

Award criteria: How proposals are reviewed and expectations from evaluators

Alessia Melasecche Germini

First, what comes first... (1/2)

The SME Instrument programme is **looking for:**

- > **Highly innovative SMEs** with ground-breaking concepts
- > Capacity to **shape new markets or disrupting existing ones**
- > **High-growth potential** with European and global ambitions

... in which to invest.

Evaluators are advised to consider whether **all participants have a realistic role to play in the proposed project.**

Evaluators are invited to:

1. score proposals strictly **as they were submitted**
2. **"google" the company**, its facts and figures, and to submit their described innovation to a reality check
3. thoroughly **check the validity of any “letter of intent”** included as part of the Technical Annex 4-5— a simple search should reveal whether the person/company behind the letter exists and, in some cases, what their relationship with the applicant is.

First, what comes first... (2/2)

Admissibility - proposals must be:

- Readable, Accessible and Printable;
- Complete (all requested forms);

Eligibility:

- SME status, country*;
- Limited number of pages (10 for Phase 1; 30 for Phase 2). Excess pages are watermarked – evaluators have to ignore them;
- Only one application per company allowed for all phases (no concurrent submission or implementation).

The EC is trying to support **only the very best innovative business propositions, not well written proposals. Evaluators are asked to try to see beyond first impressions.**

Proposals will be matched to experts via keywords.

(*EU Member States and Countries Associated to Horizon 2020)

Ukrainian SME Instrument projects awarded, so far (1/3)

Joint Stock Company NVO Chervona Hvilya, Project Phase: Phase 1, **01/02/2017-31/07/2017**,
<http://rw3dmetals.com>

Project: xBeam 3D Metal Printing, **Project Acronym:** xBeam

PASSIV DOM UKRAINE LCC, Project Phase: Phase 1, **01/06/2017-30/11/2017**,
<http://passivdom.com/>

Project: Feasibility study for PassivDom – autonomous self-learning 3D-printed modular house,
Project Acronym: PassivDom

SOLARGAPS LLC, Project Phase: Phase 1, **01/11/2017-28/02/2018**, <https://solargaps.com/>

Project: SolarGaps - Energy generating solar smart window blinds, **Project Acronym:** SolarGaps

Private enterprise «Dominion», Project Phase: Phase 1, **01/11/2017-30/04/2018**, **Project:**
Technology for Onsite 3D Printing Production of Lengthy Large Diameter Polyethylene Pipes with
Cellular Walls, **Project Acronym:** TOPpipes

Ukrainian SME Instrument projects awarded, so far (2/3)

EXTRUSION IN MOTION LLC, Project Phase: Phase 1, 01/03/2018-31/08/2018, <http://www.eim3d.com>

Project: Passive and Active Acoustic Leak Detection System, **Project Acronym:** PAALD

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY INTEGRO-SD, Project Phase: Phase 1, 01/03/2018-31/08/2018, <http://www.integro.co.ua>

Project: Innovative Manure Biofertilizers, **Project Acronym:** IMBIO

LLC RACCOON TECHNOLOGIES UKRAINE, Project Phase: Phase 1, 01/06/2018-30/11/2018, <https://raccoon.world/rehabilitation/>

Project: Raccoon.Recovery – effective mobile data driven hand rehabilitation solution, **Project Acronym:** Raccoon.Recovery

Ukrainian SME Instrument projects awarded, so far (3/3)

LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY POLYTEDA CLOUD, Project Phase: Phase 2, 01/01/2017-31/12/2018, <http://www.polyteda-cloud.com>, EU contribution: 1.220.888 €

Project: Innovative Cloud-Based PV Workflow for Semiconductor Foundries, Project Acronym: PVCLOUD

FIRMA INSTYTUT ECOLOGII LIUDYNY-INEKO, Project Phase: Phase 1, 01/07/2018-31/12/2018, <http://inecoinstitute.com/>

Project: A mobile super high frequency equipment to produce highly dispersed nanosorbent in real time based on thermally expanded graphite for liquidation of natural and man-made accidents, **Project Acronym:** OILCS

DISCOPERI UKRAINE LLC, Project Phase: Phase 1, 01/11/2018-31/03/2019, <http://www.discoperi.com>

