



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

GUIDE FOR EXPERTS ON QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF E+ ACTIONS

PART II

KA2 – KNOWLEDGE ALLIANCES

(v. 2/2019)

Table of Contents

ANNEX 1.a Criteria to assess an application submitted under the call 'Knowledge Alliances'	3
ANNEX 1.b Description of the specific selection process and methodology for KA2 – 'Knowledge Alliances'	4
ANNEX 2. Declaration of absence of conflict of interests and of confidentiality	8
ANNEX 3. Reference documents on policy priorities	11
ANNEX 4.a Individual assessment form template for the call 'Knowledge Alliances' .	13
ANNEX 4.b Consolidated assessment form template for the call 'Knowledge Alliances'	17

ANNEX 1.a Criteria to assess an application submitted under the call 'Knowledge Alliances'

The eligibility and award criteria to assess an application submitted under Knowledge Alliances are available in the [Erasmus+ Programme Guide](#) (from page 135 in the EN version).

ANNEX 1.b Description of the specific selection process and methodology for KA2 – 'Knowledge Alliances'

ASSESSMENT OF 'KNOWLEDGE ALLIANCES' PROPOSALS

In conjunction with the Guide Part I, this Part II is intended to provide experts with specific instructions on how to assess the project applications received under the calls for proposals on 'Knowledge Alliances'.

SELECTION OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS

The role of experts is to assist the Evaluation Committee in assessing the quality of applications in relation to a call for proposals and the subsequent selection process in the field of education, training, youth and sport.

Experts are recruited through an [open call for expression of interest](#). Experts are appointed by the Authorising Officer Responsible on the basis of their expertise. However, other criteria like language competencies, gender balance, the coverage of nationalities and geographical representation will also be taken into account in the final composition of an expert panel.

As mentioned in the Guide Part I, these experts are bound to a [Code of conduct for experts](#) as set out in the call and contract with the Agency. The declaration of any potential conflict of interest is part of their contractual obligations. The 'Knowledge Alliances' experts are also bound by confidentiality.

ASSESSMENT OF KNOWLEDGE ALLIANCES APPLICATIONS

The experts mobilised for the assessment of 'Knowledge Alliances' applications will have to follow the steps described below.

1. Expert briefings

The 'Knowledge Alliances' experts are invited to participate in the 2 online briefing sessions (compulsory for the new experts and the quality check/lead experts). During this briefing the experts' role, the assessment procedure and its timetable, the action, the award criteria and their scoring are explained. The briefing also includes practical exercises to ensure that all experts reach the same understanding of the award criteria, the scoring system and the assessment procedures.

2. Individual assessments

Following the briefing, experts will work on remote. Before starting their assessment work, they will check the proposals allocated to them so as to ensure that they have no conflict of interest with any of them.

The individual assessment work will take place on remote as follows:

Each application will be assessed independently by two different experts against the award criteria published in the call. Experts will give a score and comments for each award criterion after having analysed all the aspects stated for the award criterion concerned.

Before submitting their draft individual assessments on the online assessment tool (OEET), experts will send them by email to their quality check (QC) expert for quality control (cc EACEA-KNOWLEDGE-ALLIANCES@ec.europa.eu). For each expert a number of draft individual assessments will be quality checked.

On the basis of the QC observations, experts will have to revise their individual assessment and,

after a final proofreading, "submit/endorse" their individual assessment (comments and scores) in OEET.

Experts will be expected to work in accordance with the timetable indicated by the Agency.

3. Consolidated assessments

Once the two individual assessments have been finalised and submitted electronically, the Agency will put the two experts in contact so that they consolidate their views on the application and produce a single agreed score and set of comments on each of the award criteria.

The consolidation work will take place on remote as follows:

For each application, the two experts will be appointed as Expert 1 and Expert 2. Expert 1 will be in charge of drawing up the draft consolidated assessment in terms of scores and comments, based on the two already completed individual assessments. Experts will also be required to provide a summary of the main strengths and weaknesses of each application.

