



EVALUATION FORMS

Competitiveness and Innovation Framework Programme
ICT Policy Support Programme
ICT-PSP Call 6

CIP-ICT PSP-2012-6

The following forms exemplify those which will be issued to independent experts employed as evaluators in the evaluation of proposals received in

ICT PSP Call 6 (CIP-ICT PSP 2012-6)

In this call there will be strong competition. Therefore, edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator; refer to the evaluation criteria and procedure given in annex 6 of the Guide for Applicants. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.

CONTENTS

EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE A.....	3
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE B.....	3
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A THEMATIC NETWORK.....	3
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A BEST PRACTICE NETWORK.....	3

ICT-PSP Call 6

IER Pilot A

Evaluation Report for a Pilot Type A

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	

A1) Relevance (threshold 3/5)

Score-

Note: when a proposal only partially addresses the topic, this will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion

- a) The alignment with the general objectives of the Work Programme and with the addressed specific objective described under section 3 of the Workprogramme
- b) Alignment and synergies with relevant policies, strategies and activities on European and national level

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1** - *Very poor*: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2** - *Not satisfactory*: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3** - *Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4** - *Very Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5** - *Excellent*: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE A

IER Pilot A

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective	
<p>A2) <u>Impact (threshold 3/5)</u></p>			<p>Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p>
<p>Note: Refer to the applicable list of impacts specified in the work programme</p>			
<p>a) The contribution of the project to the target outcome and expected impact as defined in the specific objective addressed</p> <p>b) Long term impact: viability, sustainability and scalability beyond the phases of work sponsored by the Community in view of EU-wide operations. Attention should be given to the support by public entities and the capability to build support across the EU in view of reaching EU wide consensus</p> <p>c) The free availability of common results in view of implementing interoperability on EU wide level (specifications of interfaces, protocols, architecture, etc, as well as – where appropriate - open source reference implementations of necessary components and building blocks for interoperability)</p>			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE A

IER
Pilot A

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective :	
A3) <u>Implementation (threshold 3/5)</u>		Score-	<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 2px solid black;" type="text"/>
<i>NOTE - For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an <u>above-threshold score</u> for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the <u>consortium has the operational capacity to carry out the work</u></i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Quality of the approach (taking into account specificities of the participation of administrations) and convincing work plan with well-defined work packages, schedule, partner roles and deliverables; effectiveness of the management approach b) Capability and commitment of the partnership to reach the objectives of the project. Attention should be given to the involvement of relevant stakeholders to achieve the objectives of the proposal c) Appropriateness of resource allocation and estimated cost in view of the achievement of the objectives of the proposal d) Specific and realistic quantified indicators provided to measure progress towards the achievement of the addressed objectives at different stages in the project lifetime e) The appropriate attention to security, privacy, inclusiveness and accessibility; the appropriate use of interoperable platforms; standards or open technical specifications and open-source components 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE A

IER Pilot A

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	

OVERALL SCORE (Threshold 9/15)

REMARKS:

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6

IER Pilot B

Evaluation Report for a Pilot Type B

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
A1) <i>Relevance (threshold 3/5)</i>			Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
Note: when a proposal only <u>partially addresses the topic</u> , this will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion			
c) The alignment with the general objectives of the Work Programme and with the addressed specific objective described under section 3 of the Workprogramme d) Alignment and synergies with relevant policies, strategies and activities on European and national level e) The maturity of the technical solution proposed, i.e. the research phase of the different applications involved in the realisation of the pilot is complete, and integration of the different components does not imply further research work			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1** - *Very poor*: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2** - *Not satisfactory*: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3** - *Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4** - *Very Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5** - *Excellent*: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE B

IER
Pilot B

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective	
<p>A2) <i>Impact (threshold 3/5)</i></p> <p>Note: Refer to the applicable list of impacts specified in the work programme</p>			<p>Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/></p>
<p>d) The contribution of the project to the target outcome and expected impact as defined in the specific objective addressed</p> <p>e) Capability to survive, develop and scale-up without Community funding after the end of the project</p> <p>f) Quality of the approach to facilitate wider deployment and use, in view of EU-wide take-up beyond the partners, and optimal use of the project results , including dissemination plan and if applicable networking activities</p>			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE B

IER Pilot B

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective :	
A3) <u>Implementation (threshold 3/5)</u>			Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
NOTE - For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an <u>above-threshold score</u> for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the <u>consortium has the operational capacity to carry out the work</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) Capability and commitment of the consortium to reach the objectives of the project g) Quality of the approach and convincing work plan with well-defined work packages, schedule, partner roles and deliverables; effectiveness of the management approach; adequacy of intended implementation of solutions h) Appropriateness of resource allocation and estimated cost in view of the achievement of the objectives of the proposal i) Specific and realistic quantified indicators provided to measure progress towards the achievement of the addressed objectives at different stages in the project lifetime j) The appropriate attention to security, privacy, inclusiveness and accessibility; the appropriate use of interoperable platforms; standards or open technical specifications and open-source components 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A PILOT TYPE B

