



ECSEL Joint Undertaking

Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership



Horizon 2020
European Union Funding
for Research & Innovation

Self-evaluation form

ECSEL Coordination and Support Actions (ECSEL-CSA)

**Version 1.0
21 March 2018**

Version	Date	Change	Page
V 1.0	21/03/2018	<i>Initial version</i>	

Self-evaluation form

ECSEL Coordination and Support Actions (ECSEL-CSA)

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 criteria, scores and thresholds used for the evaluation of the ECSEL JU proposals. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. The definitive evaluation schemes are given in the ECSEL JU Annual Work Plan.

A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted to the ECSEL JU/European 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 & weighting

The standard threshold for individual criteria is 3. The standard overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10. The scores are given using half marks (0.5).

Scores are normally NOT weighted. Weighting is used for some type of actions (see the ECSEL JU Annual Work Plan) — and only for the *ranking* (not to determine *if* the proposal passed the thresholds.)

<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 relevant work plan topic description in the ECSEL Annual Work Plan 2018 and the additional requirements as described in the “Additional Call Requirements” document:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and pertinence of the objectives • Soundness of the concept and credibility of the proposed methodology • Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures <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 ECSEL Annual Work Plan 2018 and the additional requirements as described in the “Additional Call Requirements” document • 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 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 implementation*</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>* - Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.</p>	<p>Score 3: <i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	---

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

--