

Evaluation Summary Report

Total score: 8.50 (Threshold: 10.00)

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

Interpretation of the score:

0— The proposal **fails to address the criterion** or **cannot be assessed** due to **missing or incomplete** information.

1— **Poor.** **The criterion is inadequately addressed**, or there are serious **inherent weaknesses**.

2— **Fair.** The proposal **broadly addresses** the criterion, but there are **significant weaknesses**.

3— **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion **well**, but a **number of shortcomings** are present.

4— **Very good.** The proposal **addresses the criterion very well**, but a **small number of shortcomings** are present.

5— **Excellent.** The proposal **successfully addresses all relevant aspects** of the criterion. **Any shortcomings are minor.**

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **2.50** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

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

Based on a mapping of European SME clusters, the proposal aims to foster the development of business networks and cross-fertilisation among ICT and CI industry players, through the provision of an online platform, combined with a series of networking and brokerage events, personalised consulting engagements and investor readiness webinars.

*The objectives of the proposal are **within the scope** of the call. **However**, they are **poorly articulated** with respect to the specific requirements for Coordination and Support Actions within this call.*

*The proposal demonstrates a **good understanding of the sectors** it is attempting to address and offers **a valuable combination** of mapping the CI and ICT SME landscape with the provision of personalised consulting. **However**, other aspects of the concept are **not adequately developed**. In particular, the role and function of the web portal, a core component for stakeholder interaction, are **not sufficiently elaborated**.*

*The proposed approach does **not adequately address** the **operational challenges** of creating and developing a business ecosystem.*

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **2.50** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

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

*The proposal addresses the impacts of the work programme and offers **quantitative targets**. **However**, the estimated figures on SME engagement and establishment of business relationships **lack appropriate grounding and justification**. While the proposal mentions the engagement of potential innovation multipliers, **concrete actions** for their integration and **sustainability are not specified**.*

*The proposed dissemination plan is generally well explained and applies **various approaches** for reaching out to stakeholders, taking into account their diversity. **However**, the plan **relies heavily on** user-generated content **without including adequate provisions** for fostering content generation and managing it.*

*The communication strategy is **appropriate**.*

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

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 proposed work plan and allocation of resources are **generally appropriate** for the stated **goals**. **However**, the proposal does **not pay sufficient attention** to the **timing** and **interdependencies** of some of the WPs and tasks, in particular as regards the **integration** between activities of WP2 and those of WPs 4 and 5. Furthermore, **justification of subcontracting** costs is provided only for participant 3 but not for participant 5.*

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium is good, and overall, the consortium is credible. Project Management is well defined with clearly identified roles and responsibility assignments. Risk management is appropriate.

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: **Yes**