

Call title:

Eureka Network projects

Evaluation Form

Technical & Technology Evaluation

Main applicant/member:

Project title:

Project Partner(s):

Technical & Technology Evaluator 1 (TTE1):

POINTS GUIDE	0 – 5 not enough	6 – 10 good	11 – 15 excellent
---------------------	------------------	-------------	-------------------

A. Impact	POINTS (0-15)	Comments as example (to be rewrite as original one)
A.1 Is the market properly addressed in terms of size, access and risk?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The product, process or service has a potentially very large and growing market with only limited near-term competition. This includes domination of a global niche market. ➤ The product, process or service has moderate market prospects in the near to medium-term, but the market will not expand subsequently and/or is open to competition. ➤ It is unlikely that a profitable market for the developed products, processes or services exists.
A.2 Is the value creation in terms of growth, employment, environmental and societal benefits properly addressed?		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The project will produce important tangible and intangible outcomes for both partners, leading to enhanced and value-added skill sets, competitiveness and good-will. ➤ The project will produce moderate outcomes for both partners that will lead to some enhanced and value-added skill sets, competitiveness and good-will. ➤ It is unlikely that the project will create any added value.

<p>A.3 What would be the competitive advantages resulting from the project?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The near-term achievements of the project should lead to a long lasting, world-class competitive position in vital, strategic business areas for one or more of the partners. The achievements support competitiveness of existing key products or new related products. The project activities give access to highly important collaboration in the value chain. ➤ The near-term achievements of the project should lead to an increase in competitiveness in strategic business areas for one or more of the partners. The achievements support to some extent the sale of existing products or form the basis for an extension of the total life cycle of these. The project will create new opportunities in the value chain for some of the partners. ➤ The results of the project will have little influence on the competitive position of the partners.
<p>A.4 Are the commercialization plans clear and realistic?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The product, process or service has a potentially very large and growing market with clear and realistic commercialization plans. ➤ The product, process or service has moderate commercialization plans, but the market will not expand subsequently and/or is open to competition. ➤ It is unlikely that a commercialization of the developed products, processes or services will be possible.
<p>TOTAL A</p>	<p>=</p>	

B. Excellence	POINTS (0-15)	Comments as example (to be rewrite as original one)
<p style="text-align: center;">B.1 What is the degree of innovation?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The innovation is based on the latest research results and technological developments, is radically new and is superior to comparable solutions. New, or vastly improved, industries are likely to be generated. ➤ The innovation should result in a product, process or service that is better than comparable solutions and it brings visible development to existing industry or introduces minor new niches. ➤ The innovation is unlikely to lead to a new or significantly improved product, process or service.
<p style="text-align: center;">B.2 How is the new knowledge going to be used?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The partnership creates much synergy and adds considerably to the qualifications of each partner. There is potentially extensive exchange of knowledge between the partners. ➤ The partnership creates a degree of synergy and at least some partners should raise their competencies. ➤ The partnership will create no synergy and there are no prospects for knowledge exchange / added qualifications.

<p>B.3 Is the project challenging scientifically, technically and for the partners?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed technological solution represents a potential breakthrough that carries a high impact, primarily due to its data-driven value and non-invasiveness. Although the novelty and high dimensionality of data inherently brings some risks, project partners have substantial complementary forefront expertise regarding the technology area in question. ➤ The proposed technological solution represents a potential breakthrough that carries a medium impact, primarily due to its data-driven value and non-invasiveness. There are some risks to be tackled regarding the technology area in question. ➤ The proposed technological solution represents no potential breakthrough that carries low or no impact, primarily due to several risks.
<p>B.4 Are technical achievability & risks conveniently addressed?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The risks are addressed in a proper manner. Mitigation measures and activities are presented as well in a manner that specific measures to reduce risk have been clearly identified. ➤ The risks are addressed in a moderate way with some mitigation measures and activities proposed. ➤ Not all the risks were taken into consideration and there is no clear approach related to mitigation measures.
<p>TOTAL B</p>	<p>=</p>	

C. Quality & efficiency of the implementation	POINTS (0-15)	Comments as example (to be rewrite as original one)
<p>C.1 Quality of the consortium.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Both partners possess key skills to reach project objectives, as well as ample strategic and commercial interest to carry out the project. Technology and expertise provided by one company are not available in the other, resulting in complementary qualifications. ➤ The partners have reasonable qualifications to reach project targets, but the participants are capable of improvement. ➤ The partnership lacks sufficient expertise overall to array out the project. There is a risk of conflicting goals.
<p>C.2 Is there added value through international co-operation?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The partnership will generate a fair amount of synergy, which means both partners will raise their capabilities due to exchange of technological knowledge and know-how. Partners also plan to establish a network and contacts necessary for continued development of technologies and products. ➤ The partnership creates a degree of synergy and at least some partners should raise their competencies. ➤ The partnership will create no added value.

<p style="text-align: center;">C.3 Are project management & planning realistic and clearly defined?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A project manager with a proven track record will lead the project. Very substantial managerial /coordination skills are available throughout the partnership. ➤ Adequate experience in project management is available within the partnership but the overall managerial resources are limited. At least one partner has managerial skills to exploit results. ➤ The overall project manager has no relevant track record or experience. There is no overall coordinated structure within the partnership. ➤ The methodology is precisely formulated and all key aspects of the project planning have been taken account of. ➤ A satisfactory methodology has been outlined, but not all aspects have been rigorously demonstrated. Project organisation breakdown of cost and resources to activity level, market analysis as well as assumptions and risks are part of the planning but not at a fully satisfactory level. Considerations concerning exploitation and marketing are adequate and have the potential to be strengthened during the project. ➤ The methodology is incoherent, and / or unrealistic and / or incomplete.
--	---

<p>C.4 Is the cost structure reasonable?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The estimated cost structure fully meets the demands of the proposed project, and the amounts are realistic in accordance with the working plan. The output is feasible within the proposed budget and the projected time frame, with very small probability that additional costs will be incurred for the ongoing development and subsequent solution refinement. ➤ Cost structure and their height fully meet the needs of development of the underlying project. The total cost of development is realistic given the amount and duration. The probability that the ongoing development will be necessary for additional cost is very low. The present development is feasible within a certain budget. ➤ Cost structure and their height → does not correspond to the needs of the development of the underlying project. It is necessary to correct and add or remove some types of expenses. But the total cost of development is within + - 20% of the total budget which is allowable. The development is viable within the projected years. ➤ Cost structure and their height → does not correspond to the needs of the development of the underlying project. It is necessary to correct and add or remove some types of expenses. The total cost of development is not within + - 20% of the total budget and it is not allowable (too low or too high). The development is not feasible within the projected years.
<p>TOTAL C</p>	<p>=</p>	

TOTAL A	=	Comment if applicable
TOTAL B	=	Comment if applicable
TOTAL C	=	Comment if applicable

TOTAL POINTS FOR TECHNICAL TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION		Comment if applicable
TOTAL (A + B + C)	=	

Zagreb,

Technical & Technology Evaluator 1 (TTE1)

.....