



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



2016-2017

Self-evaluation form

European Joint Programme (EJP) -
Cofund actions

Version 2.0

22 October 2015

*Research and
Innovation*

History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
2.0	22.10.2015	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ 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)	

Self-evaluation form

European Joint Programme (EJP) - Cofund 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.

Self-evaluation form

1. Excellence

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:

- **Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;**
- **Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology;**
- Level of ambition in the collaboration and commitment of the participants in the proposed action to pool national resources and coordinate their national/regional research programmes

Comments:

Score 1:
Threshold 3/5

2. Impact

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

- **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;**
- Critical mass in terms of proposed overall budget, maturity and degree of integration in the proposed research area as well as consistency of proposed activities with the development of a European Joint Programme towards a joint undertaking or other permanent structure in the proposed research area.
- Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the programme's results and to communicate the programme

Comments:

Score 2:
Threshold 3/5

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation¹

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

- 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
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management
- Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise
- Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.

Comments:

Score 3:
Threshold 3/5

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

¹ Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work