

MissionGreenFuels

Pool 2.5 and 3 - Assessment criteria

Below are four assessment criteria, each of which is unfolded in a number of points that form the basis for the assessment of the application for Pool 2.5 and 3 funding for the MissionGreenFuels Partnership.

All four criteria are included in the assessment and contribute to the overall assessment. The assessment provided by each evaluator is the reasoned opinion of the evaluator and is not a simple weighted sum of the ratings on the criteria.

The points that form the basis of each assessment criterion are a guide for the applicant and evaluator as to what can be included in the applicant's statement and the evaluator's assessment. For a given application, some points may be more relevant than others. The assessment on a given criterion is the evaluator's overall assessment of the relevant points for the criterion and the given application.

Assessment Criteria

1. The quality of the idea

(Quality of research and innovation)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That the goals and objectives of the project -are clear and that they are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound.
- b. That it is clear that the idea is innovative and goes beyond state-of-the-art in an academic and industrial field at an international level.
- c. That the competitive situation of the idea is made clear– both with regard to the academic and industrial elements. The disruptive potential of the idea must be clearly stated.

2. Impact

(Value creation during and after the project period)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That it is clear which unmet need/societal problem the project addresses in a national and international perspective
- b. That it is plausible that the project will generate a societal and/or economic impact for Denmark by solving societal challenges.

- c. Account (as far as possible) of the project's quantified contribution to the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions measured in CO2 equivalents – both in Denmark and globally.
- d. Statement (as far as possible) of the project's contribution to reducing negative environmental impacts – both in Denmark and globally.
- e. Explanation (as far as possible) of the project's contribution to reduced consumption of limited or non-renewable resources, including clean water – both in Denmark and globally.
- f. Statement of the project's contribution to improved working environment – both in Denmark and globally to the extent relevant.
- g. That the project's progress towards implementation – after the project period has ended - is adequately explained to the extent relevant.
- h. That any implementation, business or sales model is adequately described, including a plan for scalability.
- i. That IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) is adequately described, if relevant.
- j. That the project's Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how and why the project is progressing on the TRL scale.
- k. That the project's Society Readiness Levels (SRL) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how and why the project is progressing on the SRL scale.
- l. That it is clear what strategic relevance the project has in relation to the project partners' strategy.

3. Quality of execution

(Efficiency in the execution of the project and implementation of the project results)

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. That a clear and detailed operational plan has been prepared, including the methods applied within the project and listing the project's work packages and their content, deliverables, milestones and participant contribution.
- b. That the relevant critical path of the project and the dependencies of the work packages are adequately described.
- c. That the project is realistically budgeted and realistic in relation to the set activities.
- d. That the composition of project participants has the relevant competencies and experience to carry out the project work tasks, and that organization, governance and leadership will be handled in a reassuring manner.
- e. That relevant and specific risks have been identified and that it has been explained how these are mitigated.
- f. That relevant legal, ethical and regulatory aspects are adequately described in relation to the implementation of the project.
- g. That it is clear what other funding opportunities the project will attract or has attracted before, during and after the end of the project, to the extent relevant.

- h. That relevant end users and core stakeholders either help shape the project, participate in the project, or are otherwise directly involved in the project, e.g., through investment. To the extent relevant and in collaboration with end users and core stakeholders, a plan for the project's implementation must be drawn up – including a process plan for this.
- i. The proposal is efficient, that is, the expected achievements are commensurate with the requested resources
- j. The proposal is effective, that is, there is reasonable confidence that the set objectives will be met

4. Strategic fit to the MissionGreenFuels Vision and Roadmap

This includes, but is not limited to:

That the project:

- clearly contributes to creating societal value and value for the MissionGreenFuels partnership
- describes clearly the direction towards the Danish 2030 and/or 2050 climate goals, i.e. total time horizon and investment need for the potential CO₂ reduction and long-term plan for the proposed solution
- contributes to maturing the entire Danish value chain
- clearly describes how the project fits into the EU legal framework
- can be scaled internationally
- contributes to CO₂ reduction, job creation in Denmark and export potential.
- contribute to lowering overall system costs in the production, distribution, and utilization of green fuels.