After drafting the consolidated assessment in agreement with Expert 2, Expert 1 will send a copy of this draft to the QC expert (cc: Expert 2, [FACEA-KNOWLEDGE -ALLIANCES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:FACEA-KNOWLEDGE-ALLIANCES@ec.europa.eu)). The QC expert will quality control the consolidated assessment and will send his/her comments to both experts (cc: [FACEA-KNOWLEDGE -ALLIANCES@ec.europa.eu](mailto:FACEA-KNOWLEDGE-ALLIANCES@ec.europa.eu)). These QC observations will have to be taken into account for the final version of the consolidation.

In agreement with Expert 2, Expert 1 finalises the consolidated assessment and submits it electronically in the Agency's online assessment tool. If more suitable some of the consolidations might be finalized at the Agency's premises during the final consolidation and panel meeting:

- If the difference between the total score of both individual assessments is of more than 30 points an **additional third assessment** of the application is required¹. This would also be the case if:
 - the two experts are unable to reach consensus, or to agree on consolidated scores and comments for an application;
 - there are serious discrepancies in comments between two individual assessments.
- When a third assessment is triggered, the experts with the assessments that are closest in terms of their overall score will undertake the consolidation, however the two consolidating experts will have access to the individual assessment of the other expert and are expected to take into account any pertinent observations in the final consolidated comments and score. Consolidation follows the same rules as explained above.

The consolidated assessment is considered the final assessment of a given application. It means that in case of applications for a grant, the consolidated assessment and scores form the basis for the review and deliberations of the Evaluation Committee in view of ranking applications in order of merit on the list of eligible grant applications.

4. Quality assurance

Quality check (QC) experts will review a number of draft individual assessments of each expert and all the draft consolidated assessments. They will ensure the quality, coherence and completeness of the consolidated assessment comments and scores.

¹ This requirement does not apply when all experts have scored the application under the thresholds for acceptance for the action.

5. Final consolidation and panel

After the remote assessment phase experts will meet in Brussels to finalise their consolidation work. By the end of this meeting, all the experts' final consolidated assessments shall be submitted and available in the online assessment tool.

On this basis the Agency will extract the list of applications by order of merit.

Experts may be asked to assist the Evaluation Committee with ranking applications that received the same total score, i.e. ex-aequo cases, when they are positioned around the funding line. To this end Experts will have to follow the approach described in Part I of the Guide.

At the end of the evaluation, the Evaluation Committee will seek feedback from experts concerning the call, the evaluation process, and experts' recommendations for future calls and evaluations.

ASSESSMENT OF AWARD CRITERIA AND SCORING

'Knowledge Alliances' experts assess applications against the 4 award criteria for an action as defined in the E+ Programme Guide:

- **Relevance of the proposal (max. 25 points)**
- **Quality of the proposal design and implementation (max. 25 points)**
- **Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements (max. 30 points)**
- **Impact and dissemination (max. 20 points)**

Each of the award criteria is defined through several elements which must be taken into account by experts when analysing an application. These elements form an exhaustive list of points to be considered when scoring the criterion. They are intended to guide experts through the evaluation of the criterion in question but they must not be scored individually.

Assessments must be based on information provided by the applicant only. Information relevant to a specific award criterion may appear in different parts of the application and experts take all of it into consideration. Experts must not assume information that is not stated explicitly in the application or search the internet or make use of their personal background knowledge.

An application can receive a maximum total of 100 points. The maximum score for the different criteria ranges between 20 and 30 points. In order to ensure quality standards and coherence in approach 4 ranges of scores and quality levels for applications have been defined. The table below shows the ranges of scores for the individual quality standards depending on the maximum score of the award criterion. Applications scored weak (< 50 %) in any criterion *cannot be funded*.

