

## Assessment Criteria – AgriFoodTure Pool 2

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 funding for the AgriFoodTure.

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. A good project cannot have a low rating on any of the four 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 assessor's overall assessment of the relevant points for the criterion and the given application.

Criteria 1-3 are evaluated by international peers from the EUREKA expert database. Criteria 4 is evaluated by the Partnership Board of Directors, Advisory Panel and Mission Director.

The final assessment will be done by the Partnership Board of Directors taking the EUREKA evaluation and criteria 1-4 into consideration.

### 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 societal field at an international level.
- c. That the competitive situation of the idea is made clear– both with regard to the academic and societal 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 generates societal and/or economic impact for Denmark through economic growth and/or by solving societal challenges.
- c. That the project's progress towards implementation - after the IFD investment period has ended - has been adequately explained.

- d. That the associated implementation, business or sales model are adequately described including a plan for scalability.
- e. That intellectual property rights are described, if relevant.
- f. That the project's Technology Readiness Levels (TRLs) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how and why the project progresses on the TRL-scale.
- g. That the project's Society Readiness Levels (SRLs) have been adequately explained, including an explanation of how/why the project progresses on the SRL-scale.
- h. That it is clear which strategic relevance the project has in relation to the project participants' strategy and/or Danish roadmaps in the field.
- i. That the possibilities for international market penetration as well as scaling are clearly described.

### 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, which includes the methods applied within the project and lists the project's work packages and their content, deliveries, milestones and participant contribution.
- b. That the project's relevant critical paths as well as the dependencies of the work packages are adequately described.
- c. That the project is realistically budgeted and realistic in relation to the activities set up.
- 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 taken care of.
- 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 have been adequately described in relation to the project's implementation.
- g. That it is clear which other options for funding opportunities the project will attract/has attracted before, during and after the project ends.

### 4. Relevance to the objectives of the AgriFoodTure Partnership

Assessed on the basis of:

- a. Potential effect on climate, environment, and biodiversity (Please see sub-scoring below) (32)  
*Assessed based on quantifying and setting clear KPI's for the mission CO2e reduction impact, as well as the project partnership's contribution to fulfilling each of the strategic goals for climate, environment, and biodiversity.*
- b. Height of innovation (18)

*Assessed based on moving beyond existing thinking and implementing new technologies. Degree of innovation within implementing new technologies, solutions and business models that provide novel approaches on an international level towards creating environmental and economic value.*

d. Circularity and side streams (17)

*Assessed based on how efficient, or to what extent, side streams are included in the solution.*

e. Excellence (17)

*Assessed based on quality in relation to unmet needs, State-of-the-Art and competing scientific, behavioral, or technical solutions based on current and future Danish strongholds with a clear European and global perspective and outlook.*

f. Scalability – both national and international (16)

*Assessed based on scalability of the solutions.*

- Contribution to the speed of implementation of the green transition  
*Assessed based on how well it is described that the solutions can contribute to meeting the 2030 and 2050 reduction targets.*
- Competitiveness and business potential including growth and employment potential  
*Assessed based on how the solutions provide a business case with growth and employment potential.*

Regarding “a. Potential effect on climate, environment and biodiversity” the following sub-scoring will be used (weight in parenthesis):

1. Effect on climate (contribution to national and global reduction targets as well as reduced product LCA footprint) (47)
2. Reduction of NOx to water (16)
3. Reduction of pesticides via alternatives (8)
4. Reduction of ammonia emissions (8)
5. Contribution to increased biodiversity (21)