

# PROPOSAL GUIDELINES

This document covers applications for funding under SGA2020.

**Call Opens: 01<sup>st</sup> October 2019**

**Deadline: Dependent on Activity and submission scheme – please see relevant call to action**

## Covering

Innovation Projects, including Regional Innovation Scheme (RIS)

Climate Innovation Ecosystems

Young Innovators

Research and Thought Leadership

Climate Impact Assessments

Deep Demonstrations of Change

**Publication Date:** 01 October 2019

**Version:** 1.1

# Contents

<b>Part 1: Call Overview .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Summary of Main Changes .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Things to Be Aware Of .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Call 2 2020 Timelines .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Part 2: Application, Assessment, and What to Expect.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Review Mechanism &amp; Decision-making .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Eligibility Criteria by Programme .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Annex 1: Portfolio Design Principles .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Annex 2: Assessment Criteria .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Other Assessment Criteria .....</b>	<b>15</b>

## Part 1: Call Overview

### Summary of Main Changes

Operating one stage and two stage application processes

- We now operate two types of submission scheme:
  - A one-stage submission scheme, proponents must submit a full proposal on or before the deadline as indicated for the relevant activity.
  - A two-stage submission scheme, there is a first-stage and a second-stage evaluation (against the evaluation criteria for each stage). In a two-stage submission scheme, proposals must pass the first-stage submission in order to proceed to the second. For avoidance of doubt, an Expression of Interest (first-stage) must be submitted within the specified timeframe – failure to do so will preclude the full submission of a full proposal (second-stage) for that call.
- We are not splitting the call into multiple innovation sub-categories as we have done previously. We are not asking proposers to select Pathfinder, Accelerator, Demonstrator or Scaler for example. However, in the detailed guidance, we do highlight the specific requirements associated with Ecosystem proposals (see below) as these have different characteristics to the body of innovation proposals. Equally, it is important to be clear how mature the innovation is on an innovation development journey.

### Things to Be Aware Of

To increase your chances of being successful, please:

Engage with someone from EIT Climate-KIC, who are ready to co-create ideas with you. Contacts can be found on website: <https://www.climate-kic.org/in-your-country/>

Read the eligibility, and assessment criteria and the portfolio design principles annexes enclosed within this document. These will be used by EIT Climate-KIC and, where relevant, external assessors to assess proposals. Note that details vary from programme to programme.

- This call will be followed by a Resubmission board, where proponents may be invited by EIT Climate-KIC to resubmit a proposal following a re-working period for re-consideration for funding in 2020. Proposals accepted to the board are by invitation only.
- UK Partners and Linked Third Parties, and consortiums involving UK entities are advised to read the communications issued by EIT Climate-KIC regarding eligibility and the UK's exit from the EU detailed under the Brexit section on the [website](#).
- EIT Climate-KIC will use a portfolio approach and reserve the right to redistribute funding between areas depending on the quality of incoming applications and portfolio needs. This is to make sure that the criteria described in the call documentation is met for all projects considered to be above the quality threshold.

## Call 2 2020 Timelines

**This call for proposals covers funding applications for 2020 start dates only.**

### Timeline for Innovation Projects including Regional Innovation Scheme, and Climate Innovation Ecosystems

- October 1, 2019 – Call Documentation released and online application portal (Plaza) opens for proposal preparations
- October 25, 2019: Deadline for first-stage: Proponents must submit Expression of Interest (in Plaza)
- November 18, 2019: Successful Proponents invited to second-stage submission
- January 03, 2020: Deadline for second-stage: Invited proponents must submit Full Proposal (in Plaza)
- March 16, 2020: Final decisions for second-stage applications will be communicated to proponents

### Timeline for Young Innovators

- The deadline for submitting a full proposal in PLAZA is October 31, 2019, 1800hrs CET
- The final outcomes and feedback will be communicated by November 22, 2019

### Timeline for Research and Thought Leadership

- The deadline for submitting a full proposal in PLAZA is January 03, 2020 1800hrs CET
- The final outcomes and feedback will be communicated by January 20, 2020

### Timeline for Climate Impact Assessments

- The deadline for submitting a full proposal in PLAZA is November 10, 2019, 1800hrs CET
- The final outcomes will be communicated by December 31, 2019

### Timeline for Deep Demonstrations of Change

- The deadline for submitting a full proposal in PLAZA is November 5, 2019 1800hrs CET
- Proponents who successfully pass the first stage assessment will be notified by November 18, 2019.
- The final outcomes will be communicated by December 13, 2019.

### Timeline for The Journey Hosts 2020

- The deadline for submitting a full proposal in PLAZA is November 13, 2019 1800hrs CET
- The final outcomes will be communicated by November 30, 2019.

