Policy Instrument No. 01.2.2-CPVA-K-703

Promotion of Activities of Centres of Excellence and Centres for Innovation and Technology Transfer
Questions received from partners

➢ How are the projects evaluated and by whom?
➢ How the commercialization is potential defined?
➢ Which TRLs does it support?
➢ Does it support non-economic activity?
➢ What are the eligibility criteria and the project evaluation criteria?
➢ Why is there such a difference between the number of applications and the number of approved projects (e.g. eligibility criteria, minimum grade)?
➢ Are there the research institutions the ones that conduct the testing?
➢ Why are not firms included in he beneficiaries i.e. collaboration grants?
➢ Do you provide support for client company applications? – If not, is there any where else they can get support?
CPMA activities

Administration and implementation of various EU and other Donors’ funded programmes

Public Private Partnership (PPP) Competence Centre

International co-operation and international projects
Functions performed by CPMA in the programme administration

- Participation in the development and improvement of the management and control system
- Monitoring of projects
- Management of grant contract
- On the spot checks
- Management of irregularities
- Project assessment
- Ex-ante and ex-post procurement control
- Management verifications
- Forecasts of payment flows and absorption
- Information and publicity campaigns
STEPS FOR PROJECT SELECTION – Open Calls

1. Open Call for proposals (Agency)
2. Submission of application (Beneficiary)
3. Evaluation (Eligibility/Priority criteria) (Agency)
4. Decision to finance projects (Ministry)
5. Project Selection Committee (Ministry)
6. Grant Contract (Agency and Beneficiary)
7. Guidelines for Applicants (Ministry)
8. Priority (selection) criteria approved (Monitoring Committee)
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**Policy Instrument No. 01.2.2-CPVA-K-703**

- **Call No. 1**
  - Qualified staff carrying out knowledge and technology transfer functions

- **Call No. 2**
  - Idea

**Commercialization of R & D results**

- Patent Application
- Prototype
- Reagents
- Equipment
- Researchers

---
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**Purpose of Instrument**

To promote the activities of Research and Higher education institutions for research and experimental development (R & D), which have commercial potential

**Activities supported**

- Promotion of innovation and technology transfer centers
- Promotion of competence centers to test R & D-based, commercially-promising ideas, create a follow-up investment or other outcome that can be tailored to market deployment
What is Competence Centre?

**Definition**
- Competence Center means the high intellectual potential within relevant Research and higher education institutions or university hospitals.

**Objective**
- Orientation towards faster technology transfer
- Faster and more efficient way to the market

**Features**
- Exceptional activity in the field (s) of R & D
- International and / or interdisciplinary and / or cross-sectoral cooperation
- Commercialization of R & D activities

**Added value for Applicants**
- Internal networking
- Interdisciplinary teams
- Significant support for testing R & D idea
Promotion of Activities of Centers of Excellence and Centers for Innovation and Technology Transfer

**Promotion for innovation and tech. transfer action**

- Open call
- Project selection is carried out according to the priority criteria
- Experts from Agency for Science, Innovation and Technology (MITA) involved in the evaluation of applications
- Minimum score – 51, maximum – 100. Projects scored less than 51 are eliminated
- Amount allocated for the call **Eur 14.481.001**
- The maximum amount of funding available for a project is EUR **700.000**, the minimum EUR 100.000.
- Max duration of the project – 36 months

**Promotion of activities of centres of competence/excellence**

- Open call
- Project selection is carried out according to the priority criteria
- Experts from Lithuanian Research Council involved in the evaluation of applications
- Minimum score - 41, maximum – 100. Projects scored less than 41 are eliminated
- Amount allocated for the call **Eur 11.584.801**
- The maximum amount of funding available for a project is EUR **1.000.000**, the minimum EUR 100,000.
- Max duration of the project – 36 months
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call No. 1</th>
<th>Call No. 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection criteria</strong></td>
<td><strong>Selection criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Impact of project implementation on the results of commercialization of the results of the applicant’s R &amp; D activities.</td>
<td>1. Applicant and partner experience in R &amp; D, participating in international R &amp; D programs, results reflecting co-operation with business, reflecting the thematic specificity of RIS3 action plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Experience (competence) of persons carrying out the project.</td>
<td>2. The opportunities for applicants and / or partners to commercialize R &amp; D activities that may be generated by the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Applicant has an organizational structure for the commercialization of R &amp; D results and / or knowledge and technology transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Preparation of Applicants and Partners for carrying out scientific management or knowledge and technology transfer activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max score:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min score:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Min score:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common eligibility criteria

Basic principles of general selection criteria

ELIGIBILITY
Eligibility of the beneficiary and eligibility of the project application