Maximum number of points for a criterion	Range of scores			
	Very good	Good	Fair	Weak
30	26-30	21-25	15-20	0-14
25	22-25	18-21	13-17	0-12
20	17-20	14-16	10-13	0-9

- **Very good:** the application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question convincingly and successfully. It provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness.

- **Good:** the application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. It gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.
- **Fair:** the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. It gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- **Weak:** the application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. It does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information.

Experts must provide comments on each award criterion and, in their comments, refer explicitly to the elements of analysis under the relevant criterion. The comments on each award criterion have to reflect and justify the given score. They should emphasise the application's strengths and weaknesses.

As regards **budgetary assessment of an application** the budget is based on a simplified grant i.e. a fixed amount (unit cost) is applied to specific budget headings and / or types of activity or outputs.

Experts must assess all applications in full, regardless of the score given to any of the award criteria.

THRESHOLDS

An application submitted to the Agency under the call for "Knowledge Alliances" in the frame of the E+ Programme qualifies for funding if it receives a score of:

- ✓ at least 70 out of 100 points in total and
- ✓ score at least 13 points for the category "relevance of the proposal" and "quality of the project design and implementation"; 16 points for the category "quality of the project team and cooperation arrangements", and 11 points for the category "impact and dissemination".

ASSESSMENT FORMS

Experts will carry out their assessment online using the Agency's **Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET)**. The applications to be assessed as well as the assessment forms are accessible through the OEET. Experts will be provided with technical instructions for the use of OEET as part of their briefing. The information to be provided by experts in their individual and consolidated assessments is presented for information in Annex 4A and 4B.

ANNEX 2. Declaration of absence of conflict of interests and of confidentiality

For information, the Declaration will form an integral part of the contract. The model contract for experts is available at [FACEA website](#).

EXPERT CONTRACT – ANNEX – CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EXPERTS

ARTICLE 1 – PERFORMANCE OF THE CONTRACT

1. The expert works independently, in a personal capacity and not on behalf of any organisation.
2. The expert must:
 - (a) carry out their tasks in a confidential and fair way, in accordance with the EACEA guidelines for submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures
 - (b) assist the contracting party or relevant service to the best of their abilities, professional skills, knowledge and applying the highest ethical and moral standards
 - (c) follow any instructions and time-schedules given by the contracting party or relevant service and deliver consistently high quality work.
3. The expert may not delegate another person to carry out the work or be replaced by any other person.
4. If a legal entity involved in a proposal approaches the expert during the evaluation of this proposal, s/he must immediately inform the contracting party or relevant service.

ARTICLE 2 – OBLIGATIONS OF IMPARTIALITY

1. The expert must perform their work **impartially**. To this end, the expert is required to:
 - (a) take all necessary measures to prevent any situation of conflict of interest;
 - (b) inform without delay the contracting party or relevant service of any conflicts of interest arising in the course of their work including of any proposal competing with the proposal where the expert may have a conflict of interest;
 - (c) confirm there is no conflict of interest for each proposal s/he is evaluating by signing a declaration in the electronic evaluation system.
2. **Definition of the conflict of interest:** Such situation arises where the impartial and objective performance of the Contract is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, family or emotional ties, or any other shared interest.

For a given proposal, a conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- (a) was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- (b) stands to benefit directly or indirectly if the proposal is accepted
- (c) has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant or participating legal entity
- (d) is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant legal entity
- (e) is employed or contracted by one of the applicant or participating legal entities² or any named subcontractors

² However, the contracting party or relevant service may decide to invite an expert who is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities or any named subcontractors to take part in the panel review session, if the expert works in a different department/laboratory/institute from the one where the work is to be carried out, and if the constituent bodies operate with a high degree of autonomy, and if such a role is justified by the requirement to appoint the best available experts and by the limited size of the pool of qualified experts. [**OPTION by default:** *In this case, the expert must not take part in any detailed panel discussion (or electronic forum) of the proposal involving the legal entity concerned or in any hearings concerning the proposal. In exceptional duly justified cases, experts in the circumstances described above may also participate in the consensus group for the proposal in question, provided valid reasons are given. The contracting party or relevant service will inform the other experts in the group of the affiliation of the expert concerned.*]

