



# EVALUATION FORMS

*Information and Communication Technologies*  
**ICT**

***FP7-ICT-2013-11***

The following forms exemplify those which will be issued to independent experts employed as evaluators in the evaluation of proposals received in

### **ICT Call 11 (FP7-ICT-2013-11)**

In this call there will be strong competition. Therefore, edit your proposal tightly, strengthen or eliminate weak points. Put yourself in the place of an expert evaluator; refer to the evaluation criteria and procedure given in annex 2 of the Guide for Applicants. Arrange for your draft to be evaluated by experienced colleagues; use their advice to improve it before submission.

### **CONTENTS**

EVALUATION REPORT FOR AN INTEGRATED PROJECT .....	3
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A STREP .....	5
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A COORDINATION ACTION OR ERANET PLUS ACTION.....	7
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A SUPPORT ACTION .....	9
EVALUATION REPORT FOR A CP-CSA PROPOSAL IN PRE-COMMERCIAL PROCUREMENT .....	11
EVALUATION REPORT FOR AN ERANET ACTION IMPLEMENTED AS A COORDINATION ACTION IN FET FLAGSHIPS.....	13

ICT Theme

IER

***Evaluation Report for an Integrated Project***

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<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>

*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.*

## Evaluation Report for an Integrated Project 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>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

NO

YES

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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

***Evaluation Report for a STREP***

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<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>

*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.*

### 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>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	YES <input type="checkbox"/>
---	-----------------------------	------------------------------

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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

**Evaluation Report for a Coordination Action or ERANET Plus action**

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<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>• Contribution to the coordination of high quality research</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the coordination mechanisms 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>

*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.*

## **Evaluation Report for a Coordination Action or ERANET Plus action 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 spreading excellence, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?	<b>NO</b> <input type="checkbox"/>	<b>YES</b> <input type="checkbox"/>
---	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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

**Evaluation Report for a Support Action**

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>• Quality and effectiveness of the support mechanisms 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) <i>[only if relevant]</i></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>

*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.*

### **Evaluation Report for a Support Action 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 spreading excellence, exploiting results and disseminating knowledge through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

NO

YES

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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

### ***Evaluation Report for a CP-CSA proposal in Pre-commercial Procurement***

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
<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 (relevant only to CP part of the proposal).</li> <li>• Contribution to the coordination of high quality research (relevant only to CSA part of the proposal).</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the CSA mechanisms (mechanisms proposed to achieve the objectives of the networking and coordination CSA part of the project), and associated work plan</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and associated work plan (relevant only to CP part of the proposal).</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>• Appropriate allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (staff, equipment ...).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>

*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.*

### Evaluation Report for a CP-CSA in PCP 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 level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under relevant topic/activity.</li> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for the exploitation of project results, dissemination of knowledge, through the engagement with stakeholders and the public at large, and the management of intellectual property and for spreading excellence</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b> (Threshold 10/15)</p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

NO

YES

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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

***Evaluation Report for an ERANET action implemented as a  
Coordination Action in FET Flagships***

<b>Proposal No. :</b>	<b>Acronym :</b>
-----------------------	------------------

<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>• Clarity of objectives</li> <li>• Contribution to the coordination of high-risk and high -impact research, for new or emerging areas or horizontally</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the coordination activities</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 40%)</p>
<p><b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of workplan and management</li> <li>• Quality and relevant experience of the individual participants</li> <li>• Quality of the consortium</li> <li>• Appropriate management of the resources to be committed (person months, equipment, budget)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 20%)</p>

*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.*

### **Evaluation Report for an ERANET Coordination Action in FET Proactive 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>• Transformational impact on the communities and/or practices for high-risk and high impact research</li> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, use of results and dissemination of knowledge, including engagement with stakeholders</li> </ul>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 3/5; Weight 40%)</p>
<p><b>Remarks</b></p>	<p><b>Overall score:</b></p>

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention ?

**NO**

**YES**

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

*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.*