



This project is co-financed by the
European Union and the Republic of Turkey
Bu proje Avrupa Birliđi ve Türkiye Cumhuriyeti tarafından
finanse edilmektedir



Technical Assistance for Turkey in Horizon 2020 Phase-II
EuropeAid/139098/1H/SER/TR

Horizon Europe Calls & Proposal Documents

General & Introductory Training in Horizon Europe
for Cluster 3: Civil Security for Society

Adamantios Koumpis

Online, 26 May 2021

Photo by Christian Lue on Unsplash



REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY
AND TECHNOLOGY



Topics to cover:

- Work Programme & Call Documents
- Admissibility & Eligibility
- Financial & Operational capacity
- Award criteria & Procedure
- **Proposal Template**
- Model Grant Agreement

Structure and format

1. Introduction - setting the context
2. Deficiencies of the old proposal templates
3. Comparison of old and new templates
4. Suggestions on how to proceed
5. Conclusions and take away messages

1. Introduction – context setting

- Templates are important – ***not only a technicality***
- Form follows function
- Trade offs:
- too (much) scientific
- too (much) industry
- too (much) sale pitch
- Compromise: accommodate all above aspects even partly
- With a bad template several hundreds of people will ... suffer
- A good template shall help all write better proposals and – ***very important***: help people ***build better learning curves***

2. Deficiencies of the old templates

1.1 Objectives

- Describe the overall and specific objectives for the project, which should be clear, measurable, realistic and achievable within the duration of the project. Objectives should be consistent with the expected exploitation and impact of the project (see section 2).

1.2 Relation to the work programme

- Indicate the work programme topic to which your proposal relates, and explain how your proposal addresses the specific challenge and scope of that topic, as set out in the work programme.

1.3 Concept and methodology

(a) Concept

- Describe and explain the overall concept underpinning the project. Describe the main ideas, models or assumptions involved. Identify any inter-disciplinary considerations and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge. Where relevant, include measures taken for public/societal engagement on issues related to the project. Describe the positioning of the project e.g. where it is situated in the spectrum from 'idea to application', or from 'lab to market'. Refer to Technology Readiness Levels where relevant. (See [General Annex G of the work programme](#));

2. Deficiencies (cont'd)

(b) Methodology

- Describe and explain the overall methodology, distinguishing, as appropriate, activities indicated in the relevant section of the work programme, e.g. for research, demonstration, piloting, first market replication, etc.

1.4 Ambition

- Describe the advance your proposal would provide beyond the state-of-the-art, and the extent the proposed work is ambitious.
- Describe the innovation potential (**e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models**) which the proposal represents. Where relevant, refer to products and services already available on the market. Please refer to the results of any patent search carried out.

3. Comparison of old and new templates

- **OLD:** 70 pages
- **New:** 45 pages (but...)
- **OLD:** Section 1 (Excellence): 4 subsections
- **New:** Section 1 (Excellence): 2 subsections (but...)
- **OLD:** Section 2 (Impact): 2 Sections
- **New:** Section 2 (Impact): 2 'old' + one new: Impact canvas
- **OLD:** Section 3 (Implementation): 4 Sections
- **New:** Section 3 (Qual. & effic. of implem.): 2 Sections

Value Proposition Canvas

Designed for:

KER Name

Designed by:

Name1, Name2, ...

Date:

DD/MM/YYYY

Version:

X.Y

Product

Benefits

A benefit is what your product does for the customer. The benefits are the ways that the features make your customer's life easier by increasing pleasure or decreasing pain. The benefits of your product are the really core of your value proposition. The best way to list out the benefits of your product on the canvas is to imagine all the ways that your product makes your customer's life better.

Features

A feature is a factual description of how your product works. The features are the functioning attributes of your product. The features also provide the 'reasons to believe'. Many FMCG marketers deride the importance of features because features are no longer a point of difference in most FMCG marketing. But for technology products and innovative new services the features on offer can still be an important part of your value proposition.

