

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)



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 cuprofiling, 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.





Embedded System Design & Applications Laboratory