



The EU Framework Programme  
for Research and Innovation

# HORIZON 2020



**2018-2020**

**H2020 Programme**

**Self-evaluation form**

Form 1: SME instrument phase 1  
Form 2: SME instrument phase 2

Version 3.0  
27 October 2017

*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>updated to apply only to the SME instrument</li></ul>	
2.0	04.12.2015	<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>	
2.1	13.10.2016	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Wording updated to clarify and better capture the evaluation criteria</li></ul>	2,3,5,6
2.2	01.02.2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Information on environmental and socially important impacts added</li></ul>	2,5,6
3.0	27.10.2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Updates for WP 2018-20</li></ul>	

# Self-evaluation form

## SME instrument phase 1

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. Scores may be awarded down to one decimal place. 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 & weighting

For Phase 1 and Phase 2, the threshold for individual criteria is 4. The overall threshold, applying to the weighted sum of the three individual scores is 13.

The consensus score at the level of the three evaluation criteria is the median of the scores given by each evaluator. The overall consensus score is the weighted sum of these separate scores (50% weight on impact, 25% weight on excellence and 25% weight on quality and efficiency of implementation).

## 1. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- Convincing description of substantial demand (including willingness to pay) for the innovation; demand generated by new ideas, with the potential to create new markets, is particularly sought after.  
Total market size envisaged.
- Convincing description of targeted users or customers of the innovation, how their needs have been addressed, why the users or customers identified will want to use or buy the product, service or business model, including compared to what is currently available if anything at all.
- Good understanding of need for a realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions, total potential market size and growth-rate, competitors and competitive offerings, key stakeholders, clear identification of opportunities for market introduction; potential for market creation is particularly sought after.
- Realistic and relevant description of how the innovation has the potential to scale-up the applicant company (or companies). This should be underpinned by a convincing business plan with a clear timeline, and complemented, where possible, by a track-record that includes financial data.
- Alignment of proposal with overall strategy of applicant SME (or SMEs) and commitment of the team behind them. Demonstration of need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organisational requirements for commercial exploitation and scaling up (and - Phase 2 only) as well as key third parties needed.
- Outline of initial commercialisation plan and how this will be developed further (in-house development, licensing strategy, etc.).
- European/global dimension of innovation with respect to both commercialisation and assessment of competitors and competitive offerings.
- Realistic and relevant description of knowledge protection status and strategy, need for 'freedom to operate' (i.e., possibility of commercial exploitation), and current IPR situation. Where relevant, description of potential regulatory requirements.
- Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
Threshold 4/5  
Weighting: 50%

## 2. Excellence

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- High-risk/high-potential innovation idea that has something that nobody else has. It should be better and/or significantly different to any alternative. Game-changing ideas or breakthrough innovations are particularly sought after.  
Its high degree of novelty comes with a high chance of either success or failure.
- Realistic description of current stage of development (Phase 2 only: TRL 6, or something analogous for non-technological innovations), and clear outline of steps planned to take this innovation to market.
- Highly innovative solution that goes beyond the state of the art in comparison with existing or competing solutions, including on the basis of costs, ease of use and other relevant features as well as issues related to climate change or the environment, the gender dimension, any other benefits for society, or (Phase 1 only) includes plans for obtaining this information.
- Very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to successful market introduction of the innovation from both technical and commercial points of view or (Phase 1 only) includes convincing plans for obtaining this information.

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

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives for the feasibility study and the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact of the innovation.</li> <li>Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b> Threshold 4/5 Weighting: 25%</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>Technical/business experience of the team, including management capacity to lead a growing team If relevant, the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences.</li> <li>Availability of resources required (personnel, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop project activities in the most suitable conditions. Where relevant, complementarity of partners in a consortium.</li> <li>Realistic timeframe and comprehensive description of implementation (work-packages, major deliverables and milestones, risk management) taking the company's or applicant's innovation ambitions and objectives into account.</li> <li>Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 3:</b> Threshold 4/5 Weighting: 25%</p>
---	---

**Total score**  
Threshold 13/15

--

# Self-evaluation form

## SME instrument phase 2

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. Scores may be awarded down to one decimal place. 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 & weighting

For Phase 1 and Phase 2, the threshold for individual criteria is 4. The overall threshold, applying to the weighted sum of the three individual scores is 13.