Project: System EYE - cutting-edge innovation to make your drive safer, collect and monetize automotive data, **Project Acronym:** System EYE

Phase 1

Threshold: 13

Phase 2

Impact

Excellence

Implementation

**Evaluation
Award
Criteria**

Threshold: 4

Operational Capacity

Impact

Excellence

Implementation

Phase 2 only

Sub-contracting

Technical Readiness Level

Use of embryonic stem cells

The scoring

- Each evaluation sub-criterion is scored **out of 10 points** (one decimal may be used);
- Each evaluation sub-criterion question has the same weight, except overall
- The individual scores (from 0 to 10) given to each sub-criterion are used to calculate each of the three award criterion scores (Impact, Excellence and Implementation) in the scale of (0 to 5). **The threshold of each criterion is 4.**
- The total score of the proposal is the weighted sum of these three separate scores (**Impact is given a weight of 50% and the Excellence and Implementation is given a weight of 25% each**).
- The total **maximum score** for a proposal is **15 points**.

The final score

- The score at the level of the three evaluation criteria is the median score of the scores given by each of the four evaluators.
- The final score is the weighted sum of these three separate scores and the quality threshold is 13 out of 15.
- The scale used to obtain the qualitative assessment is the following:
- The final score
 - Very Good to Excellent (4.5 – 5)
 - Good to Very Good (3.5 – 4.49)
 - Fair to Good (2.5 – 3.49)
 - Insufficient to Fair (1.5 – 2.49)
 - Insufficient (0-1.49)

The evaluation process - Phase I

- All expert-evaluators will prepare an **Individual Evaluation Report (IER)** that will contain scores for each of the three award criteria – *Excellence, Impact* and *Quality & efficiency of the implementation* – from 0 to 5 with a resolution of one decimal.
- Based on these Individual Evaluation Reports, the **Overall Consensus Score is automatically calculated** by: 1. applying the *median* to the individual scores per criterion to obtain the Consensus Scores at criteria level; 2. applying the *weighting* to the Consensus Scores at criteria level; 3. *summing* the weighted Consensus Scores at criteria level to obtain the Overall Consensus Score from 0 to 15 with a resolution of two decimals.
- The final score of the evaluation is the Overall Consensus Score which will be part of the **Evaluation Summary Report (ESR)**. *The ESR is the final result of the evaluation process for Phase 1.*
- Proposals must reach the quality thresholds in order to be ranked. The **quality threshold of Consensus Scores at criteria level is 4 out of 5** and the quality threshold of the **Overall Consensus Score is 13 out of 15**.

The evaluation process - Phase II (1/6)

- Each expert-evaluator will prepare an **Individual Evaluation Report (IER)** that will contain: scores for each of the three award criteria – *Excellence, Impact* and *Quality & efficiency of the implementation* – from 0 to 5 with a resolution of one decimal; an assessment of the operational capacity of the participant; an assessment of the best-value-for-money for the subcontracted tasks; an evaluation of the Technology Readiness Level (TRL).
- On the basis of these Individual Evaluation Reports, the **Overall Consensus Score is automatically calculated** by: 1. applying the *median* to the individual scores per criterion to obtain the Consensus Scores at criteria level; 2. applying the *weighting* to the Consensus Scores at criteria level; 3. *summing* the weighted Consensus Scores at criteria level to obtain the Overall Consensus Score – from 0 to 15 with a resolution of two decimals.
- *The final result of step 1* is the **Overall Consensus Score**, which will be part of the Evaluation Summary Report.
- Your proposal must reach the quality thresholds in order to be ranked. The **quality threshold of Consensus Scores at criteria level is 4 out of 5** and the **quality threshold of the Overall Consensus Score is 13 out of 15**.

