

Appeal and redress procedure

EIT Manufacturing

Paris | 2022

eitmanufacturing.eu



The rules set out in this document are aimed at providing the applicants with a transparent appeal procedure concerning the decisions made by EIT Manufacturing during the eligibility check and the evaluation process.

In accordance with Article 30 of the Horizon Europe Regulation, an evaluation review may be requested if the applicable evaluation procedure has not been correctly applied to its proposal. Only the procedural aspects of an evaluation may be the subject of a request for an evaluation review. The evaluation of the merits of a proposal shall not be the subject of an evaluation review. Therefore, evaluation results and scores based on the merits of the proposal are not subject to evaluation review.

A Proposal Leader is the only entity that can request an evaluation review if its proposal was found not eligible during the eligibility check or was rejected after the evaluation process and considers that the applicable evaluation procedure has not been correctly followed for its proposal. Only the procedural aspects of an evaluation may be the subject of a request for an evaluation review, namely:

- a) Process errors by EIT Manufacturing
- b) Technical problems beyond the applicant's control
- c) Obvious human/mechanical errors by EIT Manufacturing
- d) Factual errors during the evaluation process.

Appeals cannot be made based on other grounds than those indicated in the list above.

Proposal leaders must base their complaints on the information included in the communication addressed to them containing the decision of rejection.

To be admissible, a complaint must:

- I. relate to a specific proposal;
- II. be submitted by the specific Proposal Leader;
- III. contain the name and address of the Proposal Leader, reference to the notified decision of ineligibility or evaluation results, clear reasons for the appeal, and any supporting documents;
- IV. be received within 5 working days after the communication of evaluation results, or 5 working days after the communication of the ineligibility (eligibility check);
- V. be submitted in writing;
- VI. be addressed to the EIT Manufacturing CEO.

The relevant documentation provided by the Proposal Leader in support of its appeal shall not alter the quality or content of the evaluated proposal. Appeals that are not filed according to points I-VI above will be rejected.

The request must be sent to the functional mailbox support@eitmanufacturing.eu with the text "REVIEW REQUEST" and the proposal code clearly indicated in the subject.

A reply will be provided no later than 3 weeks after the review request is received by EIT Manufacturing.

An Evaluation Review Committee shall provide an opinion on the procedural aspects of the evaluation or eligibility check.

The Committee will be composed of 3 people. It will contain at least one staff of the Pillar relevant to the proposal and not involved in the eligibility check or the evaluation of the proposals and one staff of the legal unit. The Committee will ensure the absence of conflict of interest in its processes in accordance with the EIT Manufacturing Code of Conduct. The review process will ensure a coherent interpretation of requests and equal treatment of applicants. The Members of the Committee will be appointed ad hoc by the CEO of EIT Manufacturing. Its recommendations are taken by a simple majority and are binding.

The Evaluation Review Committee may recommend one of the following:

- a) a partial or complete re-evaluation of the proposal to be carried out primarily by evaluators who were not involved in the previous evaluation; or
- b) confirmation of the initial decision.

An evaluation review shall not delay the selection process for proposals that are not the subject of that review. On the basis of the Committee's recommendation, a decision will be taken by the EIT Manufacturing CEO and the Proposal Leader will be notified in writing.

To avoid possible misunderstandings, proposers are kindly asked to note the following points:

- The Committee will not call into question the judgment of the independent experts, whose qualifications have been already assessed and validated.
- A re-evaluation will only be carried out if there is evidence of a procedural shortcoming that affects the quality assessment of a proposal. This means, for example, that a problem relating to one evaluation criterion will not lead to a re-evaluation if a proposal has failed anyway on the other criteria.
- The evaluation score following any re-evaluation will be regarded as definitive. It may be lower than the original score.
- Only one request for redress per proposal will be considered by the Committee.
- All requests for redress will be treated confidentially.