



Directorate-General for
Health & Consumers



Self-evaluation form

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 external experts during the EAHC evaluation will be broadly similar, assessing the compliance with the award criteria (see Annex II work plan 2012), although the detail, points given and layout may differ. This self-evaluation, if carried out, has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation by the EAHC.

Projects

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-8, 0-6, 0-5, depending on the award criteria block. Half marks may be given.

Interpretation of the scores (%):

0 –The **proposal fails to address the criterion** under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information

20% –**Very poor**. The criterion is addressed in a cursory and unsatisfactory manner.

40% – **Poor**. There are serious inherent weaknesses in relation to the criterion in question.

60% –**Fair**. While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses that would need correcting.

80% –**Good**. The proposal addresses the criterion well, although certain improvements are possible.

100%–**Excellent**. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor

<p>1. Policy and contextual relevance of the project (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</p> <p><i>Note: when a proposal only partially addresses the topics, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project's contribution to the Second Health programme, as defined in the 2012 work plan in terms of meeting the objectives and priorities (8 points) • Strategic relevance to the EU Health Strategy in terms of expected contribution to the existing knowledge and implications for health (8 points) • Added value at European level in the field of public health(8 points) • Pertinence of the geographical coverage (8 points) • Adequacy of the project with social, cultural and policy context (8 points) <p>Peer evaluators' comments will be inserted here.</p>	<p>Score A: (40 points) Threshold 20/40</p>
--	--



Executive
Agency for
Health and
Consumers



Directorate-General for
Health & Consumers



<p>2. Technical quality of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence base (6 points) • Content specification (6 points) • Innovative nature, technical complementarity and avoidance of duplication of other existing actions at EU level (6 points) • Evaluation strategy (6 points) • Dissemination strategy (6 points) <p><i>Peer evaluators' comments will be inserted here.</i></p>	<p>Score B: (30 points) Threshold 15/30</p>
<p>3. Management quality of the project and budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning and organisation of the project (5 points) • Organisational capacity (5 points) • Quality of the partnership (5 points) • Communication strategy (5 points) • Overall and detailed budget, including financial management (10 points, threshold 5) <p><i>Peer evaluators' comments will be inserted here.</i></p>	<p>Score C: (30 points) Threshold 15/30</p>
<p>Total score (A+B+C): / 100 points (Threshold 50/100)</p>	



Directorate-General for
Health & Consumers



Recommended for funding

YES NO

If yes:

Maximum amount to be co-financed by the Commission	€
Maximum percentage to be co-financed by the Commission	%

Any other remarks

e.g. recommendations for review, only if the proposal is above threshold

Peer evaluators' comments will be inserted here

Peer evaluator name and signature:

1.

Date