The evaluation process - Phase II (2/6)

- Only the proposals above all thresholds are ranked in descending order according to their Overall Consensus Score. **The ranking list contains: proposals to be invited to *step 2 - interview*; - proposals that cannot be invited to step 2.**
- Around 120 companies whose proposals received the highest scores will pass to the second step and be invited for an interview in front of a jury of business experts.
- These interviews will be performed during one week by a total of 30 experts. The EC groups the proposals in 7 interview juries composed of 5 experts, interviewing around 20 companies each. The proposals will be allocated to one of the 7 juries that will all combine various thematic areas, considering the thematic knowledge required by the experts and the need to have proposals evenly distributed across juries.
- <https://ec.europa.eu/easme/en/evaluations-eic-pilot>

The evaluation process - Phase II (3/6)

Invitation to the interview:

- Applicants whose proposal has passed to step 2 will receive an **invitation letter for a face-to-face interview in Brussels**. You will be invited on **very short notice since interviews will normally take place one week after you receive the invitation letter**. *The invitation letter will include:*
- *date, room and time* of the interview - interview times will not be changeable; address and directions where the interview will take place – please note that however **all interviews will take place in Brussels**; details and template of a pitch document that you need to prepare in English prior to the interview; instructions on how to appoint up to three company representatives for the interview and which information you must provide in order to demonstrate their role in the company.

Interview format: The interview process includes the jury interview and panel review

The pre-selected applicants will need to convince – the innovation and investment jury – that their proposals are truly worth supporting.

The evaluation process - Phase II (4/6)

Participation in the interview

If you submit a Phase 2 proposal for one of the cut-off dates, you should ensure that you are available and able to travel to Brussels during the corresponding interview weeks as indicated below.

- *interview week for 1st cut-off date: February 12-16;*
- *interview week for 2nd cut-off date: April 16-20;*
- *interview week for 3rd cut-off date: June 25-29;*
- *interview week for 4th cut-off date: November 12-16*

You are allowed to send a maximum of **3 company representatives per proposal**, *preferably the CEO or, alternatively, other senior staff*, to the interview.

Please note that **all expenses related to your participation in the interview** (e.g. travel, accommodation) **will not be reimbursed**.

If the appointed representatives fail to appear or if no one is appointed, the interview will remain scheduled and proceed only on the basis of the documents already provided.

The evaluation process - Phase II (5/6)

Jury interview:

Each of the **7 interview juries** will be composed of at least **5 international high-level expert-evaluators** selected on the basis of their high profile and level of *expertise in investment, business or innovation*.

The interview will take place **in English** and last **no longer than 30 minutes** including:

- **10 minutes (maximum) of presentation** supported by a pitch document (slide format in pdf) of maximum 10 pages. A template will be attached to the invitation letter;
- **20 minutes of questions and answers** to clarify aspects of the proposal evaluated in Step 1, in particular those under 'Award Criteria' including the commercialisation strategy, the team/company, the technological feasibility, the projected results and the market creating potential. There will be no pre-set questions, the jury may ask any question related to the proposal.

The evaluation process - Phase II (5/6)

Panel review:

The panel is composed of the **30 expert-evaluators who participated in the jury interviews**. The panel will review all the proposals from the interview stage to ensure that the interview juries have been consistent in their evaluation. The panel **may adjust scores or change the comments if necessary**.

The panel review will approve a panel report that will comprise the Evaluation Summary Report for each proposal in step 2 and a ranking list.

Ranking:

The ranking list is determined by the Panel report and contains:

- proposals proposed for funding – final score A;
- proposals rejected due to insufficient budget – final score B.

Impact

Phase 1

Threshold: 4

8 sub-criteria

Phase 2

Threshold: 4

8 sub-criteria

- The expected impacts listed in the work programme
- Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge
- Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets; and, where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets
- Any other environmental and socially important impacts (not already covered above)
- Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant

DOs

> Impact:

- **Writing to investors.** Think of the evaluators if he/she was an investor.
- **Business over technology.** Put emphasis in **describing your competitors** and on **explaining your competitive advantage** and **the commercialization plan**
- Provide **concrete and realistic figures** on the market size, the market share, the sales price.
- Show at least **3 years of projection** of sales volume, turnover and number of jobs created.
- **European dimension.** Show how your proposal is relevant to Europe: analyze the market in Europe, detail how your product is relevant to Europe, discuss goals and regulations if relevant. *If it's targeted only at a national market, it won't be supported by the SME Instrument.*
- The protection of **intellectual property** is also very important and must be explained.

