Smart and Healthy Ageing through People Engaging in Supportive Systems

SHAPES

Grant agreement ID: 857159

SHAPES-OC1-Enablers Evaluation Criteria

© Copyright 2020, the Members of the SHAPES Consortium

For more information on this document or the SHAPES project, please contact:

Niamh Redmond, SHAPES Project Manager, Maynooth University: Niamh.Redmond@mu.ie

Artur Krukowski, Open Call leader, Intracom S. A. Telecom Solutions: krukowa@intracom-telecom.com

The SHAPES Project Consortium

- National University of Ireland Maynooth (coordinator)
- Access Earth Limited
- AGE Platform Europe
- Associazione Italiana Assisteza Spastici Provincia di Bologna onlus
- Aristotelio Panepistimio Thessalonikis – Aristotle University of Thessaloniki
- Carus Consilium Sachsen GmbH
- Clinika de Kay - Clinica Humana
- EDGENEERING Lda
- European Union of the Deaf aisbl
- Fakultni Nemocnice Olomouc – University Hospital Olomouc
- Fraunhofer Gesellschaft zur Foerderung der Angewandten Forschung E.V.
- Future Intelligence Limited
- GNOMON Informatics SA
- HRCB Projekt GmbH
- Intracom SA Telecom Solutions
- KOMPAI Robotics
- Laurea University of Applied Sciences Ltd
- MedicalSyn GmbH
- Northern Health and Social Care Trust
- Omnitor AB
- Palacký University Olomouc – Social Health Institute
- PAL Robotics SL
- Regional Health Authority of Central Greece
- Residencia de Mayores el Salvador – Asociatión Benéfico-Social el Salvador
- Rock Couture Productions Ltd – Agile Ageing Alliance
- Science for You – ¬Epistimi Gia Sena Astiki Mi Kerdoskopiki Etairia
- Technological Educational Institute of Crete
- Tree Technology SA
- Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha
- Universidade de Aveiro – Digital Media and Interaction Research Centre
- Universidade do Porto
- University College Cork
- University of Nicosia
- University of Ulster
- VICOMTECH
- World Federation of the Deafblind

1 Evaluation Criteria for SHAPES Open Calls

When your proposal is admissible and eligible, the independent experts follow the below evaluation criteria during the evaluation. The experts will also advise if applicants have the sufficient operational capacity with respect to their role and tasks in the proposed action. This assessment will be based on the competence and experience of the applicants, including operational resources (human, technical and other) and, if applicable, exceptionally the concrete measures proposed to obtain it by the time of the implementation of the tasks.

2 Operational capacity

As a distinct operation, carried out during the evaluation of the award criterion 'Quality and efficiency of the implementation', experts will indicate whether each individual participant has, or will have in due time, a sufficient operational capacity to successfully carry out its tasks in the proposed work plan. This assessment will be based on the competence and experience of the applicant, including its operational resources (human, technical and other) and, if applicable, exceptionally the concrete measures proposed to obtain it by the time of the implementation of the tasks.

3 Scoring

Evaluation scores will be awarded for the criteria, and not for the different aspects listed in the above table. For full proposals, each criterion will be scored out of 5. The threshold for individual criteria will be 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, will be 10. Experts score each **award criterion** on a scale **from 0 to 5** (half point scores may be given):

0 – <u>Proposal fails</u> to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1 – <u>Poor</u>. The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 – <u>Fair</u>. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.

3 – <u>Good</u>. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

4 – <u>Very good</u>. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

5 – <u>Excellent</u>. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Evaluation Criteria	Scoring
Criterion 1 - Excellence Sub-criteria: • *Clarity and pertinence of the objectives* • *Credibility of the proposed approach* • *Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant.* • *Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches)*	Score range: 0 - 5 Threshold: 3 / 5
Criterion 2 - Impact Sub-criteria: *The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic* • *Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge* • *Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by*	Score range: 0 - 5 Threshold: 3 / 5

developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets and where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets. • *Any other environmental and socially important impacts* • *Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant*	
Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation Sub-criteria: • *Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources.* • *Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)* • *Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management*	Score range: 0 - 5 Threshold: 3 / 5

4 Priority order for proposals with the same score

If necessary, the panel will determine a priority order for proposals which have been awarded the same score within a ranked list. Whether or not such a prioritization is carried out will depend on the available budget or other conditions set out in the call fiche. The following approach will be applied successively for every group of proposals with same scores and thus requiring prioritisation, starting with the highest scored group, and continuing in descending order:

a) Proposals that address topics, or sub-topics, not otherwise covered by more highly- ranked proposals, will be considered to have the highest priority.

b) The proposals identified under (a), if any, will themselves be prioritised according to the scores they have been awarded for the criterion excellence. When these scores are equal, priority will be based on scores for the criterion impact. In the case of Innovation actions this prioritisation will be done first on the basis of the score for impact, and then on that for excellence.

c) If necessary, any further prioritisation will be based on the following factors, SME status of an applicant; gender balance among the personnel named in the proposal who will be primarily responsible for carrying out the research and/or innovation activities.

d) If a distinction still cannot be made, the panel may decide to further prioritise by considering how to enhance the quality of the project portfolio through synergies between projects, or other factors related to the objectives of the call or to Horizon 2020 in general. These factors will be documented in the report of the Panel.

e) The method described in (a), (b), (c) and (d) will then be applied to the remaining proposals with same scores in the group.