Experience

The product experience is the way that owning your product makes the customer feel. It's the sum total of the combined features and benefits. Product experience is different to features and benefits because it's more about the emotional reasons why people buy your product and what it means for them in their own lives. The product experience is the kernel that will help identify the market positioning and brand essence that is usually built out of the value proposition.



Customer

Wants

The emotional drivers of decision making are things that we want to be, do or have. Our wants are usually conscious (but aspirational) thoughts about how we'd like to improve our lives. They sometimes seem like daydreams but they can be powerful motivators of action. The wants speak more to the pull of our hearts and our emotions.

Fears

Fears can be a strong driver of purchasing behaviour and can be the hidden source of wants and needs. For any product there is a secret "pain of switching". Even if your product is better than the competition, it might not be a big enough improvement to overcome the inertia of the status quo.

Needs

The customer's needs are the rational things that the customer needs to get done. Interestingly, needs are not always conscious. Customers can have needs that they may not know about yet. Designers call these "latent needs". The needs speak more to the pull of our heads and rational motivations.

Product

Name your product or service

Ideal Customer

Name your ideal customer

Substitutes

These are not just the obvious competitors, but also existing behaviours and coping mechanisms. Remember that people made it this far in life without your product. If your product isn't better than the existing solutions then you don't have a real-world value proposition.

The HE Impact canvas

- **Caution:** It is meant to be a *summary*



- It consists of six parts:

1. Specific needs
2. Expected results
3. D&E&C measures
4. Target groups
5. Outcomes
6. Impacts

See is to believe...

TARGET GROUPS

Who will use or further up-take the results of the project? Who will benefit from the results of the project?

Example 1

9 European airports:

Schiphol, Brussels airport, etc.

The European Union aviation safety agency.

Air passengers (indirect).

Example 2

End-users: consumers of electronic devices.

Major electronic companies: Samsung, Apple, etc.

Scientific community (field of transparent electronics).

OUTCOMES

What change do you expect to see after successful dissemination and exploitation of project results to the target group(s)?

Example 1

Up-take by airports: 9 European airports adopt the advanced forecasting system demonstrated during the project.

Example 2

High use of the scientific discovery published (measured with the relative rate of citation index of project publications).

A major electronic company (Samsung or Apple) **exploits/uses the new product** in their manufacturing.

IMPACTS

What are the expected wider scientific, economic and societal effects of the project contributing to the expected impacts outlined in the respective destination in the work programme?

Example 1

Scientific: New breakthrough scientific discovery on passenger forecast modelling.

Economic: Increased airport efficiency
Size: 15% increase of maximum passenger capacity in European airports, leading to a 28% reduction in infrastructure expansion costs.

Example 2

Scientific: New breakthrough scientific discovery on transparent electronics.

Economic/Technological: A new market for touch enabled electronic devices.

Societal: Lower climate impact of electronics manufacturing (including through material sourcing and waste management).

The basic notions



Final remarks for the impact canvas

- It is not as 'easy' as it seems...
- Needs hands-on practice
- Don't forget: practice makes the master!
- Ideal: to be composed with interaction amongst partners
- Also: ***it needs time*** – it is not wise to leave for the last moment
- Even better: Ideal to ***start your proposal from this section*** and then build and elaborate on the other parts!

Other points of the new template

- **New** Section 1.1 Objectives and ambition:
- Combines and integrates following of the old template:
- **OLD** Section 1.1 Objectives
- **OLD** Section 1.2 Relation to the work programme
- **OLD** Section 1.3a Concept
- **OLD** Section 1.4 Ambition
- And all these in only (as suggested) 4 pages!
- (Don't dare to come up with an estimate how many pages were used for these sections as of today...)