Excellence

Phase 1

Threshold: 4

5 sub-criteria

Phase 2

Threshold: 4

5 sub-criteria

- Clarity and pertinence of the objectives
- Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations where relevant
- Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches)
- Credibility of the proposed approach

DOs

> Excellence:

- you need to convince the evaluators that **your innovation is excellent**, that your product, process or service is **disruptive**, that it has the potential to change the dynamic of the market and possibly to address a societal challenge.
- Show the **added value** of your idea and explain why it is **viable and better than existing solutions**.
- While it's important to describe the opportunities, you must also demonstrate that you **understand the risks**.

Implementation

Phase 1

Threshold: 4

3 sub-criteria

Phase 2

Threshold: 4

3 sub-criteria

- Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources
- Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)
- Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

DOs

> Implementation:

- You need to convince the evaluators that **you can make it**.
- Don't forget that, as well as describing technical competence, you'll also need to provide **information on commercial competence**.
- Evaluators will assess the **credibility of your team and of your work plan**.
- Make sure you clearly describe how you **will organize your team** and, if you intend to use external **partners** to bring competences that you don't have in your company, explain what they will do and what they will bring.
- Planning is important as well: your project should fit into a **realistic time frame**.

Operational Capacity

Phase 2 only

- Operational Capacity

Current status:

Based on the information provided in the proposal, do all the partners in this proposal possess the basic operational capacity to carry out the proposed work?.

If you believe that an applicant does NOT have the operational capacity to carry out the proposed work, you should also score the Quality and efficiency of implementation to below the threshold, in other words less than 4.

☐ No ☒ Yes

If you believe that an applicant does **NOT** have the operational capacity to carry out the proposed work, you should choose **NO**, justify the reason and score the **"Quality and efficiency of implementation"** criterion below the threshold (**<4**).

Technological Readiness Level

Phase 2 only

- Technology Relevance Level (TRL):

In the event of the proposal being awarded a 'Seal of Excellence' and in view of complying with the General Block Exemption Regulation (GBER), please assess the TRL described in the proposal and reply to the following question:

Is the project proposed containing activities above TRL 8? *

☒ No ☐ Yes

N.B.: TRL 8 corresponds to 'system complete and qualified' (not yet proven in operational environment).

The answer is set to 'No' by default in the Individual Evaluation Report Form (IER). If your assessment reveals a TRL greater than 8, switch the radio button to 'Yes'.

The TRL described in the proposal has to be assessed by replying to the following question:

"Does the project proposed contain activities above TRL 8?"

TRL 8 corresponds to 'system complete and qualified' (not yet proven in operational environment).

The answer is set to 'No' by default in the Individual Evaluation Report Form (IER). If your assessment reveals a TRL>8, switch the radio button to **'Yes'**.

Technology Readiness Levels (TRL)

- TRL 1 – basic principles observed
- TRL 2 – technology concept formulated
- TRL 3 – experimental proof of concept
- TRL 4 – technology validated in lab
- TRL 5 – technology validated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies)
- TRL 6 – technology demonstrated in relevant environment (industrially relevant environment in the case of key enabling technologies)
- TRL 7 – system prototype demonstration in operational environment
- TRL 8 – system complete and qualified
- TRL 9 – actual system proven in operational environment (competitive manufacturing in the case of key enabling technologies; or in space)

Technological Readiness Level

Phase 2 only

Please note that **it is NOT an evaluation criterion**. We ask you to note the level of TRL but being above TRL8 will not disqualify the proposal.

This assessment of TRL is necessary in the framework of the Seal of Excellence*. Potential national funding authorities are informed if TRL9 activities (already commercialised) are foreseen to avoid that their related costs are considered eligible for funding through other public resources.

* The Seal of Excellence is a quality label granted by the EC to proposals submitted under Horizon 2020, which succeeded an independent highly competitive evaluation at EU level but could not be funded due to insufficient call budget. The Seal allows regions, Member States or any other funding sources to easily identify these high quality proposals and possibly support them.

