

FPP Annex template

ITEA 3 Call 4

Foreword

Do not remove or modify in any way the sections having these notations,

All guidelines in the template appear in this “boxed” format. These instructions, as well as the preceding title page (“FPP Annex template”) and this foreword, should never be removed manually from the submitted files: they are automatically removed by the merging function of the ITEA Community website. Potential layout issues appearing when removing the instructions (e.g. a large image leaving half a page blank) will be adjusted by the ITEA Office, between the proposal submission and the transfer of the generated PO/FPP to the reviewers.

NB: all texts between “<” and “>” symbols (incl. on the front page and in the headers) should be replaced or removed.

It is highly recommended that you carefully read all the instructions provided: they indicate for each chapter and subchapter what is expected, and must be carefully taken into account.

It is crucial that proposal writers comply with the pre-defined formatting and styling rules: breaking these rules may create errors when inserting the auto-generated sections and thus cause the merge process to fail. Complying with formatting rules can be achieved by adhering to the following guidelines:

- do not remove any predefined title and do not add headers, incl. annexes, that are not supposed to be defined according to this template, at any level of the hierarchy (e.g. do not add a §5 after §4 Rationale for public funding); in particular, for references or publications, as additional annexes are forbidden, please rely on footnotes; you are, however, free to add subsections when there is no subsection yet defined (e.g. you can define a subsection §2.2.1.1 within §2.2.1 Market analysis);
- do not modify the predefined styles, except for standard “emphasis” effects (i.e. underlined or bold text) – we recommend using the underlined and bold formatting in a consistent and prudent way throughout the document, and on body text exclusively;
- only use the pre-defined styles that start with “ITEA_”: the most relevant ones are “ITEA_BodyText” for standard paragraphs (Arial 10 with a line spacing factor of 1.2 pt), “ITEA_BodyBullets” for bullet points within standard paragraphs and “ITEA_Figure”; for captions, you can use the standard “Insert Caption” function from Word, as it will automatically use the “ITEA_Caption” styling; these styles are accessible in the “Quick Styles Gallery” of the “Home” tab;
- do not remove the instructions (both green and orange ones), and do not remove the auto-generated sections, incl. the annexes;
- do not overload the document with uncompressed / excessively large images; a proposal should ideally fit in less than 10 MB.

It is in the interest of consortia to ensure that a merged document (i.e. including auto-generated sections) can be generated and downloaded before the submission deadline so that all the relevant information is provided in the project proposal document.

Items that need to be filled in exclusively via the ITEA Community website will have the following notation:

Auto-generated section: input to be provided only on the Community website.

Do not remove or modify in any way the sections having these notations throughout the whole Annex template since they are needed to automatically merge the information provided via the ITEA Community website with your uploaded Annex document.

Unless otherwise specified, section length recommendations (in words and page numbers) are only provided as suggestions to help the editing. However, the overall length of the final merged document up to section §4 excluded must not exceed 45 pages for a merged PO and 75 pages for a merged FPP, which roughly corresponds to an uploaded file of 55 pages for a PO, and of 85 pages for an FPP (all sections included, i.e. including comments and empty auto-generated sections). A merged FPP that exceeds 75 pages up to section §4 can have a negative impact on evaluation.

Full Project Proposal Annex

<ACRONYM> or <PROJECT NAME>

<FULL PROJECT NAME>

Edited by: <name>

Date: <date>

Apart from the State-of-the-Art-dedicated text (§2.3.1) which is handled by the ITEA Office as public information, unless otherwise specified by the consortium, this document will be treated as strictly confidential.

Project key data

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.

The inserted key data will contain (among others) the acronym, full title, time frame, the respective countries and partners per country, the coordinator, as well as a short description which should include the project idea, the main expected market impact and the main technological objective.