### Proposal Submission

Proposals can be submitted at any time from the launch of the call **until 1800hrs CET** on the day of closing as indicated in the timeline section of this document. We strongly recommend that you liaise with your local EIT Climate-KIC office prior to submitting a proposal to receive support and guidance on completing your application.

**All applications must be submitted via Plaza.**

**Please note:** No extensions will be granted. Any changes to the proposal requested by the applicant after submission will not be allowed.

## Part 2: Application, Assessment, and What to Expect

### How to Participate

To Participate in this call, you should ensure:

- That you've read this document and the Call to Action carefully, and started to think about what contribution your idea could make to the portfolio
- You have reviewed our online tool [Expative](#) to see what else is in our portfolio
- **You have spoken to people at EIT Climate-KIC about the idea you have, to see if it is worth putting in an expression of interest**
- You have registered both your organisation and your individual account in our grant management system Plaza early. Registration processes can take 48 hours to approve – so don't leave it until the last minute! Please ensure you have registered more than 5 days in advance of any deadline.

If you've done all the above and wish to proceed, you should then complete your expression of interest or Proposal in Plaza ahead of the deadline. If invited to do so, you must also complete the full proposal by the specified deadline. EIT Climate-KIC will not proceed with any late applications. Plaza is available via: <https://plaza.climate-kic.org/SITE/PRIVATE/GO/login.aspx>

Please note that we will not accept any applications outside of the system. If you experience difficulties with the system please consult the guidance within the Systems Manuals section of Plaza, if you are still unable to resolve your issue then please: for technical issues raise a support ticket in the system, for all other queries contact your local EIT Climate-KIC team for support. **We will not accept late submissions and please note the system will be locked after the deadline.**

The information requested in Plaza is required to verify that projects are constructed and planned effectively by the organisations receiving funding and to meet our reporting obligations from EIT. Please ensure that all required information is provided. Without the availability of the relevant information the application will not be progressed. Based on experience, EIT Climate-KIC would like to **request attention to detail in the cost category descriptions** – please consult the help-notes that you will find alongside each field in the system for guidance and examples where offered.

All applications should be written in English. Exceptions can be made for supporting documents, such as letters of intent, which you may wish to attach in the 'Files' tab in Plaza. – these documents could be written in one of the official languages spoken in the country from which the application is submitted. To be assessed by all reviewers, you may choose to provide a short summary in English. EIT Climate-KIC reserves the right to request a translation at any time. EIT Climate-KIC also reserves the right not to pass additional information to reviewers if not provided in English or supported by a translation.

Please be aware that the system does not support images or graphics (if required please submit these as a PDF under the 'Files' tab – you will need to clearly name this document and reference it within the workplan/ work package information provided. Any tables, graphs, or images inserted into other sections of the Proposal will not be provided to independent reviewers for evaluation.

### Lodging a Complaint About a Failed Submission

If you think that the submission of your proposal was not entirely successful due to a technical error on the side of EIT Climate-KIC, you may lodge a complaint through the IT Support page on Plaza, available from the 'Support' tab on the homepage. For the complaint to be admissible it must be filed within 24 hours following that of the call closure, ideally as soon as the issue arises to enable submission prior to the deadline. You will receive an automatic acknowledgement.

What else to do? You should secure a PDF version of all the parts of your proposal holding a time stamp (file attributes listing the date and time of creation and last modification) that is prior to the call deadline

dd/mm/yyyy:hh:mm, as well as any proof of the alleged failure (e.g. screenshots). Later in the procedure you may be requested by the operations team reviewing the case to provide these items. Please note that any information regarding the proposal will be treated in a strictly confidential manner.

To consider your complaint is upheld, the audit trail (application log files and access log files of the IT systems involved) must show that there was indeed a technical problem on EIT Climate-KICs side which prevented you from submitting (or resubmitting) the proposal using the Plaza.

Outcome: You will receive a notification about the outcome of the treatment of your complaint within 48 hours of all evidence being provided. If a decision cannot be reached in this timeframe, you will receive a holding reply. If your complaint is upheld, the files submitted, for which the investigation has demonstrated that technical problems on the EIT Climate-KICs side prevented (re)submitting, will be used as a reference for accepting the proposal for subsequent evaluation. In absence of such documents, the version present in Plaza will be evaluated.

### Preparing a proposal

We now operate both one-stage and two-stage application processes, for the latter there is a first-stage and a second-stage evaluation (against the evaluation criteria for each stage). In a two-stage submission scheme, proposals must pass the first-stage submission to proceed to the second stage. For avoidance of doubt, an Expression of Interest must be submitted within the specified timeframe – failure to do so will preclude the full submission of any new idea. Please check you have read the relevant call to action to understand the application process that applies to you.