Seal of Excellence

The Seal of Excellence is the **high-quality label awarded to projects submitted to Horizon 2020 which were deemed to deserve funding but did not receive it due to budget limits.**

It recognises the value of the proposal and supports the search for alternative funding

<https://ec.europa.eu/research/soe/index.cfm>

Example

8 August 2018

Funding available for Seal of Excellence holders in **Slovakia**

The Ministry of Economy of the Slovak Republic (MoE SR) has launched a call for SMEs that have received at least 12 points in the SME Instrument of Horizon 2020 and have not yet received funding from the European Commission. For the first time, Slovak SMEs have a chance to receive a flat rate of €50.000 to prepare a feasibility study and to prepare a proposal for Phase 2 of the SME Instrument.

Subcontracting

Phase 2 only

- Regulated under Art 13 of the H2020 SME Instrument Phase 2 **Model Grant Agreement** (see link - page 551);
- Subcontracting is NOT restricted to a limited part of the action;
- It is in the SME Instrument spirit that the applying SME has the capacity to carry out the activity;
- Compliance with best value-for-money is assessed during the evaluation.

Subcontracting: SME Instrument specificities

- Subcontracting is **NOT** restricted to a limited part of the action.
- The **beneficiaries** have the right to commercially exploit the results generated by **subcontractors** (by transfer of intellectual property rights, licence or other).
- Compliance with **best value-for-money must be assessed** during the evaluation of the proposal.
- Subcontracting **between beneficiaries** is **NOT** allowed.
- Subcontracting **to affiliates** is **NOT** allowed.
- **Coordination tasks** can **NOT** be subcontracted;
- **Existing contracts or subcontracts must comply with best value-for-money and absence of conflict of interest.**

How to assess best value-for-money

If **subcontractors are known**, you should ensure that there are sufficient details for:

- The action tasks, the award procedure, the name of the subcontractor, the price and object, the explanation why the subcontractor and the price are appropriate.

If **subcontractors are unknown**, you should ensure that there are sufficient details for:

- The action tasks, the estimated budget, the procedure that will be followed to ensure best value-for-money.

If the above information is not provided, this shall be reflected in your assessment of the Quality & efficiency of implementation criterion.

Example of good subcontracting (known subcontractor)

RED S.P.A.

The subcontractors will provide for the right of "the applicant" to commercially exploit the results generated during the subcontract implementation.

Tasks subcontracted:

- Task 4.2 Quality Plans
- Task 4.4 1st stage of prototype construction on dry dock; load out
- Task 4.5 2nd stage of prototype construction from harbour pier
- Task 4.6 Coordination for supply and implementation of tower and nacelle

Price: 380.000 €

Description of the tasks: RED S.P.A. will be responsible for..... The works will last 3 months.

Procedure to select RED S.P.A.:

- Identification of 3 or more companies specialised in... and located in our geographical area;
- Request for price offer of costs, the time requested for the work and the years of experience;
- Selection of the best offer in terms of costs, time requested and years of experience.

Justification for the choice of RED S.P.A.:

RED S.P.A. fulfils the criteria indicated in the selection procedure. Beside this, the company has already collaborated in the construction ofand is heavily familiarized with the construction of the..... RED

Example of bad subcontracting (known subcontractor)

Yellow LTD

Tasks subcontracted:

This company will follow all the works requested to build the earth dry-dock.

Price: 780.000€ - 2.500.000€

Description of the tasks: Yellow LTD will carry out all the works.

Procedure to select Yellow LTD:

Yellow LTD is a construction company located near our premises. Yellow LTD is well known and with successful previous experiences.

Not enough information !!!

Example of good subcontracting (Unknown subcontractor)

Task to be subcontracted:

Design of prototype filtration device and manufacture by rapid prototyping technology for laboratory evaluation.

Description of the selection procedure

To ensure the compliance with the best value for money principle, we will:

- Prepare an estimate of the costs for this type of work and a full specification of the work to be subcontracted.
- Launch a call for expression of interest to all the companies specialised in..and located.....
- Select the best company according to the following criteria:
 1. prices;
 2. time requested;
 3. years of experience;
 4. previous participation to public funded activities;
 5. years of guarantee.
- Sign an agreement for the commercial exploitation of the results.

Example of bad subcontracting (Unknown subcontractor)

Task to be subcontracted

Clinical trials to provide evidence of the performance of the Cell Filtration Device and the Slide reading software.

Description of the selection procedure

We will seek two companies located in two different areas. We will choose the best offer in terms of price, quality, etc.

