

RULES OF THE BALTIC TRAM EVALUATION COMMITTEE (INTERNAL DOCUMENT – NOT FOR DISCLOSURE TO 3rd PARTIES)

I. GENERAL

1. The Baltic TRAM Evaluation Committee is an informal body of evaluators set up within the scope of the Baltic TRAM project¹.
2. The Committee is responsible for evaluating applications submitted by companies (hereinafter applicants) to the Baltic TRAM Call for Applications. If the application fulfills a set of content and feasibility criteria, including the availability of a suitable Analytical Research Facility (ARF) capable of carrying out the required measurements, the Evaluation Committee recommends a proposal for execution.
3. The Committee will in its recommendations be guided both by a macroregional approach (best reflected in the make-up of the Baltic TRAM project consortium, which represents ARFs from 7 different countries) and a local approach (local support being preferred under 'market' circumstances because of cost factors, which post-project will play a greater role than during the project).

II.COMPOSITION

1. Each Baltic TRAM project partner has the right to nominate one (1) or two experts as a member of the Evaluation Committee (EC). The EC is chaired by Prof. Krystyna Jabłońska.
1. Membership in the EC consists of the Chair and representatives of the Baltic TRAM project partners.. The chair can invite additional external experts if needed.
2. Observers, who represent associate partners in the Baltic TRAM project, are allowed to participate in the Evaluation Session (ES).

III. ROLES

1. For the duration of the project, the Chair of the EC (hereinafter: Chair) is Prof. Krystyna Jabłońska. The Chair is responsible for organizing the ES and making sure that it is carried out according to the agreed on rules and that the expertise areas of attending members cover the knowledge necessary to evaluate the considered applications. . The Chair prepares the agenda for each session, that is, the list of applications which will be reviewed by the EC and the list of EC members who have to be involved. The Application Packet of the projects to be evaluated should be distributed as an attachment. The Committee should be notified by email at least 1 week prior to the ES. .
2. The Chair appoints a Secretary for every ES. The Secretary is responsible for preparing the minutes of each ES, recording the attendance at the ES and noting down the recommendations on each Application by the Committee.
3. In case a Member is unable to take part in the ES, they shall inform the Chair at least 3 days in advance of the ES. It shall be the responsibility of the Member to pass on to their replacement any Applications already received that the next ES will deliberate on. The Member is obligated to inform the Chair who their replacement is.

¹ Following the completion of the Baltic TRAM project, the Committee will continue to cooperate with the Industrial Research Centres (hereinafter IRECs). The exact form of cooperation and possible changes to the scope of work of the Committee after March 2019 will be the subject of discussion

IV. APPLICATIONS

1. The basis for evaluation by the Committee is the Application Packet (AP). The AP consists of the translation into English of the original application, the original application and (optionally) internal remarks by the responsible Industrial Research Centre (IReC). If the AP is a re-submission by the same applicant, the IReC should indicate this in the internal remarks.

V. EVALUATION SESSION (ES)

1. Applications can be submitted continuously while the Baltic TRAM Call for Applications is open. Each IReC will forward the AP to the Chair as soon as it is deemed mature for evaluation.
2. The Chair is responsible for the timely distribution of the AP to the EC members. The chair notifies the EC members about the time and mode of the respective ES when the APs are distributed to them. The EC members are obliged to respond as soon as possible to confirm their participation.
3. The EC will convene on a regular basis to evaluate applications.
 - a. In general, the ES shall preferably be carried out via phone/video conference or alternatively in writing (e-mail). Physical meetings are not foreseen, unless the chair sees a need for one.
 - b. Typically, an ES will take place once a week. For practical reasons, however, the schedule of ES will be tied to the number of applications to be evaluated.
4. A quorum is considered to be 8 EC members + the Chair.
5. The recommendation by the EC is based on the fulfillment by the application and applicant of specific criteria described below. A recommendation to fund requires that the EC by consensus indicates a “YES” for both Feasibility and Expected Impact criteria. This recommendation is registered in the Evaluation Form, which the Secretary fills out at the conclusion of the review of each AP.
6. As a last resort, if for whatever reason the EC cannot arrive at a consensus on the recommendation, the Chair will motion to cast a vote. The vote to recommend is valid if a minimum 5 EC members cast their vote to recommend.
7. After filling out all Call for Proposals Evaluation Forms, the Secretary shall notify the Chair of the same, and the Chair will enquire whether the Members have any outstanding issues that have not been addressed up until this point. The Chair will then motion to close the Evaluation Session.