If you are completing an Expression of Interest, you should include brief statements of the following:

- A clear articulation of the need, problem or challenge the proposal will address.
- A strong strategic argument for how the innovation will effect change in one or more of the four systems outlined (cities, finance, materials, land), including the lever(s) of change it will influence to do so.
- A description of the proposed solution or path to develop the solution.
- The geographical focus of any activities, the organisations involved in the proposal, the project start and end date, and proposed budget.
- How this idea brings something new to EIT Climate-KIC's portfolio.

Note, while proposals do not need to be a systemic (addressing a whole system) in and of themselves, the ideas statement should outline the system that the proposal will intervene in.

At the full proposal stage, proposers will also need to detail the role of each organisation involved, budget breakdowns, key performance indicators, and several other components outlined in our detailed guidance. This is not needed at the expression of interest phase.

When completing your full proposal application, you will need to pay attention to:

- How you detail the activities that will be conducted (the workplan) to achieve the objectives of the project/activity
- The outputs of your work. EIT use the format of Outputs, Deliverables, and KPIs.
  - Outputs should be considered substantial pieces of work done to achieve the objectives – a typical formulation might see one output per work package.
  - Deliverables are supporting documentary evidence that evidence the work has taken place to the standard planned and they should always be high quality and 2 or 3 deliverables might typically underpin one major output. Suggested deliverable types can be found here.
  - KPIs are Key Performance Indicators and there are two sets of KPIs – Climate-KIC KPIs and EIT KPIs – both can be found here.

Proponents must now also identify KIC Complementary Activities at proposal stage. KCAs are KIC activities having a link with at least one KAVA at the level of outputs and results. They are not financed from the EIT contribution.

- KCAs must have a clear and described link with at least one KAVA at the level of outcomes/ results and must be funded from sources other than the EIT.
- The cost of KIC complementary activities must:
  - Be incurred by a KIC LE/ partner, their Linked Third Parties and/or third parties receiving financial support
  - Be proportionate to the cost of the KAVA and/ or to the expected impact in furthering the mission of a KIC (i.e. the relative weight of the KCA within KIC activities must be suitable and reasonable to achieve the objectives of the activity):
  - Be identifiable and verifiable.

External, independent experts may assess the quality your application. We will then select the projects to fund, building a portfolio of projects that are high quality and clearly address an Impact Goal or goals as described in the call documentation. Subject to meeting the quality threshold, we reserve the right to manage the portfolio to achieve the correct balance of projects and funding.

### EIT Reimbursement Rate

The Maximum EIT Reimbursement Rate is applied at the project level and each project is subject to the Maximum EIT Reimbursement Rate as stated in the Eligibility section of this document. Individual Partners may seek EIT reimbursement of up to 100% within a consortium providing the maximum EIT Reimbursement Rate for the programme is not exceeded by the project overall. For multi-annual projects, a Partners' EIT Reimbursement Rate should remain the same each year. Please refer to [Managing Performance, Risk, and Fairness in Implementing the EIT Grant](#), under the Finance and Grant Management section of the website.

An example where the Maximum EIT Reimbursement Rate of the programme is 80% is set out as follows:

The EIT Reimbursement Rate is viewed at partner level – where the project reimbursement must not exceed 80%, individual Partners can seek up to 100% EIT reimbursement (but others would need to seek lower amounts) i.e.:

- Partner A: 70% EIT Reimbursement + 30% co-funding
- Partner B: 100% EIT Reimbursement + 0% co-funding
- Partner C: 70% EIT Reimbursement + 30% co-funding

Partner	EIT Funding Request (€)	Co-funding (€)	EIT Reimbursement Rate	Co-funding
Partner A	70,000	30,000	70%	30%
Partner B	100,000	0	100%	0%
Partner C	70,000	30,000	70%	30%
TOTAL	240,000	60,000	80%	20%

### Partner Status

Only EIT Climate-KIC Partner Organisations who have acceded to the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) with EIT are eligible to receive EIT-funding.

However, organisations who have not applied for or received partnership status are strongly encouraged to participate in/apply. Should such organisations wish to receive EIT-funding, they are welcome to apply for partnership status (which must be obtained before receiving EIT funds). Please reach out to your local EIT Climate-KIC office for further information.

Non-EIT Climate-KIC Partners can apply to the call but will not be eligible to receive funding until they have EIT Climate-KIC Partner status. Please note that Plaza is only accessible to EIT Climate-KIC partners. Organisations/ individuals who are not yet EIT Climate-KIC Partners but are preparing a bid will need to contact [your local Climate-KIC office](#) before starting your application.

