Digital Europe

Evaluation form

Expression of Interest
(CPL)

Call for Expression of Interest for the selection of a Hosting Consortium for the Pilot Lines

Version 1.0
15/01/2024

Version	Date	Change	Page
V 1.0 ED 2024 154	14/01/2024	Initial version	

Evaluation form

Expression of Interest (CPL)

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 threshold for individual criteria is 2.5. The standard overall threshold, applying to the sum of the three individual scores, is 9. The scores are given using a resolution of one decimal (0.1).

Scores are weighted. Weighting is used for some type of actions and the weighting factors are defined in the Chips-JU Work Programme applicable to the call 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.

1. Excellence and relevance *Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the relevant Chips JU Work Programme 2023-2027 sections applicable to the call/topic:* • **Clarity and pertinence of the pilot line's objectives, and the extent to which the proposed pilot line complies with the general specifications, is ambitious, and goes beyond the state-of-the-art while being relevant for the Initiative and the other components of the Chips Act.** • **Soundness of the proposed methodology, including the underlying concepts, models, assumptions.** • **Clarity and pertinence of the cooperation between the pilot line and the other actions under the Chips for Europe Initiative.** • **Clarity and pertinence of access conditions and their practical implementation, including the business plan for covering the operational expenses related to access to the pilot line.** Comments:	**Score 1:** *Threshold 2.5/5*

2. Impact *Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:* • **Credibility of the pathways to achieve the expected outcomes and impacts, and the likely scale and significance of the contributions.** • **Suitability and quality of the measures to maximize expected outcomes and impacts, as set out in the dissemination and exploitation plan, including communication activities.** • **Credibility of the business model justifying the sustainability of operating the pilot line beyond the end of the project.** • **Significant spill-overs that support the broader European semiconductor ecosystem.** Comments:	**Score 2:** *Threshold 2.5/5*

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation *Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:* • **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 brings together the necessary expertise.**	**Score 3:** *Threshold 2.5/5*

Experience of the Hosting Entity(ies) in implementing and operating similar systems; • **Quality and pertinence of experience of the Hosting Entity in installing and operating similar systems.** • **Extent that provided experience is sufficient for supporting the system described in the general system specifications.** *Quality of the hosting facility's physical infrastructure;* • **Quality and pertinence of the current and proposed hosting facility's physical capacity and preparedness.** *Quality of service to the users, namely capability to comply with the service level agreement provided among the documents accompanying the selection procedure;* • **Quality and pertinence of service to the users, namely capability to comply with the service level agreement provided in the Hosting application.** • **Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures to ensure requested service level towards pilot line users.** *Total cost of ownership of the pilot line and methodology to calculate it including an accurate estimate and a verification method of the set up and integration costs as well as the operating cost of the pilot line during its lifetime;* • **Clarity and effectiveness of the estimated cost of implementation of the application.** • **Appropriateness of the methodology to calculate, report, validate and verify the operating costs.** Comments:	

Total score (1+2+3) *Threshold 9/15*	