



The EU Framework Programme
for Research and Innovation

HORIZON 2020



Self-evaluation form:

ERC Proof of Concept grants (PoC) 2014

Version 1.0
5 September 2014

*Research and
Innovation*

Extract from ERC Work Programme 2014 (Page 39-40)

1. Excellence (Innovation potential)

Does the proposed proof of concept activity greatly help move the output of research towards the initial steps of an innovation process leading to a new or significantly improved product, process or method of production, or form of organization or methodology (commercial innovation); or a new principle, a new piece of legislation, a new social movement, an intervention or a new form of participation (social innovation)?

2. Impact

- 2.1 Is the project to be taken to proof of concept expected to generate economic and/or societal benefits which are appropriately identified in the proposal?
- 2.2 Does the proposal indicate a suitable process designed either to generate a financial profit i.e. the commercialisation process to be followed (licenses to a new or existing company, a venture funded start-up, a spin-off company or other forms) or any other process designed to generate a social benefit?
- 2.3 Does the proposal include sound plans for undertaking competitive analysis to find out features which make the proposed technology/product/process innovative or distinctive compared to other technologies/products/processes? (Including plans for analysing the competitive advantage of the technology/product/process vs. alternate technologies/products/processes that can meet the same market/societal needs).
- 2.4 (Where applicable) Does the proposal include suitable plans for seeking confirmation of the technology/product/process (testing, technical reports) and a brief explanation of what testing is foreseen?
- 2.5 (Where applicable) Does the proposal comprise suitable plans to clarify the IPR position and strategy, including an evaluation on whether there is an opportunity for creating intellectual property protection (in terms of patents or other forms of protection) or a freedom-to-operate analysis¹. This includes plans for sufficient protection to get the technology/product/process to market and attain at least a temporal competitive advantage.
- 2.6 (Where applicable) Does the proposal include suitable plans for industry/sector contacts, appropriateness of receptor company/organization, ability to further the development of the technology/product/process? Activities aimed at attracting further funding from non-ERC sources once the ERC-funded activities end will also be considered, including activities aimed at identifying specific companies for further financial commitments. If there are no "hard" commitments for funding (i.e. letters of support or intent), demonstration of a solid roadmap for pursuing the funding needed for future commercialisation is included.

¹ Any application for funding of IPR activities under the ERC Proof of Concept will not discharge beneficiaries from their prior obligations under their pre-existing ERC Grant Agreement in respect of protecting IPR capable of industrial or commercial application. If any foreground was potentially protectable in the pre-existing ERC project, beneficiaries had the legal obligation to seek for adequate and effective protection according to the Rules for Participation and the ERC Model Grant Agreement.

3. Quality and efficiency of the implementation (Quality of the proof of concept plan)

- 3.1 Is the proposed proof of concept based on a sound approach for establishing technical and commercial feasibility of the project?
- 3.2 Does the proposal provide a reasonable and acceptable plan of the proposed activities against clearly identified technical and commercial objectives?
- 3.3 Is a sound project-management plan presented in the proposal, including appropriate risk and contingency planning?
- 3.4 Does the proposal demonstrate that the proposed activities will be conducted by persons well qualified for the purpose?
- 3.5 Is the budget requested necessary for the implementation of the proposed project and properly justified in the proposal?