



**Horizon Europe**

# **Evaluation form**

**KDT Coordination and Actions (KDT-CSA)**

**Version 1.0  
10 December 2021**

Version	Date	Change	Page
V 1.0 ED 2021.05	10/12/2021	<i>Initial version</i>	

## Evaluation form

### KDT Coordination and Support Actions (KDT-CSA)

#### IMPORTANT NOTICE

##### Scoring

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

##### 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 & weighting

The standard threshold for individual criteria is 3. The standard overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 11. The scores are given using a resolution of 0.1 decimal.

Scores are normally NOT weighted. Weighting is used for some type of actions and the weighting factors are defined in the KDT-JU Work Programme 2021 and only for the *ranking* (not to determine *if* the proposal passed the thresholds.)

#### 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

<p><b>1. Excellence</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the relevant work programme topic description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Clarity and pertinence of the project’s objectives</b></li> <li>• <b>Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures, including soundness of methodology</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 1:</b></p> <hr/> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	--

<p><b>2. Impact</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions to the project</b></li> <li>• <b>Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 2:</b></p> <hr/> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
--	--

<p><b>3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation*</b></p> <p><i>Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Quality and effectiveness of the work plan; assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the efforts assigned to work packages, and the resources overall</b></li> <li>• <b>Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise</b></li> </ul> <p><u>Comments:</u></p>	<p><b>Score 3:</b></p> <hr/> <p><i>Threshold 3/5</i></p>
---	--

**Total score (1+2+3)**  
*Threshold 11/15*

--