5 Evaluation Procedure

Proposals are evaluated by independent experts (see Article 15(7) Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation Regulation No 1290/2013 for exceptional cases).

As part of the evaluation by independent experts, a panel review will recommend one or more ranked lists for the proposals under evaluation, following the scoring systems indicated above. A ranked list will be drawn up for every indicative budget shown in the call conditions.

Proposal coordinators will receive an Evaluation Summary Report (ESR), showing the results of the evaluation for a given proposal.

Independent experts evaluate your proposal following this 3-steps process:

- Phase 1 — Individual evaluation. Experts work individually. Each expert gives a score for each criterion, with explanatory comments, and prepares an 'individual evaluation report (IER)'. They also indicate if the proposal:

    - falls entirely outside the scope of the part of the call which they are evaluating or

    - involves security issues that will need further scrutiny.

- Phase 2 — Consensus group. After carrying out an individual evaluation, an expert will join other experts who have evaluated the same proposal in a consensus group, to agree on a common position, including comments and scores. Each group is assisted by a moderator who:

    - seeks a consensus, impartially and

    - ensures that each proposal is evaluated fairly, according to the evaluation criteria

    The moderator will be appointed from SHAPES consortium.

- Phase 3 — Panel review. After the consensus phase a panel of experts:

    - reach an agreement on the scores and comments for all proposals within a call, checking consistency across the evaluations

    - if necessary, propose a new set of marks or revise comments, and resolve cases where evaluators were unable to agree

    - rank the proposals having a qualifying score and give a priority order for proposals with the same score

    The panel may comprise experts from consensus groups, new experts, or a combination of the two. There may be one panel covering the whole call or several panels covering different parts of the call. Each panel will be responsible for one or more ranked lists, as defined by the indicative budget and call conditions set out in the work programme.

All proposals within a call (or within a coherent part of a call) are evaluated together.

Briefing of Experts

Before starting the evaluation process, the experts are briefed on:

- the evaluation processes and procedures (including selection and award criteria)

- the content of topics under consideration

- the terms of their contract (e.g. confidentiality, impartiality, conflicts of interest, completing tasks and approving reports, penalties for non-compliance)

- disregarding excess pages

- the need to evaluate proposals as they were submitted, rather than their potential should certain changes be made.

Similarly to standard Horizon 2020 procedures, in SHAPES Open Calls, there will be no scope for recommending improvements to proposals (including improvements on the budget). In particular, proposals with a significantly inflated budget, taking into account cost efficiency considerations, will receive a lower score and may not pass the threshold.

Each full proposal is evaluated by at least three experts.

6   Final Evaluation Results

Before notifying coordinators of the final evaluation results, the SHAPES Open Call coordination team reviews the results of the experts' evaluation and puts together the final ranking list. Proposals will not be offered funding if the SHAPES Open Call coordinator finds that it is already funding very

similar work elsewhere, or a proposal is in any way manifestly contrary to established EU policies.

Final rankings

The SHAPES Open Call coordination team:

- produces a ranked list of proposals, including all proposals with scores above qualifying score
- draws up a list of proposals for possible funding from that list. The number of proposals in the list depends on the available budget.
- Each page of topic conditions of a call on the SHAPES Open Calls portal gives approximate timelines when coordinators will receive information on the outcome of the evaluation.

Reserve list

If the available budget is too small to fund all proposals that reached the qualifying score in the evaluation round, some proposals may be put on a reserve list – of proposals that may be offered funding if a higher-scoring project does not go ahead or additional funds become available.

Rejection decisions

The SHAPES Open Call coordination team will notify proposal coordinators if their proposal has been rejected because:

- it is found to be inadmissible or ineligible (before or during the evaluation)
- it falls short of the relevant thresholds
- it is too far down the ranked list to qualify for the limited amount of funding available
- if it fails to obtain ethics clearance, following an ethics review (see Article 13.3 - Rules for participation and the ethics section
- it raises security concerns.

Evaluation Summary Report

After the finalisation of the evaluation, applicants will receive the Evaluation Result Letter (ESR).

7   Invitation to sign Accession to SHAPES Grant Agreement

The coordinators of successful proposals for which funding is available, are invited to start preparations of the accession to SHAPES grant agreement as a beneficiary.

You are informed about evaluation and ranking results by an e-mail notification from the SHAPES Open Call coordination team, which will include the Evaluation Result Letter.

If your proposal is successful, you will receive in the same notification a request to start preparing accession data to SHAPES grant agreement. It is possible, when the invitation to start preparation for accession to SHAPES grant is delayed, that you may still receive two different notifications - first about the Evaluation Results, then another about the start of grant preparation.

You will receive e-mail notifications about all the actions that you need to carry out for the grant preparation.

8   Contacts

The SHAPES consortium will provide information to the applicants only via the F6S online portal so that the information (question and answer), will be visible to all participants.

More info can be found at: https://shapes2020.eu