### Your Data

In Plaza, all registrants will have to accept EIT Climate-KIC's [General Terms and Conditions](#) which also includes in particular, our [Privacy Policy](#), [Acceptable Use Policy](#) and [Cookie Policy](#) and warrant and represent that they have the authority to agree and accept these on behalf of the named organisation. Personal data provided may be processed, including sharing with other organisations, by EIT Climate-KIC and certain sensitive data elements will be visible to other partners or potential partners of EIT Climate-KIC. The named partner organisation or potential partner of EIT Climate-KIC warrants and represents that in providing personal data in connection with the proposal, the data subjects have consented to the provision of this personal data and the processing of it by Climate-KIC in the manner indicated in accordance with our Privacy Policy, and that the partner organisation or potential partner of EIT Climate-KIC provides the personal data in accordance with applicable law.

### Confidentiality

EIT Climate-KIC will treat your proposal confidentially, as well as any related information, data and documents received in accordance with our Privacy Policy or as otherwise indicated throughout the proposal form (i.e. public summary, Climate Impact Assessments). Independent expert reviewers or evaluators are also bound by an obligation of confidentiality, as our Partners completing Climate Impact Assessments as a part of the evaluation process.

Please pay attention not to attempt to discuss your proposal with persons you believe may act as an independent expert for EIT Climate-KIC.

## Review Mechanism & Decision-making

### Expression of Interest Assessment

Proponents applying for a two-stage application must submit this first stage of their submission (expression of interest) by the deadline specified in this document, without exception.

Any that do not meet the eligibility criteria will be informed that they will not progress to the next stage of assessment.

All other applications will be sent for first stage assessment in the scope of EIT Climate-KIC's Innovation Impact Goals, eligibility, assessment criteria, and the current portfolio. EIT Climate-KIC reserves the right to declare applications as out of scope based on the parameters set out in this Call for Proposals. All first stage submissions will be assessed fairly and transparently by EIT Climate-KIC teams.

### Full Proposal Submissions Assessment

Full proposals will be assessed by EIT Climate-KIC teams and additionally, applications may be assessed by up to three independent assessors. All proposals exceeding a total value of €250,000 will be assessed by external experts. The assessors from both business and academia in areas relevant to our 'Transformation, In Time strategy'.

All second stage submissions will be assessed fairly and transparently in the scope of EIT Climate-KIC's Innovation Impact Goals, eligibility, assessment criteria, and the current portfolio.

The Portfolio Review process will culminate in the final decision regarding funding, if required, EIT Climate-KIC's commissioning board may review all decisions. EIT Climate-KIC will manage the portfolio to achieve the correct balance of projects and funding across the Impact Goals and our drivers of change.

Conflicts of interest are mitigated through a disclosure process and follow a full recusal from the decision process in such instances. Decisions as to whether a proposal is accepted or rejected will be communicated as detailed in this document.

### Deep Demonstrations of Change Submission Assessment

Deep Demonstrations applications will follow a one-stage submission scheme but will be assessed by EIT Climate-KIC teams via two stages. Any applications that do not pass the first phase assessment will be notified in accordance with the timeline as stated in the Call for Proposals. Please read the Call for Proposals for full details on assessment.

### Eligibility Criteria by Programme

Project Type	MAX. DURATION	MAX. EIT REQUEST Per annum	MAX. EIT REIMBURSEMENT RATE	MIN. CO-FUNDING (total project costs)	OTHER
Climate Innovation Ecosystems WP3	N/A	NA	67%	33%	CIE: Consortia must comprise organisations covering at least three countries
Innovation Projects (inc. RIS*)	1- 3 years	Minimum 100k EIT request	70%	30%	Guiding maximum EIT request for 2020 is circa 300k
	RIS: 12 months		RIS: 80%	RIS: 20%	RIS: Guiding maximum EIT request for 2020 is circa 50k Projects cannot span multiple calendar years
Research and Thought Leadership	12 months	100-400k EIT Request	Guide: 80%	Guide: 20%	Proponents are asked to provide co-funding where possible, but the maximum EIT reimbursement rate for this work could be up to 100% Projects cannot span multiple calendar years
Climate Impact Assessments	1- 3 years	Maximum 250,000 EIT contribution per annum	100%		Minimum of 2 EIT Partners
Young Innovators	1-3 years	Maximum 40k EIT Request per annum	75%	25%	
Deep Demonstrations of Change	N/A	N/A but typically €100,000 to € 500,000	80%	20%	
The Journey Hosts 2020	Please refer to the document <i>Call for Journey Hosts Proposals 2020</i> for the eligibility criteria.				

\*Only partner consortia led by partners located in EIT RIS countries (Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czechia, Estonia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Northern Macedonia) are eligible to apply under this project type - projects have to benefit stakeholders located in these countries exclusively

**Please note that all else being equal, proposals with a lower EIT Reimbursement Rate will be favoured.**

## Annex 1: Portfolio Design Principles

EIT Climate-KIC introduced the Portfolio approach to project assessment and selection in 2018. We are looking to support ambitious, and potentially transformative innovation experiments that can add something unique and complementary to our existing portfolio.

