Evaluation criteria for RIA and IA proposals

Evaluator's briefing materials are useful for understanding from what angle an issue should be presented in one or another section. ***It is crucial to know what questions the evaluators will have in mind when reading a particular proposal section*** *– there are sections (e.g. the abstract) about which they do not need to provide specific answers, even though those sections may also impact their impression about the proposal.*

The evaluation criteria for ***RIA and IA proposals*** *are expounded in the* ***standard briefing slides****.*

The following specific criteria correspond to the 27.10.2023 version of the standard briefing slides.

Evaluation criteria in the evaluation form and as quoted in the Application Form part B	**More specific criteria in the briefing slides** *NB! many of the requirements (e.g. open science, the gender dimension, IP management, evaluation of lump-sum projects and many more) are additionally explained in the briefing slides and videos*
1. Excellence	
1.1 Objectives and ambition Clarity and pertinence of the project's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed work is ambitious, and goes beyond the state of the art.	Assess the project's objectives: ● Are they **clear and pertinent** to the topic? ● Are they **measurable and verifiable**? ● Are they **realistically achievable**? ● Is the proposed work **ambitious and goes beyond the state-of-the-art**? ● Does the proposal include **ground-breaking** R&I, **novel** concepts and approaches, **new** products, services or business and organisational models? ● Is the **R&I maturity** of the proposed work in line with the topic description? *Please bear in mind that advances beyond the state of the art must be interpreted in the light of the positioning of the project. For example, expectations will not be the same for RIAs at lower TRL, compared with Innovation Actions at high TRLs.*
1.2 Methodology Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions, inter-disciplinary approaches, appropriate consideration of the gender dimension in research and innovation content, and the quality of open science practices, including sharing and management of research outputs and engagement of citizens, civil society and end users[1] where appropriate.	Assess the scientific methodology: ● Is the **scientific methodology** (i.e. the concepts, models and assumptions that underpin the work) clear and sound? ● Is it clear **how expertise and methods from different disciplines will be brought together** and integrated in pursuit of the objectives? if applicants justify that an inter-disciplinary approach is unnecessary, is it credible? ● Has the **gender dimension** in research and innovation content been properly taken into account? ● Are **open science practices** implemented as an integral part of the proposed methodology? ● Is the **research data management** properly addressed? ● For topics indicating the need for the **integration of social sciences and humanities**, is the role of these disciplines properly addressed?

[1] in terms of knowledge co-creation

2. Impact (*weight 1.5 for Innovation Actions*)	
2.1 Impact pathways Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work programme, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions from to the project.	Assess the proposed pathways towards impact: ● Is the contribution of the project towards the 1) expected outcomes of the topic and 2) the wider impacts, in the longer term, as specified in the respective destinations of the WP, **credible**? ● Are **potential barriers** to the expected outcomes and impacts identified (i.e. other R&I work within and beyond Horizon Europe; regulatory environment; targeted markets; user behavior), and **mitigation measures** proposed? Is **any potential negative environmental outcome or impact** (including when expected results are brought at scale, such as at commercial level) identified? Is the **management of the potential negative impacts** properly described? ● Are the **scale and significance** of the project's contribution to the expected outcomes and impacts **estimated and quantified** (including baselines, benchmarks and assumptions used for those estimates)? ***'Scale'*** *refers to how widespread the outcomes and impacts are likely to be. For example, in terms of the size of the target group, or the proportion of that group, that should benefit over time;* ***'Significance'*** *refers to the importance, or value, of those benefits. For example, number of additional healthy life years; efficiency savings in energy supply.*
2.2 Dissemination, exploitation and communication plan Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities. **2.3 Summary table for 2.1 and 2.2**	Assess the measures to maximise impact – Dissemination, exploitation and communication: ● Are the proposed dissemination, exploitation and communication measures **suitable** for the project **and of good quality**? All measures should be **proportionate to the scale** of the project, and should contain concrete actions to be implemented both during and after the end of the project. ● Are the **target groups** (e.g. scientific community, end users, financial actors, public at large) for these measures identified? ● Is the **strategy for the management of intellectual property** properly outlined and suitable to support exploitation of results? If exploitation is expected primarily in non-associated third countries, is it properly justified how that exploitation is still in the Union's interest?
3. Quality and efficiency of implementation	
3.1 Work plan and resources (the tables) Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.	Assess the proposed work plan, and the effort and resources: ● Is the work plan **of good quality and effective**? ● Does it include **quantified information** so that progress can be monitored? ● Does it follow a **logic structure** (for example regarding the timing of work packages)? ● Are the **resources allocated** to the work packages **in line with their objectives and deliverables**? ● Are **critical risks**, relating to project implementation, identified and **proper risk mitigation** measures proposed?

	Do not penalize applicants that did not provide detailed breakdown of costs as they are not required. Exception: In the case of lumps sums, there is a requirement of a detailed budget table.
3.2 Capacity of participants and consortium as a whole (the narrative) Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.	Assess the quality of participants and the consortium as a whole: (Note that important information on role of individual participants and previous experience is included in part A of proposal) ● Does the consortium match the project's objectives, and bring together the **necessary disciplinary and inter-disciplinary knowledge**. ● Does the consortium include **expertise in open science practices, and gender aspects of R&I**, as appropriate? ● For topics flagged as SSH relevant, does the consortium include **expertise in social sciences and humanities**? ● Do the partners have access to **critical infrastructure** needed to carry out the project activities? ● Are the participants **complementing one another** (and cover the value chain, where appropriate) ● In what way does each of them **contribute to the project**? Does each of them have a valid role, and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role (so they have sufficient operational capacity)? ● **Is there** industrial/commercial **involvement in the project to ensure exploitation of the results**? *Participants' previous publications, in particular journal articles, are expected to be open access and existing datasets FAIR and 'as open as possible, as closed as necessary'. Evaluate positively if this is sufficiently addressed.*

Additional questions – the evaluators are asked to take a position on **additional questions linked to the selection procedure or policy considerations:**

- Scope of the application
- Additional funding
- Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)
- Use of human embryos (hE)
- Activities not eligible for funding
- Exclusive focus on civil applications
- Do not significant harm principle
- Artificial Intelligence

During the evaluation experts give their opinion on the **exceptional funding to participants from non-EU countries not eligible for funding and international organisations**. Participation is considered essential for the action if there are clear benefits for the consortium, such as:

- outstanding competence/expertise
- access to research infrastructure
- access to particular geographical environments
- access to data.