
ANNEX II.2: QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORM

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the Deliverable respond to the needs of the service, as expressed in the Technical Specifications?

SCORING: Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Justification for scoring:

(2) COMPLIANCE

Is the information gathered compliant with the requirements defined in the Technical Specifications?

SCORING: Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Justification for scoring:

(3) CLARITY

Are the summaries of the judgments clear and concise?

SCORING: Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Justification for scoring:

(4) COMPLETENESS

Is all the required metadata complete and provided in accordance with the defined requirements?

SCORING: Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Justification for scoring:

(5) TECHNICALITY

Does the Deliverable correspond to the technical requirements of format and language?

SCORING: Very Poor Poor Good Very Good Excellent

Justification for scoring:

GUIDE FOR SCORING THE CRITERIA

The descriptions of indicators below aim at helping to score each criterion and can also assist in developing the argumentation underpinning the score.

The overall assessment of quality control will be based on the average of all indicators.

(1) RELEVANCE

Does the Deliverable respond to the needs of the service, as expressed in the Technical Specifications?

This criterion concerns how well the Deliverable responds to the needs of the service, as defined in the Technical Specifications.

- The Deliverable provides the requested information (i.e. key judgments dealing with enforcement of IP rights) on the basis of the Technical Specifications.
- The scope of the Deliverable covers the requested timeframe, jurisdictions and number of judgments.
- An explanation is provided if any part of the Deliverable is not implemented or is insufficiently implemented.
- The Deliverable helps to improve knowledge in the area by filling the gaps identified in the Technical Specifications.

(2) COMPLIANCE

Is the information gathered compliant with the requirements defined in the Technical Specifications?

This criterion concerns the compliance and coherence of the information with the requirements provided in the Technical Specifications.

- The judgments have been identified as 'key enforcement judgments' in line with the definition of 'key enforcement judgment' provided in the Technical Specifications.
- The information provided complies with the applicable laws and regulations, including the EU general data protection regulation and the rules on the publication of official documents.
- Personal data is anonymised, if and when required by national legislation
- The supplied content is not subject to any restrictions deriving from the rights of third parties.

(3) CLARITY

Are the summaries of the judgments clear and concise?

This criterion refers to the adequacy of the method applied for providing summaries.

- The methodology for preparing the summaries is applied, providing a clear structure and content (facts, substance, conclusions and comments are clearly identified and presented).
- The facts are described clearly and briefly while allowing them to be understood.
- The key legal issues related to the enforcement of IP rights and the conclusions reached are well described.
- The relevance and importance of the judgments from an IP rights' enforcement perspective are indicated and well described.
- The length of the summary does not exceed the specified number of characters.

(4) COMPLETENESS

Is all the required metadata complete and provided in accordance with the defined requirements?

This criterion concerns the extent to which the requirements for providing metadata for indexation purposes have been followed.

- Metadata concerning the country, case number, ECLI (when available), parties, date, court name, instance, nickname and language is supplied.
- Keywords have been chosen from the list of keywords provided.
- IP rights have been correctly identified.
- EU norms and other (national and international) norms relating to IP rights' enforcement are provided; the format defined for providing EU and other legal norms has been followed.
- The amount of damages awarded (when available) is specified using the defined format.
- It is indicated if the judgment was issued by a European Union trade mark/Community design court in a counterclaim for the revocation or invalidity of a European Union trade mark or for the declaration of invalidity of a registered Community design.

(5) TECHNICALITY

Does the Deliverable correspond to the technical requirements of format and language?

This criterion concerns the technical requirements applicable to the format and language of the Deliverable.

- The Deliverable is provided using the EUIPO Excel template; the template has not been modified.
- The texts of the judgments are provided in the original language; the files have been provided using the defined format and named in accordance with the instructions.
- The texts of the summaries do not have linguistic errors (i.e. they have been proofread by a native English speaker).

OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE DELIVERABLE

The overall assessment of the Deliverable is not a self-standing criterion but summarises the key elements and consequences of the preceding criteria, in particular:

- Does the Deliverable fulfil the contractual conditions?
- Does the information provided correspond to the needs and specifications?
- Are there any specific limitations to the validity and completeness of the information provided?