Portfolio, in the case of EIT Climate-KIC, refers to a portfolio of initiatives designed to unlock systemic change for decarbonization and resilience. The portfolio is deliberately composed of initiatives that offer a range of learning ‘positions’ managed as complementary and connected to one another. Each ‘position’ or initiative is chosen because it offers a means of developing or testing a solution to achieve an element of decarbonization and/or resilience relevant to our impact goals, or because it represents an opportunity to learn about how complex man-made and human systems change. None of these initiatives are likely to be able to achieve systemic change on their own (although multi-dimensional experiments are preferable), but the experiences and learnings across many or all of them can: by generating the insights, the strategic arguments and policy arguments and the pathways for whole systems change. The intention of a portfolio is to test multiple hypotheses about how we can effect change in our economic, social and physical systems and create new momentum and choices that make adoption and acceleration easier.

There are five design principles that are considered in the portfolio approach: spread, diversity, scale, speed, and connectivity.

### Spread

How are the initiatives in the portfolio spread by:

- impact goal – look for concentrations and gaps
- levers of change – this is the most critical. Here we recognize that systemic change will most likely be achieved through a combination of interrelated effects caused by working on multiple levers of change simultaneously
- riskiness (of failure) – high | medium | low
- optimization of the current systems vs. ‘leading edge’ transformation potential
- Location – consider impact on place-specific and relevant learning
- Funding source (e.g. EIT vs. other named funders)
- Initiative types (e.g. innovation, entrepreneurship, education, ecosystems, outreach/dissemination)

### Diversity

- How is the leadership of initiatives in the portfolio distributed (by entity type)? (i) university and/or research body, (ii) community group or grassroots NGO, (iii) large business, (iv) SME, (v) public body etc?
- What % of initiatives in the portfolio involve (i) Partners cf. (ii) non-partners?
- How many of the initiatives in the portfolio have the ‘problem owner’ at the heart of the project?
- How diverse is the cluster of initiatives addressing each impact goal and/or targeted systems change (e.g. supply chain) with respect to levers of change?
- What % of initiatives in the portfolio are configured to produce hyperlocal solutions leveraging specific contexts vs solutions that have multi-contextual applications?
- What component of the portfolio as a percentage is wildcard or random solutions?

### Scale

- How are the initiatives in the portfolio distributed by administrative/geographical scale: (i) community or district (ii) city, (iii) region, (iv) nation state, (v) multiple state involvement, (vi) working beyond Europe?
- How are the initiatives in the portfolio distributed by financial value – total project costs? Define financial value categories.
- How are the initiatives distributed by scale of impact?

### Speed

- How quickly is the initiative/portfolio able to transition from project approval to the implementation/action phase?
- How quickly is the initiative/portfolio likely to offer learning/insights?

### Connectivity

- How integrated is the initiative/portfolio with existing social networks? (e.g. degree of embeddedness of lead entity and individuals with other parts of the portfolio).
- How integrated is the initiative/portfolio with 'networks of networks', which can offer a multiplier effect?
- What level of engagement does Climate-KIC Holding have with the initiative/portfolio? (low, medium, high)

## Annex 2: Assessment Criteria

### Expression of Interest Assessment Criteria- Innovation Projects, RIS, Climate Innovation Ecosystems

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Portfolio Fit &amp; Contribution to the Climate Innovation Impact Goals &amp; Levers of Change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the expression of interest provide a clear narrative substantiating how and why the project contributes to EIT Climate-KICs portfolio?</li> <li>Is the expression of interest aligned with our Transformation, in Time strategy, and seeks to effect change through innovation in four overarching systems - Cities, Land Use, Materials, Finance?</li> <li>Does the proposal help unlock systemic change to support achievement of one or more of EIT Climate-KIC's Impact Goals?</li> <li>Does the proposal have a clear strategic argument for the relationship between innovation and impact, including how the innovation will act on key levers of systems change?</li> </ul>
<b>Systems Innovation Potential</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the expression of interest show how it will innovate around policies or regulations, or behavioural change, or new ways of developing skills and learning?</li> <li>Does the idea address climate change but also inequality, well-being and social justice?</li> <li>Is the idea statement complementary to the areas addressed by our new <a href="#">Deep Demonstrations?</a></li> <li>Is the systems challenge that is being addressed clearly articulated?</li> </ul>
<b>Project Consortium/ Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the consortium involve unusual innovation actors – for example community groups, faith organisations, or arts and culture bodies?</li> <li>Does the consortium engage <a href="#">start-ups</a> from EIT Climate-KIC's Entrepreneurship Programme?</li> <li>To what extent are demand side representatives expressing interest in the innovation? Or, are challenge owner representatives' part of the project consortium and/or expressing concrete interest in the innovation? (Note: Formal commitments will be favoured.)</li> <li>Do the consortium partners have the appropriate skills and capabilities to successfully deliver the project?</li> <li>To what extent does the consortium engage organisations from different parts of society (government, academia, industry and civil society)? All else being equal, a high degree of diversity will be preferred.</li> </ul>

