

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

**Note:** The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring, and explained in the comments.

**Clarity and pertinence of the objectives**

**Credibility of the proposed approach**

**Soundness of the concept**

**Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures**

*The project falls within the call scope. The objectives are set out clearly and can be considered in line with the call. Special emphasis is made on cross-disciplinary interactions, bringing all relevant stakeholders together, identifying and eliminating barriers, organizing technology transfer, promoting expert and public awareness, and strengthening the science-policy and the science-society interface. The objectives are also in line with the EU Association Agreements with Eastern Partnership countries and the policy background of the proposal is clearly set out (both at EU level, globally and regionally).*

*The proposed approach is partially credible by bringing together and better coordinating research and innovation actions within Europe and in the target region. Having said that, much text has been spent on general policy issues, and the link to the way these are actually dealt with in the project's workplan is not straightforward. Moreover, the proposal lacks details on the methodological aspects.*

*Another shortcoming is the link to existing networks and initiatives which is defined adequately (Enterprise Europe Network, Danube Transfer Centres, KIC) but could have included other networks. The list of EU-funded projects, on the other hand, supposedly relevant for Green Economy issues (1.3.6) is sometimes off track (including also projects on food-security in Mediterranean countries or biodiversity conservation) and mostly - list projects which do not necessarily include project partners.*

*The underlying concept is sound as it focuses on raising awareness of, and increasing cooperation on, green economy research and innovation, and technological and social innovation.*

*The good quality of the coordination and support measures is demonstrated by the following measures, which are:*

- *The GE Panel, which will advise the consortium with a Needs and Barriers Analysis;*
- *Actors and Barriers Analysis*
- *Pilot Action for policymakers using foresight to lead to GE roadmaps*
- *Project networks linked to international GE networks*
- *A project portal with a networks database*
- *New EU-ECP R&I networks*
- *Framework for long-lasting cooperation*
- *Brokerage events and twinning project*
- *Two new technology transfer centres, leading to five new Climate KIC proposals*
- *Five reports in targeted countries on GE social innovation*
- *A mini-grant scheme as a pilot project*
- *Various communication activities, including awareness-raising and a social media presence.*

Score: **2.50** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

**Note:** The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:

**The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic**

**Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant**

*Most impacts listed in the work programme are covered although in some cases not enough details are provided. The proposal can be expected to deliver the impacts required by the EC in the geographical context of the Eastern Partnership Countries (EPC), with indirect impact on the broader international level. On the other hand, it does not discuss the need for dissemination for an improved science-policy interface, or the Green Economy relevance.*

*The narrowing down of the geographical scope, however, will undermine the achievement of some of the more global impact foreseen in the call, such as demonstrated improved science based evidence in support of sustainability, decision making at national, regional and global level. This is considered by the panel as a serious weakness.*

*The expected impact of "Greater EU influence in multilateral processes and better support to implementation of international commitments" is feasible only to some extent. The policy dimension in the partnership is limited, as it seems able to support only the implementation of international commitments of both the EaP countries and the EU, but not to support (green) policy dialogue at the global level.*

*The plans for dissemination and communication are clearly described in the proposal. The partnership includes specific partners experienced in this kind of activities, which enhances their potential impact. Two separate WP were devised for this purpose: one more related to general communication issues while the other aimed at increasing awareness of the issue at stake and enhance policy impact. The list of identified stakeholder groups and of tools to be used is wide ranging and the approach to dissemination is clear. Having said that efforts are based on traditional tools.*

Score: **3.00** (Threshold: 3.00/- , Weight: -)

**Note:** The following aspects will be taken into account:

**Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources**

**Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)**

**Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management**

*The overall work plan is coherent and could be effective.*

*However, there is a number of shortcomings on the description of some concrete tasks which are not always clear, such as:*

*(i) Task 2.2 entails data gathering on actors, policies and funding opportunities, but not on similar initiatives or projects (which is done actually in Task 3.1). The rationale behind the decision to divide the two activities is not clear.*

*(ii) Task 2.5 mentions a public consultation to identify needs and barriers linked to green economy in Europe and in EaP countries. At the same time, the "public" to be consulted will be the stakeholders identified in 2.2 which are not so "general", but rather technical in nature.*

*(iii) Assessing the potential effectiveness of the dialogues in WP3 is difficult. It is not clear how many webinars will be organised and what is the target number of participants in each (and from which countries).*

*(iv) Task 4.2 aims at creating a new cross-sectorial Cluster on the green economy. It is not clear what this cluster will actually be.*

*(v) Also the description of Task 4.3 - Innovation and Technology Transfer Centers, while highly interesting and potentially useful, is not described very clearly.*

*(vi) Task 6.4 (Relations with other multipliers and support projects) does not provide concrete information on how this will be done.*

*Task allocation is reasonable but resource allocation raises some concerns: for instance, the mapping activity and the drafting of the Needs and Barriers report - WP2 - require*