



# Horizon Europe (HORIZON)

## Evaluation Form

Version 2.0  
12 October 2022



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

Scores are normally NOT weighted. (Weighting is only used for some types of actions — and only for the ranking (not to determine if the proposal passed the thresholds)).

 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**

## EVALUATION FORM (IA)

| PROJECT          |                                  |
|------------------|----------------------------------|
| Project number:  | [project number]                 |
| Project acronym: | [acronym]                        |
| Project name:    | [project title]                  |
| Call:            | [call ID]                        |
| Topic:           | [topic ID]                       |
| Type of action:  | [ToA ID]                         |
| Service:         | [responsible unit, e.g. JUST/04] |
| Call deadline:   | [dd/mm/yyyy]                     |

| PARTICIPANTS |      |            |            |         |     |
|--------------|------|------------|------------|---------|-----|
| Partner No   | Role | Short Name | Legal Name | Country | PIC |
| 1            | COO  |            |            |         |     |
| 2            | BEN  |            |            |         |     |
| 2.1          | AE   |            |            |         |     |
| 3            | BEN  |            |            |         |     |
| 4            | AP   |            |            |         |     |
|              |      |            |            |         |     |

**PROJECT ABSTRACT***Text from Proposal Abstract (Application Form Part A).***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**

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, and goes beyond the state of the art.
- Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end users where appropriate. Quality of the proposed joint activities to achieve the deliverables
- Quality of the proposed joint activities to achieve the deliverables

**Comments:****Score 1 (0-5):**

Threshold: 3/5

**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 pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from to the project.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.</li> <li>• Quality and credibility of the action to contribute achieving the EU-Rail Master Plan objectives and the expected impact of the EU-Rail Multi-Annual Work Programme.</li> </ul>  |  |
| <p><b>Comments:</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>Score 2 (0-5):</b><br/>Threshold: 3/5</p>  |  |
| <p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation</b></p> <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"> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.</li> <li>• Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the project management structure and quality of the proposed coordination.</li> </ul> |  |
| <p><b>Comments:</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>Score 3 (0-5):</b><br/>Threshold: 3/5</p>  |  |
| <p><b>Total score</b><br/>Overall threshold /15</p>  |  |