

## Annex A)

### Selection criteria for call 6.3 – Pre-seed activities

The project evaluation process for call 6.3 of support area 3.1 Commercialization of results of research organizations and protection of their intellectual property of priority axis 3 Commercialization and popularization of R&D of OP RDI is comprised of two parts. The first represents an evaluation of the formal particulars and a review of acceptability, its aim being to eliminate formal shortcomings in projects and to disqualify those projects failing to meet any of the acceptability requirements. The formality and acceptability criteria are defined in the first part of this document: I: Formal Control and General Acceptability Criteria.

The second part of the project evaluation process is an evaluation according to technical selection criteria. This part of the evaluation process in which the basic qualification requirements, overall quality of the project plan and other criteria will be evaluated is described in the second part of this document: II Expertise evaluation<sup>1</sup>.

#### I. Formal verification and general acceptability criteria

##### Exclusion (binary yes/no) criteria

- 1) The project application was delivered within the time-limit and in the manner stipulated in the call and the Guide for Applicants.
- 2) All required applicant identification data are provided in the Project Application and are accurate and correspond to the extract from the commercial register or other registry in which the applicant is entered.
- 3) All documents containing a column for a signature and the name/identification of the entity include the name/identification duly signed by the statutory representative or representatives or another person based on a power of attorney specific to the submitted project, the original or a notarised copy of which is submitted together with these documents.<sup>2</sup>
- 4) The hard-copy version of the Project Application is identical to the electronic version based on an identification key, and the electronic version of the application was successfully downloaded to the IS MONIT7+.
- 5) The applicant (beneficiary) fulfils the recipient acceptability requirements set out in the given call and the Guide for Applicants.
- 6) The project is implemented in a territory that complies with the call requirements, i.e. in the territory of the Czech Republic and outside the territory of the Capital City of Prague.

---

<sup>1</sup> Given its nature and purpose, this document's aim is not to present a detailed description of project selection procedures. Applicants and beneficiaries are provided with a detailed description of procedures and of their rights and obligations in the Handbook for Applicants and the Handbook for Beneficiaries.

<sup>2</sup> The authorised person must be an employee of the specific entity (applicant).

- 7) The project will be implemented in compliance with the time-frame for the 2007-2013 programming period and the deadlines stipulated in the call requirements.
- 8) The amount of eligible project expenses meets the requirement of falling within the minimum and maximum amounts of eligible expenses stipulated in the respective call.
- 9) The amount of total project expenses complies with the maximum amount of total project expenses stipulated in the call.
- 10) Support provided from the OP RDI is planned exclusively for eligible expenses in accordance with the OP RDI Expense Eligibility Rules of the respective call.
- 11) The project demonstrably has no adverse impact on OP RDI horizontal criteria (i.e. sustainable development and equal opportunities).
- 12) The planned length of project sustainability complies with the requirements set out in the Guide for Applicants.
- 13) The application (project) complies with the aims of the call, i.e. support for projects promoting the commercialisation of results of research institutions and protection of their intellectual property.
- 14) The applicant obtained at least 1,000 points in RIR between 2008 and 2010.<sup>3</sup>

## II. Expert Evaluation

This part of the evaluation is broken down into the following steps:

1. Evaluation using the criteria below. The evaluation is performed by three independent evaluators, at least one from abroad. Communication takes place via e-mail. Evaluators complete forms.
2. Afterwards, the evaluators participate in a meeting at MEYS where the consensual evaluation of the whole project is reached.
3. The third step is the selection committee – a panel of expert evaluators of the whole round (participation of selected Czech and foreign evaluators).

Merit-based criteria will be awarded points based on a pre-set **point scale from 0 to 5**. Awarded points are multiplied by a coefficient representing the weight used to calculate the final point score for the given criterion. Weights are determined based on the relative significance of a criterion in the assessment of overall project quality. Points are awarded based on the following system:

*0 – The project plan fails to address aspects evaluated in the given criterion or these cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.*

*1 – Weak. The project plan has failed to adequately fulfil this criterion or suffers from serious, irremovable shortcomings.*

*2 – Satisfactory. The project plan has generally fulfilled the given criterion, though certain shortcomings exist.*

---

<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this calculation, only the part of the entity (or organizational constituent) is counted that fulfils the condition in Section 4.4 of the call. If the exact number of points relating to this part of the RIR cannot be determined, the proportional part of the FTE will be used unless the MA of the OP RDI decides otherwise upon the request of the applicant.

