

## 1 ANNEX 5 – Evaluation Criteria

In case the application does not meet any of the following pre-evaluation criteria, the innovation voucher request will be rejected with 0 points:

- Validation of the VAT number (Y/N)
- Geographical criteria (Y/N)
- SME status (Y/N)
- The purpose of the project is in line with the purpose of the IVS Call (Y/N)
- Declaration(s) (Y/N)
- Signature (Y/N)
- Submitted via the on-line platform, non-writable pdf file is attached, within the deadline(Y/N)

If CV(s) has not been attached, the IVS ask for send it within 5 days, via e-mail, otherwise the Innovation Voucher application will be rejected with 0 point.

### 1.1 Criteria for 2IV applications

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evaluation (0,0-5,0 by 0,5 points)</b>	<b>Marks</b>
1. Expected outcomes of participating the ITNE	Score 1: Threshold 3/5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How are your research/innovation activities connected to the challenges of PN? (choice by Table 1 or new challenge)</li> <li>• Why do you want to participate in the ITNE? What kind of outcome/networking possibilities are you expecting?</li> </ul>	max 2 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What activities are you planning to carry out during the event (presenting the SME's research/innovation field, ideas, participation in bilateral meetings, matchmaking, etc. )</li> </ul>	max 2 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How much does the budget planning cost effective?</li> </ul>	max 1 point	
2. Excellence in innovation	Score 2: Threshold 3/5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keywords of the innovation activities, and research topics</li> </ul>	max 1 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Personal/team professional competencies</li> </ul>	max 1 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Patent(s) (if any)</li> </ul>	max 1 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The most important publications, products and services by the attached CVs</li> </ul>	max 1 point	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key SME competencies</li> </ul>	max 1 point	



3. Excellence in national and international projects/cooperation	Score 3: Threshold 3/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>list of relevant national/international innovation projects; and the role of the SME</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>previous participation in innovation training/networking events</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planning of cross-sectoral and/or cross-regional innovation cooperation</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planning of INCluSilver PIV and/or IPR Innovation Voucher project</li> </ul>	max 2 point
FINAL Score (max 15 points):	

## 1.2 Criteria for PIV&IPR applications

Criteria	Evaluation	Marks (0,0-5,0 by 0,5 points)
1. Excellence in innovation and networking	Score 1: Threshold 3/5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Keywords of the innovation activities, and research topics</li> </ul>		max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Personal/Team Professional Competencies</li> <li>Patent(s) (if any)</li> <li>The most important publications, product and services by the attached CVs</li> </ul>		max 2 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key SME competencies</li> </ul>		max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>list of relevant national/international innovation projects; and the role of the SME</li> <li>experience on innovation voucher projects, and the outcomes/benefits</li> </ul>		max 1 point
2. Excellence the INCluSilver Innovation Voucher Project	Score 2: Threshold 3/5	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cross-sectoral and/or cross-border cooperation is in the focus</li> </ul>		max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Challenge and the proposal are in coherence</li> <li>Extent that the proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential</li> <li>A realistic comparison with the current state-of-the-art solutions, including consumer benefits</li> </ul>		max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A good understanding of both risks and opportunities related to a successful market introduction of the innovation</li> </ul>		max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Realistic description of the impact of the project for the growth of the applying company</li> <li>The market research and analyses on the needs,</li> </ul>		max 1 point



and the way of introduction the innovation into the market	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The targeted users of the final product/application, and their needs, are well described and the proposal provides a realistic description of why the identified groups will have an interest in using/buying the product/application, compared to current solutions available</li> </ul>	max 1 point
3. Excellence in project implementation	Score 3: Threshold 3/5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The status and strategy of knowledge protection and (if relevant), the current IPR situation</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The right team and the relevant resources and skills available, including relevant technical/scientific knowledge/management experience and good understanding of the relevant market aspects.</li> </ul>	max 2 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A plan to acquire missing competences by applying the voucher scheme.</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Resources assigned to the project are in line with their objectives and deliverables</li> </ul>	max 1 point
<b>FINAL Score (max 15 points):</b>	

### 1.3 Scoring

Scores must be in the range 0,0-5,0 (0,5 scale) . Evaluators score the proposals as they were submitted, rather than on their potential if certain changes were to be made. When an evaluator identifies significant shortcomings, he or she must reflect this by awarding a lower score for the criterion concerned.

Interpretation of the scores

0 — The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.

1 — Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.

2 — Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.



3 — Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.

4 — Very Good. The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.

5 — Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

**The threshold for individual scores is 3. The overall threshold to be supported is the sum of the three individual scores, with the min. of 10 points.**