



The EU Framework Programme  
for Research and Innovation

# HORIZON 2020



2016-2017

Self-evaluation form

Form 1: SME instrument phase 1

Form 2: SME instrument phase 2

Version 2.0  
4 December 2015

Research and  
Innovation

## History of changes

| <b>Version</b> | <b>Date</b> | <b>Change</b>   | <b>Page</b> |
|----------------|-------------|---|-------------|
| 1.1            | 27.02.2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Information on Evaluation added - scoring of proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes to be made</li></ul>               | 1           |
| 1.2            | 10.03.2014  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>updated to apply only to the SME instrument</li></ul>   |             |
| 2.0            | 04.12.2015  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Wording in sections 1, 2 and 3 adjusted to align with revised "aspects to be taken into account" under the three evaluation criteria (re General Annex H)</li></ul> |             |

# Self-evaluation form

## SME instrument phase 1

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 based on the standard criteria, scores and thresholds. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. 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

SME phase 1

The threshold for individual criteria is 4. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 13.

### Weighting

For 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.

## 1. Excellence

*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:*

- The innovation aims at exploring new market opportunities addressing EU/global challenges
- The proposal provides a realistic description of the current stage of development and added value of its innovation as well as an understanding of the competing solutions. Includes good comparison with state-of-the-art, known commercial solutions, including costs, environmental benefits, gender dimension, ease-of-use and other features, or includes plans for achieving this information
- The objectives for the feasibility study and the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact of the project
- The expected performances of the innovation are convincing and have the potential to be relevant from a commercial point of view (Value for money). It is potentially better than alternatives
- The proposal reflects a very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to a successful market introduction of the innovation, both from a technical, commercial point of view
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion)

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
Threshold 4/5

## 2. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- The proposal indicates in a convincing way that there will be demand/market (willing to pay) for the innovation when the product /solution is introduced into the market
- The targeted users or user groups of the final product/application, and their needs, are well described and the proposal provides a realistic description of why the identified groups will have an interest in using/buying the product/application, compared to current solutions available
- The proposal demonstrates very good understanding of the needs for a realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions, total available market size and growth rate, competitors and competitive solutions and key stakeholders, or includes a plan for achieving this information
- It is described in a realistic and relevant way how the innovation has the potential to boost the growth of the applying company
- The proposal demonstrates the alignment with the overall strategy of the participating SME(s) and the need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organizational requirements for commercial exploitation. The initial commercialisation plan is outlined and explains how will be further developed (in-house development, licensing strategy, etc.)
- The innovation /solution has a clear European dimension both with respect to commercialisation and with respect to competitor / competition evaluation
- The proposal includes a realistic and relevant description of status and strategy of knowledge protection, the need of "freedom to operate analysis", and current IPR situation, which could include a plan for achieving this information. If relevant, potential regulatory requirements are also addressed.
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion)

Comments:

**Score 2:**  
Threshold 4/5

### 3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- The proposal demonstrates that the project has the relevant resources (personal, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop its activities in the most suitable conditions. If relevant, describes in a realistic way how key stakeholders / partners / subcontractors could be involved
- Taking the project's ambition and objectives into account, the proposal includes a realistic time frame and a comprehensive description of work
- The team has relevant technical/scientific knowledge/management experience, including a good understanding of the relevant market aspects for the particular innovation. If relevant the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion).

Comments:

**Score 3:**  
*Threshold 4/5*

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
*Threshold 13/15*

# Self-evaluation form

## SME instrument phase 2

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 based on the standard criteria, scores and thresholds. Check whether special schemes apply to the topics of interest to you. 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

SME phase 2:

The threshold for impact is 4. The threshold for the other 2 criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 12

### Weighting

For 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.

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.

## 1. Excellence

*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:*

- The innovation aims at exploring new market opportunities addressing EU/global challenges
- The included feasibility assessment demonstrates the technological/practical/economic viability of the innovation.
- The proposal provides a realistic description of the current stage of development (TRL 6 - see note 1- or similar for non-technological innovations) and added value of its innovation as well as very good understanding of the competing solutions. Includes good comparison with state-of-the-art, known commercial solutions, including costs, environmental benefits, gender dimension- see note 2-, ease-of-use and other features
- The objectives for the project as well as the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact (commercialisation/deployment). Specifications for the outcome of the project and criteria for success are well defined
- The expected performances of the innovation are convincing and have the potential to be relevant from a commercial point of view (Value for money). It is potentially better than alternatives
- The proposal reflects a very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to a successful market introduction of the innovation, both from a technical, commercial point of view
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion)

Comments:

**Score 1:**  
Threshold 4/5

## 2. Impact

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- The proposal indicates in a convincing way that there will be demand/market (willing to pay) for the innovation when the product /solution is introduced into the market
- The targeted users or user groups of the final product/application, and their needs, are well described and the proposal provides a realistic description of why the identified groups will have an interest in using/buying the product/application, compared to current solutions available
- The proposal provides a realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions, total available market size and growth rate, competitors and competitive solutions and key stakeholders, clear opportunities for market introduction
- It is described in a realistic and relevant way how the innovation has the potential to boost the growth of the applying company
- The proposal demonstrates the alignment with the overall strategy of the participating SME(s) and the need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organizational requirements for commercial exploitation as well as key third parties needed
- The innovation /solution has a clear European dimension both with respect to commercialisation and with respect to competitor / competition evaluation
- The strategy plan for commercialisation is described in a realistic and relevant way, including approximate time to market/deployment. Activities to be further developed after phase 2, including additional dissemination measures, are well outlined
- Measures to ensure "freedom to operate" (possibility of commercial exploitation) are realistic and there is a convincing strategy of knowledge protection, including current IPR filing status, IPR ownership and licensing issues. Regulatory and/or standard requirements are well addressed
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion)

Comments:

**Score 2:**  
Threshold 3/5

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.

### 3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation\*\*

*Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:*

- The proposal demonstrates that the project has the relevant resources (personal, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop its activities in the most suitable conditions. If relevant, describes in a realistic way how key stakeholders / partners / subcontractors could be involved and why and how they were selected (subcontractors must be selected using the best-value-for-money principles). (Where relevant/) Participants in a consortium are complementary
- The team has relevant technical/scientific knowledge/management experience, and a very good understanding of the relevant market aspects for the particular innovation. If relevant the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences, namely through partnerships or subcontracting (subcontractors must be selected using the best-value-for-money principles)
- Taking the project's ambition and objectives into account, the proposal includes a realistic time frame and a comprehensive implementation description
- The work package descriptions and major deliverables and milestones are realistic and relevant, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources, risk and innovation management
- Overall perception including other pertinent factors not covered by the above questions (25% weight in the assessment of this criterion)

Comments:

**Score 3:**  
*Threshold 3/5*

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
*Threshold 12/15*

\* Experts will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work.

\*\* Experts will also be asked to assess 'best value for money' of the subcontracts for Phase 2.