



The EU Framework Programme  
for Research and Innovation

# HORIZON 2020



2016-2017

Self-evaluation form

Form 1: Research and innovation actions  
Innovation actions

Form 2: Coordination & support actions

Version 2.0  
22 October 2015

Research and  
Innovation

## History of changes

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Change</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.1	27.02.2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Information on Evaluation added - scoring of proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes to be made</li></ul>	1
1.2	10.03.2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>evaluation form not any more applicable to the SME instrument which has a specific evaluation form</li></ul>	
2.0	22.10.2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Wording in sections 1, 2 and 3 adjusted to align with revised "aspects to be taken into account" under the three evaluation criteria (re General Annex H)</li></ul>	

# Self-evaluation form

## Research and innovation actions Innovation actions

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (e.g. by an impartial colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The aim is to help applicants identify ways to improve their proposals.

The forms used by the experts for their evaluation reports will be broadly similar, although the detail and layout may differ.

These forms are based on the standard criteria, scores and thresholds. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. The definitive evaluation schemes are given in the work programme.

A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted to the Commission, and has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation.

### Scoring

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned.

### Interpretation of the scores

- 0** — The **proposal fails to address the criterion** or 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.  
Any shortcomings are minor.

### Thresholds

The threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

### Two-stage submission schemes

The scheme below is applicable to a full proposal. For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' will be evaluated. Within these criteria, only the aspects in bold will be considered. The threshold for both individual criteria will be 4.

<p><b>1. Excellence</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clarity and pertinence of the objectives</b></li> <li>• <b>Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology</b></li> <li>• <b>Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models)</b></li> <li>• <b>Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 1:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>2. Impact</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;</b></li> <li>• Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society;</li> <li>• Quality of the proposed measures to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant.</li> <li>➢ Communicate the project activities to different target audiences</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation*</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables;</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management;</li> <li>• Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise;</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 3:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	---

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
*Threshold 10/15*

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.

# Self-evaluation form

## Coordination & support actions

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (e.g. by an impartial colleague) prior to final editing, submission and deadline. The aim is to help applicants identify ways to improve their proposals.

The forms used by the experts for their evaluation reports will be broadly similar, although the detail and layout may differ.

These forms are based on the standard criteria, scores and thresholds. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. The definitive evaluation schemes are given in the work programme.

A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted to the Commission, and has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation.

### Scoring

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Evaluators will be asked to score proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned.

### Interpretation of the scores

- 0** — The **proposal fails to address the criterion** or 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. Any shortcomings are minor.

### Thresholds

The threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

### Two-stage submission schemes

The scheme below is applicable to a full proposal. For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' will be evaluated. Within these criteria, only the aspects in bold will be considered. The threshold for both individual criteria will be 4.

<p><b>1. Excellence</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clarity and pertinence of the objectives</b></li> <li>• <b>Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology</b></li> <li>• Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Score 1:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	---

<p><b>2. Impact</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;</b></li> <li>• Quality of the proposed measures to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➢ Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant</li> <li>➢ Communicate the project activities to different target audiences</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Score 2:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	---

<p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation*</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management</li> <li>• Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Score 3:</b> <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	---

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
Threshold 10/15

--

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.