Horizon Europe

Evaluation Form (HE MSCA)

Version 1.0
18 June 2021

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Scoring:

Scoring must be in the range from 0-5. Half-marks may be given.

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 & weighting:

The threshold for the individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 10 points.

Weighting is only for the ranking (not to determine if the proposal passed the thresholds).

⚠ Specific calls or topics may have different rules regarding threshols and weighting.

Specific cases:

Two-stage calls

For stage 1 proposals, only the criteria Excellence and Impact will be evaluated and within those criteria only the aspects indicated in bold in General Annex of the Main Work Programme. The threshold for each of the two individual criteria is 4.

After the evaluation, the call coordinator will then fix an overall threshold, to limit the proposals that will be invited to stage 2. (This overall threshold will be set at a level which ensures 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 2.5 the available budget. The actual level will therefore depend on the volume of proposals received. The threshold is expected to normally be around 8 or 8.5.)

SENSITIVE

*[*INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)*][*CONSENSUS REPORT (CR)*]*
*[*EVALUATION SUMMARY REPORT*]*

PROJECT	
Project number:	[project number]
Project name:	[project title]
Project acronym:	[acronym]
Coordinator contact:	[PCoCo name NAME], [organisation]
Call:	[call ID]
Topic:	[topic ID]
Type of action:	[ToA ID]
Responsible service:	[responsible unit, e.g. JUST/04]
Project duration:	[number of months]

PARTICIPANTS					
Number	**Role**	**Short name**	**Legal name**	**Country**	**PIC**
1	COO				
2	BEN				
2.1	AE				
3	BEN				
4	AP				

PROJECT ABSTRACT
Text from Proposal Abstract (Application Form Part A).

EVALUATION	
Evaluation model:	*[*single*] [*step 1*] [*step 2*]*
Panel:	[insert panel identifier]
Evaluators:	[name NAME], [name NAME], [name NAME]

1. EVALUATION

⚠ *Applications **must be evaluated as they were submitted**, NOT on their potential if certain changes were made. Therefore, do NOT recommend any modifications (e.g. consortia composition, resources or budget, or inclusion of additional work packages). Shortcomings should be reflected in lower score.*

⚠ *If an application is partly out of scope, this should be reflected in the scoring and explained in the comments.*

1. Excellence

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- *[OPTION for MSCA Doctoral networks, Postdoctoral fellowships and Staff exchanges:* Quality and pertinence of the project's research and innovation objectives (and the extent to which they are ambitious, and go beyond the state of the art).
- Soundness of the proposed methodology (including interdisciplinary approaches, consideration of the gender dimension and other diversity aspects if relevant for the research project, and the quality and appropriateness of open science practices). *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Doctoral networks* Quality and credibility of the training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral and gender as well as other diversity aspects).
- Quality of the supervision (including mandatory joint supervision for industrial and joint doctorate projects). *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Postdoctoral fellowships;* Quality of the supervision, training and of the two-way transfer of knowledge between the researcher and the host.
- Quality and appropriateness of the researcher's professional experience, competences and skills. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Staff exchanges:* Quality of the proposed interaction between the participating organisations in light of the research and innovation objectives. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA COFUND:* Quality and novelty of the selection / recruitment process for the researchers (transparency, composition and organisation of selection committees, evaluation criteria, equal opportunities, the gender dimension and other diversity aspects) and quality and attractiveness of the appointment conditions, including competitiveness of the salary for the standards of the hosting countries.
- Quality and novelty of the research options offered by the programme in terms of science, interdisciplinarity, inter-sectorality and level of international mobility. Quality of open science practices.
- Quality, novelty and pertinence of the research training programme (including transferable skills, inter/multidisciplinary, inter-sectoral and gender as well as other diversity aspects).
- Quality, novelty and pertinence of the supervision, career guidance and career development arrangements. *]*

- *[OPTION for MSCA Special needs allowances:* Appropriateness and relevance of the proposed measures [or special needs items or services] that are necessary for the researcher/staff member to carry out the work in the linked MSCA action. *]*

Comments:

Score 1 (0-5)**:**
Threshold: 3/5
Weighting: 50%

2. Impact

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- *[OPTION for MSCA Doctoral networks* Contribution to structuring doctoral training at the European level and to strengthening European innovation capacity, including the potential for:
  a) meaningful contribution of the non-academic sector to the doctoral training, as appropriate to the implementation mode and research field
  b) developing sustainable elements of doctoral programmes. *]*
- Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Postdoctoral fellowships:* Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of the researcher and contribution to his/her skills development. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Staff exchanges:* Developing new and lasting research collaborations, achieving transfer of knowledge between participating organisations and contribution to improving research and innovation potential at the European and global level.
- Credibility of the measures to enhance the career perspectives of staff members and contribution to their skills development. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA COFUND:* Strengthening human resources good practices at institutional, regional, national or international level, in particular through aligning the practices of participating organisations with the principles set out by the EU for human resources development in research and innovation.
- Credibility of the proposed measures to enhance the career perspectives and employability of researchers and contribution to their skills development. *]*
- *[OPTION for all MSCA except Special needs allowances:* Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Doctoral networks, Postdoctoral fellowships and Staff exchanges:* The magnitude and importance of the project's contribution to the expected scientific, societal and economic impacts. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Special needs allowances:* Effectiveness of the proposed measures with respect to the work in the linked MSCA action. *]*

Comments:

Score 2 (0-5): Threshold: 3/5 Weighting: 30%	

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- *[OPTION for all MSCA except Special needs allowances:* Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Doctoral networks and Staff exchanges:* Quality, capacity and role of each participant, including hosting arrangements and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Postdoctoral fellowships:* Quality and capacity of the host institutions and participating organisations, including hosting arrangements. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA COFUND:* Quality and capacity of the host institution(s) and participating organisations (where appropriate), including hosting arrangements and extent to which they bring together the necessary expertise to successfully implement the research training programme. *]*
- *[OPTION for MSCA Special needs allownces:* Appropriateness of the resources deployed. *]*

Comments:	
Score 3 (0-5): Threshold: 3/5 Weighting: 20%	
Total score Overall threshold /15	

]

2. OTHER QUESTIONS

Opinion on additional questions
Scope of the application
Based on the information provided, this application is:
○ 'in scope' because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been

submitted

○ 'out of scope' because:

[Comment box]

Exceptional funding

⚠ A third country participant/international organisation not listed in the General Annex to the Main Work Programme may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the HE programme guide)

Please list the concerned applicants and requested grant amount and explain the reasons why.

Based on the information provided, the following participants should receive exceptional funding:

[Comment box]

Based on the information provided, the following participants should NOT receive exceptional funding:

[Comment box]

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?

○ No

○ Yes

If YES, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not, because of a lack of information.

[Comment box]

Use of human embryos

Does this proposal involve the use of human embryos?

○ No

○ Yes

If YES, please explain how the human embryos will be used in the project.

[Comment box]

Activities excluded from funding

Activities that:

- aim at human cloning for reproductive purposes, or
- intend to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable (with the exception of research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads, which may be financed), or
- intend to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer, or
- lead to the destruction of human embryos (for example, for obtaining stem cells)?

are excluded from funding. Does the proposal include any of these activities?

○ No

○ Yes

If YES, please explain.

[Comment box]

Do not significant harm principle

Is this proposal compliant with the 'Do no significant harm' principle?

- ○ Not applicable
- ○ Yes.
- ○ Partially
- ○ No
- ○ Cannot be assessed

If Partially/No/Cannot be assessed please explain.

[Comment box]

Exclusive focus on civil applications

Do the activities proposed have an exclusive focus on civil applications (activities intended to be used in military application or aims to serve military purposes cannot be funded)?

- ○ No
- ○ Yes

If NO, please explain.

[Comment box]

Artificial Intelligence

Do the activities proposed involve the use and/or development of AI-based systems and/or techniques?

- ○ No
- ○ Yes

If YES, the technical robustness of the proposed system must be evaluated under the appropriate criterion.

3. COMMENTS

Overall comments

[Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for CR:

Consensus meeting

Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Minority opinion
Does this proposal have a minority opinion? ○ No ○ Yes If YES, please encode the names of dissenting evaluators and the reasons: [Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for ESR (for internal use – will not be included in the ESR sent to applicants):

Panel review
Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Proposal panel review minutes
[Comment box]

]

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	18.06.2021	Initial version (new MFF).