Table of Contents

PROJECT KEY DATA	5
PROJECT ACRONYMS	7
1. PROJECT ONE-PAGE DESCRIPTION	8
2. PROJECT OVERVIEW	9
2.1. RATIONALE OF THE PROJECT.....	9
2.1.1. <i>Problem statement and market value chain</i>	9
2.1.2. <i>Project innovations and technology value chain</i>	9
2.2. TARGETED IMPACT.....	10
2.2.1. <i>Market analysis</i>	10
2.2.2. <i>Consortium market access</i>	10
2.2.3. <i>Impact on quality of life</i>	11
2.3. TECHNOLOGY.....	12
2.3.1. <i>State-of-the-Art (SotA) analysis</i>	12
2.3.2. <i>Proposed technological innovation and novelty in relation to the SotA</i>	13
2.3.3. <i>Expected project outputs</i>	13
2.3.4. <i>Quantified objectives and quantification criteria</i>	14
2.4. CONSORTIUM OVERVIEW	15
2.4.1. <i>Cooperation added value: business level</i>	15
2.4.2. <i>Cooperation added value: technology level</i>	15
3. WORK DESCRIPTION	17
3.1. PROJECT STRUCTURE	17
3.2. MAIN MILESTONES	17
3.3. WORK PACKAGE DESCRIPTIONS.....	18
3.3.1. <i>WP 1: <work package title></i>	19
3.3.2. <i>WP 2: <work package title></i>	20
3.3.3. <i>Etc.</i>	20
4. RATIONALE FOR PUBLIC FUNDING	21
ANNEX A: SUMMARY OF COSTS & EFFORT BREAKDOWN.....	23
ANNEX B: CONSORTIUM FEEDBACK ON THE PO EVALUATION	24

Project acronyms

1. Project one-page description

(Recommended length: maximum 600 words)

Provide, within one page maximum, a strategic description of your proposed project addressing:

- *the context and goals of the proposal;*
- *the business relevance and the targeted market impact;*
- *the innovative aspects and the major expected technical outcomes;*
- *the consortium relevance.*

<Text to be inserted here>

2. Project overview

2.1. Rationale of the project

2.1.1. Problem statement and market value chain

(Recommended length: maximum 1200 words)

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 societal, economic and/or technological challenges addressed by the proposed project.

Also introduce the market value chain(s). The market value chain is a representation of the various processes involved in producing products or services and delivering them to the market. It indicates where and how value is considered and created, and how the market actors in their respective markets can be profitable. It also describes the actors' strategies and relative positioning: it must show all the actors involved in designing, producing, distributing the products and/or services and the relationships among them. All the peripheral actors who can influence the market(s), through regulations, recommendations, indirect suggestions, etc., must also be included. Describe clearly the interfaces between these actors and define the customer – provider relationship(s) wherever relevant.

This subsection 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 evolving, both technology- and business-wise.

<Text to be inserted here>

2.1.2. Project innovations and technology value chain

(Recommended length: maximum 1200 words)

Present here a brief view of the project innovations you are introducing: focus the description on novelty in terms of the 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 from existing market actors and become competitive (or how they can create or reimagine a market). Remain concise in this section (cf. §2.2 and §2.3).

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

Introduce also the technological value chain(s): it is a kind of modular architecture comprising the main functions and building blocks required to create the solution, as well as their interactions.

This subsection should convince evaluators of the novelty of the project proposal.

<Text to be inserted here >

2.2. Targeted impact

2.2.1. Market analysis

(Recommended length: maximum 2700 words)

Present here a detailed market analysis that is focused on the actual markets targeted by the project partners. Present market trends (e.g. graphics and figures), main products, describe the landscape in terms of competing or alternative solutions (companies, products...), the situation in Europe vs. US and Asia, etc.; provide figures whenever possible. Use up-to-date data or comment on outdated information (e.g. forecasts of several years ago). Do not rely solely on current market situations but consider also predictions and estimates of future growth from the latest studies.

Describe the existing or announced industrial products or services in the project domain. Explain which competitive advantages the market leaders have and how differentiation could be achieved towards them. Detail why smaller actors are restricted to low market share (e.g. targeting niche markets or competitiveness issue) and how volatile the market currently is (are there more and more actors or is it the opposite? In the latter case, does it derive from market consolidation or from competitors dying out?).

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.

< Text to be inserted here >

2.2.2. Consortium market access

(Recommended length: maximum 4500 words)

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.