Not enough information !!!

Scope of the Proposal

Phase 1 & 2

– Scope of the proposal

Current status: Yes

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

I believe this proposal is in scope because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been submitted

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

- You have to consider whether the contents of a proposal correspond, wholly or in part, to the description of the SME Instrument, as outlined in the [Work Programme](#).
- Only change the radio button to 'No' and add comments explaining your decision to the 'Scope of the Proposal' box if you believe that a proposal does not fit the description.
- If a proposal is of poor quality this does not necessarily mean it is outside the scope of the SME Instrument. In this case, you should still carry out an evaluation of the proposal with appropriate comments and scores.

General TIPS!

- **Answer to ALL the questions** indicated in the form
- The core is the **business**: let a third person understand the business (**not only science!**)
- **Avoid jargon** and **techno speech**, but use terminology relevant to the context
- Convince evaluators that **what is offered is what is asked for**: provide facts & data and refer to public data (statistics) if relevant
- **Fluent English** needed! If not fluent ask somebody outside the revise and review

General TIPS!

- **The WOW effect.** The project abstract (which you fill on line) should be a short pitch of your company: problem, solution, competitive advantage. Catch the evaluator's eye, and make her/him want to read the rest of the proposal.
- **Write the abstract and choose the keywords last.** These are used to select **evaluators**. It should not be a scientific abstract, but rather it should sell your project and should be understandable to the generalist.
- **Using links.** You can include links to web-pages that demonstrate different aspects of the project; however, this isn't a gateway to buy additional space for text. **The proposal must have all the information needed, while the links are «bonuses».** Do not assume the evaluator will click these links, since they sometimes prefer printing the proposal and reading hard copy.

Important to HAVE!

- > **Catchy title** and **acronym**
- > **Make the proposal readable**. Short and dense text. Evaluators have few hours to read your proposal and evaluate it. Write in bold, use cursive, underline.
- > **Visuals**. *A picture is worth a thousands words*. Use pictures and graphics instead of lengthy textual explanations, where possible and where they increase the comprehension
- > **Telling a story**. Make sure the proposal is written as a continuous coherent story, rather than as collection of parts. Make the story interesting for the reader.
- > **As many eyes as possible**. Before submitting let other people read your proposal and comment. Try to choose people who are not from your field, **to make sure the proposal can be easily understood by a «layman»**.

Exploitation vs Dissemination

Dissemination	Exploitation
Describing and making available results so that they can be used	Making use of results , for scientific, societal or economic purposes
Audiences that may make use of results	Groups and entities that are making concrete use of results
All results which are not restricted due to the protection of intellectual property, security rules or legitimate interests	All results generated during project Participant shall make best efforts to exploit the results it owns, or to have them exploited by another legal entity
Grant Agreement Art. 29	Grant Agreement art. 28

Dissemination vs Communication

Communication	Dissemination
About the project and results	About results only
Multiple audiences Beyond the project's community (include media and the public)	Audiences that may use the results in their own work, e.g. peers (scientific of the project's own community), industry and other commercial actors, professional organisations, policy makers
Inform and reach out to society , show the benefits of research	Enable use and uptake of results
Grant Agreement Art. 38.1	Grant Agreement Art. 29

Let's get familiar with the Evaluation form IMPACT (1/2)

- Convincing description of substantial demand (including willingness to pay) for the innovation; demand generated by new ideas, with the potential to create new markets, is particularly sought after. Total market size envisaged.
- Convincing description of targeted users or customers of the innovation, how their needs have been addressed, why the users or customers identified will want to use or buy the product, service or business model, including compared to what is currently available if anything at all.
- *Phase 1 only:* Good understanding of need for a realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions, total potential market size and growth-rate, competitors and competitive offerings, key stakeholders, clear identification of opportunities for market introduction; potential for market creation is particularly sought after. *Phase 2 only:* Realistic and relevant analysis of market conditions and growth-rate, competitors and competitive offerings, key stakeholders, clear identification of opportunities for market introduction, market creation or disruption (e.g. via new value-chains).
- Realistic and relevant description of how the innovation has the potential to scale-up the applicant company (or companies). This should be underpinned by a convincing business plan with a clear timeline, and complemented, where possible, by a track-record that includes financial data.

