



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



Self-evaluation form

Call H2020-FETOPEN-2018-2020
Topic FETOPEN-01-2018-2019-2020

Version 2.0
26 October 2017

*Research and
Innovation*

Self-evaluation form

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.

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. 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 criterion *Excellence* is 4, 3.5 for criterion *Impact*, and 3 for criterion *Quality and efficiency of the Implementation*.

<p>1. Excellence</p> <p>Adherence to the "FET gatekeepers" as described in the call text::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of the radical vision of a science-enabled technology and its differentiation from current paradigms. • Novelty and ambition of the proposed science-to-technology breakthrough that addresses this vision. • Range of and added value from interdisciplinarity for opening up new areas of research; non-incrementality of the research proposed. • High-risk, plausibility and flexibility of the research approach. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 1: <i>Threshold 4/5</i> <i>Weight 60 %</i></p>
---	--

<p>2. Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under this topic. • Effectiveness of measures and plans to disseminate and use the results (including management of IPR) and to communicate about the project to different target audiences. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 2: <i>Threshold 3.5/5</i> <i>Weight 20%</i></p>
--	---

<p>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation</p> <p>The following aspects are taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence and effectiveness of the research methodology and work plan to achieve project objectives and impacts, including adequate allocation of resources to tasks and partners. • Role and complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise. <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p>Score 3: <i>Threshold 3/5</i> <i>Weight 20%</i></p>
--	---

<p>Total score (60% of 1 + 20% of 2 + 20% of 3) No threshold applicable to the total score</p>