*3 – Good. The manner in which the project plan has met the given criterion is good, though improvements will be necessary.*

*4 – Very good. The manner in which the project plan has met the given criterion is very good, but improvement is possible.*

*5 – Excellent. The project plan has successfully fulfilled all aspects of the evaluated criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*

No half-points may be awarded.

The evaluation has the following parts:

- A. Summary evaluation of individual project activities. Each project consists of individual activities. Each activity is evaluated separately (including the application of threshold values) using criteria from this part. Afterwards, the summary evaluation of individual activities is entered in the forms according to instructions in “Evaluation of individual activities” below.
- B. Evaluation for the overall project.
- C. Links to the Integrated urban development plan (IUDP)

Elimination criteria:

- A project’s minimum point award for parts A+B must be at least 65 points out of a possible 100. Projects with a lower point award will be rejected.
- Individual project activities can be eliminated because they failed to reach the threshold value in a criterion of part A. If the volume of funds for excluded activities reaches at least 50% of the total eligible expenditure, the whole project will be rejected.
- The threshold value must be reached for all criteria in part B for which it is defined. Failure to reach the threshold value means that the whole project will be rejected.

Detailed information on the evaluation will be contained in the Handbook for applicants in OP RDI, PA 3.

### **Evaluation of individual activities**

Each project consists of individual activities (IA). Each activity is evaluated separately using criteria from part A. The objective is not to award a total number of IA in one project. The evaluation includes criteria with threshold value. If the IA fails to reach the threshold value for a criterion, it will be excluded from the project, which need not mean the rejection of the whole project (see the elimination criteria). At the same time, the total eligible project expenditure will be decreased accordingly.

The summary evaluation of activities will be added in part A of the form. Weighted average of evaluations of IA yields the summary evaluation X for each criterion. The weight of each IA is equal to its planned financial volume.

$$X = (\sum v_i x_i) / \sum v_i,$$

where:  $x_i$  is the evaluation of IA,  
 $v_i$  is the volume of funds of IA,

summing all IA

The summary evaluation of all activities has the same threshold value as individual activities.

## A Overall evaluation of individual project activities

(merit criteria)

### A.1. – Technological quality of activities, at most 15 points

Criterion for individual activities (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
A.1. Do the individual activities correspond to the current state of research in the area? Is there a realistic strategy to verify the applicability of research results in practice in the Proof of concept phase? Is the schedule for the technological verification of the concept realistic?	Points (0 to 5)	3	15	7.5

**A threshold value of 7,5 points** (of total 15) will be applied to criterion A.1. Activities that fail to reach the threshold value of 7,5 points will be excluded from the project.

### A.2. – Commercialization potential, prerequisite for cooperation with users of R&D results, team experience, at most 40 points

Criterion for individual activities (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
A.2.1. Is there a basic business plan for verifying the commercialization possibilities and market demand? Is there a realistic potential for the commercial use of research results by means of contractual research cooperation with a commercial partner, licensing, establishing a start-up? Have there been preparatory steps, have potential partners been identified? Have competing products or services been identified? Is the schedule for the commercialization of the concept realistic?	Points (0 to 5)	4	20	10

**A threshold value of 10 points** (of total 20) will be applied to criterion A.2.1. Activities that fail to reach the threshold value of 10 points will be excluded from the project.

Criterion for individual activities (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>A.2.2.</b> Is there a preliminary plan of handling intellectual property with regard to the possible commercialization (contractual research cooperation with a commercial partner, licensing, establishing a start-up)? E.g. by entering a contractual relationship with a commercial entity, with a research organization, licensing, intellectual property protection, patenting, etc.?	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	5

**A threshold value of 5 points (of total 10)** will be applied to criterion A.2.2. Activities that fail to reach the threshold value of 5 points will be excluded from the project.