## Full Proposal Assessment Criteria- Innovation Projects, RIS, Climate Innovation Ecosystems

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Project Consortium/ Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do the consortium partners have the appropriate skills and capabilities to successfully deliver the project? If no, what skills and capabilities are missing?</li> <li>▪ Does the consortium engage organisations from different parts of society (government, academia, industry and civil society)? Are there sectors missing relevant to the proposal's effective delivery/ impact?</li> <li>▪ Does the consortium have a high degree of geographical diversity that is relevant for the project?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal convey how it aims to identify or address the challenges and needs of the challenge owners (business, society, policy community, etc.) of the innovation? (Note: For projects exploring the supply side only, the proposal must clearly describe the already established challenges and needs.)</li> <li>▪ To what extent are demand side representatives expressing interest in the innovation?</li> <li>▪ Are challenge owners representatives part of the project consortium and/or expressing concrete interest in the innovation? (Note: Formal commitments will be favoured.)</li> </ul>
<b>Project Plan &amp; Clarity of Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the work plan and work packages clearly explained and relevant to support the project objectives and expected impact?</li> <li>▪ Are the project outputs, deliverables and KPIs clearly stated and linked to the different work packages/project stages identified in the work plan?</li> <li>▪ Is the work plan, work packages, outputs, deliverables and KPIs targeted reasonable for the duration of the project and the grant amount requested?</li> <li>▪ Is consideration given to how the results and learnings inform further action?</li> <li>▪ Are key assumptions and risks presented clearly?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well is the funding spent on activities directly linked to achieving the project objectives, deliverables and KPIs?</li> <li>▪ How appropriate is the funding request in relation to the anticipated benefits?</li> <li>▪ How much co-funding is offered to match the EIT funding? (Note: Baseline is the minimum programme-specific co-funding requirement.)</li> <li>▪ How high is the potential for the innovation to attract further capital/ investment (beyond EIT-funding)?</li> </ul>
<b>Portfolio fit &amp; Contribution to the Climate Innovation Impact Goals &amp; Levers of Change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the Proposal provide a clear narrative substantiating how and why the project contributes to EIT Climate-KICs portfolio?</li> <li>▪ Is the Proposal aligned with our Transformation, in Time strategy, and seek to effect change through innovation in four overarching systems - Cities, Land Use, Materials, Finance?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal outline how it will help unlock systemic change to support achievement of one or more of EIT Climate-KIC's Impact Goals?</li> <li>▪ Does the proposal have a clear strategic argument for the relationship between innovation and impact, including how the innovation will act on key levers of systems change.?</li> </ul>
<b>Demand Assessment</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Does the proposal convey how it aims to identify or address the challenges and needs of the challenge owners (business, society, policy community, etc.) of the innovation? (Note: For projects exploring the supply side only, the proposal must clearly describe the already established challenges and needs.)</li> <li>▪ To what extent are demand side representatives expressing interest in the innovation?</li> <li>▪ Are challenge owners representatives part of the project consortium and/or expressing concrete interest in the innovation? (Note: Formal commitments will be favoured.)</li> </ul>

---

**Systems Innovation Potential**

- Does the Proposal show how it will innovate around policies or regulations, or behavioural change, or new ways of developing skills and learning?
- Does the Proposal address climate change?
- Does the Proposal also address inequality, well-being and social justice?
- Is the Proposal complementary to the areas addressed by our new [Deep Demonstrations](#)?
- Is the systems challenge that is being addressed clearly articulated?

---

**Expected Impact & Speed to Impact**

- Does the proposal clearly describe the mechanism for how it will contribute to climate change mitigation and/or increasing climate resilience? What is the potential scale of the impact?
- How well does the proposal consider socio-economic benefits and risks that the innovation entails?
- Is evidence provided to substantiate (if appropriate: quantify) the expected impact? Does the proposal adequately reference other studies?
- Does the project encourage diversity and gender equity?