Other points (cont'd)

- **New** Section 1.2 Methodology
- Corresponds to:
- **OLD** Section 1.3b Methodology
- includes also references to national or international research and innovation activities linked to the project (in the past was under the

1.2 Methodology [e.g. 15 pages]

- Describe and explain the overall methodology, including the concepts, models and assumptions that underpin your work. Explain how this will enable you to deliver your project's objectives. Refer to any important challenges you may have identified in the chosen methodology and how you intend to overcome them. [e.g. 10 pages]




*This section should be presented as a **narrative**. The detailed tasks and work packages are described below under 'Implementation'.*

4. Conclusions

- The new proposal template (as any other) has to be lived-in by the people
- Consider the 10.000 hours rule ;-)
- Less pages does not necessarily mean less effort
- Impact canvas is tricky: looks simple but has to be filled-out with good quality information
- Impact canvas can be the starting point for a proposal


TRL: Technology Readiness

The Technology Readiness Levels




Evaluation Process

From submission to invitation to a Grant



How evaluation works?

The evaluation timeline



Award Criteria

How Proposals are evaluated

| EXCELLENCE | IMPACT | IMPLEMENTATION |
|---|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are objectives clearly identified? • Is proposed work is ambitious? • Goes beyond the state-of-the-art? • Is proposal sound? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the pathway suggested credible? • Are outcome and impacts in line with WP? • What's the scale of the contributions? • Are measures to maximise impact suitable? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the WP effective? • Are risks identified? • Effort assigned appropriate? • Capacity and role of participants ? • Consortium as a whole? |

Some anecdotal evidence on how things *actually* are...

- Stories from the trenches: Two examples



A Call of 2016..

work programme.

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

The objectives are clearly stated and are fully in line with the terms of the call. The contribution to each challenge is precisely specified and credibly addressed. The objectives are well motivated by the results of a survey performed by the consortium indicating the lack of cybersecurity preparedness in local public administrations (LPAs).

Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology

The overall concept is very sound and well described. The approach is credible. Each component of the approach is clearly described and the challenges faced are appropriately identified. The approach takes due account of the multilingualism issue, which is an important obstacle to a Europe-wide cybersecurity solution. The proposed pilots are extensive and well described.

Extent that proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models)

The proposal includes an analysis of the current state of the art in current projects in similar areas and in existing patents. The work mainly consists of integrating, in a novel way, several existing tools and approaches brought to the proposed project by the participants. This integration activity has the potential to develop new services and business models, and enable analysis of diverse types of data. This innovation potential is precisely identified in the proposal.

Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge

The proposed work brings together knowledge in ICT and linguistics. The gender dimension as it relates to the nature of cyber attacks is well addressed.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00, Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic

The proposed work has potential for significant impact in all three areas listed in the work programme, and this impact is clearly justified in the proposal.

Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society

The proposed work has potential to enhance innovation capacity by applying big data decision support algorithms to the automatic detection of cyber incidents, although the proposal does not explain fully how this impact will be achieved. There is also potential for the proposed work to have beneficial impact in strengthening the growth of companies in view of the numerous start-ups currently active in the area of cybersecurity.

Quality of the proposed measures to:

- exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant
- communicate the project activities to different target audiences

The exploitation plan is wide-ranging, convincing and detailed, and includes a market overview. It includes collaboration in a large number of countries and across application domains. The dissemination plan is in general well described, including measurable success criteria.

IPR and data management are well addressed.

Communication with relevant communities and initiatives is well addressed, and appropriate stakeholders have been identified. However, communication and dissemination activities are considered together in the proposal, and there is no adequate high-level communication strategy.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **4.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00, Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables

In general the work plan is clear, balanced and coherent, and the structure of work packages is appropriate. The proposal does not clearly explain why the development of the core elements in tasks T3.1 to T3.7 is finished before the requirements analysis is finished. Resources are appropriately allocated.

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

Management structure and procedures are appropriate, efficient and well described. A clear strategy for the communication within the consortium is identified. Innovation management is adequately addressed. A risk analysis is provided, with appropriate mitigation actions. However, technical risks are not analysed in sufficient detail.

Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise

The participants complement one another very well, and the consortium includes all the necessary expertise to achieve the objectives of the proposal. The consortium includes particularly strong expertise in cybersecurity and in legal matters.

