

RIPEET CALL FOR SOLUTIONS

Evaluation criteria

Each eligible proposal will be evaluated by a Selection Committee. Evaluators will score and rank each proposal according to a grid consisting of a quantitative score for each evaluation criteria.

The Selection Criteria will be scored from 0 to 10 following the description established in the table below:

| Point Scale | Explanation |
|-------------|---|
| 0-1 | Insufficient: even basic criteria were only partially met |
| 2-3 | Poor: criteria were met inadequately |
| 4-5 | Adequate: criteria were just met |
| 6-7 | Good: criteria were met in essence |
| 8-9 | Very Good: correspond fully to the defined criteria |
| 10 | Excellent: criteria were met above expectations |

If a criterion is scored 3 or lower the application will be deemed not eligible

Each criterion is subdivided into several sub-criteria as described in the table below:

| Criteria | Explanation | Marks |
|--|---|---------|
| Solution excellence: Fit with the particular energy need, potential impact and achievability | | |
| 1. Soundness, innovativeness and excellence of the concept | Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art, enhancing innovation capacity and the integration of new knowledge & the implementation of such innovations to the market | 0 to 10 |
| 2. Solution fit to the need | Alignment of the solution with the identified need | 0 to 10 |
| 3. Objectives and success indicators | Clarity and achievability of the objectives and relevance of the indicators | 0 to 10 |
| Work Plan viability | | |
| 4. Credibility of the proposed Work Plan | The work plan is realistic and fits with the RIPEET calendar | 0 to 10 |



| | | |
|--|--|---------|
| 5. Co-creation process | Relevance of the co-creation work and importance given to the co-creation work (objectives and means employed) | 0 to 10 |
| 6. Risk assessment | The applicant has adequately assessed project risk and proposed appropriate mitigation strategies | 0 to 10 |
| 7. Experience and skillset of the team | Appropriateness of the team | 0 to 10 |
| Sustainability and scaling options | | |
| 8. Market description and/or scaling and dissemination | Expected market potential and/or strategy for scaling and dissemination of the solution | 0 to 10 |
| 9. Sustainability and engagement | Potential sustainability of the solution and engagement and interest in the development of the solution | 0 to 10 |
| Responsible Research and Innovation* | | |
| 10. Anticipation | Does the solution relate to the anticipated vision and transition pathway? | 0 to 10 |
| 11. Inclusion | Does the solution approach marginalised stakeholders? | 0 to 10 |
| 12. Reflexivity | Does the solution provide explicit space for reflection on goals and strategies? | 0 to 10 |
| 13. Responsiveness | Does the solution include measures to respond to changing regional contexts? | 0 to 10 |
| *The score obtained in this section will only be taken into account in case two or more solutions get the same score. In that case, the score received in this section will be used as tiebreaker. | | |

CONTACTS

Document Contact: Sarah Marshall, Highlands and Islands Enterprise (HIE),
sarah.marshall@hient.co.uk

