

## H. Evaluation rules

### Selection Criteria

1. *Financial capacity*: In line with the Financial Regulation No 966/2012 and the Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013. For grants, coordinators will be invited – at the proposal stage – to complete a self-assessment using an on-line tool.
2. *Operational capacity*: As a distinct operation, carried out during the evaluation of the award criterion ‘Quality and efficiency of the implementation’, experts will indicate whether the participants have sufficient operational capacity to carry out the proposed work, based on the competence and experience of the individual participant(s).
3. For prizes, neither financial capacity nor operational capacity is subject to evaluation.

### Award criteria, scores and weighting

1. Grant proposals will be evaluated by experts, on the basis of the **award criteria** ‘excellence’, ‘impact’ and ‘quality and efficiency of the implementation’ (see Article 15 of the Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013).

The aspects to be considered in each case depend on the types of action as set out in the table below, unless stated otherwise in the call conditions:

	<b>Award criteria</b>		
	<p><b>Excellence</b></p> <p><i>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>	<p><b>Impact</b></p> <p><i>The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p>	<p><b>Quality and efficiency of the implementation</b></p> <p><i>The following aspects will be taken into account*:</i></p>
<p><b>All types of action</b> (except Framework Partnership Agreement; see below)</p>	<p><b>Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;</b></p> <p><b>Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology;</b></p>	<p><b>The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;</b></p>	<p>Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables;</p> <p>Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation</p>

General Annexes

			<p>management;</p> <p>Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as whole brings together the necessary expertise;</p> <p>Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role.</p>
<p><b>Research and innovation actions (RIA); Innovation actions (IA) ; SME instrument actions</b></p>	<p><b>Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models)</b></p> <p><b>Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge.</b></p>	<p>Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society;</p> <p>Quality of the proposed measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant.</li> <li>• Communicate the project activities to different target audiences (not applicable to SME Instrument, phase 1)</li> </ul>	<p>(For SME instrument phase 2) Best value for money of subcontracts is assessed<sup>43</sup>.</p>
<p><b>Coordination &amp; support actions (CSA)</b></p>	<p><b>Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures.</b></p>	<p>Quality of the proposed measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant.</li> </ul>	

<sup>43</sup> For SME instrument phase 2 subcontracting has a crucial impact on the quality and efficiency of the implementation criteria.

General Annexes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate the project activities to different target audiences</li> </ul>	
<b>ERA-NET Cofund actions</b>	Level of ambition in the collaboration and commitment of the participants in the proposed ERA-NET action to pool national resources and coordinate their national/regional research programmes.	<p>Achievement of critical mass for the funding of trans-national projects by pooling of national/regional resources and contribution to establishing and strengthening a durable cooperation between the partners and their national/regional research programmes;</p> <p>Quality of the proposed measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant.</li> <li>• Communicate the project, to activities to different target audiences</li> </ul>	
<b>Pre-commercial procurement (PCP)/ Public procurement of innovative solutions (PPI) actions</b>	Progress beyond the state of the art in terms of the degree of innovation needed to satisfy the procurement need.	<p>Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global procurement markets</p> <p>Quality of the proposed measures to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR) and to manage research data where relevant.</li> <li>• Communicate the project activities to different target audiences</li> </ul> <p>More forward-looking concerted procurement</p>	

General Annexes

		approaches that reduce fragmentation of demand for innovative solutions	
<b>EJP Cofund actions</b>	Level of ambition in the collaboration and commitment of the participants in the proposed action to pool national resources and coordinate their national/regional research programmes.	Critical mass in terms of proposed overall budget, maturity and degree of integration in the proposed research area as well as consistency of proposed activities with the development of a European Joint Programme towards a joint undertaking or other permanent structure in the proposed research area.  Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the programme's results and to communicate the programme	
<b>Framework Partnership Agreements (FPA)</b>	Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;	The extent to which the action plan of the FPA would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic;	Complementarity of the partners, and balance of expertise ;  Potential for long term cooperation among the partners

\* not all aspects are relevant to proposals involving just one beneficiary

## 2. Scoring and weighting:

Unless otherwise specified in the call conditions:

- Evaluation scores will be awarded for the criteria, and not for the different aspects listed in the above table. For full proposals, each criterion will be scored out of 5. The threshold for individual criteria will be 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, will be 10.
- For Innovation actions and the SME instrument (phases 1 and 2), to determine the ranking, the score for the criterion 'impact' will be given a weight of 1.5.
- For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the criteria 'excellence' and 'impact' will be evaluated. Within these criteria, only the aspects in bold will be considered. The threshold for both individual criteria will be 4. For each indicative budget-split in the call conditions, the overall threshold, applying to the sum of the two individual scores, will be set at the level such 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 two and a half times the available budget.

- The actual level will therefore depend on the volume of proposals received. The threshold is expected to normally be set at 8 or 8.5.

**3. Priority order** for proposals with the same score:

Unless the call conditions indicate otherwise, the following method will be applied (except for the first stage of two-stage calls, where proposals having the same score are kept together and no prioritisation is made.)

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. Whether or not such a prioritisation is carried out will depend on the available budget or other conditions set out in the call fiche. 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:

- a) Proposals that address topics, or sub-topics, not otherwise covered by more highly-ranked proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.
- b) The proposals identified under (a), if any, 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.
- c) If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on the following factors, in order: size of EU 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.
- d) 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.
- e) The method described in (a), (b), (c) and (d) will then be applied to the remaining ex aequos in the group.

4. For prizes, the award criteria, scoring and weighting will be set out in the Rules of contest.

**Evaluation procedure**

1. Calls may be subject to either a one-stage or two-stage submission and evaluation procedure.
2. Proposals are evaluated by independent experts (see Article 15(7) Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013 for exceptional cases).

As part of the evaluation by independent experts, a panel review will recommend one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above. A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget shown in the call conditions.

3. Proposal coordinators receive an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), showing the results of the evaluation for a given proposal. For proposals that successfully pass the first stage of two-stage calls, common feedback is provided to all coordinators, but the first stage ESR is only sent after the second stage evaluation.

4. If special procedures apply, they will be set out in the call conditions.

\*\*\*

Note:

*1. The evaluation criteria applied to ‘**specific grant agreements (SGAs)**’ in the context of an FPA are those shown in the table above, for the respective type of action, unless otherwise specified in the call conditions*

*2. The provisions applying to calls for **Marie Skłodowska–Curie (MSC) actions** are set out under the MSC part of the Work Programme.*