## Other Assessment Criteria

### Climate Impact Assessments

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Project Consortium/ Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the consortium partners have the appropriate skills and capabilities to successfully deliver the project? If no, what skills and capabilities are missing?</li> <li>Does the proposal adhere to the funding and timing constraints listed in the call? If not, what constraints are not met?</li> <li>Does the consortium have adequate cultural/language skills to cover the EIT Climate-KIC investment landscape? If not, what measures are planned?</li> </ul>
<b>Project Plan &amp; Clarity of Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do the project deliverables include production of adequate methodological guidance, training and reference materials for use by other EIT Climate-KIC partners?</li> <li>Does the project work plan clearly indicate how a harmonized approach to climate impact measurement across the portfolio will be formulated and implemented?</li> <li>Does the project address the climate impact measurement challenges of innovation projects, start-ups, education projects, and deep demonstrations?</li> <li>Does the project clearly state how comparable climate impact estimates and projects will be produced for the project types listed above?</li> <li>Does the project plan work to make aggregation of the different climate impact measurements possible at different levels (portfolio, impact goal, country, EIT Climate-KIC as a whole etc.)?</li> <li>Does the project clearly state how it will practically work across the EIT Climate-KIC partnership and support other partners to do their climate impact estimates during project proposal formulation stage?</li> <li>Does the project clearly state how it will practically support partners during project implementation to improve their climate impact estimates by making them more precise, thereby turning the estimates into climate impact projections that can be reported to the European Institute of Technology (EIT) and potential other future donors?</li> <li>Are the work plan and work packages clearly explained and relevant to support the project objectives?</li> <li>Are the project outputs, deliverables and KPIs clearly stated and linked to the different work packages/project stages identified in the work plan?</li> <li>Is the work plan, work packages, outputs, deliverables and KPIs targeted reasonable for the duration of the project and the grant amount requested?</li> <li>Does the project have a clear communications and engagement plan to communicate and share project progress, methodologies, experiences, recommendations and case studies within the EIT Climate-KIC partnership and more widely across the European Union, including sharing knowledge assets with key actors in Brussels.</li> <li>Does the project encourage diversity and gender equity?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well is the funding spent on activities directly linked to achieving the project objectives, deliverables and KPIs?</li> <li>How appropriate is the funding request in relation to the anticipated benefits?</li> <li>Does the composition of the team in terms of their complementary experience, expertise and seniority promise value for money?</li> </ul>

## Young Innovators

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Project Partner and strategic fit</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project partner have the appropriate skills, capabilities and networks to successfully deliver the programme or can they add concrete value to the programme that is missing so far?</li> <li>Does the proposal convey an understanding and commitment to the EIT Climate-KIC Young Innovators Visual Toolbox?</li> <li>Does the partner express a clear understanding and link to EIT Climate-KIC's strategy paper and priorities, including the Deep Demonstrations?</li> </ul>
<b>Project Plan &amp; Clarity of Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the work plan and work packages clearly explained and relevant to support the project objectives and expected impact?</li> <li>Are the project outputs, deliverables and KPIs clearly stated and linked to the different work packages/project stages identified in the work plan?</li> <li>Is the work plan, work packages, outputs, deliverables and KPIs targeted reasonable for the duration of the project and the grant amount requested?</li> <li>Is consideration given to how the results and learnings inform further action?</li> <li>Are key assumptions and risks presented clearly?</li> <li>Does the project encourage diversity and gender equity?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well is the funding spent on activities directly linked to achieving the project objectives, deliverables and KPIs?</li> <li>How appropriate is the funding request in relation to the anticipated benefits?</li> <li>How much co-funding is offered to match the EIT funding? (Note: Baseline is the minimum programme-specific co-funding requirement.)</li> <li>Does the partner show effort in attracting further funds / capital/ investment (beyond EIT-funding)?</li> <li>Does the partner have the capacity and willingness to create a sustainable model of delivery outside EIT Climate-KIC funding?</li> </ul>

## The Journey Hosts 2020 Call

Please refer to the document: [Call for Journey Hosts Proposals 2020](#), for full details on the Assessment Criteria for the Journey Hosts 2020 Call.

## Research and Thought Leadership

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Project Consortium/ Partnership</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Do the consortium partners have the appropriate applied research skills and capabilities to successfully deliver the project? If no, what skills and capabilities are missing?</li> <li>▪ Do the project consortium have the communication and outreach skills necessary to conduct research for impact? Does the consortium have the geographical knowledge and relationships relevant for the project? Does the team include a range of specialists from appropriate disciplinary backgrounds? Does the team have sufficient intellectual leadership from senior research leaders and appropriate levels of research support?</li> </ul>
<b>Quality and appropriateness of research plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Are the work plan and work packages clearly explained and relevant to support the project objectives and expected impact?</li> <li>▪ Is the work plan, work packages, outputs, deliverables and KPIs targeted reasonable for the duration of the project and the grant amount requested?</li> <li>▪ Is consideration given to how the results and learnings inform further action?</li> <li>▪ Is the research design appropriate in terms of rigour, applicability of findings and speed of learning?</li> <li>▪ Have any research ethics and data archiving issues been properly considered?</li> <li>▪ Does the programme proposed generate insights relevant to the existing or future portfolio within CKIC?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How well is the funding spent on activities directly linked to achieving the project objectives, deliverables and KPIs?</li> <li>▪ How appropriate is the funding request in relation to the anticipated benefits?</li> <li>▪ How much co-funding is offered to match the EIT funding? (Note: Baseline is the minimum programme-specific co-funding requirement.)</li> <li>▪ Is there value for money in the design of the team and use of appropriate levels of staff for different activities?</li> </ul>

## Deep Demonstrations of Change

Deep Demonstration of Change will follow a one-stage submission scheme but will have a two-phase assessment process.

