**Scoring Table for use by Peer Reviewers**

Once projects have been submitted as Pilot Competition entries via the Web Portal, a group of peer reviewers will review and score each application. The scoring will be done using the Scoring Table shown below. The projects will be ranked by the peer reviewers in accordance with the overall score they reach, and the finalists will be selected accordingly.

See also the document entitled “Guidelines and Template for Applicants”.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **1** | | **2** | | **3** | | **4** | | **5** | | **Multiplier** | **Score** | **Max. Score** |
| Pain Point description | Not described at all | | Try to understand but fail | | On the way but worstly described | | Close to be well described | | Clearly and simply described for a non specialist of the context | | 2 |  | 10 |
| Project description | Very confuse | | Too much scientific words are used | | Well described for someone who knows science and technology | | Described but too much developed (not concise enough) | | clearly and Simply described for a non specialist in science and technology | | 1.8 |  | 9 |
| CBRN risk mitigation relevance | Not at all | | Not enough clearly related to CBRN risk mitigation | | Supposed to be CBRN RM related by not enough expressed | | Must be validated by NFP | | Validated by the NFP | | 2 |  | 10 |
| Technical solution well described, innovative | Not clearely described | |  | |  | | Described and might be innovative at the regional level (SEEE) | | Simply described and sounds innovative at international level (CBRN Coe WW Network) | | 1.2 |  | 6 |
| TRL scale location correct[[1]](#footnote-1) | Existing POC without IP protection | | Existing Patent | | Existing brick of technologies to be assembly | | Existing Prototype | | Existing MVP | | 1.8 |  | 9 |
| Past achievements well described and relevant | Nothing is described | | The process of the development is not the result of an empirical method | | Current stage of development is the result of idea and capacity building from diverse actors | | Current stage of development is the result of an empirical method | | Current stage of development is the result of a method of project management | | 1.4 |  | 7 |
| Target market understood and well described | Not done | | unknown | | Market is locally estimated | | Market is regionally estimated | | TAM SAM SOM method is used | | 1.6 |  | 8 |
| Competitors known and own competitive advantage clear | Not done | | Competitive advantages are mentioned without any reference | | Competitive advantage is based on a patent on pending | | Competitors are identified but CA are not clearly described | | Competitors are mentioned and CA described compared to each of them | | 1.4 |  | 7 |
| Team well described and fitting the project | Not described | | Project holder is a | | Project holder is alone but knows perfectly the core activity | | A team of 2 persons with complementary profiles are co-funder | | A team of at least 3 persons with complementary profiles ex | | 2 |  | 10 |
| Team strengths and weaknesses understood | Not described | | One or the other is missing | | S & or W Underestimated | | S&orW  overestimated | | Clearly described and well balanced | | 1.6 |  | 8 |
| Missing ingredients (other than funding) clear | Not described | | Off topic answer | | Under evaluated | | Over evaluated | | pragmatic evaluation | | 2 |  | 10 |
|  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | Total | |  | 94 |

1. Note: projects below TRL 3-4 (proof of concept stage) are not eligible. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)