

The procedure for assessment of the applications submitted within the scope of the call for proposals Support for Knowledge-Intensive Activities of Ida-Viru Enterprises (Applied Research and Product Development) (6.1.2) of the Regulation on Support for Knowledge-Intensive Activities of Ida-Viru Enterprises – Version 1

Methodology for assessing applications containing product development or applied research

1. Process of assessment of proposals

- 1.1. The applications submitted and declared admissible within the scope of the call for proposals Support for Knowledge-Intensive Activities of Ida-Viru Enterprises (Applied Research and Product Development) (6.1.2) of the Regulation on Support for Knowledge-Intensive Activities of Ida-Viru Enterprises will be assessed on the basis of the award criteria set out in the Regulation and described in this assessment methodology.
- 1.2. The assessment committee will base their decisions on the assessment committee rules of procedure confirmed by the Estonian Business and Innovation Agency (hereinafter: the Agency), taking into account the following:
 - 1.2.1. Expert committees may be formed from the members and substitute members of the assessment committee, and the majority of members who are entrepreneurs must be ensured in its work, including in decision-making;
 - 1.2.2. The composition of the expert committees formed from the members and substitute members of the assessment committee must be adjusted in accordance with the fields relevant to the project being assessed, – while following the stipulations in point 1.2.1 – replacing entrepreneurial members with substitute members who have knowledge and experience in the field of the project;
- 1.3. The Agency will involve independent experts in the assessment process.
- 1.4. Any data found in the application as well as any data found in public databases will be taken into account during the assessment process.
- 1.5. The members of the expert committees formed from the members and substitute members of the assessment committee as well as independent experts will assess the applications on the basis of assessment criteria detailed in the Regulation and in accordance with the assessment criteria and their sub criteria found in Annex 1 of this methodology assessment.
- 1.6. The score for every award criterion is formed from the weighted average of its sub-criteria.
- 1.7. The overall score of an application is the weighted average of the five award criteria. The overall score and the scores of the selection criteria will be calculated to the accuracy of two decimal places.
- 1.8. Applications declared eligible within the budget of the call for proposals will be considered for funding if they have obtained an overall score of at least 2.50 for the award criteria and at least 2.00 for award criteria 2–4 and at least 2.5 for award criterion 1.
- 1.9. The assessment of suitable proposals will follow these stages, as stipulated in the award criteria specified in Annex 1:
 - 1.9.1. in the first stage, independent experts give an expert opinion on the proposals with the scores and their reasoning behind the scores;
 - 1.9.2. in the second phase of the assessment, the Agency has the right to form expert committees from the assessment committee members and substitute members, who will assess the applications considering the opinions of the experts and the assessment report prepared by an employee of the Agency.

2. Expert assessment of proposals

- 2.1. Every proposal is assessed by at least two independent experts.
- 2.2. The experts who assess the proposals will fill out an assessment report form for every proposal that they assess.
- 2.3. The experts assessing the proposal will have the opportunity to propose, if necessary, the reclassification of the proposal or part of it from industrial research to product development and vice versa. The experts who assessed the proposal can also give their opinion on whether the proposal is a research and development project and propose partial, conditional or phased funding.

2.4. If an application does not exceed the weighted average score of 2.0 points for at least one of award criteria 2–4 in Annex 1 or 2.5 points for award criterion 1, the application will not be forwarded to the expert committee for assessment and the Agency will make the decision to reject the application.

3. Expert committee assessment of applications

- 3.1. The expert committee will base their assessment on the materials provided in the application, assessments made by independent experts and an assessment report compiled by an employee of the Agency, which gathers the assessments given by the involved experts and the average scores received for the award criteria and their sub-criteria.
- 3.2. The expert committee has the right to invite the applicant for a defence of their application or ask them additional questions regarding the application. When answering questions, the applicant cannot amend their proposal, only explain the statements found therein.
- 3.3. The expert committee confirms the sub-criterion grade proposed in the assessment report, compiled through expert opinions, through a simple majority, or proposes to change the grade. If a new score is proposed, every committee member must give a separate score to the sub-criterion under discussion. In this case, the score of the sub-criterion will be the average of the scores provided by the committee members.
- 3.4. The grade of each assessment criterion will be formed through the weighted average of its sub-criteria grades as given by the expert committee members.
- 3.5. The expert committee has the right to propose amendments to the application in order to improve it.