IER
Pilot B

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
OVERALL SCORE (Threshold 9/15)			<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
REMARKS:			

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6

IER
TN

Evaluation Report for a Thematic Network

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
A1) <i>Relevance (threshold 3/5)</i>			Score- <input type="checkbox"/>
Note: when a proposal only <u>partially addresses the topic</u> , this will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion			
<p>f) The alignment with the general objectives of the Work Programme and with the addressed specific objective described under section 3 of the Workprogramme</p> <p>g) Alignment and synergies with relevant policies, strategies and activities on European and national level</p>			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1** - *Very poor*: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2** - *Not satisfactory*: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3** - *Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4** - *Very Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5** - *Excellent*: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A THEMATIC NETWORK

IER
TN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective	
<p>A2) <u>Impact (threshold 3/5)</u> Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/></p> <p>Note: Refer to the applicable list of impacts specified in the work programme</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> g) Capacity of the network to achieve the target outcomes and expected impact of the addressed objective h) Viability, sustainability and scalability beyond the phases of work sponsored by the Community, including take-up beyond the partners i) The dissemination plan, free availability of common results and outcomes and the openness of the network towards relevant organisations which are not part of the network 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A THEMATIC NETWORK

IER TN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective :	
A3) <u>Implementation (threshold 3/5)</u>			Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
NOTE - For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an <u>above-threshold score</u> for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the <u>consortium has the operational capacity to carry out the work</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> k) Capability and commitment of the coordinator and the partnership to reach the objectives of the network and to build support across the EU in view of reaching EU wide consensus l) Quality of the approach and convincing work plan with clear partner roles and deliverables; effectiveness of the coordination m) Appropriateness of resource allocation in view of the achievement of the objectives of the proposal, including rationale and added value for Community contribution 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A THEMATIC NETWORK

IER
TN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
OVERALL SCORE (Threshold 9/15)			<input style="width: 40px; height: 30px; border: 2px solid black;" type="text"/>
REMARKS:			

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6

IER BPN

Evaluation Report for a Best Practice Network

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
A1) <i>Relevance (threshold 3/5)</i>			Score- <input type="checkbox"/>
Note: when a proposal only <u>partially addresses the topic</u> , this will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> h) The alignment with the general objectives of the Work Programme and with the addressed specific objective described under section 3 of the Work Programme i) Contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the European Digital Library initiative 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1** - *Very poor*: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2** - *Not satisfactory*: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3** - *Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4** - *Very Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5** - *Excellent*: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A BEST PRACTICE NETWORK

IER
BPN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective	
<p>A2) <u>Impact (threshold 3/5)</u></p> <p style="text-align: right;">Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/></p> <p>Note: Refer to the applicable list of impacts specified in the work programme</p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> j) Contribution of the project to the target outcome and expected impact as defined in the addressed objective k) Capability to survive, develop and scale-up without Community funding after the end of the project l) Quality of the approach to facilitate wider deployment and use, in view of EU-wide take-up beyond the partners and in particular of the dissemination plan and networking activities to ensure optimal use of the project results 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A BEST PRACTICE NETWORK

IER
BPN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective :	
A3) <u>Implementation (threshold 3/5)</u>			Score- <input style="width: 40px; height: 20px; border: 1px solid black;" type="text"/>
NOTE - For the purposes of any subsequent negotiation, an <u>above-threshold score</u> for this criterion is regarded as an indication that the <u>consortium has the operational capacity to carry out the work</u>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> n) Capability and commitment of the consortium to reach the objectives of the project o) Quality of the approach and convincing work plan with well-defined work packages, schedule, partner roles and deliverables; effectiveness of the management approach; adequacy of intended implementation of solutions p) Appropriateness of resource allocation and estimated cost in view of the achievement of the objectives of the proposal q) Specific and realistic quantified indicators provided to measure progress towards the achievement of the addressed objectives at different stages in the project lifetime r) The appropriate attention to security, privacy, inclusiveness and accessibility; the appropriate use of interoperable platforms; standards or open technical specifications and open-source components 			

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1** - *Very poor*: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2** - *Not satisfactory*: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3** - *Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4** - *Very Good*: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5** - *Excellent*: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.

ICT-PSP Call 6
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A BEST PRACTICE NETWORK

IER
BPN

Proposal No.:		Proposal Acronym:	
Evaluator name:		Objective:	
OVERALL SCORE (Threshold 9/15)			<input style="width: 40px; height: 20px;" type="text"/>
REMARKS:			

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal

Name	
Signature	
Date	

SCORES: 0 - The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. **1 - Very poor:** The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner or there are serious inherent weaknesses. **2 - Not satisfactory:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses. **3 - Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary. **4 - Very Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. **5 - Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question, any shortcomings are minor.