



ECSEL Joint Undertaking

Electronic Components and Systems for European Leadership



Horizon 2020
European Union Funding
for Research & Innovation

Self-evaluation form

ECSEL Innovation Actions (ECSEL-IA)

ECSEL Research and Innovation Actions (ECSEL-RIA)

Version 2.0
25 January 2019

Version	Date	Change	Page
V 1.0 ED 2018.208	16/02/2018	<i>Initial version</i>	
V 2.0 ED 2019.234	25/01/2019	<i>Changed the thresholds as per the Annual Work Plan 2019</i>	3,5

Self-evaluation form

ECSEL Innovation Actions (ECSEL-IA)

ECSEL Research and Innovation Actions (ECSEL-RIA)

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 2.5 for the Stage 1 (PO phase) and 3 for Stage 2 (FPP). The standard threshold for individual criteria for the RIA Special Topics is 3.0 for both Stage 1 and Stage 2 (PO phase and FPP phase). The standard overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 11. For the PO phase scores are given using half marks (0.5) for the FPP the scores are given using a resolution of one decimal (0.1).

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.)

Two-stage submission schemes

For stage 1-proposals (PO phase) only the aspects indicated in bold will be considered.
 For stage 2-proposals (FPP phase) all the aspects will be considered

<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 MASP:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clear reference to the topics and the main challenges to which the proposal contributes • Clarity and pertinence of the objectives and the expected results of the proposed work with quantified objectives and results and reference baseline • Credibility (soundness) of the concept (<i>what</i>), including inter-disciplinary considerations where relevant, and where relevant use of stakeholder knowledge and gender dimension in research and innovation content (if the proposal addresses the gender dimension) • Credibility (soundness) of the proposed methodology (<i>how</i>) • Extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models) <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score 1:</p> <p><i>Threshold 2.5/5 (PO)</i> <i>Threshold 3 (PO – Special Topics)</i> <i>Threshold 3/5 (FPP)</i></p>
--	---

<p>2. Impact</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <p>The extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or international level to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The creation and exploitation of the market potential and the gain of a competitive technology advantage (impact from the participant perspective) • Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge (<i>impact from the participant perspective</i>) • Creating economic value in Europe (by future employment and industrial investment), including industrial end-user leverage (impact from EU perspective) (<i>this aspect is ONLY for IA Actions!</i>) • Strengthening Europe and the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations that meet the needs of European and global markets; and by delivering such innovations to the markets or introducing new technologies/ process/ tools to the European industry ((impact from EU perspective) • The exploitation of project results per participant and where relevant at project level; management of IPR and where relevant management of the research data (for proposals that do not opt out of the pilot on open research data) • The dissemination of project results, the communication of the project; the contribution of standards, where appropriate <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score 2:</p> <p><i>Threshold 2.5/5 (PO)</i> <i>Threshold 3 (PO – Special Topics)</i> <i>Threshold 3/5 (FPP)</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** • Significant coverage of the value chain, including industrial end-users, and/or different industry domain where relevant (this aspect is only for IA actions!) • Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise • Adequate participation of large companies, SMEs, universities and research institutes. Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role • Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management <p><u>Comments:</u></p> <p>* - Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work. **- for the PO phase only the overall quality of the work plan will be considered</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Score 3:</p> <p><i>Threshold 2.5/5 (PO)</i> <i>Threshold 3 (PO – Special Topics)</i> <i>Threshold 3/5 (FPP)</i></p>
--	---

Total score (1+2+3)
Threshold 11/15