4. Compiling a financing proposal

- 4.1. If the application process is carried out in rounds, the Agency will rank all of the applications submitted in the call for proposals that exceed the threshold specified in point 1.8 on the basis of the total scores received from the expert committee starting from the application that received the highest score. If two applications have the same average aggregate score, the application with the smaller amount of requested aid will be placed higher in the rankings.

Annex 1. Award criteria

1. The project's economic justification and the applicant's ability to implement the results of the project for the achievement of the objectives of the measure (the project's economic necessity and justification with respect to the applicant and their partners, the financial benefits stemming from the project, the change in the applicant's business model and financial growth stemming from the change in the future, the relevance of the business plan, the ability of the applicant and their partners to carry out the business plan and use the outcomes in a business setting and the applicant's ability to fund the deployment of the project's outcomes are assessed): 35% of the overall score.	
1.1. The conformity of the business plan to the needs of the applicant (partner), the relevancy of the business plan (weight 60% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation
4	The need for the project is very well justified and the problem, bottleneck or untapped development opportunity has been articulated. The project is innovative and its implementation will create a competitive advantage. The business objectives of the project are specifically defined and the action plan to achieve them is detailed. The financial projections are very clear, realistic and ambitious, and are very likely to be achieved by the end of the project, given the applicant's capacity and project preparation. The market introduction of a new, innovative product and/or service is very clearly described and realistic. Projects ending up to TRL 5 specify clearly and realistically how customers will be reached (specific customers need not be shown). Projects ending TRL 6 or 7 have identified specific customers and proven their interest. The risk analysis is substantive and takes into account different risks while also outlining potential ways to lessen these risks and actions that can be taken in the event that they are realised. The market analysis is relevant and provides a good overview of the market situation. Competitor analysis identifies direct and indirect competitors, their advantages and disadvantages. The pricing model is relevant and takes into account market conditions and the level of technological readiness. The project creates a significant increase in added value. The projected increase in the company's added value, as set out in the project plan, is definitely achievable, very ambitious and realistic within the timeframe given.

