

UTTER – FSTP – Pilot Projects Open Call 1 Call Documentation – Annex 4 – Evaluation Criteria

Eligibility Criteria

Formal Requirements

Criterion	Evaluation	
Language	Proposal is in English in all required parts.	Yes / No
Submission	Proposal delivered on time.	Yes / No
Declaration of Honour	Declaration of Honour is signed.	Yes / No
Legal Status	Applicant is an SME or research organisation (incl., but not limited to, higher education organisations, independent research organisations and NGOs).	Yes / No
Country	Applicant is legally established in a Horizon Europe eligible country .	Yes / No
Number of Proposals	Maximum of one proposal per applicant.	Yes / No
Conflict of Interest	No conflict of interest.	Yes / No
Ethical self-assessment	Proposal includes an ethical self-assessment	Yes / No

Formal requirements check is the first step in the evaluation process. It will be checked prior to further evaluation. If one of the formal requirements is not fulfilled, the proposal is rejected. Formal requirements are described in full detail in the call documentation.

Eligibility criteria

Criterion	Evaluation	
Uniqueness	No similar project, technology, or application exists.	Yes / No
Relevance for UTTER	Match of the actual proposal to the objective.	Yes / No
Project Phases	Proposal includes all required phases (Development and Dissemination)	Yes / No

Eligibility criteria are checked by all evaluators. If the evaluation of these criteria differ, the Pilot Board decides. If one of the eligibility criteria is not fulfilled, the proposal is rejected.

Evaluation Criteria

Criterion	Evaluation	Weight	Points
Objective fit	Are the project goals and planned achievements in line with the overall objectives of UTTER? Is it likely that the project will deliver added value to UTTER?	2	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points
Technical approach	Are the planned activities feasible and facilitate the achievement of project outputs? Does the proposal push the boundaries of existing XR technology?	2	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points
Business, Integration and Dissemination plan	Is the business plan reasonable and ambitious? How well is the integration of project outputs planned? Are the dissemination and promotion activities planned adequately?	3	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points
Budget adequacy ¹	Does the budget correspond to all planned activities and outputs? ²	1	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points
Team	Is the applicant's team capable of executing the project and delivering its outputs (in required time, quality and with estimated budget)?	1	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points
Ethics	Is the ethical self-assessment thoughtful and thorough? Does it provide convincing justification that the applicant will ensure the work will be done ethically?	1	0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points

¹ The Pilot Board will separately check if the budget fulfills all the budget requirements set out in the Call documentation.

² Evaluators can propose budget changes.

Rating Scale – Criteria fulfillment	
0 points	Not at all The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
3 points	Limited The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are significant weaknesses.
7 points	Good The proposal addresses the criterion well, but some shortcomings are present.
10 points	Excellent The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion, any shortcomings are minor.

All project proposals are evaluated by at least two independent experts (evaluators). Each evaluator will evaluate all individual criteria and assign points. The points from all evaluators are then averaged by criterion. Points by criterion are then multiplied by the criterion's weight and summed up in order to get the proposal's overall score.

The Pilot Board can change the total number of points assigned to a proposal in the range of at most 30 points (up or down) of all the points the proposal received from the evaluators.

The total overall score of an individual proposal is 130 points: maximum 100 points from evaluators + maximum 30 points from Pilot Board.