

# Guiding principles

- *Independence*

**We are evaluating in a personal capacity**

**We represent neither our employer, nor our country**

- *Impartiality*

**We must treat all proposals equally and evaluate them impartially on their merits, irrespective of their origin or the identity of the applicants**

- *Objectivity*

**We evaluate each proposal as submitted; meaning on its own merit, not its potential if certain changes were to be made**

- *Accuracy*

**We make your judgment against the official evaluation criteria and the call or topic the proposal addresses, and nothing else**

- *Consistency*

**We apply the same standard of judgment to all proposals**

# The role of the expert

**We evaluate each proposal as submitted** - not on its potential if certain changes were to be made

**We identify shortcomings and reflect those in a lower score for the relevant criterion**

**We explain the shortcomings, but do not make recommendations** - meaning do not suggest additional partners, additional work packages, resources cut...

**For proposals with significant weaknesses that prevent the project from achieving its objectives or with resources being seriously over-estimated we do not give above-threshold scores**

**Any proposal with scores above the thresholds and for which there is sufficient budget will be selected as submitted**

# Scores used

**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 (check for each WP/Call)**

The threshold for individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

# Evaluation criteria - Research and Innovation Actions

EXCELLENCE – 0-5 – [default threshold is 3 \(unless specified otherwise in the WP\)](#)

- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- 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)
- Credibility of the proposed approach

IMPACT– 0-5 – [default threshold is 3 \(unless specified otherwise in the WP\)](#)

- The expected impacts listed in the work programme 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 management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant

IMPLEMENTATION– 0-5 – [default threshold is 3 \(unless specified otherwise in the WP\)](#)

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

# Proposals with identical total scores

The following approach will be applied successively for every group of *ex aequo* proposals requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

(i) Proposals that address topics not otherwise covered by more highly-ranked proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.

(ii) These proposals will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion *excellence*. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion *impact*. In the case of Innovation actions, and the SME instrument (phases 1 and 2), this prioritisation will be done first on the basis of the score for *impact*, and then on that for *excellence*.

If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on the following factors, in order: size of budget allocated to SMEs; gender balance among the personnel named in the proposal who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the research and/or innovation activities.

If a distinction still cannot be made, the panel may decide to further prioritise by considering how to enhance the quality of the project portfolio through synergies between projects, or other factors related to the objectives of the call or to Horizon 2020 in general. These factors will be documented in the report of the Panel.

(iii) The method described in (ii) will then be applied to the remaining *ex aequos* in the

# COMPARE SUBMISSION WITH EVALUATION

EXCELLENCE – 0-5 – [default threshold is 3 \(unless specified otherwise in the WP\)](#)

- **Clarity and pertinence of the objectives**

#### 1.1 Objectives

- Describe the specific objectives for the project<sup>1</sup>, which should be clear, measurable, realistic and achievable within the duration of the project. Objectives should be consistent with the expected exploitation and impact of the project (see section 2).

- **Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant**

#### 1.3 Concept and approach

- Describe and explain the overall concept underpinning the project. Describe the main ideas, models or assumptions involved. Identify any trans-disciplinary considerations;

- Describe the positioning of the project e.g. where it is situated in the spectrum from ‘idea to application’, or from ‘lab to market’. Refer to Technology Readiness Levels where relevant.

- Describe any national or international research and innovation activities which will be linked with the project, especially where the outputs from these will feed into the project;

- Describe and explain the overall approach and methodology, distinguishing, as appropriate, activities indicated in the relevant section of the work programme, e.g. for research, demonstration, piloting, first market replication, etc;

- Where relevant, describe how sex and/or gender analysis is taken into account in the project’s content.

- **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)**

#### 1.4 Ambition

- Describe the advance your proposal would provide beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent the proposed work is ambitious. Your answer could refer to the ground-breaking nature of the objectives, concepts involved, issues and problems to be addressed, and approaches and methods to be used.

- Describe the innovation potential which the proposal represents. Where relevant, refer to products and services already available on the market. Please refer to the results of any patent search carried out.

- **Credibility of the proposed approach**

#### 1.2 Relation to the work programme

- Indicate the work programme topic to which your proposal relates, and explain how your proposal addresses the specific challenge and scope of that topic, as set out in the work programme.

# DO's & DON'T's

- do*

- follow the rules/guidelines from the submission template**
  - fill in all the requested information – including Gantt and PERT charts**
  - read the work program for SCOPE and EXPECTED IMPACT – do your homework**
  - check how a tied proposal will be untied**

- don't*

- try to “bend” the rules/guidelines – we see it when comparing to the others that followed the rules**
  - make into consortia where you are not adding real value**
  - think we are either too smart...nor very stupid**

- remember*

- we have a work life beyond Evaluations (and a family life too)**
  - we have to perform on very strict time limits**
  - the easier to read and find the needed information – the better**
  - well-written, clear and concise proposals are easier to understand and evaluate**
  - good science/technology is always good science, bad science/technology is always bad science**
  - small is beautiful**
  - the first impact (clear sentences) together with visual impact (organization) will impress**

# THE EVALUATION PROCESS

There are three evaluators with different social/educational/cultural backgrounds

It is a honest process – and quite fair

*however if you fail to impress one single evaluator your chances to be on the top 10% are drastically reduced (personal experience/data)*

No way to “cheat” the process clearly

*no possibility for REA or Commission employees to influence the individual evaluations*

Become an Evaluator by registering in the Expert Database