3.5	Interim assessment
3	The need for the project is justified; the problem, bottleneck or untapped development opportunity is broadly identified, but not very clearly. The business objectives of the project have been defined and the action plan to achieve them is given in detail, but there are inconsistencies between the objectives and the action plan. Financial projections are provided but their realisticness requires further explanation or the financial projection is not ambitious and its achievement by the end of the project, taking into account the applicant's capacity and project preparation, requires further explanation. Projects ending up to TRL 5 specify how customers will be reached (specific customers need not be shown), but it needs to be improved. Projects ending TRL 6 or 7 have identified specific customers, but the proof of their interest requires further explanations. The introduction of a new product and/or service to the market has been described, but its realisticness requires further explanations. The risk analysis has been compiled, and it reflects the main risks of the project, but the ways in which to lessen these risks and the actions that can be taken after the realisation of these risks are somewhat unclear. A market analysis is provided but does not give a very good opportunity to clearly assess the position of the product and/or service. Competitor analysis only identifies a few direct competitors and their advantages and disadvantages are broadly described. The pricing model is generally straightforward and based on the level of technological readiness, but could be improved. The project results in a rise in value added. The projected growth in the company's added value is achievable, ambitious and realistic within the timeframe given.
2.5	Interim assessment
2	The necessity of the project is indirectly justified, the nature of the problem has not been explained, the bottleneck or the untapped development opportunity has been given indirectly and does not allow for an accurate assessment of their adequacy. The business objectives of the project are too general and unclear and the action plan to achieve them is fragmented and too general. The financial forecasts are presented in a very general manner and do not allow for an assessment of the realistic nature of the project, and their achievement by the end of the project is unclear, given the capacity of the applicant and the preparation of the project. The market entry of a new product and/or service is described at a level that is too general and does not allow for a clear understanding of whether market entry is realistic. Projects ending up to TRL 5 specify how customers will be reached (specific customers need not be shown), but it is too general. Projects ending TRL 6 or 7 have identified specific customers, but the proof of their interest is not convincing. The risk analysis is very general, many important aspects have been omitted. The market analysis is too general and does not give a true picture of the market. The analysis of competitors is too general, direct competitors have not been identified and their advantages and disadvantages have not been assessed. The pricing model is provided and is generally based on the level of technological readiness, but it may not work in the market as such. The added value created by the project is modest. The projected growth in the company's added value is modest and not ambitious and its implementation within the timeframe given is not questionable.
1.5	Interim assessment
1	The need for the project has not been justified, the problem has not been described and the bottlenecks or the untapped development opportunity have not been identified. The business objectives of the project are not defined and there is no detailed action plan for achieving them. Financial projections are not provided or are unrealistic and unlikely to be achieved by the end of the project, given the applicant's capacity and project preparation. The introduction of a new product and/or service to the market has not been described. A risk analysis has not been submitted, or is not relevant. A market analysis has not been submitted, or is too vague to give a proper overview of the market situation. A competitor analysis has not been submitted, or is not relevant. A pricing model has not been submitted or is not adequate. The added value of the project is low. The projected growth in the company's added value given in the project plan is unrealistic, unambitious and unrealistic within the timeframe given.
0.5	Interim assessment
0	The project does not meet the needs of the applicant and, if any, the partner; the business plan is not relevant. The project does not bring any added value.
1.2. The applicant's and their partner's (if any) commercial and financial capability to carry out the project (weight 40% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation

4	The applicant and its partners have a very good potential and capacity to commercially carry out the project. The team of the applicant and the partners has all the necessary competences to manage the project and, if necessary, to control the quality of the outsourcing. The application clearly identifies the contribution and responsibility of the applicant and the partners for the successful joint implementation of the project. The financial capacity of the project applicant and partners to sustainably implement the project and achieve its objectives and results is excellent. If additional activities are necessary to produce the project results/achieve the project objectives at the end of the project, the applicant has also described these activities and is able to carry them out.
3.5	Interim assessment
3	The applicant and their partners have the potential and capability to commercially carry out the project. The team of the applicant and the partners are largely competent enough to manage the project and, if necessary, to control the quality of outsourcing. The proposal must at least set out the applicants and the contribution and responsibility of its partners, if any, for the successful joint implementation of the project, and the applicant's and, where applicable, the partners' financial capacity is sufficient for the sustainable implementation of the project and the achievement of its objectives and results.
2.5	Interim assessment
2	The applicant and the partners, if any, have limited potential and capacity to commercialise the project. There is a lack of representation of the necessary competences in the team of the applicant and the partners, which could jeopardise the management of the project and, if necessary, the quality control of outsourcing. The proposal does not adequately describe the contribution and responsibility of the applicant and the partners, if any, for the successful joint implementation of the project, and the financial capacity of the applicant and, where applicable, the partners to implement the project in a sustainable manner and to achieve the objectives and results of the project.
1.5	Interim assessment
1	There is very little potential and capacity for the applicant and the partners, if any, to commercialise the project. The team of the applicant and the partners does not have the necessary competences to manage the project and control the quality of outsourcing. It is not clear what the applicant and the partners, if any, will contribute and who will be responsible for the successful joint implementation of the project. The financial capacity of the project applicant and partners, if any, to sustainably implement the project and achieve its objectives and results is not clearly explained.
0.5	Interim assessment
0	The applicant and the partners do not have the potential and capacity to implement the project.
2. The project's technological justification, the applicant's ability to implement the project from a technological perspective (the novelty and technological advantages of a product, service, technology or process in comparison with similar products and the technological level of the development plan along with the descriptions of activities that will be carried out and the relevance of the schedule, the method by which the project will be implemented and its feasibility, the knowledge, skills and earlier experience of the research team in relation to industrial research and experimental development and the existence of infrastructure required for implementing the project are assessed): 30% of the overall score.	
2.1. The quality and methodology of the development plan (weight 30% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation
4	The developmental purpose of the project is well founded – there is a clearly defined problem, bottleneck or untapped development opportunity. The project is well suited to the five key characteristics of R&D: novelty, creativity, unpredictability, systemic nature and repeatability. The methods outlined in the development plan are relevant and modern. The technological level of the development plan is outstanding, and the implementation of the development plan will result in a significantly novel product/service/technology or process. The development plan is comprehensively thought through, fully meets the needs of the contracting authority, and its objectives and the methods for achieving them are realistic and achievable, taking into account the applicant's capacity and project preparation. The result of the project can be turned into a product and actually produced/created. The project or activities preceding the project have been recognised at international level (e.g. Horizon 2020, Innovation Award, etc).
3.5	Interim assessment