The consensus score at the level of the three evaluation criteria is the median of the scores given by each evaluator. The overall consensus score is the weighted sum of these separate scores (50% weight on impact, 25% weight on excellence and 25% weight on quality and efficiency of implementation).

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

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.

## 1. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- Convincing description of substantial demand (including willingness to pay) for the innovation; demand generated by new ideas, with the potential to create new markets, is particularly sought after.  
Total market size envisaged.
- Convincing description of targeted users or customers of the innovation, how their needs have been addressed, why the users or customers identified will want to use or buy the product, service or business model, including compared to what is currently available if anything at all.
- Realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions and growth-rate, competitors and competitive offerings, key stakeholders, clear identification of opportunities for market introduction, market creation or disruption (e.g. via new value-chains).
- Realistic and relevant description of how the innovation has the potential to scale-up the applicant company (or companies). This should be underpinned by a convincing business plan with a clear timeline, and complemented, where possible, by a track-record that includes financial data.
- Alignment of proposal with overall strategy of applicant SME (or SMEs) and commitment of the team behind them. Demonstration of need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organisational requirements for commercial exploitation and scaling up (and - Phase 2 only) as well as key third parties needed.
- Realistic and relevant strategic plan for commercialisation, including approximate time-to-market or deployment. Activities to be undertaken after the project

*The 'commercial strategy' aspect is particularly examined in Step 2 of the evaluation of Phase 2 proposals.*

- European/global dimension of innovation with respect to both commercialisation and assessment of competitors and competitive offerings.
- Evidence of or realistic measures to ensure 'freedom to operate' (i.e., possibility of commercial exploitation), convincing knowledge-protection strategy, including current IPR filing status, IPR ownership and licensing issues. Regulatory and/or standards requirements addressed.
- Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
Threshold 4/5  
Weighting: 50%

## 2. Excellence

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- High-risk/high-potential innovation idea that has something that nobody else has. It should be better and/or significantly different to any alternative. Game-changing ideas or breakthrough innovations are particularly sought after.  
Its high degree of novelty comes with a high chance of either success or failure.
- Realistic description of current stage of development (Phase 2 only: TRL 6, or something analogous for non-technological innovations), and clear outline of steps planned to take this innovation to market.
- Highly innovative solution that goes beyond the state of the art in comparison with existing or competing solutions, including on the basis of costs, ease of use and other relevant features as well as issues related to climate change or the environment, the gender dimension, any other benefits for society, or (Phase 1 only) includes plans for obtaining this information.
- Very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to successful market introduction of the innovation from both technical and commercial points of view

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

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.

<p>Documentation on the technological, practical and economic feasibility of the innovation.</p> <p><i>The 'feasibility' aspect is particularly examined in Step 2 of the evaluation of Phase 2 proposals.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objectives for the innovation proposal as well as the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact (i.e. commercialisation or deployment resulting in company growth). Appropriate definition provided of specifications for outcome of project and criteria for success.</li> <li>Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible</li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b> Threshold 4/5 Weighting: 25%</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>Technical/business experience of the team, including management capacity to lead a growing team If relevant, the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences, namely through partnerships and/or subcontracting*, and explains why and how they are selected (subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles). <i>The 'team' aspect is particularly examined in Step 2 of the evaluation of Phase 2 proposals.</i></li> <li>Availability of resources required (personnel, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop project activities in the most suitable conditions. Where relevant, complementarity of partners in a consortium. Where relevant, realistic description of how key stakeholders / partners / subcontractors could be involved* (subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles). Where relevant, the estimated budget and the procedure planned for selecting the subcontractors are appropriate*.</li> <li>Realistic timeframe and comprehensive description of implementation (work-packages, major deliverables and milestones, risk management) taking the company's or applicant's innovation ambitions and objectives into account.</li> <li>Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.</li> <li><i>*Subcontracting is acceptable to the extent required for the implementation of the proposed activities. Subcontracting may be an essential part of the implementation of the project, but should not be a disproportionate part of the total estimated eligible costs. Subcontractors must be selected using 'best value-for-money' principles.</i></li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 3:</b> Threshold 4/5 Weighting: 25%</p>
---	---

**Total score**  
Threshold 13/15

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.  
\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.