Horizon Europe

Evaluation Form (HE EIC Pathfinder Open)

Version 4.0
15 December 2023

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Scoring:

Scoring must be in the range from 0-5. Half-marks may be given.

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 threshold for the Excellence criterion is 4, for the Impact criterion is 3.5 and for the Quality and efficiency of the implementation criterion is 3.

Weighting is only used for the ranking (not to determine if the proposal passed the thresholds).

⚠ Specific calls or topics may have different rules regarding thresholds and weighting.

Specific cases:

Two-stage calls

For stage 1 proposals, only the criteria Excellence and Impact will be evaluated and within those criteria only the aspects indicated in bold in General Annex of the Main Work Programme. 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 2.5 the available budget. The actual level will therefore depend on the volume of proposals received. The threshold is expected to normally be around 8 or 8.5.)

SENSITIVE

*[*INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)*]/[*CONSENSUS REPORT (CR)*]*
*[*EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT*]*

PROJECT	
Project number:	[project number]
Project name:	[project title]
Project acronym:	[acronym]
Coordinator contact:	[PCoCo name NAME], [organisation]
Call:	[call ID]
Topic:	[topic ID]
Type of action:	[ToA ID]
Responsible service:	[responsible unit, e.g. JUST/04]
Project duration:	[number of months]

PARTICIPANTS					
Number	**Role**	**Short name**	**Legal name**	**Country**	**PIC**
1	COO				
2	BEN				
2.1	AE				
3	BEN				
4	AP				

PROJECT ABSTRACT
Text from Proposal Abstract (Application Form Part A).

EVALUATION	
Evaluation model:	*[*single*] [*step 1*] [*step 2*]*
Panel:	[insert panel identifier]
Evaluators:	[name NAME], [name NAME], [name NAME]

1. EVALUATION

⚠ *Applications **must be evaluated as they were submitted**, NOT on their potential if certain changes were made. Therefore, do NOT recommend any modifications (e.g. consortia composition, resources or budget, or inclusion of additional work packages). Shortcomings should be reflected in lower score.*

⚠ *If an application is partly out of scope, this should be reflected in the scoring and explained in the comments.*

1. Excellence
The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme: • <u>Long-term vision</u>: How convincing is the vision of a radically new technology towards which the project would contribute in the long term? • <u>Science-towards-technology breakthrough</u>: How concrete, novel and ambitious is the proposed science-towards-technology breakthrough with respect to the state-of-the-art? What advancement does it provide towards realising the envisioned technology? • <u>Objectives</u>: How concrete and plausible are the proposed objectives to reach the envisaged proof of principle? To what extent is the high-risk/high-gain research approach appropriate for achieving them? How sound is the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, alternative directions and options, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research content, and the quality of open science practices? • <u>Interdisciplinarity</u>: How relevant is the interdisciplinary approach from traditionally distant disciplines for achieving the proposed breakthrough?
Comments:
Score 1 (0-5)**:**   Threshold: 4/5   Weight 60%

2. Impact

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- <u>Long-term impact</u>: How significant are the potential transformative positive effects that the envisioned new technology would have to our economy, environment and society?

- <u>Innovation potential</u>: To what extent does the envisioned new technology have potential for generating disruptive innovations in the future and for creating new markets? How adequate are the proposed measures for protection of results and any other exploitation measures to facilitate future translation of research results into innovations? How suitable are the proposed measures for involving and empowering key actors that have the potential to take the lead in translating research into innovations in the future?

- <u>Communication and Dissemination</u>: How suitable are the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, including scientific publications, communication activities, for raising awareness about the project results' potential to establish new markets and/or address global challenges?

Comments:

	Score 2 (0-5)**:** Threshold: 3.5/5 Weight 20%	

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- <u>Work plan:</u> How coherent and effective are the work plan (work packages, tasks, deliverables, milestones, timeline, etc.) and risk mitigation measures in order to achieve the project objectives?

- <u>Allocation of resources:</u> How appropriate and effective is the allocation of resources (comprising person-months and other cost items) to work packages and consortium members?

- <u>Quality of the consortium:</u> To what extent do all the consortium members have the necessary capacity and high quality expertise for performing the project tasks?

Comments:

	Score 3 (0-5)**:** Threshold: 3/5 Weight 20%	
	Total score	

2. OTHER QUESTIONS

Opinion on additional questions
Scope of the application
Based on the information provided, this application is: ○ 'in scope' because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been submitted ○ 'out of scope' because: [Comment box]
Exceptional funding ⚠️ A third country participant/international organisation not listed in the General Annex to the Main Work Programme may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the HE programme guide) *Please list the concerned applicants and requested grant amount and explain the reasons why.*
Based on the information provided, the following participants should receive exceptional funding: [Comment box] Based on the information provided, the following participants should NOT receive exceptional funding: [Comment box]
Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)
Does this proposal involve the use of hESC? ○ No ○ Yes *If YES, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not, because of a lack of information.* [Comment box]
Use of human embryos
Does this proposal involve the use of human embryos? ○ No ○ Yes *If YES, please explain how the human embryos will be used in the project.* [Comment box]

Activities excluded from funding

Activities that:

- aim at human cloning for reproductive purposes, or
- intend to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable (with the exception of research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads, which may be financed), or
- intend to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer, or
- lead to the destruction of human embryos (for example, for obtaining stem cells)?

are excluded from funding. Does the proposal include any of these activities?

○ No

○ Yes

If YES, please explain.

[Comment box]

Do no significant harm principle

Is this proposal compliant with the 'Do no significant harm' principle?

○ Not applicable

○ Yes.

○ Partially

○ No

○ Cannot be assessed

If Partially/No/Cannot be assessed please explain.

[Comment box]

Exclusive focus on civil applications

Do the activities proposed have an exclusive focus on civil applications (activities intended to be used in military application or aims to serve military purposes cannot be funded)?

○ No

○ Yes

If NO, please explain.

[Comment box]

Artificial Intelligence
Do the activities proposed involve the use and/or development of AI-based systems and/or techniques?
⭕ No
⭕ Yes
If YES, the technical robustness of the proposed system must be evaluated under the appropriate criterion.

3. COMMENTS

Overall comments
[Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for CR:

Consensus meeting
Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Minority opinion
Does this proposal have a minority opinion?
⭕ No
⭕ Yes
If YES, please encode the names of dissenting evaluators and the reasons:
[Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for ESR (for internal use – will not be included in the ESR sent to applicants):

Panel review
Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Proposal panel review minutes
[Comment box]

]

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	18.06.2021	Initial version (new MFF).
2.0	12.10.2022	Award criteria updated according to European Innovation Council (EIC) Work Programme 2022
3.0	9.01.2023	Award criteria updated according to European Innovation Council (EIC) Work Programme 2023
4.0	15.12.2023	Award criteria updated according to European Innovation Council (EIC) Work Programme 2024