



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



Self-evaluation form Research and innovation actions for e-Infrastructure proposals

Version 1.1
27 February 2014

History of changes

Version	Date	Change	Page
1.1	27.02.2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Information on Evaluation added - scoring of proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes to be made	1

Self-evaluation form

Research and innovation actions for *e-Infrastructure* proposals

This form is made available to applicants who may themselves wish to arrange an evaluation of their proposal (e.g. by an impartial colleague) 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 specific for the following calls: H2020-EINFRA-2014-1, H2020-EINFRA-2014-2 and H2020-EINFRA-2015-1 (topics: **EINFRA-1-2014, EINFRA-2-2014, EINFRA-4-2014, EINFRA-5-2015, EINFRA-7-2014 and EINFRA-9-2015**). The definitive evaluation schemes are given in the work programme.

A self-evaluation, if carried out, is not to be submitted to the Commission, 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 individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 10.

<p>1. Excellence</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and pertinence of the objectives; • Credibility of the proposed overall approach and methodology; • The extent to which the Networking Activities will foster a culture of co-operation between the participants and other relevant stakeholders; • The extent to which the Service activities will offer access to state-of-the-art infrastructures, high quality services, and will enable users to conduct excellent research; • The extent to which the Joint Research Activities will contribute to quantitative and qualitative improvements of the services provided by the infrastructures. • 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. improved performance and capacity of the proposed e-Infrastructures): <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 1: Threshold 3/5</p>
<p>2. Impact</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • 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. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 2: Threshold 3/5</p>
<p>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation*</p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></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 (when relevant); • Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 3: Threshold 3/5</p>
<p>Total score (1+2+3) Threshold 10/15</p>	