- (f) is a member of an Advisory Group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU work programmes related to, or in an area related to, the call for proposals in question
- (g) is a National Contact Point
- (h) is a member of a Programme Committee

In the following situations the contracting party or relevant service will decide whether a conflict of interest exists, taking account of the objective circumstances, available information and related risks when an expert:

- i. was employed by one of the applicant or participating legal entities in the last three years
- ii. is involved in a contract or grant agreement, grant decision or membership of management structures (e.g. member of management or advisory board etc.) research collaboration with an applicant or participating legal entity or a fellow researcher, or had been so in the last three years
- iii. is in any other situation that could cast doubt on their ability to participate in the evaluation of the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

3. Consequences of conflicts of interest

If a conflict becomes apparent at any stage of the evaluation, the expert must immediately inform the contracting party or relevant service staff. If a conflict is confirmed, the expert must stop evaluating the proposal concerned. Any comments and scores already given by the expert will be discounted. If necessary, the expert will be replaced.

If it is revealed during an evaluation that an expert has knowingly concealed a conflict of interest, the expert will be immediately excluded, and sanctions will apply (see Articles 14, 15, 16 and 18 of the Contract or in the Financial Regulation and its implementing rules).

ARTICLE 3 – OBLIGATIONS OF CONFIDENTIALITY

1. The contracting party or relevant service and the expert must treat confidentially³ any information and documents, in any form (i.e. paper or electronic), disclosed in writing or orally in relation to the performance of the Contract.
2. The expert undertakes to observe strict **confidentiality** in relation to their work. To this end, the expert:
 - (a) must not use confidential information or documents for any purpose other than fulfilling their obligations under the Contract without prior written approval of the contracting party
 - (b) must not disclose, directly or indirectly, confidential information or documents relating to proposals or applicants, without prior written approval of the contracting party.

In particular, the expert:

- i. must not discuss any proposal with others, including other experts or contracting party or relevant service staff not directly involved in evaluating the proposal, except during the formal discussion at the meetings moderated by or with the knowledge and approval of the responsible contracting party or relevant service staff
- ii. must not disclose:
 - any detail of the evaluation process and its outcomes or of any proposal submitted for evaluation for any purpose other than fulfilling their obligations under the Contract without

³ In this context, the term “confidentiality” does not refer to the security classification “EU CONFIDENTIAL”. The procedures related to “EU CONFIDENTIAL” documents apply only to information and material the unauthorised disclosure of which would harm the essential interests of the EU or one of its Member States (Commission provisions on security (Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ L 317, 3.12.2001, p. 1))).

- prior written approval of the contracting party
- their advice to the contracting party or relevant service on any proposal to the applicants or to any other person (including colleagues, students, etc.)
- the names of other experts participating in the evaluation.
- iii. must not communicate with applicants, beneficiaries or any person linked to the applicant or participating legal entity on any proposal:
 - during the evaluation or on-site visits, except in hearings or on-site visits between experts and the applicants or beneficiary organised by the contracting party or relevant service as part of the evaluation process;
 - after the evaluation.
- 3. If the proposals are made available electronically to the expert who then works from their own or other suitable premises, s/he will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent, and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files upon completing the evaluation as instructed.
- 4. If the evaluation takes place in premises controlled by the contracting party or relevant service, the expert:
 - (a) must not remove from the premises proposals, copies or notes on evaluation, either on paper or in electronic form
 - (b) will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent, and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files on completing the evaluation as instructed.
- 5. If the expert seeks further information (for example through the internet, specialised databases, etc.) to complete their examination of the proposals, s/he:
 - (a) must respect the overall rules for confidentiality for obtaining such information
 - (b) must not contact applicants, beneficiaries or any person linked to the applicant legal entity
 - (c) must not contact third parties without prior written approval of the contracting party.
- 6. These confidentiality obligations are binding on:
 - (a) the contracting party (see Regulation No 31 (EEC), 11 (EAEC), laying down the Staff Regulations of Officials and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community⁴)
 - (b) the expert during performance of the Contract and for five years starting from the date of the last payment made to the expert unless:
 - i. the contracting party agrees to release the expert from the confidentiality obligations earlier
 - ii. the confidential information becomes public through other channels
 - iii. disclosure of the confidential information is required by law.

