

## 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 <a href="#">Horizon Europe eligible country</a> .  | 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?<br><br>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?<br><br>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?<br><br>How well is the integration of project outputs planned?<br><br>Are the dissemination and promotion activities planned adequately? | 3      | 0 / 3 / 7 / 10 points |
| Budget adequacy <sup>1</sup>                 | Does the budget correspond to all planned activities and outputs? <sup>2</sup>  | 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 |

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

<sup>2</sup> Evaluators can propose budget changes.

| Rating Scale – Criteria fulfillment |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| <b>0 points</b>                     | <b>Not at all</b><br>The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information. |
| <b>3 points</b>                     | <b>Limited</b><br>The criterion is inadequately addressed or there are significant weaknesses.                                   |
| <b>7 points</b>                     | <b>Good</b><br>The proposal addresses the criterion well, but some shortcomings are present.                                     |
| <b>10 points</b>                    | <b>Excellent</b><br>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.