplete/clearly lacking manner, resulting in several significant concerns or areas of improvement; and/or the information provided is inadequately documented or otherwise substantiated (where relevant). «As described, the proposed project is seen as unlikely to deliver good value with regard to the criteria in question»