



SELSUSTAINED CROSS-BORDER CUSTOMIZED
CYBERPHYSICAL SYSTEM EXPERIMENTS
FOR CAPACITY BUILDING AMONG EUROPEAN STAKEHOLDERS

Things to avoid when preparing a proposal

(based on reviews of submitted proposals)

Christos Antonopoulos

University of Peloponnese

SMART4ALL Technical Manager



Co-funded by the Horizon 2020 programme
of the European Union

DT-ICT-01-2019
Smart Anything Everywhere Area 2

www.smart4all-project.eu
Grant Agreement: 872614

Excellence

Experiment description/Innovation/Soundness



- **Experiment description**

- **The potentials** that the project has in a broader perspective are not mentioned or adequately highlighted
- How the proposed solution/system/idea **compares to competing** solutions/systems/ideas
- Failure to clearly describe **the technical specifications** of the solution and **its practical implementation**.
- Project **objectives should be made clear**

- **Innovation level description**

- The project is **not ambitious enough** to stand out.
- Does not make the operative **added value** so clear.
- The impact on the market is yet questionable.

- **How the participating organizations will interact to achieve a successful outcome**

- The **competences** of the partner are strongly **correlated** to the project **challenges**.
- The **end user** is not sufficiently explained
- Required further **steps to reach other clients** is not mentioned.

Impact/Market

Define the Target Market and its size. Be precise



- The **market analysis** of the proposed solution is **not distinct** enough.
 - **potential customers** around the world are not identified
 - generic analysis without **specific numbers** about the specific target market
 - the **target customers** are not defined
 - the **need** for such a product should be better **emphasized**.
- More information should be provided on the **positive effect** of the collaboration also for the technology provider and receiver.
- SMEs do not show how they intend to **grow its customer base** based on the experiment.
- **Benefits** identified are **related only** to **economic** aspects → More **multifaceted analysis increases** overall impact
- **Operational KPIs** are not provided

Impact/Competition

PAE technology is included in other products/services?



- **Competition description is abstract and in general terms**
 - It is not shown what is on the market now and **who is offering what**.
 - How it is intended to **disrupt the market share** or target a different customer segment
 - The **added value** of the proposed solution is missing.
 - The analysis lacks quantitative indicators on the competitive advantage
- **The potential competitors are not clear**
 - What **market share they** cover
 - How the new product has **better market potential**
 - not clear on the degree of competition and whether there are already entrenched competitors in the space

Impact/Commercial Strategy and Scalability

Pricing model and projected revenues

- **Benefits** for the technology receiver are not clear



- The impact for the technological receiver remains not sufficiently described nor foreseen.

- **Economic impact** and job creation per partner are not fully envisaged.

- **Future projections** and associated hypotheses are not included.

- The proposal lacks a description of the strategy that the technology receiver plans to implement in order to address the target market and how they plan to implement their business.

- **Economic information** are missing.

- An identification of the value chain and stakeholders, as well as the customer profiling, is not included.



Implementation/Workplan

Workpackages, tasks, deliverables, and responsibilities

- The proposed workplan is **too generic**.
 - **PMs** are **not indicated**.
 - The **relation** between **partners** and **activities** is not present is **missing**
 - **No clear/Convincing** indication of the **time-line**
 - A specific structure of WPs, tasks and deliverables are missing.
 - The workplan does not specify deliverables and milestones.
- The workplan has **logical errors**
 - In WP4 is led by X academic partner and the leading partner only dedicates 1 PM to that.
 - Unbalanced budget and requested funds.
 - The timeline exceeds however the maximum duration of a FTTE



Implementation/Team


How the work is divided among the team members

- **Limited information** about the dedicated team and the partners is provided.
 - Individual team roles are not described.
- The **management and leadership qualities** of the promoters are not presented.



Implementation/Resources

Costs (in PMs) for every partner, for every workpackage, and task

- **No or limited** information about the allocated **PMs per WP** is provided. 
- The **budget distribution is unbalanced** towards the technology receiver.
- **Better connection** to the activities and deliverables might have been stated.