QUALITY
Quality and relevant of the proposal

CAPACITIES
Financial and operational capacities of the beneficiary

EFFICIENCY
Indicators, outcomes, cost-benefit analysis shows efficiency of the project
## Common eligibility criteria (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Project is in line with at least one of the specific objectives of the priority axes of the Operational program and carries out at least one of the eligible activities set in the Guidelines for Applicants</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Project is in line with National Strategic documents</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Project’s objectives are consistent and realistic</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Project is in line with EU horizontal policies and competition policies</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Common eligibility criteria (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE BODY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Applicant and partner (if relevant) have relevant capacities to implement a project and satisfy other requirements</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Financing resources of the project are reliable, clearly and precisely defined</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The effectiveness of usage of project’s expenditure is ensured</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Activities of project are carried out in eligible territory of Operational Program for 2014-2020</td>
<td>Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Applicant and partner experience in R & D, participating in international R & D programs, results reflecting co-operation with business, reflecting the **thematic specificity** of RIS3 action plan.

What do we evaluate:

- Evaluation of the scientific (artistic) works declared by the Applicant and/or partner and recognized/ assessed as 1st level works (evaluation by experts from Lithuanian Research Council).

- Applicant’ and partner’ activities (experience) in R & D fields that correspond to at least one thematic specificity of RIS3 (for the last 2 years). We evaluate:
  - **Submitted patent applications** to the European Patent Office, the US Patent and Trademark Office or the Japanese Patent Office under the registration certificate;
  - **Number of products** created and placed on the market;
  - **Number of spin-offs**;
  - **Number of joint ventures with business enterprises** and their financial value.
State Aid Assessment: 4 steps method

1. Is the support granted by the State or through State resources?
2. Is the support under the measure given to an undertaking engaged in economic activity?
3. Does the support confer a selective advantage to an undertaking which it would not have obtained under normal market conditions?
4. Does the support distort or have a potential to distort competition and affect trade between Member State?
### Assessment of State Aid (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Explanations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is it intended to provide financing directly or indirectly to economic operators for the pursuit of an economic activity?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questions – answers through e Wiki:**

According to the par. 19(a) and par. 21 of R&D&I Framework, independent R&D are generally considered non-economic activity, while contract research is considered economic activity. (carried out without any contract) R&D still be considered non-economic activity and fall under par. 19(a), **if the result of such independent R&D is a patent (which can later be either used for licensing or can be sold on the market)?**

Reply: **Where the result of independent R&D is a patent (which can later be either used for licensing or can be sold on the market), such independent R&D can still be considered non-economic**, if the all income is reinvested by the research organisation or research infrastructure in its primary activities (see point 19 b of the RDI Framework).
Promotion of Activities of Centres of Excellence and Centres for Innovation and Technology Transfer – current situation

- 22 applications in total received
- 11 applications did not score min score of 51, one application did not pass eligibility criteria
- 9 projects are recommended to be funded
- Amount allocated Eur 5.701.274
- 9 contracts are concluded and projects implemented

- 35 applications in total received
- 26 applications did not score min score of 41, one application did not pass eligibility criteria
- 8 projects are recommended to be funded
- Amount allocated Eur 6.207.132
Reasons for not collecting the minimum score – Call No. 1

**Criterion No.1**
Growth of financial value of contracts with enterprises

The planned growth of contracts with enterprises is not economically justified

**Criterion No.2**
Experience in commercializing R & D results

Contracts carried out are not R & D contracts

**Criterion No.3**
Organizational structure of the commercialization of R & D results

Only few institutions have not fulfilled the requirement

**Criterion No.4**
Feasibility study

Feasibility studies prepared according to EU funded measure
The main insights, lessons learned – Call No. 2

➢ It is advisable to combine the open call instrument planning documents in parallel – on purpose to design the evaluation process in advance. In order to do that you need to see Measure Implementation plan, special and priority selection criteria and the Guide for applicant and have the opportunity to adjust / coordinate them simultaneously.

➢ The main reason for the relatively small number of projects scored the minimum score was the link between experience and project activities with a specific thematic specificity of SMART.

➢ The amount and variety of evaluation criteria influenced the large quantities of documents to be provided and evaluated, which greatly increased the time costs of both the experts and the evaluators for evaluating one application.

➢ The readiness and quality of the applications led to the need for information adjustments on average 2-4 times during the assessment.

➢ In order to quickly find highly skilled, non-conflicting experts, advance work is required, and a single, reliable, expert database accessible to all implementing agencies would help.

➢ Applicants have collected a relatively large number of scores for the intended results. If a similar contest is announced, we should rethink the weight of the criteria.