### First Phase Assessment Criteria

The first phase assessment will be based on the following sections of Plaza and associated criteria:

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Project Summary - Deep Demonstration approach to systems innovation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent does the proposal respond to Deep Demonstration requirements for co-designers?</li> <li>Does the proponent demonstrate an understanding of Deep Demonstration approach to systems innovation, design principles, choice, exploration and discovery of new possibilities rather than running straight to solutions?</li> <li>Does the proponent demonstrate an ability to work with and collaboratively through the Deep demonstrations methodology approach?</li> </ul>
<b>Skills/Capability/Resource</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To what extent do proponents have the appropriate skills and capabilities to successfully contribute to co-designing Deep Demonstrations?</li> <li>To what extent does the proponent engage organisations or stakeholders within the Deep Demonstration regions, industries or demand side actors?</li> <li>To what extent does the proponent demonstrate growth mindset, adaptive decision making, cross-functional teamwork and intercultural communication skills?</li> </ul>
<b>Portfolio Argument</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal provide a clear response on systems change?</li> <li>Does the proposal provide a clear narrative substantiating how and why the proposal contributes to EIT Climate-KICs Deep Demonstration portfolio thinking?</li> <li>Is the proposal aligned with our Transformation, in Time strategy, and seek to effect change through innovation in one of or multiple Deep Demonstrations?</li> </ul>

## Deep Demonstrations of Change

### Second Phase Assessment Criteria

Submissions that pass the first phase will be assessed on the following criteria:

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Ambition for impact and systems transformation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal have a goal to lead to an acceleration in the system dynamics?</li> <li>Does the proposal help grow a network of innovation relationships and connections with understanding of local needs and territories?</li> </ul>
<b>Alignment to Deep Demonstration</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal provide a clear narrative substantiating how and why it aligns with the Deep Demonstration?</li> <li>Does the proposal meet the specific needs of the Deep Demonstration area?</li> <li>Does the proposal convey connections across the multiple Deep Demonstrations?</li> </ul>
<b>Deep Demonstration diversity for insight generation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal focus on learning impacts and alignment to impact goals?</li> <li>Does the proposal provide capabilities for learning?</li> <li>Does the proposal allow for multiple possibilities/perspectives?</li> <li>Does the proposal build understand about barriers to innovation, potential multipliers, leverage points and transformation potential?</li> </ul>
<b>Initiative Plan &amp; Clarity of Outputs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the work plan and work packages clearly explained and relevant to support the proposal objectives and expected impact?</li> <li>Are the proposed outputs, deliverables and KPIs clearly stated and linked to the different work packages/initiative stages identified in the work plan?</li> <li>Is the work plan, work packages, outputs, deliverables and KPIs targeted reasonable for the duration of the proposal and the grant amount requested?</li> <li>Is consideration given to how the results and learnings inform further action?</li> <li>Are key assumptions and risks presented clearly?</li> </ul>
<b>Value for Money</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How well is the funding spent on activities directly linked to achieving the proposal objectives, deliverables and KPIs?</li> <li>How appropriate is the funding request in relation to the anticipated benefits?</li> <li>How much co-funding is offered to match the EIT funding? (Note: Baseline is the minimum programme-specific co-funding requirement.)</li> <li>How high is the potential for the proposal to attract further capital/ investment (beyond EIT-funding)?</li> </ul>

## Deep Demonstrations of Change

### Methodology Principles

The methodology principles that are considered in the assessment process are akin to portfolio logic and consider: spread, scale and connectivity.

CRITERIA	DESCRIPTION
<b>Spread</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact – look for relevance, diversity, concentrations and gaps</li> <li>▪ Levers of change – through the proposal can we recognize design or thinking that systemic change will most likely be achieved through a combination of interrelated effects caused by working on multiple levers of change simultaneously</li> <li>▪ Demonstrate thinking with leading edge transformation potential vs optimization of the current systems</li> <li>▪ Location – place specific learning vs deliberately diverse perspective</li> </ul>
<b>Scale</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How are the proposals distributed by administrative/geographical scale: (i) community or district (ii) city, (iii) region, (iv) nation state, (v) multiple state involvement, (vi) working beyond Europe?</li> <li>▪ How are the proposals distributed by financial value – total proposal costs</li> <li>▪ How are the proposals contributing to scale of impact?</li> </ul>
<b>Connectivity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How integrated is the proposals with existing social networks? (e.g. degree of embeddedness of lead entity and individuals).</li> <li>▪ How integrated is the proposals with ‘networks of networks’, which can offer a multiplier effect?</li> </ul>