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role

Tasks are appropriately allocated. All participants have a valid role and adequate resources.

Scope of the proposal

A year before.

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

The objectives are pertinent to the call. However, they lack clarity and they are not coherent. In particular, the proposal contains general statements regarding each element of the overall framework. In addition, it is not explained how the targeted results will be integrated into overall work.

Credibility of the proposed approach

The approach, which is based on existing technologies and methodologies, is of limited credibility. In particular, elements of the approach, such as work pattern analysis, are not adequately explained. This is a weakness.

Soundness of the concept, including trans-disciplinary considerations, where relevant

The concept is sound.

Trans-disciplinary considerations are evident, such as in the role of biometry.

Extent that proposed work is ambitious, has innovation potential, and is beyond the state of the art (e.g. ground breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches)

The work is ambitious and has innovation potential.

However, the proposal does not go sufficiently beyond the state of the art. For example, the proposal has a lengthy description of the current state of the art of the technologies adopted by the security industry, but some relevant areas, such as security awareness, are not well described.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , 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

The proposal identifies the relevant expected impacts listed in the work programme and clearly describes how it will achieve them. However, the claim for this achievement is not sufficiently substantiated.

Enhancing innovation capacity and integration of new knowledge

The proposal is clear as to how it will enhance innovation and the integration of new knowledge.

Strengthening the competitiveness and growth of companies by developing innovations meeting the needs of European and global markets and where relevant, by delivering such innovations to the markets

The proposed project will strengthen the competitiveness of the consortium partners. However, the proposal is less clear how it will encourage the growth of companies outside of the consortium.

Any other environmental and socially important impacts

No relevant environmental and socially important elements are explicitly addressed by the proposal.

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 proposed measures to disseminate and communicate the results of the project are generic.

The commercialisation and exploitation of the project's results are well described. In particular, the Skandia framework is discussed as well as the individual exploitation interests for the consortium members.

IPR management will be addressed in the Consortium Agreement. The proposed creation of an umbrella company for Intellectual Property resources is a positive element.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **3.00** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , 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

The work plan is clear, coherent and effective. The individual work packages and associated tasks are appropriately detailed. However, there are some inconsistencies in individual work packages, for example the name of WP7 appears differently in the work package description and the PERT chart (Figure 3.1.7)

The allocations of tasks and resources are adequate.

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

The consortium is well balanced, has the required expertise and has good complementarity.

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

The management structure is clearly described and is appropriate.

The management procedures are adequate. However, innovation management is not sufficiently described.

Risk analysis, which focuses mainly on the phases of work, is adequate. However, the assessment of general project risks is not sufficiently elaborated.

Scope of the proposal

Status: **Yes**

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

What happened?

- There have been changes and improvements in all aspects: the core idea, the consortium, the proposal
- Did they justify the change in the score from 9.00 to 14.00?
- Hmmm...

What happened?

- A more convincing story? A better consortium? A change in the evaluators' attitudes? Lobbying? Politics?
- All of the above?
- None of the above?
- Noone knows!

Hope for the
Some times things g

t...)

Innovation.

Associated with document Ref. Ares(2018)3666687 - 10/07/2018

Extensive dissemination and communication activities are described to promote the project results, showing good phasing and KPIs. The identified publications will enable good knowledge transfer/sharing between partners. IPR issues are also sufficiently addressed.

However, the communications plan is insufficiently ambitious, while the approach to targeting citizens is unsatisfactorily elaborated.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables

The work plan reflects well the overall objectives and outputs achievable showing the interaction between governance, data as evidence, design and participatory approaches, blockchain, deployment, outreach to users. The identified tasks are clearly mapped to the identified objectives.

The distribution of deliverables and tasks across the project lifecycle is largely well thought through. Nevertheless, an overly long interval between some milestones limits effective tracking.

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

The project management structures, decision making boards, approach to collaboration and procedures for tracking are sound for this kind of project.

The innovation management approach is appropriate.

