

INDICATIVE EVALUATION RUBRICS



INDICATIVE EVALUATION RUBRICS

This document sets out the indicative evaluation rubrics for scoring applications under the AI4GreenDeal Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP) scheme, covering both the Energy Impact Scholarships and the DED Scholarships (DEI, Entrepreneurship and Digital Champions strands). The rubrics translate the criteria published in the FSTP call text into consistent, weighted scoring guidance and should be read alongside that call text on the EU Funding and Tenders Portal. They are indicative rather than exhaustive: evaluators are expected to apply them consistently to all applicants within the same admission cycle, score only on the information submitted, and exercise academic judgement where a profile does not map neatly onto a single band, while maintaining equal treatment throughout.

These rubrics support transparency, consistency and equal treatment. Evaluators apply them consistently to all applicants in the same admission cycle, score only on the information submitted, and may exercise academic judgement for diverse profiles while maintaining equal treatment.

FSTP recipients must be natural persons who are citizens of a country eligible under the Digital Europe Programme — namely the EU Member States and the third countries associated to, or otherwise participating in, the Programme. List is as follows:

EU Member States and Associated Digital Europe Programme (DEP) Countries: 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, Iceland, Norway, Liechtenstein, Switzerland.

Other Eligible Non-EU Countries: Albania, Algeria, Armenia, Argentina, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Georgia, India, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Libya, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Morocco, North Macedonia, Palestine, Serbia, Singapore, South Korea, Syria, Taiwan, Tunisia, Ukraine, United States.

A1.1 Energy Impact Scholarships (score 1–10 per criterion)

1. Relevance and content of previous degree(s) (weight 3)

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
9–10	Highly relevant background; excellent preparation directly aligned with programme outcomes and prerequisites.
7–8	Relevant background; strong preparation; most prerequisites covered.
5–6	Moderately relevant; partial alignment; some prerequisites missing.

3–4	Limited relevance; insufficient preparation in key areas.
1–2	Not relevant; does not meet expected preparation.

2. Academic performance / study success (GPA) (weight 2)

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
9–10	Outstanding, top-ranking results; consistently excellent across relevant subjects.
7–8	Very good, strong and consistent results.
5–6	Good, satisfactory overall.
3–4	Below expectations or inconsistent.
1–2	Weak, with significant deficiencies.

3. Quality and recognition of awarding university (weight 2)

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
9–10	Highly recognised, internationally reputable institution in the field.
7–8	Well-recognised institution, good reputation and quality.
5–6	Acceptable standards and recognition.
3–4	Limited recognition or unclear standing.
1–2	Insufficient recognition / accreditation concerns.

4. Non-academic credentials (weight 3)

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
9–10	Exceptional profile: leadership, innovation, entrepreneurship, highly relevant experience, outstanding motivation.
7–8	Strong profile: relevant extracurriculars, internships, leadership or motivation.
5–6	Adequate profile with some relevant activity.
3–4	Limited relevant engagement or experience.
1–2	Very weak or insufficient relevance.

Final ranking score = Σ (criterion score $\times$ weight); maximum 100.

AI.2 DED Scholarships (score 1–5 per criterion)

DEI — Criterion 1: Country of origin (positive action under DEP Countries):

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Tier 1 — Syria, Palestine, India, Egypt, Tunisia, Morocco, Jordan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Algeria, Libya, Ukraine
4	Tier 2 — Azerbaijan, Moldova, Armenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, North Macedonia, Brazil, Albania, Argentina, Mexico, Montenegro, Serbia
3	Tier 3 — Bulgaria, Romania, Hungary, Latvia, Greece, Croatia, Slovakia, Poland, Portugal, Japan, Lithuania, South Korea, Estonia
2	Tier 4 — Czech Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Taiwan, Cyprus, Italy, France, Malta, Finland, Canada, Belgium, Germany, Austria
1	Tier 5 — Israel, Sweden, Australia, Netherlands, Denmark, United States, Norway, Singapore, Iceland, Switzerland, Ireland, Luxembourg, Liechtenstein

*Country Prioritisation Methodology

To ensure the Financial Support to Third Parties (FSTP) scheme reaches students from the least economically advantaged eligible countries, the 61 countries eligible under the



AI4GreenDeal FSTP scheme (EU and Associated DEP countries, plus eligible non-EU countries) have been clustered into five priority tiers based on GDP per capita. GDP per capita, rather than total GDP, was chosen as the basis for clustering because it reflects a country's average standard of living and economic development, independent of population size. Total GDP would misrepresent relative advantage — for example, ranking India or Brazil as "high-GDP" purely due to population scale, despite comparatively low average income. GDP per capita therefore gives a more accurate signal of the economic disadvantage the FSTP scheme is intended to address.

Data source: IMF World Economic Outlook, April 2026 (nominal GDP per capita, current US\$).

Countries were ranked by GDP per capita and divided into five roughly equal tiers. Tier 1 represents countries with the lowest GDP per capita and therefore the highest FSTP priority; Tier 5 represents countries with the highest GDP per capita and therefore the lowest priority.

DEI — Criterion 2: Contribution to / experience in diversity and inclusion

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Extensive, clearly demonstrated D&I engagement, advocacy, leadership or community impact.
4	Strong involvement with demonstrated or sustained impact.
3	Moderate participation in D&I activities.
2	Limited evidence of involvement.
1	No meaningful contribution.

DEI — Criterion 3: Gender balance contribution

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Significantly improves gender balance in the programme or sector, esp. under-represented groups/disciplines.
4	Contributes positively to gender-diversity objectives.
3	Moderately contributes to gender balance.
2	Limited contribution.
1	No identifiable contribution.

DEI — Criterion 4: Quality and relevance of motivation video

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Exceptionally clear, structured and compelling; strong motivation, communication and alignment.
4	Clear and convincing; good motivation and relevance.
3	Adequately explains motivation and background.
2	Lacks clarity, structure or relevance.
1	Incomplete, unclear or off topic.

Entrepreneurship — Criterion 1: Start-up and entrepreneurial experience

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Successfully founded/managed/contributed to a start-up with demonstrated impact, growth or innovation.
4	Strong entrepreneurial experience: participation, leadership or business development.

3	Moderate exposure via projects, initiatives or early-stage ventures.
2	Limited experience.
1	No demonstrated experience.

Entrepreneurship — Criterion 2: Quality and relevance of motivation video

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Exceptionally clear, structured and compelling; strong motivation, communication and alignment.
4	Clear and convincing; good motivation and relevance.
3	Adequately explains motivation and background.
2	Lacks clarity, structure or relevance.
1	Incomplete, unclear or off topic.

Digital Champions — Criterion 1: Project experience in digital innovation, energy or sustainability

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Outstanding project experience: advanced digital skills applied to energy/sustainability with measurable impact.
4	Strong digital project experience and relevant technical competence.
3	Moderate experience in digital/innovation projects.
2	Limited relevant experience.
1	No demonstrated relevant experience.

Digital Champions — Criterion 2: Quality and relevance of motivation video

Score	Indicative assessment guideline
5	Exceptionally clear, structured and compelling; strong motivation, communication and alignment.
4	Clear and convincing; good motivation and relevance.
3	Adequately explains motivation and background.
2	Lacks clarity, structure or relevance.
1	Incomplete, unclear or off topic.