



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



2018-2020

Self-evaluation form

European Joint Programme (EJP) - Cofund
actions

Version 1.0
27 October 2017

Research and
Innovation

History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.0	27.10.2017	Version for WP2018-2020	

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

Two-stage submission schemes

For stage 1-proposals, only the criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' will be evaluated and within those criteria only the aspects indicated in bold will be considered. The threshold for each of the two individual criteria is 4.

After the evaluation, the call coordinator will then fix an overall threshold, to limit the proposals that will be invited to stage 2. (This overall threshold will be set at a level which ensures that the total requested budget of proposals admitted to stage 2 is as close as possible to three times the available budget, and in any case, not less than two and a half times the available budget. The actual level will therefore depend on the volume of proposals received. The threshold is expected to normally be 8 or 8.5.)

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 action to pool national resources in terms of budget, number of partners and participating countries and to 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 • Contribution to better alignment of national activities and policies • Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the programme's results and to communicate the programme <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