

Self-evaluation form

Research and innovation actions

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal 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 standard criteria, scores and thresholds which are given in the BBI JU annual Work Plan.

A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted, and has no bearing whatsoever on the conduct of the evaluation.

Scoring

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

The threshold for Excellence and Implementation criteria is 3, whereas for the Impact criterion the threshold is 4. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 11.

<p>1. Excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and pertinence of the objectives; • Credibility of the proposed approach; • Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant; • Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches); <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 1: Threshold 3/5</p>
<p>2. Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The expected impacts listed in the BBI JU annual Work Plan under the relevant topic; • Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge; • Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets; and, where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets; • Any other environmental and socially important impacts (not already covered above) • Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including IPR management), to communicate the project and to manage research data, where relevant <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 2: Threshold 4/5</p>
<p>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources; • Complementarity of the participants within the consortium; • Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 3: Threshold 3/5</p>

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