⁴ OJ 45, 14.6.1962, p. 1385.

ANNEX 3. Reference documents on policy priorities

Transversal policy priorities for education, training and youth

- **Agenda for Jobs, Growth, Fairness and democratic Change**
http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/index_en.htm
- **Education and Training 2020 in EUROPE 2020:**
 - Europe 2020: http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/index_en.htm
 - Europe 2020 targets: <http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/targets/eu-targets/>
 - Education and Training 2020 (ET2020):
http://ec.europa.eu/education/policy/strategic-framework/index_en.htm
 - "Council Conclusions on investing in education and training — a response to Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes and the 2013 Annual Growth Survey":
http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/educ/135467.pdf
 - Rethinking Education: Investing in skills for better socio-economic outcomes:
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1389776578033&uri=CELEX:52012DC0669>
- **Recognition and transparency**
 - European Qualifications Framework:
http://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/search/site?f%5B0%5D=im_field_entity_type%3A97
 - Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE):
https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/resources/documents/applicants/higher-education-charter_en
 - Europass: <http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/home>
- **Entrepreneurship education:**
 - Supporting HEIs to assess and develop their innovative and entrepreneurial potential - HEInnovate: www.heinnovate.eu
 - "Towards Greater Cooperation and Coherence in Entrepreneurship Education" – Report of the High Level Reflection Panels on Entrepreneurship Education initiated by Directorate General Enterprise and Industry and Directorate General Education and Culture: <http://ec.europa.eu/DocsRoom/documents/9269/>
 - Entrepreneurship Education: A Guide for Educators
http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/programme-guide/annexes/annex-iv_en
- **Information and Communications Technology (ICT) and Open Education Resources (OER):**
 - Digital Competence: Identification and European-wide validation of its key components for all levels of learners:
<http://is.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pages/EAP/DIGCOMP.html>

Policy priorities for Higher Education; University-Business cooperation

- **University Business cooperation:**
Review of the State of European University-Business Cooperation in Europe:
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/tools/docs/uni-business-cooperation_en.pdf
- **Study on innovation in Higher Education:**
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/tools/docs/study-innovation-he_en.pdf
- **Higher Education Modernisation Agenda:**
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0567:FIN:EN:PDF>
- **Results of the public consultation on the EU's modernisation agenda for higher education:**
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:cd0fa1ca-2ee9-11e6-b497-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_2&format=PDF
- **Cooperation between higher education and business:**
https://ec.europa.eu/education/policies/innovation-in-education/university-business-cooperation_en
- **The 6th University-Business Forum:**
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/tools/docs/university-business-forum-brussels_en.pdf
- **Electronic Platform on University-Business Cooperation:**
<https://www.yammer.com/universitybusinesscooperationnetwork#/home>

ANNEX 4.a Individual assessment form template for the call 'Knowledge Alliances'

Erasmus+ Programme
KA2 – Knowledge Alliances

Individual Assessment Form 2019 (call EAC/A03/2018)

EXPERT'S NAME:

DATE: VERSION NUMBER:

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Applicant organisation:

Proposal Number:

Proposal Title:

I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.