On the other hand, the risk management approach has a few shortcomings. For example, technological risks of blockchain lack explicit analysis, and the approach to mitigation is insufficiently proactive.

Complementarity of the participants and extent to which the consortium as a whole brings together the necessary expertise

The project shows a high degree of complementarity of academia, SME, other private companies and public sector partners, as well as it demonstrates good geographical distribution.

Many partners have extensive experience in EU projects and software development, which is positive.

The interdisciplinarity and cross-sector skills are highly relevant to successfully implement the objectives of the project, but with some reservation about the small number of industrial partners and insufficient evidence of credentials in blockchain innovation.

Appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, ensuring that all participants have a valid role and adequate resources in the project to fulfil that role

While all partners make a substantial contribution to achieve the goals, having one partner leading a whole WP, including all the tasks and deliverables, shows imbalance in the key responsibilities between the partners. This is a substantial shortcoming, because reliance on a single partner for a WP shows the misallocation of expertise, which jeopardises the whole execution.

Resources are adequate to implement the actions, and cost breakdown is well justified.

Scope of the proposal

Status: Yes

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

Operational Capacity

Status: Operational Capacity: Yes

If No, please list the concerned partner(s), the reasons for the rejection, and the requested amount.

Not provided

Exceptional funding of third country participants/International organisations

A third country participant/International organisation not listed in General Annex A to the Main Work Programme may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environment, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the [Online Manual](#).)

Based on the information provided in the proposal, I consider that the following participant(s)/International organisation(s) that requested funding should exceptionally be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Based on the information provided in the proposal, I consider that the following participant(s)/International organisation(s) that requested funding should NOT be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Here comes t

- Associated with document Ref. Ares(2018)5990318 - 22/11/2018
- 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: 3/5.00, Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme:

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

Soundness of the concept, and credibility of the proposed methodology

Extent that proposed work is beyond the state of the art, and demonstrates innovation potential (e.g. ground-breaking objectives, novel concepts and approaches, new products, services or business and organisational models)

Appropriate consideration of interdisciplinary approaches and, where relevant, use of stakeholder knowledge and gender dimension in research and innovation content

The proposal targets sub-topic B.

The proposal presented the objectives in a clear manner. However, they were not quantified adequately. Furthermore, some of the objectives of the call text were not sufficiently detailed e.g. forensics, penetration testing not covered.

The concept is not well described e.g. using a permission based blockchain structure is not sufficiently justified.

The proposed methodology is credible however there are some weaknesses, the number and location of the pilots was not consistent throughout the proposal and how they plan to implement attack-defence graphs.

The proposal presents a weak state of the art e.g. insufficient detail on which cryptographic mechanisms will be used to guarantee privacy.

Additionally, the state of the art does not consider other relevant research in this domain adequately e.g. TREPASS project or others. How the proposal plans to advance the state of the art is not sufficiently innovative.

The proposed application area and consortia configuration is good and includes public administrations from several countries, and real CSIRTs involved.

There are many partners with different background and disciplines.

The proposal has considered stakeholder knowledge however the pilots have not considered the users and services adequately.

Gender has been considered sufficiently.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **2.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00, Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic

Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society

Quality of the proposed measure to:

- exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant
- communicate the project activities to different target audiences

There was no clear link between impact and the objectives and results.

Market analysis and identification of business opportunities are insufficiently addressed. Thus innovation capacity is unclear and the economic impact is not credible.

The exploitation plan is presented, however it lacks detail and quantification for individual plans.

The dissemination plan is not sufficiently focussed on relevant targets e.g. broad list of possible publication activities not linked to appropriate target groups.

The communication plan is adequate, however, some activities were not sufficiently described (e.g. specific standardisation bodies).

The main principles of IPR management are appropriately discussed.

