# Instruction to the application process REMINDER

**Information related to using the web portal**

When preparing application, please consider the following notices

1. Only Applications submitted using web portal, accessible via www.grants.gov.ge will be considered.
2. To apply for the CBRN CoE Pilot Competition, the Applicant needs to register to the CBRN Coe Competition web site (http://cbrn-coe-competition.org), and complete the contact registration form indicating basic details. The applicants will not be able to submit any application after the submission deadline.
3. The application can no longer be modified after submission; therefore, applicants are recommended not to submit the application until they are firmly sure that all requirements have been addressed and a sample has been fill in and back upped with templates downloaded. Nevertheless, the web portal provides applicants with “save” function, so that applicants can continue modifying applications later and before submission
4. Applicant will receive confirmation and unique application will be assigned with unique reference number, once the application is submitted, however should it not receive such confirmation? Applicant may contact technical team to the email indicated on the email received when asked the access to the web portal.
5. Application reference number shall be used in all future communication between applicant and the contractor (http://cbrn-coe-compet.org).
6. Applicants are well advised to submit their proposals in advance of the deadline to avoid last minute system overload.
7. Only complete applications will be accepted. However, the Applicants may be requested to clarify/modify certain information and submitted documentation in order to avoid their possible disqualification in this initial phase due to some negligible administrative issues.
8. It is the Applicant’s responsibility to ensure that all the relevant documents are uploaded to the appropriate section of the CBRN CoE Pilot Competition web portal.

**Evaluation of application stage 1B; selection of the finalists of the Boot Camp**

Each application stage 1B namely “Application Form” will be individually evaluated by two independent and unbiased international peer-reviewers, external members of the contractor team.

Peer reviewers, will have skills and expertise from the scientific or business field in line with proposal. Each peer reviewer must have the highest standards of integrity, which preclude any questionable affiliation with Applicants, including as an employee, consultant, relative, political or business affiliate. Each candidate should disclose in advance any perceived, potential or actual conflict of interest that could affect their objectivity. The peer reviewers will be asked to remotely evaluate one or more proposals closely related to their field of expertise and to submit a completed evaluation grid. Each peer reviewer will prepare a report that both include merit-based scores and a narrative section highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the Application and indicating any issues that might be clarified at the boot camp session if selected. In the case in which an Application obtains largely diverse scoring (more than 20 points) by two peer reviewers, a third peer reviewer will review the Application.

**Scoring: The evaluation grid is divided into sections and criteria clustered under each section. Each criterion is scored between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following scaling**:

**1 - Weak, 2 - Fair, 3 - Moderate, 4- Strong, 5 – Exceptional**

At the evaluation stage the proposals will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **INNOVATION READINESS LEVEL** | | **Score** | **Comments & Justifications** |
| **1.1** | NEW (4-5 score) OR SIGNIFICANT INNOVATION INCLUDED IN THE PROPOSAL |  |  |
| **1.2** | FEASABILITY OF THE SOLUTION PROPOSED |  |  |
| **1.3** | GEOGRAPHICAL IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL; LOCAL? REGIONAL, INTERNATIONAL, (international scores 5) |  |  |
| **1.4** | DIFFICULTY of REPLICATION. ( Technical lock scores 5) |  |  |
| **1.5** | LEVEL OF READINESS INNOVATION FOR THE MARKET TARGETED |  |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL SCORE** | |  |  |
| 1. **MARKET & COMMERCIALIZATION** | | **Score** | **Comments & Justifications** |
| **2.1** | |  | | --- | | Application and market demand:  Product provides a solution to an existing problem by addressing a market demand or creates a new demand. | |  |  |
| **2.2** | Market size, needs and growth: |  |  |
| **2.3** | Customers and potential customers;  competitors, quasi-competitors, and  potential competitors |  |  |
| **2.4** | Go-to-market strategy, time to market,(TTM),product introduction risks and  opportunities addressed |  |  |
| **2.5** | IP rights obtained planned or handled appropriately (patents, licenses etc.) if applicable. |  |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL SCORE** | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY** | | **Score** | **Comments & Justifications** |
| **3.1** | |  | | --- | | Relevance of project team experience: specific and interdisciplinary, diversity of  competencies, sufficient technical background to implement a project and/or a relevant plan to acquire missing competences | |  |  |
| **3.2** | Appropriateness of management  capacity and structure (allocation of roles and responsibilities) |  |  |
| **3.3** | Implementation plan feasibility and manageability, realistic milestones |  |  |
| **3.4** | RELEVANCE OF BUDGET, ADEQUATE ALLOCATION OF FINACIAL RESOURCES, NEITHEROVERSTIMATED NOR UNDERESTIMATED |  |  |
| **3.5** | Sufficiency of sources and structure of  co-finance18. |  |  |
| **3.6** | Project profitability, growth and breakeven |  |  |
| **3.7** | Revenues STREAM or other evidence of traction  (customer/user acquisition) to date |  |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL SCORE** | |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **SUSTAINABILITY** | |  | **Comments & Justifications** |
| **4.1** | Clear sustainability measures  incorporated: the durability of the  project after the implementation  deadline |  |  |
| **4.2** | Persistency of competitive advantage19 |  |  |
| **4.3** | Potential for product renewal/ability to  pivot |  |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL SCORE** | |  |  |

**ONLY the 10 FIRST RANKED ARE SELECTED TO GO TO THE BOOT CAMP**

**DETAILS OF THE RANKING CAN BE PROVIDED UPON REQUEST BY EACH APPLICANTS**

**(Only for each scoring)**

Each section is assigned with weights due their importance (Sections I and IV -20% each, section II and III – 30% each)

The proposal can score overall 100 points in accordance with the breakdown provided in the pre-evaluation grid (Concept Note stage 1A).

Applications shall be rejected and not evaluated further if:

* The total (weighted) average score is less than or equal to 50 points;
* The sub-total weighted average score of section II, market and commercialization, is less than or equal to 15;
* The sub-total weighted average score of section III, management and finacial capacity , is less than or equal to 10;

|  |
| --- |
| **Two lists will be drafted after completion of the evaluation stage**  1) A list of proposals not recommended for the Boot Camp and the final evaluation by SC members. This list contains applications rejected due to the failure to meet the thresholds defined above in this section and the applications that scored less than those pre-selected.  2) A list of project proposals for the Boot Camp Session and final evaluation, ranked by score, and with funding requirement.  Applicants will be informed on the outcomes of the evaluation and shall be ready to prepare the boot camp session to pitching the SC members and answer questions during the selection committee. |