

# TRACE Partnership, Pool 2

## Assessment criteria

Below are four assessment criteria, each of which is unfolded in a number of points that form the basis for the assessment of the application for Pool 2 funding for the TraCE Partnership.

All four criteria are included in the assessment and contribute to the overall assessment. The assessment provided by each evaluator is the reasoned opinion of the evaluator and is not a simple weighted sum of the ratings on the criteria. A good project cannot have a low rating on any of the four criteria.

The points that form the basis of each assessment criterion are a guide for the applicant and evaluator as to what can be included in the applicant's statement and the evaluator's assessment. For a given application, some points may be more relevant than others. The assessment on a given criterion is the assessor's overall assessment of the relevant points for the criterion and the given application.

## Assessment Criteria

### **1. The quality of the idea**

(Quality of research and innovation)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That the goals and objectives of the project -are clear and that they are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound.
- b. That it is clear that the idea is innovative and goes beyond state-of-the-art in an academic and industrial field at an international level.
- c. That the competitive situation of the idea is made clear– both with regard to the academic and industrial elements. The disruptive potential of the idea must be clearly stated.

### **2. Impact**

(Value creation during and after the project period)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That it is clear which unmet need/societal problem the project addresses in a national and international perspective
- b. That it is plausible that the project will generate a societal and/or economic impact for Denmark by solving societal challenges.
- c. Account (as far as possible) of the project's quantified contribution to the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions measured in CO2 equivalents – both in Denmark and globally.

- d. Statement (as far as possible) of the project's contribution to reducing negative environmental impacts – both in Denmark and globally.
- e. Explanation (as far as possible) of the project's contribution to reduced consumption of limited or non-renewable resources, including clean water – both in Denmark and globally.
- f. Statement of the project's contribution to improved working environment – both in Denmark and globally to the extent relevant.
- g. That the project's progress towards implementation – after the Innovation Fund Denmark investment period has ended - is adequately explained to the extent relevant.
- h. That any implementation, business or sales model is adequately described, including a plan for scalability.
- i. That IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) is adequately described, if relevant.
- j. That the project's Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how and why the project is progressing on the TRL scale.
- k. That the project's Society Readiness Levels (SRL) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how and why the project is progressing on the SRL scale.
- l. That it is clear what strategic relevance the project has in relation to the project partners' strategy.
- m. That it is clear what strategic relevance the project has in relation to the Danish roadmap in the area.
- n. That the possibilities for international market penetration and scaling are clearly described to the extent relevant.

### **3. Quality of execution**

(Efficiency in the execution of the project and implementation of the project results)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That a clear and detailed operational plan has been prepared, including the methods applied within the project and listing the project's work packages and their content, deliverables, milestones and participant contribution.
- b. That the relevant critical path of the project and the dependencies of the work packages are adequately described.
- c. That the project is realistically budgeted and realistic in relation to the set activities.
- d. That the composition of project participants has the relevant competencies and experience to carry out the project work tasks, and that organization, governance and leadership will be handled in a reassuring manner.
- e. That relevant and specific risks have been identified and that it has been explained how these are mitigated.
- f. That relevant legal, ethical and regulatory aspects are adequately described in relation to the implementation of the project.
- g. That it is clear what other funding opportunities the project will attract or has attracted before, during and after the end of the project, to the extent relevant.
- h. That relevant end users and core stakeholders either help shape the project, participate in the project, or are otherwise directly involved in the project, e.g., through investment. To the

extent relevant and in collaboration with end users and core stakeholders, a plan for the project's implementation must be drawn up – including a process plan for this.

- i. The proposal is efficient, that is, the expected achievements are commensurate with the requested resources
- j. The proposal is effective, that is, there is reasonable confidence that the set objectives will be met

#### **4. Relevance to the TraCE Partnership's objectives (as described in the revised roadmap, the roadmap and the partnership plan)**

##### **Relevance to the TraCE partnership objectives:**

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That the project significantly contributes to the realization of the TraCE Partnership's goals
- b. That the project is complementary to already initiated or projects for the realization of the CE-PT Partnership's goals (two different solutions to the same problem are considered complementary here).
- c. That the project demonstrates synergy with other projects that support the TraCE Partnership's goals-
- d. That the project strengthens the partnership, e.g. through the building of methods or knowledge that can be used and scaled.
- e. That the project meets the (A) mandatory focus in the Call text by giving examples of how one or more of the project participants has worked with systemic leadership and how the project participants intend to work with the systemic approach in the project. Furthermore, the projects are encouraged to meet one or more of the themes (B) mentioned in the Call text.

## **Decision**

The Partnership Director, employed by the Partnership Association which is not a beneficiary of the funding under consideration, has neither personally nor through her place of employment, any conflicts of interest in relation to the selection of projects for funding. The Partnership Director will play a central role in drawing up the basis for the selection of projects for funding. This includes drafting of the motivations for selection or rejection of proposals that the Partnership will share with IFD and the applicants.

Workstream Leaders will generally have conflicts of interest, both personally and through interest of their places of employment. They are therefore not having any role that can be considered to have any influence on the selection of projects for funding.

Members of the Partnership Board are likely, through the interests of their places of employment or association, to have conflicts of interest in relation to individual proposals.

Members must declare which proposals they have conflicts of interests in relation to.

Members will not in any way take part in deliberations or decisions in relation to proposals for which they have conflicts of interest. If there are less than 10 proposals for consideration by the Board, a member with a conflict in relation to one or more proposals will have to be excused for the entire selection process.

Based on draft motivations recommended by the Partnership Director for funding or rejection of funding, for each proposal as well as the available budget, the Partnership Board comes to a reasoned decisions regarding funding or rejection of funding for each proposal. The draft motivations are augmented by the deliberations and considerations in the Board to form the final written reasons for decisions regarding funding or rejection of funding for each proposal. If there are less than 10 proposals for consideration by the board, it is conceivable that the Partnership Board cannot muster a quorate number of non-conflicted members. In that case the Partnership Director in collaboration with two non-conflicted members of the Advisory Group will make the final decision regarding funding or rejection of proposal.