Criterion for individual activities (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>A.2.3</b> Are the activities secured by sufficiently qualified solvers with regard to the objectives of the OP RDI call and to the content of the application? Does the team solving individual activities possess experience with commercialization or industrial cooperation? If not, can it obtain it at the project level or by purchasing services? Is there a history of cooperation between the solving team with the users of R&D results (examples of solutions and use of R&D results that contributed to the development of innovations and competitiveness)?	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	3

**A threshold value of 3 points (of total 10)** will be applied to criterion A.2.3. Activities that fail to reach the threshold value of 3 points will be excluded from the project.

### A.3 – Activity budget and financial sustainability, at most 15 points

Criterion for individual activities (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>A.3.</b> Is the budget of activities justified, economical and adequate for the expected activities and results? Is the budget sufficiently detailed? <sup>4</sup>	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	5

*A threshold value of 5 points (of total 10) will be applied to criterion A.3. Activities that fail to reach the threshold value of 5 points will be excluded from the project.*

## B Overall evaluation of the quality of the summary project

(merit criteria)

### B.1. – Management of intent, at most 10 points

Criterion for the summary project (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>B.1.</b> Are there good mechanisms for the management system of the whole project, verification of the intent, inclusion in the organizational structure, intellectual property protection? Are there clear definitions of decision-making mechanisms in the organizations, or roles and responsibilities?	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	6

*A threshold value of 6 points (of total 10) will be applied to criterion B.1. Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 6 points will not continue on to the next evaluation phase.*

### B.2. – Quality of human resources, at most 10 points

Criterion for the summary project (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>B.2.</b> Is the composition and quality of the team securing the whole project (not individual activities) sufficient with regard to the objectives of the OP RDI call and to the content of the application?	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	6

*A threshold value of 6 points (of total 10) will be applied to criterion B.2. Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 6 points will not continue on to the next evaluation phase.*

<sup>4</sup> The required degree of budget detail will be stipulated in the Guide for Applicants.

### B.3 - Project budget and financial sustainability, at most 15 points

Criterion for the summary project (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>B.3.1</b> Does the project have a sufficiently detailed and economical budget? <sup>5</sup> Are project expenses justified? Do they correspond to the project needs? The budget should be assessed as a whole, not the individual activities.	Points (0 to 5)	2	10	6

**A threshold value of 6 points (of total 10) will be applied to criterion B.3.1. Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 6 points will not continue on to the next evaluation phase.**

Criterion for the summary project (with threshold value)	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points	Threshold value
<b>B.3.2.</b> Does the project have a sufficiently detailed expense and revenue plan based on credible and clearly formulated assumptions and has it been designed so as to provide assurance that the sustainability (organization structure supporting commercialization) of the project will be ensured for at least 5 years after its completion?	Points (0 to 5)	1	5	3

**A threshold value of 3 points (of total 5) will be applied to criterion B.3.2. Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 3 points will not continue on to the next evaluation phase.**

**A maximum of 100 points in total may be awarded in part A+B.**

<sup>5</sup> The required degree of budget detail will be stipulated in the Guide for Applicants.



## C. Other

### C.1. – IUDP

Criterion for individual activities and the summary project	Maximum points
<b>C.1.</b> Is the project part of the given IUDP of the city in which the project is to be located? Is it sufficient if the IUDP contains the project or at least one of the individual activities that were successfully evaluated?	10% of awarded points from preceding parts of the evaluation.

*A maximum of 10 points in total is awarded in step C.*

*Successfully evaluated projects (i.e. those that fulfil all exclusion criteria in part I and threshold values in merit-based criteria in part II. A+ B and reach at least 65 points of the possible 100) will receive an additional bonus of 10% of the total score obtained at the end of steps A and B based on submission of a confirmation that the project is a part of the IUDP issued by the authorities of the respective city (the authority responsible for drafting the IUDP).<sup>6</sup>*

<sup>6</sup> Refer to the Ministry for Local Development Methodological Directive regarding the key principles for Integrated Urban Development Plan preparation, evaluation and approval No. 15450/2008 – 72 (based on Czech Government Resolution No. 883 of 13 August 2007).