

## Eligibility and Evaluation Criteria for Proposals

### Eligibility criteria

A proposal will only be considered eligible if it meets all of the following conditions:

- It is received by the Commission before the deadline given in the call text.
- It involves at least the minimum number of participants given in the call text.
- It is complete (i.e. both the requested administrative forms and the proposal description are present)
- The content of the proposal relates to the topic(s) and funding scheme(s), including any special conditions, set out in those parts of the relevant work programme

Other eligibility criteria may be given in the call text.

### Evaluation criteria

The evaluation criteria against which proposals will be judged are set out in article 15 of the Rules for Participation. For the 'Cooperation' specific programme these are:

- scientific and/or technological excellence;
- relevance to the objectives of these specific programmes<sup>1</sup>;
- the potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results;
- the quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.

Within this framework, the work programmes will specify the evaluation and selection criteria and may add additional requirements, weightings and thresholds, or set out further details on the application of the criteria.

The purpose of this annex is to set out such specifications. Unless otherwise indicated in the relevant parts of this work programme, the criteria, weightings and thresholds given here will apply to all calls for proposals.

Proposals will be evaluated in line with the Commission 'Rules on Submission of Proposals and the Related Evaluation, Selection and Award Procedures'.

A proposal which contravenes fundamental ethical principles, fails to comply with the relevant security procedures, or which does not fulfil any other of the conditions set out in the specific programme, the work programme or in the call for proposals shall not be selected. Such a proposal may be excluded from the evaluation, selection and award procedures at any time. Details of the procedure to be followed are given in the Commission rules mentioned above.

The arrangements for a particular call will be set out in the relevant Guide for Applicants.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Relevance** will be considered in relation to the topic(s) of the work programme open in a given call, and to the objectives of a call. In the scheme set out on the following page, these aspects will be integrated in the application of the criterion "S/T excellence", and the first sub-criterion under "Impact" respectively. When a proposal is **partially relevant** because it only marginally addresses the topic(s) of a call, or because only part of the proposal addresses the topic(s), this condition will be reflected in the scoring of the first criterion. Proposals that are clearly not relevant to a call ("out of scope") will be rejected on eligibility grounds.

		<b>1. Scientific and/or technological excellence</b> <i>(relevant to the topics addressed by the call)</i>  <b>(award)</b>	<b>2. Quality and efficiency of the implementation and the management</b>  <b>(selection)</b>	<b>3. The potential impact through the development, dissemination and use of project results</b>  <b>(award)</b>
<b>All funding schemes</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Soundness of concept, and quality of objectives</i></li> </ul>	<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> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Contribution, at the European [and/or international] level, to the expected impacts listed in the work programme under relevant topic/activity</i></li> </ul>
<b>Collaborative projects</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Progress beyond the state-of-the-art</i></li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the S/T methodology and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property.</li> </ul>
<b>Networks of Excellence</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Contribution to long-term integration of high quality S/T research</i></li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the joint programme of activities and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including ability to tackle fragmentation of the research field, and commitment towards a deep and durable integration)</li> <li>• Adequacy of resources for successfully carrying out the joint programme of activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and disseminating knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders and the public at large.</li> </ul>
<b>Co-ordination &amp; support actions</b>	<b>CA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the co-ordination of high quality research</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the co-ordination mechanisms, and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity, balance) [for SA: only if relevant]</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for spreading excellence, exploiting results, and dissemination knowledge, through engagement with stakeholders, and the public at large.</li> </ul>
	<b>SA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of the support action mechanisms, and associated work plan</li> </ul>		
<b>Research for the benefit of specific groups</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Innovative character in relation to the state-of-the art</li> <li>• Contribution to advancement of knowledge / technological progress</li> <li>• Quality and effectiveness of S/T methodology and associated work plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of the consortium as a whole (including complementarity and balance)</li> <li>• Appropriateness of the allocation and justification of the resources to be committed (budget, staff, equipment)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appropriateness of measures for the dissemination and/or exploitation of project results, and management of intellectual property</li> </ul>

Notes:

1. Evaluation scores will be awarded for each of the three criteria, and not for the sub-criteria. Each criterion will be scored out of 5. No weightings will apply. The threshold for individual criteria will be 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, will be 10.
2. The second column corresponds to the **selection criteria** in the meaning of the financial regulation<sup>2</sup> (article 115) and its implementing rules<sup>3</sup> (article 176 and 177). They also will be the basis for assessing the 'operational capacity' of participants. The other two criteria correspond to the **award criteria**.
3. For the evaluation of first-stage proposals under a two-stage submission procedure, only the sub-criteria in italics apply.

---

<sup>2</sup> OJ L248 16.9.2002, p1.

<sup>3</sup> OJ L357 31.12.2002, p1