

### MODULE 7: How are project proposals evaluated?

#### OBJECTIVES

- To make the evaluation process understandable & transparent
- To draw the attention to the evaluation criteria, for a better proposal writing
- To provide insight in the whole evaluation procedure

#### TOPICS COVERED

- How does the evaluation work?
- What are the evaluation criteria?
- Who evaluated?
- How works the decision-making process?

### •Why an evaluation procedure?

- Equal treatment of all proposals
- Unbiased and independent treatment
- Equal chance for all!

1. Eligibility check:  
Check formalities: e.g. minimum number of partners; timely submission; all parts of the proposal filled in. Done by EC officials  
IF NOT: rejected at this stage, without further evaluation
2. Evaluation = quality assessment:  
Done by external experts

### Evaluation Process:

1. Individual evaluation: 

On-site or remote

2. Consensus meetings: 

To agree among all individual evaluators comments and scores

3. Panel Meeting: 

To rank proposals

### WHO evaluates?

<ftp://ftp.cordis.europa.eu/pub/fp7/docs/ict.zip>

### HOW become an expert?

<https://cordis.europa.eu/emmf7/>

### HOW selected ?

- Profile/competences
- Availability
- No conflict of interest

For each objective in each Call separately!

### 1. Individual evaluation:

On-site or remote

#### **Evaluation Criteria:**

- 1. Scientific and/or technological excellence
- 2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management
- 3. The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results

### 1. Individual evaluation (2):



#### Scores:

- 0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information;
- 1 Poor The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses;
- 2 Fair While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses;
- 3 Good The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary;
- 4 Very good The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible;
- 5 Excellent The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

**ICT Theme**

**IER**



### Individual Evaluation Report for a STREP

**Proposal No. :** \_\_\_\_\_ **Acronym :** \_\_\_\_\_

<p><b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives</li> <li>• Progress beyond the state-of-the-art</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>
<p><b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of the management structure and procedures</li> <li>• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants</li> <li>• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance)</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>



**Individual Evaluation Report for a STREP p.2**

<p><b>3. Potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution, at the European and/or international level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under relevant topic/activity</li> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>						
<p><b>Remarks</b></p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> </div>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p> <div style="text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> </div>						
<p>Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention?</p> <p><b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>    <b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/></p>							
<p>I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal</p>							
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;"><b>Name</b></td> <td style="width: 85%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Signature</b></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Date</b></td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <div style="text-align: right; margin-top: 10px;"> </div>		<b>Name</b>		<b>Signature</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Name</b>							
<b>Signature</b>							
<b>Date</b>							

SIFIRIO PROGRAMMA MARCO
  MULTIMEDIA FORUM

## 7.2 Evaluation process (4)

**2. Consensus meetings:**

To agree among all individual evaluators comments and scores

IPs, NoEs: 5 evaluators

All others: 3 evaluators

Must agree on common text and common score!

Moderated by an EC official

Documented by the Rapporteur

### 3. Panel Meeting:

To rank proposals that are above the threshold:



→ Shortlist according to scores and “virtues” of proposals; from this shortlist, proposals will be selected for contract negotiation, according to available budget.

Information on evaluation criteria, guidelines for evaluators etc can be found at:

[http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?function=UserSite.FP7DetailsCallPage&call\\_id=185&act\\_code=ICT&ID\\_ACTIVITY=3#additionaldocs](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/dc/index.cfm?function=UserSite.FP7DetailsCallPage&call_id=185&act_code=ICT&ID_ACTIVITY=3#additionaldocs)