VI. FEASIBILITY CRITERIA

1. A company applying for support must be eligible to receive state aid under the *de minimis* rule. This is the case if the following two preconditions are fulfilled:
 - a. The applicant must declare that it has not received more than 200.000 Euro in state aid during the last three (3) consecutive years.

- b. The estimated cost of the measurements required will not exceed² the *de minimis* threshold.
2. A suitable ARF is available and has the capacity to execute the requested support measures in an acceptable time frame.

VII. EXPECTED IMPACT CRITERIA

1. The applicant must as clearly as possible explain in the application how the requested service is relevant for the company's products or services.
2. The proposed measurement concept should be linked to the applicant's product development challenge and it must be sufficiently mature.
3. The results of the measurements presumably will enhance the level of knowledge of the applicant with regard to improvement of existing or development of new products or services.
4. The concept should address how the results will be used. For example:
 - o Likely contribution of the results towards a better understanding of properties or behavior of specific materials or production processes.
 - o Potentially, in case of a successful outcome of the experiments, the company very likely plans to invest in new personnel or equipment.

VIII. SELECTION OF ANALYTICAL RESEARCH FACILITY

1. The EC is tasked with identifying and recommending the most suitable ARF to execute the proposed measurements task for each successful application according to the specific needs. For its recommendation, the EC will need to consider factors such as specific staff expertise at the ARF and/or current status & availability of targeted research equipment.
2. In the unlikely event that the Committee identifies **2 or more ARFs** which have the technical capacity necessary to carry out the measurement, the ARFs will be ranked using the following scored criteria:
 - ⊛ ARF is a member of the Baltic TRAM project (0 or 6 points);
 - ⊛ ARF is an associate member of the Baltic TRAM project (0 or 3 points);
 - ⊛ ARF is located in the country where the applicant is headquartered (0 or 2 points);An ARF may match more than one scored criterion, in which case the scored criteria should be summed. The ranking list will determine the optimal ARF.
3. In case more than one ARF is needed (e.g. two different sets of measurements are required, and there is no ARF which has all the requisite laboratory equipment at its disposal), the Committee shall make a recommendation for more than one Analytical Research Facility.
4. Preferably, the analytical measurements will be executed at a Baltic TRAM project partner facility. If this is not possible (e.g. because of time, capacity or budget constraints), the outsourcing of the measurements to a third party ARF will be an

² Under the current conditions of the Baltic TRAM call it is not expected that the total *de minimis* aid provided to any one applicant will exceed 10.000 Euro.

option. In this case, the Baltic TRAM project member (acting in the capacity of an ARF or IReC or both) should declare this during the ES, preferably, before the session begins, so that the capacity of a given ARF is not taken into account and EC members can take into consideration third party ARFs.

IX. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

1. Conflicts of interest for EC members would be actively managed and such persons would be deemed to be conflicted if they were directly involved in the applicants organization. Members would be expected to the ES during consideration of any application on which they are conflicted.

X. COMMUNICATION

1. The recommendations of the EC are communicated to the applicants by the respective IReC which sends the Evaluation Form.

XI. CONFIDENTIALITY

1. It is understood that all and any information included in the AP is to remain confidential and not be discussed or shared with any other person or organization beyond the EC. The exception is in the case of ongoing contacts between the responsible IReC and the applicant after a positive recommendation by the EC.