



Assessment criteria for EU missions

Assessment criteria for EU missions

The six assessment criteria relate to three main areas:

1. Missions' added value in relation to other relevant initiatives;
2. Mission as a new policy tool;
3. A convincing implementation.

Missions' added value in relation to other relevant initiatives	
Criteria	Rationale and legal base
<p>1. Assess added value. Does the proposed mission have a clear added value compared to existing EU initiatives in the mission areas, (such as e.g. European Partnerships, Industry Alliances, Important Projects of Common European Interest, European Innovation Partnerships, Smart Specialisation Strategies)? Is the mission's goal not more easily reachable via regular Horizon Europe actions or other Union funding, such as calls for proposals or public-private partnerships?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check the added value compared to other EU initiatives in relevant fields and the lack of unintended duplications • HE art. 2.5 missions R&I actions <i>"achieve, within a set timeframe, a measurable goal that could not be achieved through individual actions"</i>
Mission as a new policy tool	
Proposed criteria	Rationale and legal base
<p>2. Assess if the mission has a clear R&I content. Does the mission's goal clearly require research and innovation to be achieved? Does the inception phase of a candidate mission predominantly</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The legal base of missions in Horizon Europe, EU's research and innovation programme. Art. 5 SP: <i>"Research and Innovation Missions may be established in the mission areas identified in Annex Va of the</i>

Assessment criteria for EU missions

<p>entail R&I actions? The “complementary actions carried out under other Union funding programmes” are not envisaged for funding under Horizon Europe but comply with respective rules under the relevant EU programme/source of funding.</p>	<p><i>Regulation establishing Horizon Europe</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HE art 2.5: “‘mission’ means a portfolio of excellence-based and impact-driven R&I actions” • HE art 7.3: “missions shall have a clear research and innovation content” • HE art 7.1 “1. Missions shall be programmed within the pillar ‘Global Challenges and European Industrial Competitiveness’, but may also benefit from actions carried out within other parts of the Programme as well as complementary actions carried out under other Union funding programmes”.
<p>3. Assess buy-in. Does the candidate mission enjoy the support of several Commissioners? What does this support translate into? (e.g. budgetary support, alignment of policies, etc)?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Check that missions have a wide political relevance by other services than DG RTD and in the College. • HE art. 7.3(b) missions should be bold and inspirational, hence have wide, scientific, technological, societal, economic, environmental or policy relevance and impact.
<p>4. Assess if the mission’s goal is ambitious yet realistic, measurable and time bound. Does the candidate mission have a measurable goal, which is realistically reachable within the set timeframe and with the limited budget available?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Group supported a level of ambition in missions that can be delivered upon / do not overpromise • HE art. 7.3: missions should indicate a clear direction and objectives and be targeted, measurable, time-bound and have a clear budget frame
<p>A convincing implementation</p>	
<p>5. Assess if implementation plan is feasible. Is the proposed implementation plan sound and likely to reach the expected objectives? Does the implementation plan convincingly describe which actions (R&I actions, deployment actions, possible policy actions etc) need to be taken over the lifetime of a mission and by whom? Are the mission’s milestones and indicators appropriate and robust?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Test the implementation capacity • HE art 7.2: “The missions, their objectives, budget, targets, scope, indicators and milestones shall be identified in the Strategic R&I Plans or the Work Programmes as appropriate.”
<p>6. Assess Budget. Is the indicative budget of the mission adequate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Group supported a level of ambition in missions that can be

Assessment criteria for EU missions

<p>and commensurate to reach the intended objectives? What are the confirmed sources of funding for the mission?</p>		<p>delivered upon / do not overpromise</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> HE art 7.2: <i>"The missions, their objectives, budget, targets, scope, indicators and milestones shall be identified in the Strategic R&I Plans or the Work Programmes as appropriate."</i> Clarity about available resources needs to be ensured, also in light of different legal frameworks to mobilise financial sources other than Horizon Europe. Confirmed funding sources at national/regional/private level should be understood as contributions included in a proposal or decision. Otherwise there is no certainty over the long term that the money will eventually be contributed. Possible future funding sources should be assessed conservatively, given the higher uncertainty that they will be eventually contributed. They should not be counted in if they are already earmarked for other objectives. At the end of the preparatory phase candidate missions should present a budget breakdown listing the confirmed and envisaged sources of funding. The latter category, to be assessed prudently, offers some flexibility to accommodate situations where budgetary talks are advanced but not confirmed yet, due to the time needed to secure budgetary support from sources other than Horizon Europe.
Source	Please specify amount	
Horizon Europe contribution		
other Union funding		
national/regional sources		
Private sources		
<p>What are the possible future additional sources of funding for the missions?</p>		
Source	Please specify amount	
Horizon Europe contribution		
other Union funding		
national/regional		
Private sources		
<p>Is implementation of different types of funds functional, and does it bring additionality compared to the actions that would have been implemented anyway by the different EU funds?</p>		