Guidelines for preparing a Full Project Proposal
Enhancing the PO sections
Understanding the PO evaluation
Optimising the national consortia
Completing a PO to an FPP
Enhancing the PO sections
Market Value Chain(s)

PO Annex Guidelines

4G/LTE network provider

Secured mobile video streaming service provider

Cloud provider

Encryption provider

End-users

Adoption

Regulations

Constraints

Provides the network and the bandwidth

Provides a service / a selling point

Provides the security overlay

Provides the Cloud infrastructure

Explain how the market value chains are covered

Fake example defined for illustration purposes
**PO Annex Guidelines**

**Technology Value Chain**

- Artificial Intelligence
- Real-time profiling
- Cloud HPC platform
- Compression optimisation algorithm
- Data simulation
- Models and frameworks
- Encryption
- Streaming service with cloud compression
- Mobile apps

Fake example defined for illustration purposes
PO Annex Guidelines

Consortium Market Access

Business expectations
Market opportunities
Threats of substitutes
Threats of new entrants

Think global!

Market Analysis

Current market situation
Expected market trends
Competitor strategies

Innovation

New combination of technologies
New concepts
Technology disruptions
Upstream research

Current SotA
Existing products
Technology trends

ITEA Living Roadmap
Enhancing PO sections

Market Value Chain(s)

4G/LTE network provider

- provides the network and the bandwidth
- provides a service / a selling point

Secured mobile video streaming service provider

- provides the security overlay

Encryption provider

- provides the Cloud infrastructure

Cloud provider

End-users

Adoption

Constraints & needs

Corporate IT personnel

Regulations

Explain how the market value chains are covered

Fake example defined for illustration purposes
Enhancing PO sections

Technology Value Chain

Explain how the technology value-chain is covered

Fake example defined for illustration purposes
Enhancing PO sections

Examples:
- Novel algorithms
- Software architectures
- Open Source libraries
- Demonstrators
- Prototypes
- Contributions to standards
- Etc.

Tangible, realistic, ambitious
Enhancing PO sections

Quantification Criteria

Examples:
- Consumption (GPU, RAM, heat…)
- Frame rate (HW dependent)
- Algorithm performances
- Scalability
- Maturity
- Etc.
Enhancing PO sections: template

Merged proposal

Project key data

ACRONYM and full-length title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14004</th>
<th>SEACODA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Call</td>
<td>ITEA 3 Call 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-length Title</td>
<td>SELF-generAted Cabling Optimisation for the Design of Aeroplanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadmap Challenge</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description

The project aims at optimising simultaneously the overall weight, redundancy and segregation (and thus both security and operational efficiency) and the whole cabling and subsystems set that is installed on aeroplane structures within Final Assembly Lines. The concept consists in defining boards that group together systems and define simplified interfaces: these boards can then easily be set up separately, and the installation phase within plane cabins is maximised, allowing for higher production rates. The developed system will then define the optimal definition and positioning of these boards within the plane cabins, by combining appropriate optimisation criteria, an enriched functional OMU and HPC.

Project duration & size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Effort: 90.2 PY</th>
<th>Costs: 1234 ME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Start: 2015-07-01</td>
<td>End: 2018-07-01 (36 months)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordinator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>Flybus AeroSpace France</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Person</td>
<td>Dr. Jean-Francois Arthur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:j.arthur@flybus-aero.com">j.arthur@flybus-aero.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consortium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>France</th>
<th>Flybus AeroSpace France*, ReconTech, Simulated Electronics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Dassow Systems*, Flybus AeroSpace Germany, Podobski Institute, Virtual Immersion GmbH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>Korean Competence Center for HPC*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>ERIqua Services BV*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>Alternative Engineering Consulting*, Norwegian Aerospace Industries Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Based on the ITEA 3 PO Template v1.0 (September 2014)
2. Project overview

2.1. Rationale of the project

2.1.1. Problem statement and market value chains

(Recommended length: 2 page)

Introduce here the problem the project aims to solve. Explain the current issues, limitations or bottlenecks of what currently exists, explain the needs you plan to satisfy or to create.

