# AIDA-2020

Advanced European Infrastructures for Detectors at Accelerators

## Milestone Report

# Criteria to define, identify and select technologies for the PoC fund

Losasso, M. (CERN)

26 May 2016

This work is part of AIDA-2020 Work Package **2: Innovation and outreach**.

The electronic version of this AIDA-2020 Publication is available via the AIDA-2020 web site `<http://aida2020.web.cern.ch>` or on the CERN Document Server at the following URL: `<http://cds.cern.ch/search?p=AIDA-2020-MS10>`

Grant Agreement No: 654168

# AIDA-2020

Advanced European Infrastructures for Detectors at Accelerators
Horizon 2020 Research Infrastructures project AIDA-2020

# MILESTONE REPORT

# CRITERIA TO DEFINE, IDENTIFY AND SELECT TECHNOLOGIES FOR THE POC FUND

## MILESTONE: MS10

| | |
|---|---|
| **Document identifier:** | AIDA-2020-MS10 |
| **Due date of milestone:** | End of Month 12 (April 2016) |
| **Report release date:** | 26/05/2016 |
| **Work package:** | WP2: Innovation and outreach |
| **Lead beneficiary:** | CERN |
| **Document status:** | Final |

**Abstract:**

The purpose of this document is to provide guidelines and evaluation templates to be used by the Evaluation Panel to select projects for the Proof-of-Concept (PoC) fund.

The Evaluation Panel may review this methodology as needed before the start of the evaluation process.

## Delivery Slip

| | Name | Partner | Date |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Authored by** | M. Losasso | CERN | 18/01/2016 |
| **Edited by** | L. Lapadatescu | CERN | 22/01/2016 |
| **Reviewed by** | AIDA-2020 Management Team, Network of Technology Transfer Officers, Steering Committee | | 31/03/2016 |
| **Approved by** | Steering Committee | | 26/05/2016 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

# 1. DEFINITIONS

Evaluation Panel: The Evaluation Panel (EvPa) will be appointed by the AIDA-2020 Management Team. It will be composed of AIDA-2020 team members, chosen among the NA Work Package Coordinators, or NTT (Network of Technology Transfer Officers), and could include external advisors. The EvPa Chair is the coordinator of AIDA-2020 WP2. The Management Team is ex-officio member of the Evaluation Panel.

The EvPa is responsible for drafting the evaluation report and making recommendations to the AIDA-2020 Governing Board (GB) regarding the selection and award of funding for the PoC. The members of the Panel decide jointly on any non-compliance, non-selection, rejection and the points awarded during the evaluation of projects for the PoC Fund. The role of EvPa members is not to act as sponsors of specific projects, but to promote innovation and technology transfer. To this end, during the evaluation phase, contacts with the technical persons proposing the projects shall be carried out **exclusively via the Chair of the Panel**. Members of the Evaluation Panel shall not contact directly any of the applicants. The members of the Evaluation Panel are expected to sign a declaration of non-conflicting interests.

# 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

All members of the Evaluation Panel will have access to the projects' technical and financial (including budget, business plan if any) information. All the projects presented within the deadline indicated on the AIDA-2020 website will be included in a list of proposals for evaluation. All the proposals will be evaluated at a chosen date.

The requirements for proposal submission will be published on the AIDA-2020 website at least 4 months before the deadline. Proposals missing to comply with the call requirements will be rejected.

Decisions within the EvPa will be taken by consensus among all members of the Panel. In case of discrepancies, the Panel will attempt to reach a common agreement. If a common agreement is not reached, decisions will be taken by majority voting.

The evaluation should follow a number of steps. Evaluators will first check that all the mandatory questions and documentation are provided and that the requirements for participation are met (e.g. deadlines respected, signatures, minimum legal requirements).

Only the proposals meeting the requirements during an evaluation stage will pass on to the next stage. In case a proposal does not meet all requirements to pass to the next stage, the proposal is deemed not eligible and dismissed from the list.

The Chair, with the support of an appointed secretary (*to be appointed by EvPa*), will draft an Evaluation Report. The other members of the Panel are entitled to propose additions, modifications and remarks. The result of the evaluation is the responsibility of the Evaluation Panel members, and each member will sign the Evaluation Report.

