Re-Fream. Evaluation Criteria FINAL

Assessment and decision-making process

After submission, all projects will be evaluated based on specific selection criteria and subjected to a two-phases selection procedure carried out by the Consortium with the support of a group of external experts that consists of a panel Jury of international experts.

The Jury will evaluate the artistic and technical content of the applications (2nd phase of evaluation) using the same evaluation criteria as the Consortium uses in the 1st phase. The Jury must be independent of the applicant.

The selection process consists of two different parts. First, **Administrative and Eligibility criteria** of applicants. Applicants will be checked for their administrative compliance to confirm that are eligible and can take part in a Re-fream project. After their compliance, they will be evaluated by the **Quality and Operational Capacity Criteria**.

Administrative and Eligibility criteria

Applicants will be checked for their compliance with the eligibility criteria to confirm that the minimum requirements are met. These criteria examine whether the partner fulfills the minimum requirements on e.g. the legal status, the country of origin etc. Eligibility criteria can be answered with a "Yes" or "No". This check will be carried out by the Consortium and is an on/off procedure.
Applications that do not meet the administrative and eligibility criteria are rejected.

Quality and Operational Capacity Criteria

The second part of the evaluation criteria consists of the quality criteria, an in-depth assessment of the project proposal, namely the quality and operational capacity assessment.

The submitted applications will be reviewed by the consortium and only the ones demonstrating administrative compliance and satisfy the eligibility criteria will be subjected to quality assessment by the Jury.

With the aim of ranking the proposals, a scoring system is implemented. Applicants not reaching the threshold number of points (63 or 60 points) between all categories are removed from process.

Eligibility and Evaluation criteria

Administrative and eligibility criteria			
Criteria		Compliance	Comments
Is the applicant registered in an EU member state? *		Y/N	
Has the applicant chosen a specified Re-fream challenge?		Y/N	
• **Single Artist**	Is the applicant self-employed professional under the national laws of establishment country once awarded? **	Y/N	
• **Team of Artists**	Is the art company legally established under the national laws of the establishment country?**	Y/N	
Eligible legal status?		**Y/N**	

*Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and United Kingdom and associated country of the H2020 (Iceland, Norway, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey, Israel, Moldova, Switzerland, Faroe Islands, Ukraine, Tunisia, Georgia and Armenia) 2 and Kosovo.

Applicants must be a SME (under the EU definition)[1][1], a start-up, self-employed or professional freelancers **legally established as a business under the national law and based in an EU member state.

---

[1][1] What is an SME? (http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition_en)

Awarded candidates must be legally established under the national law as of the signature of the agreement and throughout the project duration.

Quality and Operational Capacity Criteria				
	Assessment questions	**Evaluation short name**	**Analysis**	**Numerical**
Design Criteria (max. Points 35)	Applicant's potential for growth (in terms of artistic potential) Where to look: Q7-Q10	Artistic potential for growth	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Portfolio, credentials and track record of the applicant (to be judged from artistic experience) Where to look: Q6/Q10	Portfolio	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Innovative quality of the proposed project (in regard to design & fashion relevant innovation) Where to look: Q1-Q5	Innovation	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Maturity of the artistic idea / concept Where to look: Q1-Q5	Maturity of the idea	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	

	Does this project address typical problems in an innovative way with regard to society and the environment? (specifically regarding issues that can be expressed/solved in fashion) Where to look: Q6	Social and environmental impact	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Is the artist's concept and message coherent with the proposed implementation of fashion and technology and does it fit the Re_FREAM mission? Where to look: Full application form and video	Coherency	Excellent (10 p) High (8 p) Very Good (6 p) Adequate (4 p) Basic (2 p) No (0 p)	
Technology Criteria (max. Points 35)	Applicant's potential for growth (in terms of potential to work with technology / interest in technology / curiosity and motivation to learn about) Where to look: Q7-Q10	Technological potential for growth	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Innovative quality of the proposed project in regard to technological innovation Where to look: Q1-Q4	Innovation	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	

	Is the proposal aligned with the technologies available within the hub? Where to look: Q2-Q5	In the scope?	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	How feasable and scalable is the idea, also with regards to urban manufacturing? Where to look: Q2-Q6	Feasibility	Excellent (5 p) Feasibility High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Does this project address typical problems in an innovative way in regard to society and environment? (specifically issues that can be addressed with technology) Where to look: Q6	Social and environmental impact	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Is the artist's concept and message coherent with the proposed implementation of fashion and technology and does it fit the Re_FREAM mission? Where to look: Full application form and video	Coherency	Excellent (10 p) High (8 p) Very Good (6 p) Adequate (4 p) Basic (2 p) No (0 p)	

Co-creation criteria (max points 35)	Applicant's potential for growth (in terms of ability to make TRLXX level prototype and in regard to the art/tech transfer guidelines Where to look: Q6/Q9	Applicant's potential for growth	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Potential for co-creation from a design perspective, how open does the artist seem to be to receive input from the design mentors Where to look: Q1/Q2/Q7/Q8	Design opennness	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Potential for co-creation from a technological perspective, how open does the artist seem to work together with the technological partners? Where to look: Q3/Q4/Q7/Q8	Technology openness	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Potential for the concept to offer urban manufacturing solutions. Where to look: Q6	Urban Manufacturing potential	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	
	Potential for new market orientation, is the artist proposing the future of fashion Where to look: Q1/Q2/Q3	New market potential- future of fashion	Excellent (5 p) High (4 p) Very Good (3 p) Adequate (2 p) Basic (1 p) No (0 p)	

	Is the artist's concept and message coherent with the proposed implementation of fashion and technology and does it fit the Re_FREAM mission? Where to look: Full application form and video	Coherency	Excellent (10 p) High (8 p) Very Good (6 p) Adequate (4 p) Basic (2 p) No (0 p)	
Two strong points				
1 2				
Two weak points				
1 2				
Maximum total: 105 points Threshold: 63 points (or 60)			Total points:	
Do you recommend this Project for funding? Yes / No				
Conclusions/ remarks/comments:				