Let's get familiar with the Evaluation form IMPACT (2/2)

- Alignment of proposal with overall strategy of applicant SME (or SMEs) and commitment of the team behind them. Demonstration of need for commercial and management experience, including understanding of the financial and organisational requirements for commercial exploitation and scaling up (and – *Phase 2 only*) as well as key third parties needed.
- *Phase 1 only*: Outline of initial commercialisation plan and how this will be developed further (in-house development, licensing strategy, etc.). *Phase 2 only*: Realistic and relevant strategic plan for commercialisation, including approximate time-to-market or deployment. Activities to be undertaken after the project.
- European/global dimension of innovation with respect to both commercialisation and assessment of competitors and competitive offerings.
- *Phase 1 only*: Realistic and relevant description of knowledge protection status and strategy, need for 'freedom to operate' (i.e., possibility of commercial exploitation), and current IPR situation. Where relevant, description of potential regulatory requirements. *Phase 2 only*: Evidence of or realistic measures to ensure freedom to operate (i.e. possibility of commercial exploitation), convincing knowledge-protection strategy, including current IPR filing status, IPR ownership and licensing issues. Regulatory and/or standards requirements addressed.
- Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible

Let's get familiar with the Evaluation form EXCELLENCE (1/2)

- High-risk/high-potential innovation idea that has something that nobody else has. It should be better and/or significantly different to any alternative. Game-changing ideas or breakthrough innovations are particularly sought after. Its high degree of novelty comes with a high chance of either success or failure.
- Realistic description of the current stage of development (*Phase 2 only: TRL 6, or something analogous for non-technological innovations*), and clear outline of the steps planned to take this innovation to market.
- Highly innovative solution that goes beyond the state of the art in comparison with existing or competing solutions, including on the basis of costs, ease of use and other relevant features as well as issues related to climate change or the environment, the gender dimension, any other benefits for society, or (*Phase 1 only*) includes plans for obtaining this information.

Let's get familiar with the Evaluation form EXCELLENCE (2/2)

- Very good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to successful market introduction of the innovation from both technical and commercial points of view or (*Phase 1 only*) includes convincing plans for obtaining this information. (*Phase 2 only: Documentation on the technological, practical and economic feasibility of the innovation*)
- *Phase 1 only*: Objectives for the feasibility study and the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact of the project. *Phase 2 only*: Objectives for the innovation proposal as well as the approach and activities to be developed are consistent with the expected impact (i.e. commercialisation or deployment resulting in company growth). Appropriate definition provided of specifications for outcome of project and criteria for success.
- Taken as whole, to what extent the above elements are coherent and plausible.

Let's get familiar with the Evaluation form IMPLEMENTATION (1/1)

- Technical/business experience of the team, including management capacity to lead a growing team. *Phase 1 only:* If relevant, the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences. *Phase 2 only:* If relevant, the proposal includes a plan to acquire missing competences, namely through partnerships and/or subcontracting, and explains why and how they are selected (subcontractors must be selected using best-value-for-money principles)
- Availability of resources required (personnel, facilities, networks, etc.) to develop project activities in the most suitable conditions. Where relevant, complementarity of partners in a consortium. Phase 2 only: Where relevant, realistic description of how key stakeholders/partners/subcontractors could be involved* (subcontractors must be selected using best-value-for-money principles). *Subcontracting is acceptable to the extent required for the implementation of the proposed activities. Subcontracting may be an essential part of the implementation of the project, but should not be a disproportionate part of the total estimated eligible costs. Subcontractors must be selected using the best-value-for-money principles.
- Realistic timeframe and comprehensive description of implementation (work-packages, major deliverables and milestones, risk management) taking the company's or applicant's innovation ambitions and objectives into account.
- Taken as a whole, to what extent are the above elements coherent and plausible.
- **Scope of the proposal**
I believe this proposal is out of scope because/ I believe this proposal is in scope because it corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it has been submitted



Alessia Melasecche Germini
a.melasecche@meta-group.com



RI-LINKS2UA is funded by EU under the Horizon 2020 - Framework Programme for Research and Innovation /grant agreement no. 692476.