

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

# Things to avoid when preparing a proposal

(based on reviews of submitted proposal)

**Christos Antonopoulos Technical Manager of Smart4All** 



## 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.

#### Innovation level description

- The project is not ambitious enough to stand out.
- Does not make the operative added value so clear.
- 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

## 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
- 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

## 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 potential competitors are not clear
  - What market share they cover
  - How the new product has better market potential

# 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.
- Economic information are missing.



# 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.

## Implementation/Team

How the work is divided among the team members

- Limited information about the dedicated team and the partners is provided.
- 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 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.



