



Fundusze Europejskie  
dla Nowoczesnej Gospodarki



Rzeczpospolita  
Polska

Dofinansowane przez  
Unię Europejską



Fundacja na rzecz  
Nauki Polskiej

## **Non-competitive PRIME Grant Project**

### **Selection criteria for Grantees in Phase I and Phase II**

**within the framework of the Programme European Funds for Smart Economy 2021-2027**

**Priority 2: Innovation-Friendly Environment Action: FENG.02.06 PRIME**

**The assessment of Grant Applications in Phase I and Phase II is conducted in three stages:**

- Formal assessment stage
- Stage I of substantive assessment
- Stage II of the substantive assessment

**The assessment criteria are divided into:**

- Mandatory criteria – this type of criteria is assessed in terms of YES/NO - an Application that fails to meet these criteria will be assessed negatively;
- Scored criteria – this type of criteria is assessed in terms of points (0-3) and an Application that does not reach the required minimum number of points will be assessed negatively;
- Ranking criteria – if two of more Applications receive an equal number of points, the Application meeting the conditions of the ranking criterion shall be given priority.

## RULES OF FORMAL ASSESSMENT:

Only **mandatory criteria are applied** in the formal assessment. Criteria are assessed in terms of YES/NO.

FORMAL ASSESSMENT				
Lp.	Type of criterion	Criterion name	Criterion description	Possible assessment
1.	Mandatory	The Application was submitted in accordance with the requirements	Under this criterion, we verify that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Application is fully complete, i.e. all required fields have been filled in according to the <i>Application Completion Guidelines</i>;</li> <li>b) the Application contains all the required declarations and annexes completed in accordance with the <i>Manual of Filling Grant Application</i>;</li> <li>c) the Application has been signed on the final and closed for editing version of the Application by an authorised person within the Applicant's organisation.</li> </ul>	YES/NO
2.	Mandatory	Eligibility of the Applicant	Under this criterion, we verify that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the Research Organisation indicated in the Application as the Applicant has its registered office in the territory of the Republic of Poland and meets the definition of an organisation conducting research and disseminating knowledge - in accordance with the definition set out in Article 7(1) of the Act of 20 July 2018. Law on Higher Education and Science (as amended) and in accordance with the definition set out in Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014 of 17 June 2014 declaring certain types of aid compatible with the internal market in Application of Article 107 and 108 of the Treaty (Article 2, point 83), where the Grant will be implemented;</li> <li>b) The Grant is planned for no longer than 18 months ;<sup>1</sup></li> <li>c) the Scientific Leader, the Business Leader and the Technology Transfer Support are identified in the Application.</li> </ul>	YES/NO
3.	Mandatory	The Applicant has not exceeded the grant amount limit specified in Article 41(6) of the Act of 28 April 2022 on the principles of implementing tasks financed from European funds in the 2021–2027 financial perspective (Ustawa z dnia 28 kwietnia 2022 r. o zasadach realizacji zadań finansowanych ze środków europejskich w perspektywie finansowej 2021-2027, Dz. U. 2022 poz. 1079)	Under this criterion, we verify that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the requested Grant amount does not exceed the Grant limit that may be awarded to the Grantee as set out in the Regulations.</li> </ul>	YES/NO

<sup>1</sup> It is permissible to change the planned project implementation period under the conditions provided for in the Grant agreement.

At the formal assessment stage, the possibility of a one-time correction to the Application is permitted.

**RULES FOR QUALIFYING AN APPLICATION TO THE FIRST STAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT:**

Only those Applications will be qualified to the first stage of substantive assessment which at the stage of formal assessment received a positive score (YES) in all criteria.

**PRINCIPLES FOR THE ASSESSMENT AND THE SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT PHASE:**

At the first stage of the substantive assessment, only **scoring criteria** are applied.

Scoring criteria: The criteria are divided into sub-criteria with a fixed weight reflecting their relevance to the Application assessment process. The sub-criteria can be scored 0-3, with a score of:

- 0 - means that the sub-criterion has been assessed as insufficient,
- 1 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as sufficient,
- 2 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as good,
- 3 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as very good.

I SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT						
Lp.	Type of criterion	Criterion name	Scope of the assessment		Weight	Possible assessment
1.	Scoring	Scientific quality and innovation	Scientific quality of the solution	The sub-criterion assesses the quality of the scientific basis of the proposed commercialisation subject, i.e. how well the Applicant justifies the functioning of the solution on the basis of its previous research and results. Under this sub-criterion, we will assess whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the object of commercialisation is precisely defined and described;</li> <li>b) the Applicant has presented the results of previous research that provide the basis for the developed solution and that these are consistent with current scientific knowledge;</li> <li>c) the research findings on which the project is based are relevant to the solution presented and to the achievement of the intended objective.</li> </ul>	30%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.

			State of the art	The sub-criterion assesses how well the Applicant understands the state of the art in the field of the subject of commercialisation, in the context of the solution it proposes. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has provided a comprehensive overview of existing research, patents and available solutions in the area(s) to be commercialised; b) the state of the art review was carried out on the basis of reliable, trusted sources.	15%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Innovation of the solution	The sub-criterion assesses the extent to which the proposed solution is new and has advantages over other existing solutions and has the potential to introduce new standards in the field. Under this sub-criterion, we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has provided evidence that the solution introduces a breakthrough in its field(s); b) it was outlined what the proposed approach is better at and what new opportunities it brings.	10%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Development and validation stage of the subject of commercialisation	The sub-criterion assesses the technological sophistication of the solution and its further development. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) and what steps have been taken so far to validate the solution and test its potential for commercial use, e.g. PoC; b) the Applicant has identified specific scientific achievements that demonstrate the level of advancement of the solution; c) the Applicant has provided a plan describing the steps necessary to be able to reach the prototype (or MVP) stage.	15%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
<b>SUM OF WEIGHTS</b>					<b>70%</b>	
2.	Scoring	Market quality	Problem solved and evidence of market demand	The sub-criterion assesses to what extent the Grant addresses a real market problem, how important this problem is for the target group, and what evidence has been provided of this need. Under this sub-criterion, we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has clearly and precisely defined what problem the product solves; b) the Applicant has provided evidence to support the assumptions made.	10%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Market advantage	The sub-criterion assesses the extent to which the product differentiates itself from existing solutions and what are its key advantages that can ensure market success. Under this sub-criterion, we will assess whether: a) The Applicant provided a competitive analysis, identifying alternatives to its solution; b) The Applicant has indicated what are the unique features of the solution that give it a competitive advantage and has provided evidence that these features are relevant to model customers.	8%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree,

						3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Model recipient	The sub-criterion assesses how well the Applicant has understood its target group, its needs and how accurately it has defined its profile. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has provided a clear profile of the model customer; b) the Applicant has provided evidence to support the assumptions made.	2%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Commercialisation strategy	This sub-criterion assesses how effectively the Applicant has planned activities to market the product and its long-term operation. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has chosen a commercialisation path tailored to the specific product and target markets; b) the strategy presented includes the specific steps needed to bring the product to market; c) the Applicant has provided evidence that the strategy can be implemented within the timeframe of the PRIME Grant Project (Phases I, II, III).	2%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Market risk analysis	The sub-criterion assesses the Applicant's ability to identify strengths, opportunities, weaknesses and threats and manage risks associated with the market aspect of the product. Under this sub-criterion, we will assess whether the Applicant has demonstrated the market risks it has identified that have the greatest impact on the market success of the product and the likelihood of their occurrence.	8%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
<b>SUM OF WEIGHTS</b>					<b>30%</b>	

**At stage I of the substantive assessment, the possibility of correcting the Application is not permitted.**

**RULES FOR QUALIFYING AN APPLICATION TO THE SECOND STAGE OF SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT:**

Only those Applications will be qualified to the second stage of substantive assessment which:

- will receive an overall score of **1.75** or higher in the scoring criteria of stage I of the substantive assessment, while in the criterion of *Scientific quality and innovation*, the Application may not receive a score lower than **1.25, and**
- not score 0 in any of the sub-criteria, i.e. regardless of the total score, each sub-criterion must be scored sufficiently (1).

## PRINCIPLES FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE STAGE II SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT:

At the second stage of the substantive assessment, both **mandatory** and **scoring criteria** are applied.

Mandatory criteria: Criteria are assessed in terms of YES/NO.

Scoring criteria: The criteria are divided into sub-criteria with a fixed weight reflecting their relevance to the Application assessment process. The sub-criteria can be scored 0-3, with a score of:

0 - means that the sub-criterion has been evaluated insufficiently,

1 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as sufficient,

2 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as good,

3 - indicates that the sub-criterion has been assessed as very good.

II SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT				
Lp.	Type of criterion	Criterion name	Criterion description	Possible assessment
1.	Mandatory	The Grant complies with the horizontal principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination	Under this criterion, we will assess whether the Grant meets the requirements under the horizontal principles of equal opportunities and non-discrimination, including accessibility for persons with disabilities and equality between women and men in accordance with Article 9(2)-(3) of European Parliament and Council Regulation 2021/1060.	YES/NO
2.	Mandatory	Grant is compliant with the Charter of Fundamental Rights	Under this criterion, we will assess whether the Grant complies with the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union of 26 October 2012 in relation to the manner of implementation and scope of the Grant. Assessment of compliance with the criterion will be made with reference to Articles 1, 3-8, 10, 15, 20-23, 25-28, 30-33 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The Applicant should provide in the Application information on how, within the scope of its own possibilities and the scope of the implementation and impact of the Grant, the compliance of the Grant with the listed articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights or neutrality towards the listed articles will be ensured. At the same time, the Applicant shall ensure that its Grant is neutral with respect to the other articles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights.	YES/NO
3.	Mandatory	Grant is compliant with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities	Under this criterion we will assess whether the Grant complies with the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities of 13 December 2006 insofar as it relates to the manner of implementation and scope of the Grant. Assessment of compliance with the criterion will be made with reference to Articles 2-7, 9 of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The Applicant should provide in the Application information on how, within the scope of its own capabilities and the scope of the implementation and impact of the Grant, the compliance of the Grant with the listed articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities or neutrality towards the listed articles will be ensured.	YES/NO

			At the same time, the Applicant ensures that its Grant is neutral with respect to the other articles of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.	
4.	Mandatory	The scope of the Application and the proposed subject of commercialisation is in line with the National Intelligent Specialisations.	Under this criterion, we verify whether the scope of the Application and the proposed object of commercialisation is in line with the 'National Intelligent Specialisations' document in force on the date of the call for Applications.	YES/NO
5.	Mandatory	The Application does not concern activities excluded from support under the FENG	Under this criterion, we verify that the Application does not concern activities excluded from support under the FENG, i.e. those listed in Article 7 of Regulation (EU) 2021/1058 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 June 2021 on the European Regional Development Fund and the Cohesion Fund.	YES/NO
6.	Mandatory	The Scientific Lead is the creator/co-creator of the intellectual property underlying the subject of commercialisation	Under this criterion, we verify whether information is provided to prove that the Scientific Lead is the creator/co-creator of the results that are the basis of the subject of commercialisation.	YES/NO
7.	Mandatory	Grant implementation indicators	Under this criterion, we verify that the Applicant has identified indicators related to the number of hourly unit rates and the number of market interviews conducted and the number of mentoring meetings.	YES/NO

## II SUBSTANTIVE ASSESSMENT

Lp.	Type of criterion	Criterion name	Sub-criterion name	Description of sub-criterion	Weight	Possible assessment
1	Scoring	Feasibility	Timeframe and budget	The sub-criterion assesses whether the schedule of tasks is realistic and whether the planned milestones are consistent with the objectives and resources of the Grant. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the timeframe and budget are realistic and well planned, and the various stages are appropriately described taking into account the complementary tasks of the individual Team members;</li> <li>b) the tasks assigned to individual team members are reasonable and reflect their respective roles.</li> </ul>	10%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
			Team	The sub-criterion assesses whether the composition of the team is suitable for the implementation of the Grant, taking into account competence, experience and ability to perform the tasks described. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The Scientific Leader has relevant experience and training in the field that is central to the Grant;</li> <li>b) The Business Leader has the competence and experience necessary to develop a strategy to commercialise and bring a new solution to market;</li> <li>c) The Technology Transfer Support has the appropriate competence in the protection of intellectual property and the commercialisation of the solution;</li> <li>d) the team is complementary and appropriately diverse in terms of the competencies needed to implement the Grant.</li> </ul>	40%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.

		Access to resources necessary to achieve the purpose of the Grant	This sub-criterion assesses how well the Applicant has identified the resources needed to implement the Grant and the way the Applicant plans to ensure access to these resources. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has clearly identified all the resources needed to implement the Grant; b) the Applicant is provided with access to the resources indicated and, if so, how.	10%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
		Risks in the implementation of the Grant and how to manage them	This sub-criterion assesses the Applicant's ability to identify potential opportunities, risks and threats to the Grant objective and planned actions to minimise the risks. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Application includes an analysis of the potential opportunities and risks associated with achieving the Grant objective, identifies their likelihood and potential impact on feasibility; b) the Applicant has proposed specific actions that will be taken to minimise the identified risks and take advantage of the opportunities.	20%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
		Intellectual property	The sub-criterion assesses the Applicant's ability to effectively manage intellectual resources to secure the Grant from a legal and commercialisation perspective. Under this sub-criterion we will assess whether: a) the Applicant has clearly identified the contributed intellectual property (Background IP) that will be used in the Grant and outlined on what basis it has access to it; b) the intellectual resources identified that are relevant to the implementation of the Grant and the commercialisation of the solution are adequately protected and have not been disclosed; c) The Applicant has presented an appropriate strategy for the protection of the new results that will be generated during the implementation of the Grant, and is aware of the possible needs, opportunities and constraints.	20%	0 - the sub-criterion has been met insufficiently, 1 - the sub-criterion has been met sufficiently, 2 - the sub-criterion has been met to a good degree, 3 - the sub-criterion has been met to a very good degree.
		<b>SUM OF WEIGHTS</b>		<b>100%</b>	

**At stage II of substantive assessment, the possibility of a one-time correction to the Application is permitted.**

#### **ELIGIBILITY RULES:**

Only those Applications will be qualified for funding which:

- meet the mandatory criteria, i.e. pass the assessment (YES), **and**
- receive a total score of **1.75** or higher in the scoring criteria of the second stage of the substantive assessment, **and**

- not score 0 in any of the sub-criteria, i.e. regardless of the total score, each sub-criterion must be scored sufficiently (1).

**Ranking criterion** – if two or more Applications receive an equal number of points, the ranking shall be determined according to the greater percentage of women on the project Team. In the event of an equal number of points occurring after ranking criterion, the Application in which a woman is the Scientific Leader of the Grant will be ranked higher.