

Open PHACTS

Competitive Call for an Additional Project Partner

Open PHACTS-2012/1

Evaluation Form

Submission Deadline: 2 May 2012 - 17:00 (CEST)

Competitive Call launched by Open PHACTS
Open PHACTS-2012

**COMPETITIVE CALL FOR AN ADDITIONAL PROJECT PARTNER
Open PHACTS-2012/1**

Individual evaluation / Consensus (delete as appropriate)

Project GA No.: 115191	Acronym: Open PHACTS
-------------------------------	-----------------------------

<p>1. Scientific and technological excellence (relevant to the topics addressed by the call) <i>(Note: when a proposal only partially addresses the topics, this condition will be reflected in the scoring of this criterion.)</i></p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</i></p>
<p>2. Hosting environment, RDF store and experience with semantic data</p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</i></p>
<p>3. Potential impact and added value for Open PHACTS</p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 3/5; Weight 1)</i></p>

0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information; 1 Poor The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses; 2 Fair While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses; 3 Good The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary; 4 Very good The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible; 5 Excellent The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.

**COMPETITIVE CALL FOR AN ADDITIONAL PROJECT PARTNER
Open PHACTS-2012/1**

Remarks	Overall score: (Threshold 10/15)
----------------	---

Does this proposal contain ethical issues that may need further attention?	NO	YES
--	-----------	------------

**I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest
in the evaluation of this proposal**

Name	
Signature	
Date	

Name	
Signature	
Date	

0 The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information; 1 Poor The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses; 2 Fair While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses; 3 Good The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary; 4 Very good The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible; 5 Excellent The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.