Signature: Date:

Learning mobility Yes/No

Partner country involved Yes/No

Financial issues Yes/No

	AWARD CRITERIA	Score	Min. thresh old
1	RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL	.../25 points	13 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: the proposal is relevant to the objectives of the Action (see section "What are the aims and priorities of a Knowledge Alliance"); • Consistency: the proposal is based on a sound and solid needs analysis; the objectives and outputs are clearly defined, realistic and address issues relevant to the participating organisations and to the Action; • Innovation: the proposal considers state-of-the-art methods and techniques, and leads to project-specific innovative results and solutions; • European added value: the proposal demonstrates clearly the added value generated through its transnationality and potential transferability; 		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	<i>In the 'Guide for Applicants – Call 2019', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.10 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf</i>		
	Comments		

2	Quality of the project design and implementation	Score .../25 points	Min. threshold 13 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence: the proposal presents a coherent and comprehensive set of appropriate activities to meet the identified needs and lead to the expected results; • Structure: the work programme is clear and intelligible, and covers all phases; • Management: timelines, organisation, tasks and responsibilities are well defined and realistic. The proposal allocates appropriate resources to each activity; • Quality and financial control: specific measures for evaluation of processes and deliverables ensure that the project implementation is of high quality and cost-efficient. 		
<i>HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION?</i> (Guide for Applicants 2019)	<i>In the 'Guide for Applicants 2019', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.11 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf</i>		
	Comments		

3	Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	Score .../30 points	Min. threshold 16 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Configuration: the proposed Knowledge Alliance involves an appropriate mix of higher education and business partners with the necessary profiles, skills, experience, expertise and management support required for its successful realisation; • Commitment: each participating organisation demonstrates full involvement corresponding to its capacities and specific area of expertise; • Partnership: contributions of higher education and business partners are significant, pertinent and complementary; • Collaboration/Team spirit: the proposal includes clear arrangements and responsibilities for transparent and efficient decision-making, conflict resolution, reporting and communication between the participating organisations; • Reward: Project provides clear added value and benefits to each partner organisation • Involvement of Partner Countries: if applicable, the involvement of a participating organisation from a Partner Country brings an essential added value to 		

	the project.		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.12 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		

4	Impact and dissemination	Score .../20 points	Min. threshold 11 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploitation: the proposal demonstrates how the outputs will be used by the partners and other stakeholders and will lead to the expected outcomes. Appropriate measures are in place for evaluating the outcomes of the project. The proposal provides means to measure exploitation within the project lifetime and after. • Dissemination: the proposal provides a clear plan for the dissemination of results, and includes appropriate activities, tools and channels to ensure that the results and benefits will be spread effectively to the stakeholders and non-participating audience within and after the project's lifetime; • Impact: the proposal shows societal and economic relevance and outreach. It provides pertinent measures to monitor progress and assess the expected impact (short and long-term); • Open access: If relevant, the proposal describes how the materials, documents and media produced will be made freely available and promoted through open licences, and does not contain disproportionate limitations; • Sustainability: the proposal includes appropriate measures and resources to ensure that the partnership, project results and benefits will be sustained beyond the project lifetime. 		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.13 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		

	Total (points)	Total score .../100 points	Min. threshold 70 points
	Total (%)	... %	70 %

In order to be considered for funding an application must:

- ✓ score at least 70 points in total and
- ✓ score at least 13 points for the categories "relevance of the project" and "quality of the project design and implementation"; 16 points for the category "quality of the project team and cooperation arrangements", and 11 points for the category "impact and dissemination".

Comments to EACEA

ANNEX 4.b Consolidated assessment form template for the call 'Knowledge Alliances'

Erasmus + Programme
KA2 – Knowledge Alliances

Consolidated Assessment Form 2019 (call EAC/A03/2018)

EXPERTS' NAMES:

EXPERT 1

EXPERT 2

EXPERT 3

.....

.....

.....

DATE: **VERSION NUMBER:**

PROPOSAL INFORMATION:

Applicant organisation:

Proposal Number:

Proposal Title:

The two experts involved in consolidation should sign below:

Signature Expert 1:

Date:

Signature Expert 2:

Date:

Signature Expert 3:

Date:

I hereby confirm that I am not in a position of conflict of interest with regard to this proposal.

