MINISTERSTVO INVESTÍCIÍ, REGIONÁLNEHO ROZVOJA A INFORMATIZÁCIE SLOVENSKEJ REPUBLIKY

EVALUATION SHEET

IPCEI AI – Pre-selection of Project Proposal - Expression of Interest (EoI)

Project Title:	
Project Number:	
Applicant (Legal Entity):	
Evaluator:	
Date of Evaluation:	

Gate Criteria (Eliminatory)

A Potential to Achieve "Beyond the State of the Art"

Template section: 2.2.2 – Technological baseline and innovativeness of the project beyond the state of the art in the sector concerned

The evaluator assesses whether:

- the current state of the art is clearly described,
- existing limitations or technological bottlenecks are identified,
- the project clearly explains how it goes beyond existing solutions at European and/or global level,
- the technological ambition, complexity, or risk is demonstrated, beyond state of the art KPIs are defined.

Assessment:

☐ YES ☐ NO

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

B Relevance for IPCEI AI and the European AI Value Chain

Template sections:

- 1.2 – Summary of the project (value chain and market failure elements)
- 1.3 – Contribution of the individual project to EU objectives and strategies
- 1.3.1 – Contribution to the integration of the IPCEI

The evaluator assesses whether:

- the project's position within the value AI chain is clearly defined,
- the project delivers added value at EU level (beyond national relevance),
- the project demonstrates integration into the IPCEI ecosystem.

Assessment:
YES
NO

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

Gate Result:

☐ The project proceeds to scoring ☐ The project is rejected

Scoring

1 Strength and Clarity of the Project Concept

Template section:

- 1.2 – Summary of the project

The evaluator assesses:

- clarity of the problem definition,
- clarity and coherence of the proposed solution,
- concreteness of expected outputs (product, service, technology),
- identification of users or customers.

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences)**:**

2 Potential for Technological Breakthrough

Template section:

- 2.2.2 Technological baseline and innovativeness of the project beyond the state of the art in the sector concerned.

The evaluator assesses:

- the extent of advancement compared to the state of the art,

- the level of ambition (incremental vs. breakthrough),
- the quality and credibility of the technological argumentation (description of technological processes, expected outputs and their added value, benchmarking against existing solutions/ competitors, etc.).

Note: The assessment focuses on potential, not full demonstration.

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

3 Strategic Contribution to the strategic EU objectives

Template sections:

- 1.3 – Contribution to EU objectives and strategies
- 1.4 – Technological and industrial impact of the project

The evaluator assesses:

- contribution to EU competitiveness and technological sovereignty,
- relevance to addressing technological or industrial dependencies,
- broader impact across Member States or sectors.

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

4 Integration into the AI Value Chain and IPCEI AI

Template sections:

- 1.2 – Summary (value chain elements)
- 1.3.1 – Contribution to the integration of the IPCEI

The evaluator assesses:

- the specificity of the project's position within the value chain,
- linkages to other actors or downstream/upstream use,
- the level of integration into the IPCEI AI ecosystem.

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

5 Implementation Concept

Template sections:

- 2.2.1 – Overview and structure of the project
- Table 3 – Work packages
- 2.3 – GANTT chart
- Preliminary Funding Gap

The evaluator assesses:

- readiness level,
- logical structure of the project, clean milestones,
- consistency of work packages,
- basic technical and financial feasibility and timeline coherence,
- identified risks and mitigation measures..

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

6 Technological and Industrial Impact

Template section:

- 1.4 Technological and industrial impact of the project

The evaluator assesses:

- expected impact on the sector or market,
- contribution to the technological competitiveness,
- potential effective collaborations and spillover effects (beyond the sector and beyond the country).

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

7 Need for Public Support (Funding Gap Logic)

Template sections:

- 3.1 – Incentive effect
- 3.1.1 – Important market failures
- 3.2 – Counterfactual scenario
- 3.3 – Economic and financial information
- Preliminary Funding Gap

The evaluator assesses:

- credibility of the claim that the project would not proceed (or would be reduced/delayed) without aid,
- high risk profile (technological / financial),
- identification of relevant market failures,
- overall consistency of the justification.

Score (0–5):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences):

Overall Result

Total Score (max. 35):

Comment (min. 3–5 sentences)