Describe the social, economic and technological challenges addressed by the proposed project.

Introduce also the market and technological value chain(s). The value chain is a representation of the various processes involved for producing products or services, and for generating value from them. It indicates where and how value is considered and created, and how the market actors in the respective markets can be profitable.

The technological value chain is a kind of modular architecture comprising the main functions, the building blocks required to create the solution. The market value chain describes the actors’ game. The building blocks act on the process, combining producing, distributing products and their services and the relationships among them. All the peripheral actors who can influence the market, through regulations, recommendations, indirect suggestions, etc., must be included.

Describe the potential solutions between these actors and define the customer – provider relationship where relevant.

This section describes the context and background relevant to the project, in terms of technological and market status, not the project itself. It should convince evaluators that the project partners have a good understanding of the context in which they will be operating.

(Recommended length: 2 pages)

2.2. Project innovations

Present here a brief view of the project innovations you are introducing, focus the description on novelty in terms of state-of-the-art. Innovation can include both technological, process, usage and business model innovations. Explain what the project brings to the table, how it differs from existing results and previous or current projects, products and services. How partners will be able to differentiate themselves towards existing market actors and to become competitive (on how they can create or reinvent a market).

Describe in a few words what the project aims to achieve and how it backs the broader goals of the main partners.

This section should convince evaluators of the novelty of the project proposal.
Enhancing PO sections: template

Present existing and potential and/or forecasted competitors (e.g., Google in the car industry or satellites). Do not hesitate to introduce Porter’s five forces model of competition to describe (on top of the current industry competitors) not only suppliers and buyers, but also potential new entrants as well as threat of substitutes.

This subsection should convince evaluators that the project partners have a clear and detailed understanding of the market they are targeting, including not only the current situation but also the current trends, forecasted evolutions and potential threats.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text to be inserted here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.2. Consortium market access

(Recommended length: up to 10 pages)

Describe how the introduced innovation will help achieve competitive advantage. Explain the expected business impact of the project with respect to the competition (see §2.2.1). Each of the partners (except for the academics and research centres) should clearly identify its markets, opportunities and how it intends to profit from them.
Understanding the PO evaluation feedback
Understanding the PO evaluation feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No status set</th>
<th>N (almost no chance)</th>
<th>N? (low chances)</th>
<th>? (unclear chances)</th>
<th>= (average chances)</th>
<th>Y? (good chances)</th>
<th>Average number of funded projects in Calls 7 &amp; 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumania</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Understanding the PO evaluation feedback

4. Rationale for public funding

Auto-generated section, input to be provided only on the Community website. Do not edit or remove this box and do not provide any text within this annex in this chapter, but provide the requested information directly on the ITEA Community website.

On the website you must fill in one section per country represented in the consortium. This section will indicate the national coordinator and detail the national rationale for funding. At the end of the national rationale for funding, the national coordinator has to indicate the national ICT clusters the project has contacted and intends to join (a clear status with regards to the cluster has to be indicated).

The national rationale for funding has four components:

- national gain: you have to explain the benefits for the participating countries (e.g. support to national strategies, standardisation, open source, knowledge dissemination, wellbeing improvement, impact on national productivity, etc.), how the country benefits from collaboration with other countries and the risk level of the investment (i.e. why is a public incentive preferred for such investments);
- return on investment (ROI): you have to explain how the money invested by both Public Authorities and companies is expected to generate value, revenue, jobs and/or economic growth, etc.;
- value creation of the national sub-consortium: how cross-fertilisation between the various participants is achieved;
- adequate balance between the national partners (e.g. ratio of effort as a percentage for academics, SMEs, etc.).

For each partner, in addition to contact details and a generic description (incl. type and size of the entity), two specific descriptions are requested:

- relevance of the partner within the project by describing its main role in the project and the main added value to the international consortium and vice versa;
- market access, i.e. how the partner intends to exploit the project results and how the market(s) will be accessed (exploitation prospects and capability); current main markets and main customers, as well as planned exploitation plans and strategies are welcome whenever doable.

It is crucial that all national coordinators get in touch with their national Public Authorities (PAs) to present them the project (idea, partnership, budget, etc.), checking funding opportunities and ensuring that the national consortium is eligible, even in countries that are not part of the ITAC (ITEA Authorities Committee). Beware of eligibility issues at national level.

For ITAC countries, information on the contact persons is available on the ITEA public website (in section “Participate in ITEA / Funding”). For the EUREKA countries (see: http://www.eurekanetwork.org) that are not member of the ITAC, the contact persons are National Project Coordinators (NPCs); look for them on the following website page:
Optimising the national consortia
Optimising the national consortia

- Cover the value-chain(s)
- Only maintain partners with actual added-value and actual chances for funding (or ready to contribute on self-funding)
  - Consider seriously the PA feedback on your PO
- Involve end-users (e.g. cities for smart cities projects), tool vendors, etc.
  - Huge differentiating factor: brings credibility to the business prospects
- Focus on strong business use-cases
  - Avoid scattering (targeting too many objectives) and focus on where you can have an impact
Completing a PO to an FFP
Completing a PO to an FPP

PO Phase
- Create a convincing story
- Push innovation for actual market impact
- Explain the concept and consortium relevance
- Present clear objectives

FPP Phase
- Refine the PO thanks to the evaluation feedback
- Propose a convincing realisation plan
Completing a PO to an FPP
Completing a PO to an FPP
Completing a PO to an FPP

PO feedback for project

Project information

STG evaluation

Mandatory Improvements
An explanation of the market value chain must be presented. An overall description of

Recommended Improvements
A more graphical representation of the cooperation added value at business and technology

Consortium feedback on the STG evaluation

No feedback on the STG evaluation has been given yet

Public Authorities evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Eligibility</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td></td>
<td>Average chances for funding</td>
<td>Average chances for funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completing a PO to an FPP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eligible</th>
<th>Low chances for funding (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Low chances for funding (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Average chances for funding (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility not set</td>
<td>No status set (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligibility not set</td>
<td>No status set (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Low chances for funding (N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>Good chances for funding (Y)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consortium feedback on the Public Authorities evaluation

[Button: Edit consortium feedback on the PO evaluation]
3. Work description

3.1. Project structure

Please check the instructions given in the template to ensure all requirements are met.

3.2. Main milestones

Please check the instructions given in the template to ensure all requirements are met.

3.3. Work package description

(Recommended length: up to 28 pages)

For each Work Package (WP), describe:
- the timeline;
- the starting point, objectives and expected results;
- the WP tasks;
- the detailed contributions of the partners;
- the type, content, confidentiality and usage terms.

Deliverables can be:
- either textual deliverables, i.e. documents and other deliverables (e.g. the deliverable tables);
- or software deliverables (executable software, "SW" in the deliverable tables), software.

Make sure deliverable titles (description) are unique and consistent with the work plan and project deliverables.

Refrain from planning too many deliverables and try to focus on essential deliverables that are listed in the work plan. The deliverables should reflect the WP’s objectives and avoid defining more than 20 textual deliverables (with a minimum of 5 pages per deliverable).

NB: no textual deliverable needs to be a comprehensive document. Deliverables should consist of a consistent set of data points, e.g. Doxygen and related documents.

It is highly recommended to provide duration estimates for each task, consisting of an update/extension of the WP's duration.

3.3.1. WP 1: <work package title>

Describe here the leadership, timeframe, as well as the overall results.

Detail also in the appropriate tables the task descriptions, the WP tasks, the detailed contributions of the partners, the timeline, confidentiality, and usage terms.

Please add links to each table by selecting an existing line and using functionality "insert new lines": it will guarantee that the format is automatically adjusted. Note that it is recommended to use predefined rules (e.g. with the automatic switching between light and even lines). You should never reserve the table for a specific partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>&lt;Company name&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>Start: M-X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives and expected results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Text to be inserted here&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;T1.1&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;FPP only&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributions per partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FPP only&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;FPP only&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2. WP 2: <work package title>

Instructions are the same as for WP1. Copy the template to create as many WPs as you desire in your project.

3.3.3. Etc.

<...>
For any question or support: info@itea3.org
Thank you for your attention