The proposal includes an appropriate plan to manage its research data.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **1.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00, Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with

And a n

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **4.00** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

The extent to which the outputs of the project would contribute to each of the expected impacts mentioned in the work programme under the relevant topic

Any substantial impacts not mentioned in the work programme, that would enhance innovation capacity, create new market opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, or bring other important benefits for society

Quality of the proposed measures to:

- exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), and to manage research data where relevant
- communicate the project activities to different target audiences

The proposal focuses on the Healthcare domain, and provides a useful analysis of the Surgical Robotics market. It addresses well the expected impact defined in the work programme, and related to the Call.

The proposal addresses well some additional impacts, in particular the development of new safety critical applications, possibility of growth for the EU companies, a redefinition of human robot interaction and innovations in VR-based training.

The management of IPR is well described.

Dissemination strategy is considered with a standard approach. However it is not adequately planned concerning the contribution to the common pool of knowledge.

Communication actions are not described in sufficient details, and left to be defined at the beginning of the project.

The exploitation strategy is based on the individual participants' exploitation plans, which are detailed and focused on the specific product coming from the project results. The proposal identifies the surgical robot manufacturers as the targets for the exploitation of the project results. However, the proposed business strategy is not convincing. There is no clear path to engage other industry stakeholders (specifically SMEs) to produce more and better healthcare robots using their new AI approaches.

A solid innovation strategy necessary to bridge the gap to the market is not presented.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the Implementation

Score: **3.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

The following aspects will be taken into account:

Quality and effectiveness of the work plan, including extent to which the resources assigned to work packages are in line with their objectives and deliverables

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

Again the question: What happened?

- There have been changes and improvements in all aspects: the core idea, the consortium, the proposal
- But how did it ended up in a change of the score from 10.50 to 6.50?
- Hmmm...

A Little Bit of This, a Li

- A little bit of Dragon's Den...
- A little bit of 'Europe's Next Top Start-Up'...

06. EI

STEP

01

IDEATION



Vague but exciting...

CERN DD/OC
Information Management: A Proposal

Tim Berners-Lee, CERN/DD
March 1989

Information Management: A Proposal

Abstract

This proposal concerns the management of general information about accelerators and experiments at CERN. It discusses the problems of loss of information about complex evolving systems and derives a solution based on a distributed hypertext system.

Keywords: Hypertext, Computer conferencing, Document retrieval, Information management, Project control

```

graph TD
    HyperCard[Hyper Card] -.->|for example| ENQUIRE((ENQUIRE))
    ENQUIRE -.->|for example| LinkedInfo[Linked information]
    LinkedInfo -- includes --> Hypertext[Hypertext]
    Hypertext -- includes --> Hypermedia[Hypermedia]
    Hypertext -- describes --> ThisDoc[This document]
    ThisDoc -- refers to --> Hypermedia
    ThisDoc -- wrote --> BernersLee[Tim Berners-Lee]
    ThisDoc -- describes --> AProposal((A Proposal X))
    AProposal -- describes --> CERNDoc((CERNDOC))
    CERNDoc -- includes --> ThisDoc
    AProposal -- unifies --> VAX[VAX/NOTES]
    AProposal -- unifies --> uucp[uucp News]
    AProposal -- unifies --> IBM[IBM GroupTalk]
    AProposal -- unifies --> Hierarchical[Hierarchical systems]
    AProposal -- unifies --> CERNDoc
    CERNDoc --> CERN[C.E.R.N.]
    CERN --> DD[DD division]
    DD --> MIS[MIS]
    DD --> OC[OC group]
    OC --> RA[RA section]
    CERNDoc -.->|for example| Hierarchical
    Hierarchical -.->|for example| CERNDoc
    
```

For follow-up questions contact me at:

- adamantios.koumpis@gmail.com



Q&A

Time to ask your
questions!

Teşekkür ederim!

Thank you!

Contact:

Office Address

*Turkey in Horizon 2020 Project
And Sokak 8/12 Akasya Apt. 06680 Çankaya/Ankara
06520 Çankaya/Ankara, Turkey*

Tel: +90 312 467 61 40

*<http://www.turkeyinh2020.eu/>
info@TurkeyinH2020.eu*