3	The development objectives of the project and the methods to achieve them are realistic but sometimes unclear. In general, the project meets the five key characteristics of R&D: novelty, creativity, unpredictability, systemic nature and repeatability. However, it needs additional explanation. The technological level of the development plan is good and the implementation of the development plan will result in a new product/service/technology or process for the company. The development plan's objectives and methods of achievement are generally realistic and likely to be achievable given the applicant's capacity and project preparation. The outcome of a project can probably be turned into a product and produced/created, but this will require the establishment of preconditions.
2.5	Interim assessment
2	The development objectives of the project and the methods to achieve them are sometimes unrealistic and unclear. In general, the project meets the five key characteristics of R&D: novelty, creativity, unpredictability, systemic nature and repeatability. However, it needs additional explanation. The technological level of the development plan is intermediate and the implementation of the development plan will lead to the renewal of an existing product/service/technology or process of the company. The goals and methods for reaching these goals are generally realistic, but are not likely to be reached, considering the preparations of the project and the applicant's competency. Turning the outcome of the project into a product and its production/creation is not clear or requires too large an investment compared to the economic results of the project.
1.5	Interim assessment
1	The development objectives of the project and the methods to achieve them are largely unrealistic and unclear. The project fails to meet one of the five key characteristics of R&D: novelty, creativity, unpredictability, systemic nature and repeatability. The technological level of the development plan cannot be considered innovative for the applicant; as a result of the development plan, an existing product/service/technology or process is somewhat renewed. The goals and methods for reaching these goals are unclear, but are not likely to be reached, considering the preparations of the project and the applicant's competency. Turning the outcome of the project into a product and its production/creation is not realistic or requires investments that are unreasonable compared to the potential economic results of the project.
0.5	Interim assessment
0	The development objectives of the project and the methods to achieve them are unrealistic. The project fails to meet the five key characteristics of R&D: novelty, creativity, unpredictability, systemic nature and repeatability. The technological level of the development plan does not involve innovation and is an ordinary activity developing an existing product/service/technology or process that does not require the involvement of specific expertise. The development plan does not meet the needs of the contracting authority and its objectives are unlikely to be achieved by the end of the project, considering the applicant's capacity and project preparation. The outcome of the project cannot be turned into a product, produced or created.
2.2. The level and competency of the person conducting research (weight 40% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation
4	The persons carrying out the R&D are highly capable, motivated and have the skills to ensure that the objectives of the development plan are fully realised and sustainable. The persons carrying out the R&D have carried out similar R&D activities in the same field as the project, including significant activities at international level. The leader of this project's R&D has previous experience in promoting cooperation between entrepreneurs and/or other organisations. The team compiled to carry out the project is capable and competent. The applicant or the provider of R&D services has the necessary infrastructure to carry out the development plan, as well as the capability to invest in it.
3.5	Interim assessment
3	The persons carrying out the R&D activities are capable and motivated, but do not have all the skills to ensure that the project's objectives are met and sustainable. The persons carrying out the R&D have carried out R&D activities in the same field. The team compiled for the implementation of the project may entail risks in some fields. The applicant or the R&D service provider owns or has the capacity to invest in a substantial part of the infrastructure needed to carry out the development plan.

