



Horizon Europe

Evaluation Form (HE EIC Transition)

Version 2.0
17 January 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 4 and for the Quality and efficiency of the implementation criterion is 3.

 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 | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| |
|---|
| <p>PROJECT ABSTRACT</p> <p><i>Text from Proposal Abstract (Application Form Part A).</i></p> |
| |

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 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 | |
| <p>The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Technological breakthrough</u>: Does the technology have a high degree of novelty compared to other technologies available or in development? Does the technology indicate high potential business application? • <u>Objectives</u>: How credible and feasible are the objectives for the planned technology development? How credible and feasible are the objectives (and KPIs) for the planned business development process? <p><u>Additional Consideration for EIC Transition Challenges ONLY</u>: How relevant are the proposal objectives in contributing to the specific objectives of the Challenge?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Methodology</u>: Is the timing right for this technology/innovation (i.e., feasibility, technological readiness, unique selling points)? | |
| Comments: | |
| | |
| <p>Score 1 (0-5): Threshold: 4/5</p> | |

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:

- Credibility of the impacts: To what extent the expected impacts described are credible and realistic within the project and beyond?
Additional Consideration for EIC Transition Challenges ONLY: To what extent the proposed application contributes to the expected outcomes and impacts, set out in the Challenge?
- Economic and/or societal benefits: To what extent does the proposed innovation have scale up potential including high capacity to gain or create new European or global markets? To what extent is the proposed innovation expected to generate other positive impacts (strategic autonomy, employment, societal or environmental, etc.)?
- Investment readiness and go to market strategy: To what extent the proposal and its activities contribute to make the technology and the team investment ready (including through IP protection and market validation)? Is there a convincing go to market pathway/strategy, including what regulatory approvals may be needed (if relevant), time to market, possible business and revenue model?

Comments:

Score 2 (0-5):

Threshold: 4/5

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:

- Quality and motivation of the team: To what extent does the (project) team have the necessary high-quality capabilities and motivation to move decisively towards market. To what extent do the applicant(s) have the necessary expertise to create a unique commercial value from the emerging technology and develop an attractive business and investment proposition?
- KPIs and Milestones: Are both milestones and KPIs present, relevant and clearly defined (measurable, timed, comparable etc.) to track progress along the pathway towards objectives? Have the main risks (e.g., technological, market, financial etc.) been identified, together with measures to mitigate in order to achieve the project objectives?
- Workplan and allocation of resources: How appropriate and effective is the allocation of resources (person-months and equipment) in the workplan and work packages and project partners?

Comments:


Score 3 (0-5):

Threshold: 3/5

Total score

Overall threshold /15

2. OTHER QUESTIONS

| Opinion on additional questions |
|--|
| Scope of the application |
| <p>Based on the information provided, this application is:</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 'in scope' because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been submitted</p> <p><input type="radio"/> 'out of scope' because: [Comment box]</p> |
| Exceptional funding <p> 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)</p> <p><i>Please list the concerned applicants and requested grant amount and explain the reasons why.</i></p> |
| <p>Based on the information provided, the following participants should receive exceptional funding:</p> <p>[Comment box]</p> <p>Based on the information provided, the following participants should NOT receive exceptional funding:</p> <p>[Comment box]</p> |
| Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC) |
| <p>Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>[Comment box]</p> |
| Use of human embryos |
| <p>Does this proposal involve the use of human embryos?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><i>If YES, please explain how the human embryos will be used in the project.</i></p> <p>[Comment box]</p> |

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.***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.***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.*

| Artificial Intelligence |
|---|
| <p>Do the activities proposed involve the use and/or development of AI-based systems and/or techniques?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p><i>If YES, the technical robustness of the proposed system must be evaluated under the appropriate criterion.</i></p> |

3. COMMENTS

| Overall comments |
|------------------|
| [Comment box] |

[additional OPTION for CR:

]

| Consensus meeting |
|---|
| Consensus meeting minutes |
| [Comment box] |
| Minority opinion |
| <p>Does this proposal have a minority opinion?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p>If YES, please encode the names of dissenting evaluators and the reasons:</p> <p>[Comment box]</p> |

]

[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] |

[additional OPTION for applicants invited to the second evaluation step (Jury interview):

The following award criteria are applied coherently with the level of technological and business maturity expected from an EIC Transition proposal as described in this Work Programme.

Award criteria for EIC Transition Open and Challenges at second evaluation step (Jury interview):

| | |
|---|--------------------------|
| <p>1. Excellence (GO/NO GO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Technological breakthrough</u>: Does the technology/innovation – through its degree of novelty/disruptiveness and/or added value/value proposition for the users/customers – have the potential to create important new markets or significant impact in existing ones? • <u>Objectives</u>: How credible and feasible are the objectives for the planned technology development? How credible and feasible are the objectives (and KPIs) for the planned business development process? <p><i>Additional Consideration for EIC Transition Challenges ONLY</i>: How relevant are the proposal objectives in contributing to the specific objectives of the Challenge?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Methodology</u>: Is the timing right for this technology/innovation (i.e., feasibility, technological readiness, unique selling points)? | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | |
| <p>2. Impact (GO/NO GO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Credibility of the impacts</u>: Is the incipient proposed business model sound? To what extent the expected impacts described are credible and realistic within the project and beyond? <p><i>Additional Consideration for EIC Transition Challenges ONLY</i>: To what extent the proposed application contributes to the expected outcomes and impacts set out in the Challenge?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Investment readiness and go to market strategy</u>: How appropriate are the plans to ensure the subsequent financing of the technology/ innovation (applying for an EIC Accelerator, private investment, patenting/licensing, etc.)? | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | |
| <p>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation (GO/NO GO)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Quality and motivation of the team</u>: Does the team have the capability and motivation to implement the proposed technological innovation and market-related activities? • <u>Risk assessment</u>: Have the risk that might prevent the validation of the innovation in relevant application environment and/or market success been appropriately considered? | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | |
| <p>Total score</p> | <p>GO/ NO GO</p> |

J

| HISTORY OF CHANGES | | |
|--------------------|------------------|---|
| VERSION | PUBLICATION DATE | CHANGE |
| 1.0 | 18.06.2021 | Initial version (new MFF). |
| 2.0 | 17.01.2023 | Award criteria updated according to European Innovation Council (EIC) Work Programme 2023 |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |