

Evaluation System Shared Research Facilities

Revised 1 December 2014

Contents

1. General information on the evaluation system	3
2. Evaluation process.....	3
3. Focus and objectives of the Programme.....	4
4. Evaluation criteria	5
4.1. Criteria - Stage 1.....	5
4.2. Criteria - Stage 2.....	6
5. Explanatory notes to the different types of questions in the evaluation tool....	10

1. General information on the evaluation system

This evaluation system provides a tool for comprehensive evaluation that is constant and homogeneous across all projects submitted, in particular against the background of the objectives of the Programme. In addition, it serves the purpose of ranking the projects in every stage of the process (for details see section 2). Such ranking helps to identify those projects which will reach the next stage, i.e. those eligible for funding within the defined budgetary restrictions and those which are not.

For that purpose it is also necessary for the Vienna Business Agency to make available its concept of the different evaluation steps to all persons involved. This is necessary all the more so as in the interest of diversity the Vienna Business Agency attaches great importance to having the projects evaluated by jury members with different individual empirical backgrounds and approaches. Accordingly, all members of the jury are invited to study this description before their first evaluation to avoid any misunderstandings.

2. Evaluation process

The evaluation process itself is carried out in the form of a two-stage competitive procedure. All applications are evaluated by national and international experts according to the criteria stated in section 4.

In **Stage 1** short applications must be submitted by the prescribed deadline. The information given therein must describe the key elements of the planned project. The scope and content required for the presentation will be stated in the relevant call for proposals or on the application form. Following a formal examination, all short applications received will be evaluated in accordance with the criteria stated in para 4.1. Only those consortiums whose short applications were evaluated positively in the first round will receive an invitation for submission of a full application from the Vienna Business Agency. The applicants of applications that were evaluated negatively will be notified of the decision.

In the first part of the application only some basic information on the project, the consortium, the resources and financing will be submitted.

Due to the fact that submission by a consortium is required also for Stage 1, participation of a science partner or business partner in the consortium must be evidenced by means of at least one partner form. For every additional cooperation partner a Letter of Interest (LOI) may be submitted instead of a partner form.

In **Stage 2** the full applications must be submitted within the defined submission period as well. The applications must contain a detailed description of the project, a research strategy, a research programme focusing on a particular topic as well as a research infrastructure development plan. In addition, all science partners and business partners involved, the planned use concept, the business and exploitation model as well as a detailed cost and finance plan must be advised already at this point. Like in Stage 1 the full applications will be examined, however, more thoroughly. The assessment will be made on the basis of the evaluation criteria stated in para 4.2.

The information provided by the partners on the key elements in their full application must not deviate significantly from that of the short application. If such deviations are noticed in the full application, the application may be excluded from the subsequent evaluation process. The information and documents to be provided are stated in the relevant call for proposals.

In Stage 2, following a detailed analysis of each project, a comparative evaluation will be carried out at a jury meeting including a hearing of the applicants. The jury will issue a joint recommendation for each project. After the jury meeting the selection procedure will be over.

The Executive Committee of the Vienna Business Agency will decide on the funding proposal made by the jury and issue a recommendation to the Municipality of the City of Vienna whether to fund or reject the project.

As a matter of principle, applications are evaluated on the basis of the application documents that are available electronically. Those documents must provide information that is sufficient for an evaluation in accordance with the Guideline. The purpose of the hearing is to obtain supplementary information and to clarify any open or controversial issues contained in the application.

3. Focus and objectives of the Programme

By this Programme the City of Vienna supports the development and start-up of so-called Shared Research Facility Centers (SRF Centers) in Vienna, the core tasks of which are acquisition, operation and making available of high-quality research infrastructure and developing technical expertise in scientific fields that are important to Vienna and required by the scientific community and businesses for research purposes. The objective is continued operation of the SRF Center beyond the term of the grant.

Additional tasks of the SRF Centers include development and implementation of reasonable use models and business models as well as research services enabling efficient use of research infrastructure and ensuring high capacity utilisation. In addition, advanced interdisciplinary research cooperation is supported.

A prerequisite for being awarded a grant for an SRF Center is a medium-term research strategy and a research programme derived therefrom that focuses on a particular topic as well as a research infrastructure development plan tailored to the needs of science and businesses, which must be implemented in the course of the project.

The research programme and the research infrastructure development plan must be designed in such a way that the research infrastructure to be acquired and the research competences developed will be able to serve a wide but reasonably combined range of different scientific disciplines.

The research infrastructure to be acquired and the related research programme must make a significant contribution to an enhancement of the research level and to expansion of research capacities. The research infrastructure must be made available to a preferably wide group of users. In this context an involvement of international partners is also desirable.

The Shared Research Facilities Programme pursues the following goals:

- quantitative and qualitative expansion of existing or establishing of new research infrastructure facilities and research competences in Vienna to strengthen the City's function as a science and business location
- easier access to and improved availability of research infrastructure at Vienna, in particular for business entities
- strategic positioning of Vienna's research facilities and innovative enterprises
- boosting excellent research and strengthening unique selling propositions
- utilisation of research infrastructure also by global players
- clustering and linking of different R&D players
- strengthening international visibility and competitiveness

4. Evaluation criteria

4.1. Criteria - Stage 1

In Stage 1 the applications shall be evaluated according to the following criteria. They primarily serve as tools to assess whether, in principle, the planned project meets the requirements of the Programme and whether it is important for Vienna's visibility and attractiveness as a science and business location and to assess the chances of realisation. As it is one of the Programme's major goals to reach a preferably wide user group from the scientific and business community with every project, the economic potential must be assessed as early as in Stage 1.

In Stage 1 a maximum of 20 score points can be reached.

No.	Criteria	Type	Max. points	KO
1	Conformity with the call for proposals	Y/N	0	Yes
	Is the planned project in line with the objectives and requirements of the Programme (see section 3)?			
2	Importance for Vienna as a science and business location	0-5	5	Yes
	Is the planned SRF Center or the chosen focus important for the future development, visibility and attractiveness of Vienna as a science and business location?			
3	Scientific quality	0-5	5	Yes
	Does the planned project suggest that it will be of relevance to future research topics? Have different fields of research been addressed? Does the planned project stand out against or is it unique compared to existing or other planned research infrastructures? Is the medium-term to long-term research perspective pursued by the			

project plausible and realistic? What is the project's research or innovation potential compared to existing offers (national, international)?				
4	Realisation potential	0-5	5	Yes
Is the described financing concept (financial volume and underlying calculation) comprehensible and realistic? Is there a plausible statement to the effect that the required resources can be raised? Are the scientific and organisational competences required for implementation of the project available (to the extent this can be seen)?				
5	Economic potential	0-5	5	Yes
Have the target groups from the business and the scientific community been described comprehensively and sufficiently? Does the project possess the potential of being used widely by researchers from the business and the scientific community also outside the consortium (nationally/internationally)? What is the amount of the added value and/or what are the benefits for the envisaged target groups (in particular for businesses)?				

4.2. Criteria - Stage 2

In Stage 2 the full applications shall be evaluated according to the following criteria. In that stage a maximum of 100 score points per project can be reached.

The questions asked below require that

- the project description in the application offers a sufficient number of indicators for an evaluation,
- the concepts and methods explained in the application are coherent and suited to achieve the planned technical/topical or economic goals of the project,
- the information is comprehensible, consistent and supported or well-founded with respect to both content and structure,
- the project has been structured into clear work packages which end at a comprehensible milestone ("deliverables"),
- the resources described in the application are adequate for the scope, content and complexity of the project and the applicants were able to plausibly state that such necessary resources are at their disposal.

Where the above does not apply the application can be rejected via the "Quality of planning" or "Adequacy and availability of human and financial resources" criteria.

Projects shall be evaluated on the basis of the specific questions relating to the criteria and via the online jury tool <https://cockpit.wirtschaftsagentur.at>.

No.	Criteria	Type	Max. points	KO
1	Conformity with the call for proposals	Y/N	0	Y
	<i>The call for proposals defines what projects are eligible for funding under this call. Such conformity must be verified in this evaluation step.</i>			
	Is the planned project in line with the objectives and requirements of the Programme?			
2	Scientific quality	0/5	15	Y
	<i>Against this background and in view of the state of the art in the relevant research field to which the project belongs, the potential of the project has to be assessed both with respect to the special field and from an interdisciplinary point of view. In addition, the scientific standard (compared to international standards) has to be assessed.</i>			
	<p>Have the starting position and the state of the art been described in an understandable way? What is the research and/or innovation potential compared to the state of the art both from a scientific and from a technical perspective (can new scientific findings be expected)? What are the risks and difficulties involved in the project?</p> <p>Are the research strategy and the research programme derived therefrom as well as the research infrastructure development programme comprehensible and suited to achieve the planned scientific goals and results?</p> <p>Have different fields of research been addressed and will new transdisciplinary cooperation opportunities arise from the planned research and service portfolio?</p> <p>Does the project stand out against or is it unique compared to existing or other planned research infrastructure? What is the relationship of the project with existing competing and/or complementary research infrastructures in and around Vienna? In the case of overlaps: what is the amount of additional benefit or value added?</p>			
3	Realisation potential	0/5	30	Y
	<i>In order to be able to assess the chances that a project will be realised it is necessary to evaluate the potential of the consortium, the quality of planning as well as the availability of financial and human resources.</i>			
3a	Potential of the consortium	0/5	10	Y
	<p>Are the composition of the consortium and the planned staffing adequate with respect to the requirements of the project and achieving the project goals?</p> <p>Does the project team of the consortium possess the necessary (scientific, technical, organisational and business) competences and capacities as well</p>			

as management skills to implement the SRF Center and to achieve the goals?				
<i>3b</i>	<i>Quality of planning</i>	<i>0/5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Y</i>
Does the project description in the application offer a sufficient number of indicators for an evaluation? Are the ideas, concepts and/or methods presented in the application coherent, is the structure (work packages, milestones, results) comprehensible, sufficiently supported or well-founded and suited to achieve the planned scientific, technical and economic goals of the project?				
<i>3c</i>	<i>Adequacy and availability of human and financial resources</i>	<i>0/5</i>	<i>10</i>	<i>Y</i>
Are the human, financial, technical and organisational resources stated in the application adequate for the scope, content and complexity of the project? Has the consortium been able to plausibly state that they have such resources at their disposal?				
4	Quality of the use concept	0/5	10	Y
<i>Research infrastructures and research services are used in many ways. In this context different utilisation rules exist, some of which are historical and some are tailored to a specific infrastructure. The projects may address new user groups from other disciplines, which have not been developed yet. Against this background the following questions arise:</i>				
Are the research services offered adequate for researchers from the envisaged target groups and has the potential user group been described well and in an understandable way? Are specific statements of interest of potential user groups available which suggest use by third parties?				
5	Economic potential	0/5	15	Y
<i>The structures and competences developed in the course of the project should, apart from research activities, also be transformed into sellable research services. For this reason a business model and/or exploitation model must be presented from which economic benefits and continuation of the SRF Center beyond the term of the grant can be drawn.</i>				
Does the business model and/or exploitation model make sense with a view to commercial utilisation? Are relevant business partners and industrial partners being addressed? How relevant are the services offered to businesses and science? Have the strategic interests of businesses and science been taken into account sufficiently (see also LOI)? How big is the estimated potential international user group? Are initial realistic assumptions regarding future contract projects available (rough outline)?				

6	Sustainability, long-term perspective	0/5	10	Y
	Does the scientific and business concept suggest that the SRF Center will continue to be successful beyond the term of the grant - can it be assumed that the SRF Center can be financed substantially out of its own funds and market activities after the funding period?			
7	Importance for Vienna as a science and business location	0/5	10	Y
	<i>This evaluation criterion refers to the importance of the project for the future development, visibility and attractiveness of Vienna as a science and business location in a European and international context.</i>			
	Is the planned SRF Center important for scientific organisations (universities, non-university research facilities) and, in particular, for businesses in Vienna? Does it help to strengthen research and competitiveness in Vienna? What is the medium-term to long-term contribution of the project to Vienna's visibility and attractiveness as a science and business location in an international context?			
8	Equal opportunities; Diversity	0/5	5	N
	<i>Have gender and/or diversity aspects been taken into account?</i>			
	How many women are in the team? Is the project managed by a woman? Have gender-specific or diversity-specific issues been considered in the research programme? Have gender-specific or diversity-specific objectives been laid down in the research strategy? <i>Identity groups: nil: not considered, 1: for one of the above aspects, 2-5: for considering several of the above aspects.</i>			
9	Ethical and ecological effects	0/5	5	N
	Do ethical and/or legal particularities or environmental impacts have to be taken into account when realising the project? What is the risk that the project will have to be modified or stopped for ethical or legal reasons or under environmental aspects? Have such risks been recognised and have appropriate measures been provided for in this connection? <i>Please note. Are no effects (neutral = 1) or positive effects (= 2-3) to be expected from the present project or is the focus on ecological effects (goal, purpose of the project = 4-5)?</i> <i>If negative consequences have to be expected, in addition to the 'nil' rating a short opinion has to be given which recommends that the project be rejected for ecological or ethical reasons.</i>			

5. Explanatory notes to the different types of questions in the evaluation tool

With most of the questions 'nil' is always the poorest and five is the best rating. The first type of questions (conformity with the call for proposals) needs to be answered by "Yes" or "No" only. Non-conformity (KO criteria) will directly lead to a rejection of the application.

A 'nil' rating always means that the relevant evaluation criterion has not been met. For most of the evaluation criteria (where "Yes" is stated in the "KO" column) a 'nil' rating is an exclusion criterion at the same time. In the case of the "Equal opportunities; Diversity" and "Ethical and ecological effects" criteria 'nil' only means that a certain aspect which might justify an upgrading of the application has not been considered.

In the online jury tool each criterion requires an evaluation and a verbal statement of reasons for the rating. **When using a KO rating comprehensible reasons must be stated in any case.** The reasons provided will help us to give a well-founded feedback to the applicants, but the name of the jury member will not be mentioned.