

Guidance for panel members

Assessing HERA project proposals against merit criteria

Research / service quality – 30 points	
Questions to consider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How extensively has this been assessed elsewhere and what is the prior art? • What is the level of novelty and technical difficulty? • Will this lead to publication in high quality publications? • What is the likelihood of attracting external competitive funding? • What is the experience/reputation of the key researchers? • What is the level of technical challenge/? <p>For dissemination projects (e.g. training, software):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will this project improve the quality of services that HERA provides, such that it is best practice delivery? • How will this project lead to improved operational efficiency/productivity of HERA services?
Rating guidance	<p>1 – 7 Lacking innovation and novelty, work done elsewhere, no publication likely, won't improve existing services.</p> <p>8 – 15 Low levels of innovation and novelty, publication in low level publications, new to steel industry in NZ, slight improvements to services.</p> <p>16 – 22 Moderate levels of innovation and novelty, moderate likelihood of winning competitive funding, publication in local publications, new to New Zealand, moderate improvements to services.</p> <p>23-30 High levels of innovation and novelty, new to world, highly regarded research team, publication in international publications, services to become best practice.</p>

Research impact – 40 points	
Questions to consider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this contribute to the development of evidence-based standards? • Will this lead to patents/IP/software with commercial outcomes? • Will this lead to positive changes in industry practice? • How many members will benefit from this research? • Will this research make the industry more competitive and/or productive? • Will this support industry to respond to disruption? • Will this support industry to take advantage of an emerging opportunity? • Will this enable differentiation of member companies? • What evidence is there of membership support for this project?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What evidence is there to show this will be important? • Will this lead to more steel sales and tonnes? • Will this lead to measurable national benefits for NZ? • Will this increase steel intensity? • Will this improve the productivity of member companies? • If this work was not done, would there be safety or reputational damage?
Rating guidance	<p>1 – 10 Will benefit a single member, deliverables won't be broadly relevant, unlikely to lead to changes in practice, lack of industry buy-in, no increase in steel tonnes, no other national benefits.</p> <p>11 – 20 Will benefit a small number of members, deliverables will have limited relevance, minor changes to practices likely to occur, limited industry buy-in, minimal increase in steel tonnes (10s), limited national benefits.</p> <p>21 – 30 Will benefit a broad range of members, will lead to potential new IP, moderate increase in steel tonnes (100s), increased industry competitiveness/resilience, several national benefits.</p> <p>31 – 40 Strong membership support, will lead to increased competitiveness, new IP developed with strong commercial value for HERA/members, will enable disruption or transformation, strong increase in steel tonnes (1000s), step-change in differentiation/resilience, significant national benefits, members committing significant resources to project, key stakeholders (e.g. SCNZ) strong support.</p>

Alignment with HERA strategy – 30 points

Questions to consider	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What specific HERA strategy(ies) does this align with? • What divisional strategies does this align with? • Has this been identified as a priority by the HERA Executive?
Rating guidance	<p>1 – 7 No alignment. This project shouldn't be put forward for consideration unless there's a belief that the strategy hasn't picked up on an emerging opportunity.</p> <p>8 – 15 Doesn't directly align. May support an aligning initiative.</p> <p>16 – 22 Aligns reasonably well with strategy.</p> <p>23 – 30 Direct links with strategy can be identified. Aligns with priority initiatives identified by the HERA Executive.</p>