



European Institute of
Innovation & Technology

EIT Proposal Evaluation form 2016

European Institute of Innovation and Technology (EIT)

December 2015

www.eit.europa.eu



The EIT is a body of the European Union



Individual evaluation report/consensus report

This is a mock-up of the individual evaluation report form or the consensus report form. The actual forms will be integrated within the SEP evaluation system

INTERPRETATION OF SCORES¹

0-5	Scores interpretation
0	The proposal does not meet the criterion at all or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information;
1	Poor – serious weaknesses
2	Fair – goes some way to meeting the criterion, but with significant weaknesses
3	Good – but with a number of shortcomings
4	Very good – but with a small number of shortcomings
5	Excellent – meets criterion in every relevant respect. Any shortcomings are minor

Note:

Proposals should be evaluated as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. Therefore, do not recommend significant modifications (e.g. consortia composition, resources or budget). Such shortcomings must instead be reflected in lower scores.

¹ Scoring for each criterion must be consistent with comments. The comments must give sufficient and clear reasons for the scores. The whole range of scores should be used.

1.1. STRATEGIC APPROACH - Relevance and specificity of the strategic approach; applicability of the KIC model to tackle the societal challenge(s) of Horizon 2020 via a multidisciplinary approach by integrating the Knowledge Triangle and fostering entrepreneurship and innovation.

Indicative list of evaluation questions:

- Is the strategic approach (vision, mission, strategy and its goals) relevant and aligned with the objectives and scope (thematic area) of the Call?
- Is the strategic approach (vision, mission, strategy and its goals) specific enough?
- What is the justification of the strategy? Is the strategic approach feasible?
- Are the strategy and strategic goals designed and formulated according to the SMART principles (simple, measurable, achievable, relevant and time dependent)?
- Is the Knowledge Triangle properly incorporated in the strategic approach by the applicant?
- Is the KIC model suitable for tackling the challenge(s) and bringing a structural (long-lasting and sustainable) impact?
- Is the multidisciplinary nature of a potential KIC (by integrating the Knowledge Triangle) reflected in the strategic approach?

<p><u>Comments (max. 4000 characters):</u></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>	<p>Score 1.1.: 0-10</p>
---	-------------------------

2.1. KIC GOVERNANCE AND LEADERSHIP- Quality and relevance of the KIC governance and management model including suitability of the KIC Legal Entity to implement the KIC's strategy, including the involvement of partners' top management in the KIC's governance and the quality of the leadership team profiles.

Indicative list of evaluation questions:

- Does the proposal clearly present a governance model (e.g. legal and organisational structures, decision-making bodies in the KIC, etc.)? Is the proposed model effective for delivering the KIC's strategy?
- Is the legal form of the KIC Legal Entity already presented and justified in the proposal? Is the chosen model of the KIC Legal Entity suitable for delivering the strategy? Will it allow for the KIC to follow the leading principles of business-like logic and flexibility to take quick decisions?
- Does the governance structure comply with the principles of good governance?
- Does the proposal substantiate how the top manager/representatives of the partners will be involved in the KIC decision-making process, respecting the principles of good governance?
- What is the quality and suitability of the proposed leadership team profiles in the context of the KIC's proposed strategy and governance model? Do the profiles ensure wide diversity in the management team, including a proper balance of skills and experience?
- How will the management team ensure effective executive power over the KIC's strategy and business plan implementation?
- Is a transparent and independent management team selection procedure presented in the proposal?

<p><u>Comments (max. 4000 characters):</u></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>	<p>Score 2.1.: 0-10</p>
---	-------------------------

2.2. OPERATIONS - Effectiveness of the operational structure including Knowledge Triangle Integration within and connectivity among co-location centres; quality, innovativeness and relevance of key identified thematic areas and demonstration of how activities (education, research, and business) are integrated in the entrepreneurship-driven Knowledge Triangle to foster innovation.

Indicative list of evaluation questions at the proposal evaluation stage:

- Can the presented operational model ensure the effective implementation of the KIC model (with a focus on the Knowledge Triangle integration) and its operations?
- Does the number of co-location centres (CLCs) exceed five?
- Does the proposal include a plan for the CLCs and a description of their role, structure, location and key activities? How will connectivity among the CLCs be ensured?
- Do the coverage and location of the CLCs respect the requirements presented in the Call?
- Does the proposal demonstrate how activities (education, research and business) will be integrated in the entrepreneurship-driven Knowledge Triangle?
- What is the quality of innovativeness and relevance of the key identified thematic areas?

<p><u>Comments (max. 4000 characters):</u></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>	 <p>Score 2.2.: 0-10</p>
---	---

2.3 KIC BUSINESS MODEL AND FINANCIAL PLAN - Feasibility of the KIC's business model and financial plan (including EIT and non-EIT resources) for achieving financial sustainability in the long-term; a plan for the management and exploitation of intellectual property supporting the KIC's business model.

Indicative list of evaluation questions:

- Is the proposed KIC's business model clear, justified, feasible and consistent with the KIC's strategy?
- Is the financial plan consistent with the proposed KIC's business model? Is it realistic and feasible in order to achieve financial sustainability in the long term?
- Are the KIC's partners financially committed? Are the financial commitments (contributions) from partners realistic (assessment also based on the Motivation and Commitment Declaration)?
- Is a plan for the management and exploitation of intellectual property demonstrated?

<p><u>Comments (max. 4000 characters):</u></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>	<p>Score 2.3.: 0-10</p>
---	-------------------------

3.1. IMPACT AND KIC SCOREBOARD - Mid and long-term potential pan-European impact on human capital, job creation, economic growth and its relevance in the context of the KIC's strategy and the EIT's Strategic Innovation Agenda. Relevance and feasibility of the expected outputs and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) included in a KIC Scoreboard and their contribution to the EIT Scoreboard.

Indicative list of evaluation questions:

- Will the partnership have a structural impact? Is the expected impact ambitious enough but at the same time realistic and relevant?
- How will the impact on human capital, job creation and economic growth be measured?
- Is the impact relevant in the context of the KIC's strategy and the EIT's Strategic Innovation Agenda?
- Are outputs/outcomes measurable and consistent with the KIC's activities?

<p><u>Comments (max. 4000 characters):</u></p> <p>Strengths:</p> <p>Weaknesses:</p>	<p>Score 3.1.: 0-25</p>
---	-------------------------

TOTAL SCORE	1.1.+1.2.+1.3.+2.1.+2.2 +2.3.+3.1.+3.2
-------------	---

Comments (max. 4000 characters):

Summary of the evaluation (only for the Consensus Report and the Evaluation Summary Report)

Comments (max. 4000 characters):

Strengths:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Weaknesses:

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.