Evaluation form for assessing the eligibility and evaluation of applications of

**PUBLIC CALL**

**»UPGRADING OF ARIS APPLICATION PROJECTS (JP NAP)«**

**(acronym of the public call "JP NAP")**

**FORM 14a**

**Evaluation form for assessing of application**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Application number** |       |
| **Title of R&D project** |       |
| **Acronym of the project** |       |
| **Applicant** |       |
| **Industrial ecosystem from the aplication** |       |
| **Focus area and sub-area S5** |       |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The application is assessed based on the assessment criteria, indicators and criteria,[[1]](#footnote-1)set out below.**Assessments and thresholds**The assessment criteria are assessed with points ranging from 0 to 5. The minimum unit of assessment is 0.25 points. The highest possible score for each assessment criterion is 5 points, with a total score of 15 points for all three assessment criteria.The assessment according to the assessment criteria is numerical and in a descriptive manner, considering all the indicators.An application is considered positive when it scores at least 10 points in total.**Evaluation of the elements determining the assessment of applications**The assessment criteria are assessed with points ranging from 0 to 5. The minimum unit of assessment is 0.25 points.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 0 (insufficient) | The application fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information |
| 1 (insufficient) | The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses |
| 2 (defective) | The application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses |
| 3 (good) | The application addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present |
| 4 (very good) | The application addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present |
| 5 (excellent) | The application successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor |

 |

**Assessment criteria:**

**I.**

**An assessment of the rationale for internationally comparable knowledge and competences throughout the entire knowledge development process.**

**(»Scientific Excellence«)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data source** | **Indicator** | **Explanation** |
| **Project objectives** |
| 1. | **1.4** | Clarity and consistency of the objectives with the expected effects of the R&D project | Descriptive |
| 2. | **1.5, 1.6, 1.7** | Relevance: Consistency with strategic document | Descriptive |
| **Concept and approach** |
| 3. | **1.1** | Suitability of the proposed methodology, clarity and credibility of the proposed concept | Descriptive |
| 4. | **1.1** | Trans-disciplinarity: Facilitating the integration of knowledge, competences and technology in priority areas S5 | Descriptive |
| **Ambitiousness** |
| 5. | **1.2, 1.3** | Ambition and justification of excellence with emphasis on the state of research in the global arena »beyond state-of-the-art«. | Descriptive |
| **Assessment of Excellence** | Maximum number of points | No. of Points/ Rating |
| 5 |  |
| Threshold for a positively assessed criterion: 3/5 points |
| **Explanation of the assessment**  |  |

**II.**

**An assessmen of the expected effects of the results of the update of ARIS aplication projects and the action plan to ensure the sustainability of the actions after the end of the project period**

**(»Social and economic impact strand«)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data source** | **Indicator** | **Explanation** |
| **Expected impacts** |
| 1. | **2.2, 2.4** | Ambitiousness and feasibility of the action plan to further development results according to the Technology Readiness Scale after the implementation of the projec | Descriptive |
| 2.  | **2.1** | Contribution of the R&D project to the achievement of the expected results and impacts of the call for proposals | Descriptive |
| 3. | **2.2** | Expected effects of the R&D project on improving innovation capacity, integration of new knowledge, integration into cross-regional and global value chains to enhance the competitiveness and growth of enterprises by developing innovations that meet the needs of European and global markets | Descriptive |
| 4. | **2.3, 2,5** | Demonstrating the wider social impact of the R&D project or responding to societal challenges with clearly defined target groups | Descriptive |
| **Impact-enhancing measures** |
| 5. | **2.4, 2.5** | The effectiveness of the proposed measures for exploiting and disseminating the results of the R&D project (including management of intellectual property rights), public presentation (popularisation) of the project and management of research data, and adequacy of the innovation and intellectual property management plan (strategy for protection, exploitation, dissemination) and associated risks. | Descriptive  |
| **Impact assessment** | Maximum number of points | No. of Points/ Rating |
| 5 |  |
| Threshold for a positively assessed criterion: 3/5 points |
| **Explanation of the assessment** |  |

**III.**

**An assessment of the demonstration of realistic feasibility within the envisaged (co)financing period and the relevance, capacity and readiness of the consortium to implement, including a closed financial structure, the quality of the proposal ensuring cost/economic efficiency and rationality, and the capacity of the final recipient to implement the project (e.g. professionalism and references of the proposed staff).**

**(»Performance quality and efficiency section«)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Data source** | **Indicator** | **Explanation** |
| **Work plan** |
| 1. | **3.4, 3.5, 3.7, 3.14****+**Substantive adequacy also in points3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.13 | The quality, relevance, efficiency and feasibility of the R&D proposal of the project in terms of ensuring cost/economic efficiency and rationality, including the appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and the allocation of resources; | Descriptive |
| **Consortium structure and governance adequacy** |
| 2.  | **3.8, 3.9, 3.12**+Substantive adequacy also in points3.1, 3.5, 3.10, 3.11, 3.14,  | Adequacy and competence of the consortium partners for the implementation of the operation (demonstration of complementarity, interdisciplinarity, professionalism and references of the proposed key personnel, also with regard to the management of comparable R&D project); | Descriptive |
| 3. | **3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.12, 3.14**+Substantive adequacy also in points3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.10, 3.13 | Adequacy of management, including innovation management, intellectual property, and risks or barriers in overcoming existing knowledge. | Descriptive |
| **Quality and efficiency of implementation** | Maximum number of points | No. of Points/ Rating |
| 5 |  |
| Threshold for a positively assessed criterion: 3/5 points |
| **Explanation of the assessment** |  |

**IV.**

**Final assessment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Achieving** **minimum of 3 points per criterion and minimum of 10 points in total**  | **Number of** **points** |
| **Excellence** | **YES - NO** |  |
| **Impact** | **YES - NO** |  |
| **Quality and efficiency of implementation** | **YES - NO** |  |
| **Total points scored** | **YES - NO** |  |
| **Notes** |  |

1. In accordance with Article 45 of the ZZrID, the selection criteria may be scientific excellence, social and economic impact, and the quality and efficiency of implementation. The term ‘criterion with associated indicators’ is translated as ‘assessment criteria’ in the document Criteria for the selection of operations under the ECP programme in the period 2021-2027 (p. 14). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)