2.5	Interim assessment
2	The capacity of the persons carrying out the R&D is not sufficient to ensure the realisation of the project's objectives or sustainability. The persons carrying out the R&D have limited experience in R&D activities in the field. The team compiled may pose risks in some areas of the project; it may be necessary to involve additional competencies. The capacity to carry out the project with the compiled team is not fully certain. The applicant or the R&D service provider has part of the infrastructure needed to carry out the development plan, but has limited further investment capacity.
1.5	Interim assessment
1	The capacity, motivation and skills of the persons carrying out the R&D to ensure the achievement of project objectives and sustainability are very low. The persons carrying out the R&D lack experience in carrying out R&D activities in the same field, the team set up is inadequate and/or the knowledge and skills of the project team are insufficient for carrying out the projects. The applicant or the R&D service provider lacks a substantial part of the infrastructure needed to carry out the project and has little capacity to invest in it.
0.5	Interim assessment
0	The persons carrying out the R&D activities do not have the capacity, motivation or skills to ensure that the project's objectives are achieved and sustained. The persons carrying out the R&D lack experience in carrying out R&D activities in the relevant field, the team set up is inadequate and/or the knowledge and skills of the project team are insufficient to carry out the projects. The applicant or the R&D service provider does not have the infrastructure required for the implementation of the project or the capacity to invest in it.
2.3. The description and schedule of project activities (weight 30% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation
4	All the activities described in the action plan form a coherent whole, appear necessary, are justified and ensure that the project's goals are met. The timely completion of the project is extremely likely.
3.5	Interim assessment
3	The action plan includes the necessary amount of activities and the activities are linked. The relevancy and justification of some activities in terms of achieving the goals of the project are questionable or activities are missing. The achievement of the project's goals and the timely implementation of the project are likely.
2.5	Interim assessment
2	The action plan contains activities of a scale that may not be sufficient, with little connection between the activities. The relevancy and justification of many activities as they pertain to the project's goals is questionable or many activities are missing. The achievement of the project's goals and the timely implementation of the project are not very likely.
1.5	Interim assessment
1	The activities found in the action plan are not sufficient for achieving the project's objectives. Some of the activities are redundant, i.e. not necessary to achieve the objectives of the project, or are missing. It is unlikely that the project can be carried out on time.
0.5	Interim assessment
0	The actions in the action plan do not allow for the objectives to be achieved. It is not possible to implement the project in time.
3. The compliance of the project with field-specific development plans, impact on the achievement of the special objective of the operational programme and the special objectives of the measure (the project's compliance with field-specific development plans, the project's impact on the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County and the creation of knowledge-intensive jobs in the county, the project's impact on the increase in enterprises' expenditure on R&D in Ida-Viru County, the project's impact on the growth of enterprises engaged in R&D in Ida-Viru County, the project's impact on the increase in the number of internationally competitive new or substantially modified technologies, processes, products and services of enterprises in Ida-Viru County are assessed) 25% of the total score.	
3.1. Impact of the project activities on the achievement of the specific objective of the Operational Programme and the objectives of the measure, including on the development of Ida-Viru County (weight 70% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation

4	The implementation of the project significantly supports the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County and the competitiveness of companies. The objectives set out in the project are fully in line with the objectives of the grant and their achievement is realistic according to the plans submitted. As a result of the implementation of the project, the share of the grant applicant's expenditure on R&D activities carried out in Ida-Viru County will increase significantly, resulting in the creation of jobs in the region. The company's added value per employee is higher than the average for the sector in Estonia following the creation of the pilot infrastructure. The number of companies engaged in R&D activities in Ida-Viru County will grow significantly through knowledge transfer within or across sectors. The implementation of the project will have a significant positive impact on the ability of companies in Ida-Viru County to invest in internationally competitive new or significantly modified technologies, processes, products or services.
3	The implementation of the project supports the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County and the competitiveness of companies. The objectives set out in the project are generally in line with the objectives of the grant and their achievement is realistic according to the plans submitted. As a result of the implementation of the project, the share of the grant applicant's expenditure on R&D activities carried out in Ida-Viru County will increase, resulting in the creation of jobs in the region. The number of companies engaged in R&D activities in Ida-Viru County will grow through knowledge transfer within or across sectors. The implementation of the project will have a positive impact on the ability of companies in Ida-Viru County to invest in internationally competitive new or significantly modified technologies, processes, products or services.
2	The implementation of the project somewhat supports the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County and the competitiveness of companies. The objectives set out in the project are generally in line with the objectives of the grant, but their achievement according to the submitted plans is not realistic. As a result of the implementation of the project, the share of the grant applicant's expenditure on R&D activities carried out in Ida-Viru County will increase somewhat, resulting in the creation of a few jobs in the region. The increase in the number of companies engaged in R&D activities in Ida-Viru County through knowledge transfer within or across sectors is questionable. The implementation of the project will have some impact on the ability of companies in Ida-Viru County to invest in internationally competitive new or significantly modified technologies, processes, products or services.
1	The implementation of the project supports the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County and the competitiveness of companies to a small extent. The compliance of the objectives set out in the project with the objectives of the grant is lacking and their achievement is questionable according to the plans submitted. As a result of the implementation of the project, the share of the grant applicant's expenditure on R&D activities carried out in Ida-Viru County will not increase and no new jobs will be created in the region as a result of this. It is not very likely that the number of companies engaged in R&D activities in Ida-Viru County will grow through knowledge transfer within or across sectors. The implementation of the project will have a small impact on the ability of companies in Ida-Viru County to invest in internationally competitive new or significantly modified technologies, processes, products or services.
0	The implementation of the project does not significantly support the diversification of the economy of Ida-Viru County or the competitiveness of companies. The objectives set out in the project are not in line with the objectives of the grant and their achievement is questionable according to the plans submitted. As a result of the implementation of the project, the share of the grant applicant's expenditure on R&D activities carried out in Ida-Viru County will not increase and no jobs will be created. The implementation of the project will have no impact on the ability of companies in Ida-Viru County to invest in internationally competitive new or significantly modified technologies, processes, products or services.
3.2. Contribution of the project to the goals of the smart specialisation focus area (the connection of the project with the road maps of the following RDIE focus areas is assessed: digital solutions in each area of life; health technologies and services; valorisation of food resources; valorisation of local resources (wood, natural resources, secondary raw materials and waste); smart and sustainable energy solutions) (weight 30% of the sub-criterion)	
Score	Explanation
4	The project contributes to the development of more than one RDIE focus area.