Signature: **Date:**

Learning mobility Yes/No

Partner country involved Yes/No

Financial issues Yes/No

	AWARD CRITERIA	Score	Min. thresh old
1	RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL	.../25 points	13 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purpose: the proposal is relevant to the objectives of the Action (see section "What are the aims and priorities of a Knowledge Alliance"); • Consistency: the proposal is based on a sound and solid needs analysis; the objectives and outputs are clearly defined, realistic and address issues relevant to the participating organisations and to the Action; • Innovation: the proposal considers state-of-the-art methods and techniques, and leads to project-specific innovative results and solutions; • European added value: the proposal demonstrates 		

	clearly the added value generated through its transnationality and potential transferability;		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.10 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		

2	Quality of the project design and implementation	Score .../25 points	Min. threshold 13 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coherence: the proposal presents a coherent and comprehensive set of appropriate activities to meet the identified needs and lead to the expected results; • Structure: the work programme is clear and intelligible, and covers all phases; • Management: timelines, organisation, tasks and responsibilities are well defined and realistic. The proposal allocates appropriate resources to each activity; • Quality and financial control: specific measures for evaluation of processes and deliverables ensure that the project implementation is of high quality and cost-efficient. 		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.11 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		

3	Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements	Score .../30 points	Min. threshold 16 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Configuration: the proposed Knowledge Alliance involves an appropriate mix of higher education and business partners with the necessary profiles, skills, experience, expertise and management support required for its successful realisation; • Commitment: each participating organisation demonstrates full involvement corresponding to its capacities and specific area of expertise; • Partnership: contributions of higher education and business partners are significant, pertinent and complementary; • Collaboration/Team spirit: the proposal includes 		

	<p>clear arrangements and responsibilities for transparent and efficient decision-making, conflict resolution, reporting and communication between the participating organisations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reward: Project provides clear added value and benefits to each partner organisation • Involvement of Partner Countries: if applicable, the involvement of a participating organisation from a Partner Country brings an essential added value to the project. 		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for Applicants 2019)	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See p.12 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		

4	Impact and dissemination	Score .../20 points	Min. threshold 11 points
AWARD CRITERION (E+ PROGRAMME GUIDE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exploitation: the proposal demonstrates how the outputs will be used by the partners and other stakeholders and will lead to the expected outcomes. Appropriate measures are in place for evaluating the outcomes of the project. The proposal provides means to measure exploitation within the project lifetime and after. • Dissemination: the proposal provides a clear plan for the dissemination of results, and includes appropriate activities, tools and channels to ensure that the results and benefits will be spread effectively to the stakeholders and non-participating audience within and after the project's lifetime; • Impact: the proposal shows societal and economic relevance and outreach. It provides pertinent measures to monitor progress and assess the expected impact (short and long-term); • Open access: If relevant, the proposal describes how the materials, documents and media produced will be made freely available and promoted through open licences, and does not contain disproportionate limitations; • Sustainability: the proposal includes appropriate measures and resources to ensure that the partnership, project results and benefits will be sustained beyond the project lifetime. 		
HOW TO MEET THIS CRITERION? (Guide for	In the ' Guide for Applicants 2019 ', applicants were provided advice on how to meet the above criterion. See		

Applicants 2019)	p.13 and next at: https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/sites/eacea-site/files/guide_for_applicants_en_ka_2019_for_publication-25-10_.pdf		
	Comments		
	Total (points)	Total score .../100 points	Min. threshold 70 points
	Total (%)	... %	70 %

In order to be considered for funding an application must:

- ✓ score at least 70 points in total and
- ✓ score at least 13 points for the categories "relevance of the project" and "quality of the project design and implementation"; 16 points for the category "quality of the project team and cooperation arrangements", and 11 points for the category "impact and dissemination".

Comments to EACEA

Assessment summary of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses