

Horizon Europe

Evaluation Form (HE RIA and IA)

Version 4.0
12 November 2025

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Scoring:

Scoring must be in the range from 0-5. Half-marks may be given.

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 threshold for the individual criteria is 3. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 10 points.

Scores are normally NOT weighted. (Weighting is only used for some types of actions — and only for the ranking (not to determine if the proposal passed the thresholds).

⚠ Specific calls or topics may have different rules regarding threshols and weighting.

Specific cases:

Two-stage calls

For stage 1 proposals, only the criteria Excellence and Impact will be evaluated and within those criteria only the aspects indicated in bold in General Annex of the Main Work Programme. The threshold for each of the two individual criteria is 4.

After the evaluation, the call coordinator will then fix an overall threshold, to limit the proposals that will be invited to stage 2. (This overall threshold will be set at a level which ensures that the total requested budget of proposals admitted to stage 2 is as close as possible to three times the available budget, and in any case, not less than two times the available budget. The actual level will therefore depend on the volume of proposals received. The threshold is expected normally to be set at 8 or 8.5.)



EVALUATION FORM (RIA IA)

PROJECT	
Project number:	[project number]
Project name:	[project title]
Project acronym:	[acronym]
Coordinator contact:	[PCoCo name NAME], [organisation]
Call:	[call ID]
Topic:	[topic ID]
Type of action:	[ToA ID]
Responsible service:	[responsible unit, e.g. JUST/04]
Project duration:	[number of months]

PARTICIPANTS					
Number	**Role**	**Short name**	**Legal name**	**Country**	**PIC**
1	COO				
2	BEN				
2.1	AE				
3	BEN				
4	AP				

PROJECT ABSTRACT

Text from Proposal Abstract (Application Form Part A).

EVALUATION	
Evaluation model:	*[*single*] [*step 1*] [*step 2*]*
Panel:	[insert panel identifier]
Evaluators:	[name NAME], [name NAME], [name NAME]

1. 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. For lump sum proposals using a detailed lump sum budget, comments are required, including concrete recommendations if changes are needed.*

⚠ *If an application is partly out of scope, this should be reflected in the scoring and explained in the comments.*

1. Excellence

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- 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.
- 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 where appropriate.

Comments:

Score 1 (0-5)**:** Threshold: 3/5	

2. Impact

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts specified in the work

programme.

- Suitability and quality of the measures to maximise expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.

Comments:

Score 2 (0-5)**:** Threshold: 3/5	

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the description in the work programme:

- Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, assessment of risks, and appropriateness of the effort assigned to work packages, and the resources overall.
- Capacity and role of each participant, and the extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise.

Comments:

Score 3 (0-5)**:** Threshold: 3/5	
Total score Overall threshold /15	

2. OTHER QUESTIONS

Opinion on additional questions

Scope of the application

Based on the information provided, this application is:

‘in scope’ because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been submitted

‘out of scope’ because:

[Comment box]

[additional OPTION for IER for lump sum topics: **Assessment of lump sum cost estimations**

I have assessed the cost estimations and included my approval of the lump sum budget or my recommendations to modify it in the evaluation report.

Yes]

[additional OPTION for CR for lump sum topics: **Assessment of lump sum cost estimations**

We have assessed the cost estimations and included our approval of the lump sum budget or our recommendations to modify it in the evaluation report.

Yes]

Exceptional funding

⚠ A third country participant/international organisation not listed in the General Annex to the Main Work Programme may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the HE programme guide)

Please list the concerned applicants and requested grant amount and explain the reasons why.

Based on the information provided, the following participants should receive exceptional funding:

[Comment box]

Based on the information provided, the following participants should NOT receive exceptional funding:

[Comment box]

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?

No

Yes

If YES, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not, because of a lack of information.

[Comment box]

Use of human embryos

Does this proposal involve the use of human embryos?

No

Yes

If YES, please explain how the human embryos will be used in the project.

[Comment box]

Activities excluded from funding

Activities that:

- aim at human cloning for reproductive purposes, or
- intend to modify the genetic heritage of human beings which could make such changes heritable (with the exception of research relating to cancer treatment of the gonads, which may be financed), or
- intend to create human embryos solely for the purpose of research or for the purpose of stem cell procurement, including by means of somatic cell nuclear transfer, or
- lead to the destruction of human embryos (for example, for obtaining stem cells)?

are excluded from funding. Does the proposal include any of these activities?

○ No

○ Yes

If YES, please explain.

[Comment box]

Exclusive focus on civil applications

Do the activities proposed have an exclusive focus on civil applications (activities intended to be used in military application or aims to serve military purposes cannot be funded)?

○ No

○ Yes

If NO, please explain.

[Comment box]

3. COMMENTS

Overall comments

[Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for CR:

Consensus meeting

Consensus meeting minutes

[Comment box]

Minority opinion

Does this proposal have a minority opinion?

○ No

Yes If YES, please encode the names of dissenting evaluators and the reasons: [Comment box]

]

[additional OPTION for ESR (for internal use – will not be included in the ESR sent to applicants):

Panel review
Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Proposal panel review minutes
[Comment box]

]

HISTORY OF CHANGES		
VERSION	PUBLICATION DATE	CHANGE
1.0	04.05.2021	Initial version (new MFF).
2.0	26.04.2022	Sections 2 and 3 included
3.0	28.02.2025	Removed references to Do No Significant Harm principle and AI robustness
4.0	12.11.2025	Instructions and declaration on lump sum budget assessment added. Impact criterion updated following HE WP26-27.