Detail how the partners will exploit the actual project results after the project end (e.g. integration in future products or services, third-party licensed software, published APIs, life-cycle maintenance through an SME, open source software, integration in in-house software tools ...). When possible, briefly discuss a timeline for commercialising the project outcome (keeping in mind that funded projects may not directly develop products or services): indicate the most relevant technology deployment time range, i.e. short-term (less than two years after project closure), mid-term (two to four years) or long-term (five years or more) that can be expected.

NB: while ambition is at the core of competitiveness, it is also important to remain realistic and credible with regards to the partner targets and capabilities.

Detail also in this section the global strategy deployed towards achieving the exploitation goals, for instance (and when relevant) through:

- *Standardisation:*

Standardisation includes de jure/de facto standards, published APIs, open source repositories and associated communities, etc. Standardisation should be seen as a way to enable exploitation plans, e.g. by enabling a market to take off, by helping integrators to embrace the proposed technology, by counterbalancing proprietary solutions of leading competitors, etc.

When relevant, define a standardisation strategy consistent with the project and document its implementation. Projects having software- or system-engineering related activities should, whenever applicable, identify the open source strategy or the tools interoperability strategy.

When Open Source Software is considered, explain how the project intends to build (on) a large, lively and strong community around the open source software and how the impact from the project will be quantified.

- *Dissemination:*

Consider here dissemination towards customers, communities (industrial, scientific, etc.), incl. communications, seminars, workshops, conferences, papers, courses, etc. Dissemination must be seen as a tool to make potential customers or partners aware of the project achievements and results, within and outside the organisations participating in the project.

Define and justify a dissemination strategy actually supporting and having impact on the project, i.e. justify the choices made (e.g. why selecting given workshops rather than others). Indicate how the project results will be disseminated in the course and at the end of the project, i.e. by means of (e.g.) which presentations in workshops and conferences, publications, etc.

If fast exploitation is expected, explain what exactly is targeted, and how the consortium intends to achieve these goals.

This subsection should convince evaluators that the consortium is credible, legitimate and relevant to address the market and to exploit the project results (if successful) to generate business (i.e. that it can have an impact on the market). This subsection should be market oriented and should only focus on the long-term goals of the project (i.e. what is expected to be achieved thanks to the project outcomes, i.e. after the project closure).

<Text to be inserted here>

2.2.3. Impact on quality of life

(Recommended length: maximum 650 words)

Describe here the expected impact on the quality of life (e.g. improved wellbeing, enhanced healthcare, increased crowd security, extended social connection, better working conditions with less physical burden and fatigue, more reliable products, broader access to knowledge, etc.). This

subsection should only mention the (potential) societal relevance of / added-value or benefit from the project.

<Text to be inserted here >

2.3. Technology

2.3.1. State-of-the-Art (SotA) analysis

(Recommended length: maximum 3000 words)

Describe the current technological situation in the project domain with a detailed technical state-of-the-art, with regard to current products, prototypes and research results and trends, both on the industrial and academic sides.

For the research state-of-the-art (SotA), also document how your proposed project relates to, and/or builds on results of, and differentiates from, other (past or running) cooperative (e.g. ITEA, H2020, or national) projects or national ICT clusters tackling related issues: we recommend filling in, for each of such projects or national ICT clusters, a short description thereof in the suggested table below, focusing on the aspects related to the proposed project and a short description of how the proposed project relates to, and/or builds on and differentiates from it. Please note that in this table below, the last column, "Relationship", should explain:

- *which input modules will be reused from the mentioned project;*
- *and/or what will be transferred from this proposal to the mentioned project;*
- *or the reasons why the consortium does not intend to reuse/transfer results from/to the mentioned project (i.e. why the results already achieved are not useful for this proposal).*

NB1: The ITEA Living Roadmap (accessible through the ITEA Community website) provides a rich source of information with regard to the existing SotA. Use it but go also beyond its content to extend the known SotA (e.g. with the very latest products, achievements, publications, etc.).

NB2: For each past or running ITEA project, a two-page description ("Leaflet") is available on the ITEA public website.

The state-of-the-art described in the project proposal will have to be updated / extended in the course of the project and integrated in a public deliverable. Except for specific cases, the state-of-the-art section of the project proposals will be considered by the ITEA Office as a public document which could be added to the Living Roadmap.