## 2.1. Exclusion criteria and assessment of administrative conformity

At this stage, the Evaluation Panel needs to check only if the proposal has been submitted duly dated and signed by the technical representative and if it is using the proposal template. In case economic operators are involved, the proposal needs to include a statement certifying no fraud, bankruptcy or pending legal complains. The evaluation results of this stage will be registered in the Evaluation Report.

## 2.2.  Selection criteria

The selection of proposals is based on a set of defined criteria. Each of the criterion below is scored using the average score of all the votes cast by EvPa members. The selection criteria are:

- **Quality** of the proposal (novelty and progress beyond the state-of-the-art). Novelty refers to innovative aspects of the proposal not covered by similar research activity.

- **Impact** (potential for application in and outside HEP). Impact refers to the extent to which the expected results influence and drive a specific technology branch and the society at large. The impact section may be supported by a business plan and market indicators. Expected applications are those commercial and industrial practices realistically within the reach of the project outcomes.

- **Implementation** (work plan, schedule, risk assessment).

Each of the criterion is scored up to 5 points.

The minimum threshold for each criterion is 3 points.

The cumulative threshold for the proposal to pass the next evaluation stage is 9 points.

The results of the selection will be registered in the Evaluation Report, including the ranking of scores. If two projects happen to have the same score, they will both pass to the next evaluation stage.

| 1. Quality | Score 1: |
|---|---|
| *Note*: The following aspects will be taken into account:<br><br>☐ Clarity and pertinence of the objectives<br><br>☐ The extent to which the proposed work is beyond the state-of-the-art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products or services) | Threshold 3/5 |
| 2. Impact | Score 2: |
| *Note*: The following aspects will be taken into account:<br><br>☐ The extent to which the outputs of the project would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies or bring other important benefits for society;<br><br>☐ Quality of the proposed measures to disseminate and exploit the project results, including management of IPR | Threshold 3/5 |
| 3. Implementation | Score 3: |
| (EvPa will also be asked to assess the operational capacity of applicants to carry out the proposed work)<br>*Note*: The following aspects will be taken into account:<br><br>☐ Soundness of the concept, credibility of the proposed methodology in terms of meeting specific market needs.<br><br>☐ Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables; budget plan and schedule. | Threshold 3/5 |
| | **Total score:** |

**Interpretation of scores:**

Scores must be in the range 0-5. Evaluators will be asked to score 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.

| | |
|---|---|
| **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. |

## 2.3. Ranking for eligibility to interview

Total score is the sum of criteria 1+2+3. Cumulative threshold is 9/15.

## 2.4. Interview of first 4 ranked projects

Depending on the total number of proposals received, EvPa, may decide to invite selected projects for an interview. However, no more than 4 projects will be invited to the interview stage, and 2 other projects will be included in a short-list in case of need.

The interview will have the following format:

- Max. 20-30 minutes presentation in front of the EvPa
- Max 20-30 minutes Q&A session after the presentation

The presentation and the Q&A session will be used for the second round of selection.

## 2.5. Assessment of proposals (awarding criteria)

Proposals that have been selected for interview are eligible for final evaluation stage. Based on the interview assessment, EvPa will make a proposal to the GB on the projects selected for the PoC Fund.

### 2.5.1. Technical evaluation

The technical criteria to be evaluated are:

➢ the technical description, presentation and relevance of Q&A session (up to 10 points)

➢ the quality of the proposal (up to 5 points)

A proposal, in order to be eligible to pass to the next stage, has to total a minimum of 9 points and not less than 7 points for technical description and 3 for quality.

Technical description refers to:

- the technical description of the project
- how the necessary resources are expected to be used
- the project schedule
- the workplan
- the person-months for the type of work foreseen
- the industry involvement.

Quality refers to:

- the general description and completeness of the proposal, including, if any a business plan
- the level of details
- how industry is coordinated and involved into the process of technology transfer

For each of these criteria (and exclusively based on these) the evaluators will give scores and **write a justification for each criterion which will be submitted to the GB for the funding decision.**

### 2.5.2. Financial and final evaluation

Only proposals that have reached the minimum thresholds for the technical evaluation will pass the financial and final evaluation. The maximum number of projects to undergo the financial evaluation is 4.

The budget allocation for each project having passed the final evaluation will be decided by the Management Team, in consultation with the WP2 coordinator.

---

**Before assessing the proposals, all evaluators need to agree with the evaluation methodology described in this document.**

---