



**Digital Europe Programme  
(DEP)**

# **Evaluation form**

**Chips JU DIGITAL Simple Grant**

**Version 1.0  
13/06/2025**

Version	Date	Change	Page
V 1.0 ED 2025 269	13/06/2025	Initial version – based on EU Grants: Evaluation form (IER, CR, ESR) (DEP): V1.0 – 01.11.2021	

#### **IMPORTANT NOTICE**

##### Scoring:

Scoring must be in the range from 1-5. Half marks (0,5) are allowed.

- 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 normally 3/5, 3/5 and 3/5. The overall threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 10 points.

Scores are normally NOT weighted.

Specific rules may be set out in the Work Programme (including Weights).



**SENSITIVE**

[INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT (IER)] [CONSENSUS REPORT (CR)] [EVALUATION SUMMARY  
REPORT]

PROJECT	
Project number:	[project number]
Project acronym:	[acronym]
Project name:	[project title]
Call:	[call ID]
Topic:	[topic ID]
Type of action:	[ToA ID]
Service:	[responsible unit, e.g. JUST/04]
Call deadline:	[dd/mm/yyyy]

PARTICIPANTS					
Partner No	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

*[OPTION for IER, CR and ESR:*

 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.

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

## AWARD CRITERIA

### 1. Relevance (0-5)

The following aspects have been taken into account:

- Alignment with the objectives and activities as described in the specific section for this call of the Chips JU Work Programme 2023-2027- Appendix 6
- Contribution to long-term policy objectives, relevant policies and strategies, and synergies with activities at European and national level

**Comments:**

		0/4000 characters
<b>Score 1 (0-5)</b> Threshold: 3/5		
<b>2. Implementation (0-5)</b> The following aspects have been taken into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Maturity of the project</li> <li>– Soundness of the implementation plan and efficient use of resources</li> <li>– Capacity of the applicants, and when applicable the consortium as a whole, to carry out the proposed work</li> </ul>		
<b>Comments:</b>		0/4000 characters
<b>Score 2 (0-5)</b> Threshold: 3/5		
<b>3. Impact (0-5)</b> The following aspects have been taken into account: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Extent to which the project will achieve the expected outcomes and deliverables referred to in the call for proposals and, where relevant, the plans to disseminate and communicate project achievements</li> <li>– Extent to which the project will strengthen competitiveness and bring important benefits for society</li> </ul>		
<b>Comments:</b>		0/4000 characters
<b>Score 3 (0-5)</b> Threshold: 3/5		
<b>Total score</b> Overall threshold: 10/15		

## 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]

### Exceptional funding

 Entities from countries mentioned in the work programme (if any) are only exceptionally eligible, if the granting authority considers their participation essential for the implementation of the action.

*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]

### Artificial Intelligence (if applicable)

Do the activities proposed involve the use and/or development of AI-based systems and/or techniques?

☐ No

☐ Yes

*If YES, the technical robustness of the proposed system must be evaluated under the appropriate criterion.*

### Other questions

#### Security restrictions Article 12(5) and (6) (if applicable)

If security restrictions apply and one (or more) applicants are found controlled from third countries (or third country entities), is the project feasible without the controlled entities?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Can the work be taken over by one of the other participants or will it be necessary to add new ones?

[Comment box]

## 3. COMMENTS

### OVERALL COMMENTS

[Comment box]

]

*[additional OPTION for CR:*

CONSENSUS MEETING
Consensus meeting minutes
[Comment box]
Minority opinion
<p>Does this proposal have a minority opinion?</p> <p><input type="radio"/> No</p> <p><input type="radio"/> Yes</p> <p>If YES, please encode the names of dissenting evaluators and the reasons:</p> <p>[Comment box]</p>

*]*

*[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]

SUMMARY OF THE COMMENTS	
Overall comments	Displayed/
Consensus meeting minutes	Not displayed
Proposal panel review minutes	Not displayed

*]*

**Additional questions to decide for Programme:**

**Does the CR need to be initialised with pre-filled scores from IERs? If YES, how: sum, average or median? For which ToA? NO**

**Does the CR or ESR include the merging of a sub-criterion? If YES, please indicate which and for which ToA? NO**