



WORTH Partnership Project is funded by COSME Programme of the European Union for the Competitiveness of Enterprises and Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs)

WORTH
PARTNERSHIP
PROJECT

Last revision date:
08.04.2019

WORTH

Partners Selection Criteria



Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
Assessment and decision-making process	3
The selection process consists of two different stages:.....	3
Eligibility criteria	5
1st STAGE.....	5
2nd STAGE	5
SCORING	7
Selection decisions, confidentiality, and independence	8



Introduction

The present guide describes the 'Partners and Partnerships Selection Criteria' for participating in the Call for Proposals within the framework of WORTH Partnership Project and illustrates clearly and transparently the project selection system. This system is made public to make all Key Players and project partners aware of the selection procedure and criteria.

Assessment and decision-making process

After submission, all partners and proposals will be evaluated based on specific selection criteria and subject to a two-phases selection procedure carried out by the Consortium with the support of a group of external experts that constitute the Steering Board.

The Steering Board will evaluate the technical content of the applications (2nd phase of evaluation). The Steering Board must be independent of the applicant and do not have any conflict of interest.

The selection process consists of two different stages:

Stage 1: Administrative and Eligibility check

The first phase consists of the administrative and eligibility criteria of applicants. Applicants will be checked for their administrative compliance to confirm that are eligible and can take part in a WORTH partnership project.

Applicants will be checked for their compliance with the eligibility criteria to confirm that the minimum requirements are met. These criteria examine whether the partner fulfills the minimum requirements *on e.g. the legal status, the country of origin etc.* Eligibility criteria can be answered with a "Yes" or "No". This check will be carried out by the Consortium and is an on/off procedure.

Applications that do not meet the administrative and eligibility criteria are rejected.

Results of the administrative and eligibility assessment will be approved by the Consortium and applicants will be informed on the eligibility status via automated email. Partners of the rejected applications will be informed accordingly.

After this 1st stage, only eligible partners will gain access to the *Gallery*, where they will be able to form a partnership and collaborate with maximum 2 additional partners from different target groups -industrial/fashion/product designers, labs/start-ups, Manufacturing SMEs/Crafters, and tech providers companies/start-ups) to co-develop the project proposal application. Consortium Partners will support the partners – when needed/ requested- to facilitate the partners' search process.



Stage 2: Quality assessment

Formed partnerships will send the full project proposal prior to the deadline. The second phase consists of the quality criteria, an in-depth assessment of the project proposal, namely the quality and operational capacity assessment.

The submitted applications will be reviewed by the consortium and only the ones demonstrating administrative compliance and satisfying the eligibility criteria will be subject to quality assessment by the Steering Board.

With the aim of ranking the proposals, a scoring system is implemented. Quality criteria are supplementary grouped into two categories:

- 1) Quality of the content and
- 2) Operational Capacity.

All applicants will be informed about the result of the assessment only after the Steering Board's final decision.

Eligibility criteria

1st STAGE

Administrative and eligibility criteria		
Criteria	Compliance	Comments
Is the applicant registered in an EU member state or a COSME associated country?	Y/N	
Is the applicant active in an eligible WORTH sector?	Y/N	
Is the SME applicant legally established for at least six months prior to the signature of the partnership agreement?	Y/N	
Eligible legal status?	Y/N	

2nd STAGE

Quality and Operational Capacity Criteria				
Criteria Group	Assessment Questions	Analysis	Numerical Assessment	Comments/Justification
Organisational and technical capacity of the partnership <u>Max: 10 points</u> Min points to be eligible: 5	To what extent applicants have the experience and competence in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to successfully implement the idea (human resources, background, etc.)? Evaluation item: Question 2	Excellent (5 points) High (4 points) Very Good (3 points) Adequate (2 points) Basic (1 points) No experience (0 points)		
	Applicant's potential for growth Evaluation items: Question 2 and Portfolio of the applicants	Excellent (5 points) High (4 points) Very Good (3 points) Adequate (2 points) Basic (1 points) No experience (0 points)		
Skills and experience of the partnership <u>Max: 10 points</u> Min points to be eligible: 5	Portfolio, credentials and track record of the applicant Evaluation items: Question 2 and Portfolio of the applicants	Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No experience (0 points)		
Commitment <u>Max: 10 points</u> Min points to be eligible: 5	Attitude and motivation of the consortium Evaluation items: Video recording answering to questions 11 and 12 of the application form	Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)		
Innovation and creativity degree <u>Max: 30 points</u>	Innovativeness of proposed project Evaluation items: Questions 4, 7	Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points)		

<p>Min points to be eligible: 15</p>		<p>Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		
	<p>Technology and/ or technique maturity</p> <p>Evaluation item: Question 8</p>	<p>Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		
	<p>Benefits to potential clients</p> <p>Evaluation items: Questions 4, 9</p>	<p>Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		
<p>Added-value, scalability, and durability of the potential results #Feasibility <u>Max: 10 points</u></p> <p>Min points to be eligible: 5</p>	<p>Is the idea feasible?</p> <p>Evaluation items: Questions 4, 5, 6, 9</p>	<p>Excellent (10 points) High (6 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		
<p>Social and/ or environmental and/ or economic impact</p> <p><u>Max: 5 points</u> <u>(Extra points)</u></p>	<p>Does this project address typical problems in an innovative way regarding society?</p> <p>Questions: (10)</p>	<p>Excellent (2,5 points) High (2 points) Very Good (1,5 points) Adequate (1 points) Basic (0,5 points) No (0 points)</p>		
	<p>Does this project address typical problems in an innovative way regarding the environment?</p> <p>Questions: (10)</p>	<p>Excellent (2,5 points) High (2 points) Very Good (1,5 points) Adequate (1 points) Basic (0,5 points) No (0 points)</p>		
<p>Market potential</p> <p><u>Max: 25 points</u></p> <p>Min points to be eligible: 12,5</p>	<p>Potential for commercialisation</p> <p>Questions: (9)</p>	<p>Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		
	<p>Potential for brand creation/plans for internationalisation/ new market orientation</p> <p>Questions: (9)</p>	<p>Excellent (10 points) High (8 points) Very Good (6 points) Adequate (4 points) Basic (2 points) No (0 points)</p>		



	<p>Market Impact</p> <p>Questions: (9)</p>	<p>Excellent (5 points)</p> <p>High (4 points)</p> <p>Very Good (3 points)</p> <p>Adequate (2 points)</p> <p>Basic (1 points)</p> <p>No (0 points)</p>		
<p>Maximum total: 100 points</p> <p>Threshold: 60 points</p>				

SCORING

The afore-mentioned criteria will be taken into account by the evaluators to assess the application. The purpose of the quality criteria is to assess the quality of the eligible partners. The quality assessment is based on a scoring system. Each criteria group (“Content related” and “Capacity related”) is assessed according to a quantitative scoring based on six levels (see column “analysis” in the table).

The assessment criteria are defined by using a set of assessment questions for the evaluator to answer together with specific guiding principles for the assessment. An overall assessment score is set for the project application.

The maximum total score a project may achieve is 100 points. Only proposals with score above 60 points can enter in the shortlist.

Two evaluators will be assigned for the evaluation of each project and the final score shall be the average of two scores. If there is deviation by more than 20% between the two scores, the project will be reevaluated by a third evaluator and the major deviation will not be averaged.

The Steering Board will score each sub-criterion in the range 0-5 (in the most important criteria the range is double 0-10).

- 0- Inadequate. Proposal fails to address the criterion
- 1 - Poor. The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses
- 2 - Fair. The proposal broadly addresses the criterion but there are serious inherent weaknesses
- 3 - Good. The proposal addresses the criterion well, but several shortcomings are present
- 4 - Very good. The proposal addresses the criterion well with few shortcomings
- 5 - Excellent. The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion.

A shortlist of finalist projects will be created by industry sectors to ensure a balanced representation and presented to the European Commission. Shortlisted projects will be invited to join the WORTH Weekend event. The **WORTH Weekend Event is the last stage of the evaluation process** to reach the final verdict of which partnerships will be proposed to receive funding. Therefore, evaluation process will consist of:



- Evaluation of the drafted project proposal (submitted on-time prior to the deadline). The Steering Board may ask for a phone/skype meeting to clarify issues if needed.
- On-site evaluation interviews with the Steering Board (during the WORTH Weekend)

Final resolution will be based on a collegiate decision by the whole Steering Board, considering the partners' performance during the WORTH weekend activities.

Selection decisions, confidentiality, and independence

Ideas and Application Forms submitted by applicants will be kept confidential. The content of project proposals and application forms should not be published or forwarded to persons or institutions which are not directly engaged in the applications assessment procedure or decision making. The project idea itself, as well as the description and concept of the project and the structures of the applications, remain the property of the project applicants.

All actors included (Consortium members, EASME, mentors and Steering Board) participating in the assessment procedure must guarantee that the privacy and confidentiality of all applications submitted in the framework of the call for proposals will be kept and that all national privacy laws and EU Directive related to the protection of personal data (95/46/EC) will be respected.

It is not allowed to forward applications and assessment documents to actors outside the regular assessment procedure, project applicants or the wider public.

Furthermore, the Consortium and Steering Board members will declare that they do not have a conflict of interest and/or political influence. All actors involved in assessment, evaluation, and selection must sign a declaration of Confidentiality.