

## ESA PHI-LAB | TEB EVALUATION FORM

Phi-Lab Austria

ESA Contract number <Contract #>

The table below provides the reference criteria / sub-criteria. Those may be adjusted and customized by the Phi-Lab, upon ESA approval. The criteria applicable for the evaluation shall be reflected in the Open Call Invitation letter.

Once filled-in, the security marking of the document should be made "Limited Distribution" (or equivalent marking by the Phi-Lab organisation) . Distribution shall be limited to TEB members only.

Scoring guidance:

- 100 Perfect
- 90 Excellent
- 75 Very good
- 60 Good
- 50 Fair
- 40 Barely acceptable
- 0 Worthless

For an application/proposal to be selected for contract negotiation, a minimum overall weighted mark of 60 and a minimum mark of 40 on each specific criterion is required.

Tenderer name:				
Criteria	Sub criteria	Score	Explanation	Evaluator Comments
<b>Background and Experience (25%)</b>	a) Experience Team composition b) Partnerships and Support Entities c) Vision	0-100	a) Does the team show skills and the relevant expertise to carry out the proposed activity? b) Does the Applicant have clear view on the partnerships that are required and have they obtained support from relevant Entities? c) Does the company propose a clear and feasible long-term vision? Does the targeted application/service fit in the company roadmap?	
<b>Research and Technology developments (30%)</b>	a) Relevance for the Call b) Suitability of technology for targeted application c) Understanding of and leveraging on the State of the Art (SoA), novelty of proposed research d) Depth and significance of technical innovation e) Maturity of technology and	0-100	a) Is the activity in line with the objectives of this Phi-Lab and more specifically with the objectives of the Call? b) Is the technology to be further developed suitable to enable the target application? c) Does the Applicant provide a suitable analysis of the SoA? Does the proposed activity leverage on it, and represent a progress wrt the SoA? d) Is the technology based on new/ unexploited scientific discovery? Does it constitute a paradigm shift in addressing the target application? Does it solve an unprecedented technical challenge? Or is it rather a marginal improvement of an existing technology? e) Is the maturity of the technology sufficient to realistically achieve the envisaged technical	

## ESA Phi-Lab | TEB evaluation form

	feasibility for target application f) Clarity and relevance of the research objectives		innovation within the scope of the proposed activity? Are the proposed developments feasible? f) Are the proposed R&D objectives and approach clear? Are they adequate and relevant?	
<b>Commercial Opportunities and Potential Socio Economic Impact (25%)</b>	a) Potential applications, problem addressed and target markets b) Hurdles, risks and roadmap to commercialisation c) Market disruption, industrial transformation and socio-economic impact d) IPR strategy	0-100	a) Target markets (and customers), problems to be solved, and potential applications (products/services) enabled by the technology. b) Account and analysis of difficulties & risks in the way of R&D and commercialisation   Proposed mitigation   Roadmap to commercialisation. c) Preliminary analysis on likely impact on market, industrial ecosystem, and socio-economy at large. d) How well does the IPR strategy support commercialisation? If no IPR is identified by the applicant, does the TEB consider there is potential for IP protection that may support commercialisation?	
<b>Activity and Management proposal (20%)</b>	a) Clarity and relevance of the work to achieve objectives b) Feasibility: Access to facility and data + Availability of personnel.	0-100	a) Is the proposed R&D approach clear? Does it include all necessary steps? Is the approach adequate and relevant to achieve objectives and in turn contribute to enable the target application? b) Does the applicant have access (through the Phi-Lab or other "suppliers") to the requested facilities and data needed to successfully perform for the proposed activity? Does the applicant have enough resource in personnel	

Kommentiert [TB1]: We expect TRL btw 2 and 6

ESA Phi-Lab | TEB evaluation form

	c) Milestones/Cost-planning / Work break down. d) Approach to align research with market needs e) Management of the activity f) Fit with the Phi-Lab g) No double funding	to carry out this activity, on top of its other business? c) Is the activity proposal feasible time and cost wise? Are clear milestones identified which allow the progress to be monitored? Is there a WBS provided? Is the work logically broken down, with clear work descriptions and I/O? d) Is the approach to keep the R&D targeted and aligned to market needs suitable? Are market representatives consulted? e) Is the management, reporting, meetings and deliverables clearly addressed in the proposal? f) Can the research project be relevantly and substantially supported by the Phi-Lab? g) Is the activity overlapping with any other publicly supported activities?	
<b>Overall Weighted Score</b>		<b>Recommendations or Requirements</b>	

