



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



2016-2017

Self-evaluation form

ERA-NET Cofund actions

Version 2.0
22 October 2015

*Research and
Innovation*

History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.1	27.02.2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information on Evaluation added - scoring of proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes to be made	1
1.2	05.03.2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Check list added	3
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

ERA-NET 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.

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.

Self-evaluation form

<p>1. Excellence</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"> • 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 ERA-NET action to pool national resources and coordinate their national/regional research programmes <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 1: <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	---







<p>2. Impact</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • Achievement of critical mass for the funding of trans-national projects by pooling of national/regional resources and contribution to establishing and strengthening a durable cooperation between the partners and their national/regional research programmes • Quality of the proposed measures to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant ➤ Communicate the project, to activities to different target audiences <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 2: <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	---







<p>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation¹</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 a 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 <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 3: <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	---

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

Check-list

General issues	
Has the correct template for ERA-NET Cofund proposals been used?	
<p>Is the duration of the action 60 months?</p> <p>For ERA-NET Cofund actions, the duration is usually 60 months.</p> <p> This time is needed because these actions include call preparation, launch of the call, proposal submission and evaluation, the selection decision, and implementation of the selected transnational projects. Every ERA-NET Cofund action has default duration of 60 months. If during implementation there are justifiable delays, the consortium may request an extension.</p>	
<p>Does the project plan include at least the following distinct work packages for the activities related to the compulsory co-funded call and the consortium management?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management • Preparation and launch of the co-funded call • Evaluation and proposal selection for the co-funded call • Follow-up and monitoring of projects resulting from the co-funded call • Communication, Exploitation and Dissemination of the results 	
<p>Does the project plan include further work package(s) on any other joint activities including other joint calls without Union co-funding that are planned?</p> <p>What can be included? The additional activities must relate to the coordination of public research and innovation programmes and should focus on preparing and implementing joint activities (including other joint calls without EU co-funding).</p> <p> These activities must be <i>in addition</i> to those related to the compulsory co-funded joint call and the resulting projects.</p> <p> Proposers have to demonstrate the appropriateness of the overall coordination costs for the proposed additional activities</p> <p> If the additional activities consist of additional calls without top-up funding from the EU, the requirements for the co-funded call do not apply.</p>	
If yes, are coordination costs on the basis of unit costs allocated to beneficiaries that take part in these activities?	
Cofunded call - compliance with the following requirements resulting from the ERA-NET Cofund Model grant agreement	
<p>Does the consortium organise a single joint transnational call for proposals with cofunding from the Commission?</p> <p> Only one co-funded call per GA.</p>	
Does the consortium foresee to publish the joint call on a dedicated webpage and to promote it at national/regional level via their usual channels of communications to potential proposers?	
Does the consortium keep the joint call open for at least 60 days?	
<p>Does the consortium make the selection through a two-step procedure, with Step 1: eligibility check / review at national or trans-national level and Step 2: single international peer review?</p> <p> A two-step procedure is necessary to ensure that only entities that are eligible for funding under the national funding rules are invited to Step 2 and that consortia can balance the requested funding and available funding per participating Member State and associated country between Steps 1 and 2.</p>	

<p>In Step 2, does the consortium evaluate proposals with the assistance of at least three independent experts per proposal, on the basis of the following award criteria?</p> <p>(a) excellence;</p> <p>(b) impact;</p> <p>(c) quality and efficiency of the implementation.</p> <p> Use of these criteria is compulsory; the consortium may define sub-criteria for each criterion, but no additional criteria.</p>	
<p>Will proposals be ranked according to the evaluation results?</p>	
<p>Will the selection of trans-national projects ('joint selection list') be based on the order of the ranking list (or the ranking lists, if there are different topics)?</p>	
<p>Does the consortium apply a funding mode that ensures that the selection of trans-national projects ('joint selection list') can be based on the order of the ranking list(s)?</p> <p> The consortium has to choose an appropriate funding mode to ensure selection of proposals according to the ranking list mixed mode, real common pot, reserve/guarantee amounts).</p> <p> If proposals have identical scores, the proposals coming from participating Member States or associated countries with still available funding should be given precedence, in order to maximise the number of selected projects.</p>	
<p>Has the consortium foreseen to appoint an independent experts — Observer?</p> <p> In addition to the expert evaluators, the consortium must appoint an independent expert as an observer, to verify that the selection procedure (and, in particular, the peer review evaluation and the ranking) meets the requirements for ERA-NET Cofund actions.</p>	
<p>Does the consortium foresee at the end of the evaluation of the co-funded call a deliverable with the following elements?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the ranking list(s) of the projects; • the observers' report on the evaluation; • the joint selection list of the projects to be funded, and • from each consortium partner participating in the joint call, a formal and duly signed commitment on availability of funds for the selected projects. 	
<p>Does the description of the participating entities and programmes (section 4, Members of the consortium) specify the maximum amount of financial support to a third party (grant beneficiaries under national funding rules) and the criteria for determining the exact amount under national funding rules?</p> <p>The Financial Regulation requires that Annex 1 to the grant agreement includes the maximum amount of financial support that can be paid to a third party and the criteria for determining the exact amount under national funding rules.</p> <p> This information must already be part of the proposal (see Table 4.1 of the Standard proposal template ERA-NET Cofund).</p> <p> Only non-repayable financial assistance (grants) is eligible cost under the cofunded call. If a programme is based on repayable grants, loans etc. and wants to participate in the call they may do so, they will however not receive any top-up funding.</p> <p>If national funding rules do not specify a maximum amount, the beneficiaries should enter the amount of the call contribution to the trans-national projects.</p>	