3	Interim assessment
2	The project contributes to the development of at least one RDIE focus area.
1	Interim assessment
0	The project does not contribute to the development of RDIE focus areas.
4. Cost-effectiveness of the project , which includes an assessment of the justification and cost-effectiveness of the project budget and the applicant's ability to finance the fixed costs of the project after completion. 5% of the overall score	
4	The project budget includes all expenses necessary to carry out the project. The budgeted costs of the activities are justified, transparent and cost-effective. The activities budgeted in the project are cost-effective in delivering results. The basis for establishing the budget is clear and transparent, and the planned expenditure is justified and reasonable for the implementation of the development activities. The applicant has a very good capacity to finance follow-up activities to bring the new product/service or technology to the market.
3	The project budget is reasonable, but is not transparent or cost effective. Some important activities from the project have not been budgeted. The basis for establishing the budget is clear and the planned expenditure is largely justified and reasonable for the implementation of the development activities. The applicant has a proven capacity to finance follow-up activities to bring the new product/service or technology to the market.
2	The project budget is in large part unjustified. It is unclear if the project budget will allow for the project to be carried out in full. The basis for establishing the budget are not clear and transparent, and the planned expenditure is partly unjustified and unreasonable for the implementation of the development activities. The applicant has sufficient capacity to finance follow-up activities to bring the new product/service or technology to the market.
1	The costs planned for project activities are mostly inefficient and do not allow for achieving the results of the project. The basis for establishing the budget is mostly unclear and not transparent, and the planned expenditure is largely unjustified and unreasonable for the development activities. The applicant has a small capacity to finance follow-up activities to bring the new product/service or technology to the market.
0	The costs planned for project activities are not cost-effective and do not allow for achieving the results of the project. The basis for establishing the budget is not transparent, and the planned expenditure is unjustified and unreasonable for the development activities. The applicant has no capacity to finance follow-up activities to bring the new product/service or technology to the market.
5. Compliance of the project with the fundamental principles and objectives of the long-term development strategy of Estonia , which includes an assessment of how the project contributes to the achievement of the objectives of horizontal principles related to the fundamental principles and objectives of the Estonia 2035 Strategy, thereby contributing to the corresponding indicator of the "Estonia 2035" strategy. 5% of the overall score	
<p>Upholding the fundamental principles of the Estonia 2035 Strategy and the achievement of its targets, balanced regional development, gender equality, equal opportunities, accessibility, environmental and climate objectives are assessed in a supportive manner with the following horizontal indicators:</p> <p>1) gender equality index – considering the gender aspect is appropriate if the product or service developed in the project is targeted at people and may have a different impact on women and men (e.g. medication, health diagnostics). Where differential impact is possible, the gender dimension must be taken into account in the implementation of the activities and the project will contribute to the gender equality index. The project will also contribute to the gender equality index if the jobs created as a result of the activities contribute to reducing the gender employment gap in the company and/or region. Further information: https://etag.ee/tegevused/sooloime/sooline-dimension-teadustoos/ and http://genderedinnovations.stanford.edu.</p> <p>2) the measure of care and cooperation – if the product or service developed within the scope of the project is aimed at helping at-risk groups (elderly, disabled, etc.), it contributes to the measure of care and cooperation. A caring society is attentive and helpful. Here, everyone has the opportunity for a lifetime of self-fulfilment, with the support network they need. Reconciling work, family and private life is supported,</p>	

everyone contributes to social and cultural activities regardless of their age, and people's well-being has improved. A cooperative society is based on a sense of belonging and the willingness of people to actively contribute to common goals and benefits. Every person, family, community and non-governmental organisation can and wants to participate and cooperate in the organisation of society.

3) accessibility indicator – if the product or service developed within the scope of the project is intended for use by the general public, accessibility must be ensured both physically and digitally for people with the four main types of special needs (mobility, visual, hearing and intellectual disabilities), in which case the project contributes to the accessibility measure. Further information: <https://ttja.ee/eraklient/tarbija-oigused/kaubandusteenused/digiligipaasetavuse-tagamine>; <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akt/115062022001>

4) gross domestic product per capita generated outside Harju County from the average of the European Union 27 – the company's activity is outside Harju County.

5) resource productivity and net greenhouse gas emissions in CO2 equivalents – the economic return in euros per kilogram of material. The development may be related to new technologies, local resources, the bio- and circular economy, development of environmentally friendly products and materials, reduction of waste generation or reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

4	The project contributes to two or more indicators of the Estonia 2035 Strategy
3	Interim assessment
2	The project contributes to at least one indicator of the Estonia 2035 Strategy
1	Interim assessment
0	The project does not contribute to the indicators of the Estonia 2035 strategy