This subsection should convince evaluators that the project partners have detailed knowledge of the technological background (and evolution) in the targeted field. ITEA considers the State-of-the-Art analysis as a key tool to clearly understand and steer innovation all along the project lifespan.

<Text to be inserted here >

Link to previous and/or current collaborative research projects:

Project Name	Cooperative Programme	Time period (approx.)	Technical Focus	Relationship
<ACRONYM>	<e.g. ITEA>	<2010-2013>	<Text to be inserted here>	<Text to be inserted here>
<ACRONYM>	<e.g. H2020>	<2012-?>	<Text to be inserted here>	
<ACRONYM>				

Table 1: Related collaborative research projects.

2.3.2. Proposed technological innovation and novelty in relation to the SotA

(Recommended length: maximum 2500 words)

Clearly explain the progress and technological innovation proposed by your project, with reference to the current technology state-of-the-art. Explain what differentiates the project from other R&D efforts, how it builds on the SotA and which novelty it brings from a technological standpoint.

This subsection should convince evaluators that the consortium has sufficient insight into the technological challenges and proposes significant breakthroughs to bring technological innovation and novelty.

<Text to be inserted here>

2.3.3. Expected project outputs

(Recommended length: maximum 650 words)

Detail the concrete final results of the project: give a clear description of what will be its actual set of outputs (novel algorithms, standards, open source libraries, implemented collaborative framework, demonstrator, product prototype, new service based on some software, wearable device, etc.). The description should be detailed enough to give a clear picture of what will be generated, including the core functionalities and levels of maturity.

At the end of the project, the results will be confronted with the content of this subsection (potentially updated through Change Requests). A poor description will be considered as a lack of expected results, or as significant uncertainty about what will be delivered: clarity is therefore highly recommended here.

The requested description must focus on tangible, realistic and credible outputs that will be developed within the project (if the project extends existing solutions, then clearly clarify the specific contributions of the project) and available at project closure, i.e. demonstrated at the final project review. Post-closure results, like exploitation plans and prospects, have to be indicated in §2.2.2.

This subsection should convince evaluators that the project will deliver tangible results of interest that will support the business goals of the project partners.

<Text to be inserted here>

2.3.4. Quantified objectives and quantification criteria

(Recommended length: maximum 1300 words)

Consider the expected project results (cf. §2.3.3), and for each one of them define appropriate quantification criteria (Key Performance Indicators - KPIs) that will be used to measure the achievements objectively. KPIs are a strong tool for project leaders to steer the project and for reviewers to evaluate the project progress and the maturity of the results. The project team is free to define any kind of KPI that is most valuable for themselves.

KPIs must be SMART, must have an initial (State of the Art) value and a target value:

- Specific (the KPI must be unambiguously)*
- Measurable (the KPI must be measurable to indicate its progress and whether the target is reached)*
- Acceptable (the KPI must be acceptable for the stakeholders)*
- Realistic (the KPI and its target must be achievable)*
- Timely (the KPI and its target must be achievable within the project time frame)*

We distinguish two types of KPI's: 1) project management oriented and 2) result maturity oriented. Both types are important for your project to check whether you are reaching your goals.

Project management KPIs are KPIs to track the progress of your project compared to the project plan. For instance the number of milestones or deliverables completed on time or the percentage of deviation from the planned budget and effort. These KPIs are important for the project leader to monitor and steer the project towards its goals. It provides the reviewers a quick view whether the project is on track or not.

Result maturity KPIs provide an indication how good the results are. If you develop for instance a new engineering methodology that will reduce the software development time significantly you need to have a KPI that indicates what the current software development time is and what the target at the end of the project is (e.g. two times or three times faster). At the end of the project you must be able to show convincing measured figures indicating to what extent you have achieved your target. These figures will also help you to convince your customers or management to use the results of your project.

<Text to be inserted here>

2.4. Consortium overview

For many Public Authorities, it is crucial to already have at the PO stage a clear national consortium as well as clear costs & effort figures: indeed, many countries need to decide on national budgets before the FPP deadline, which means significant changes between POs and FPPs at the consortium and cost levels should be limited to clearly needed updates (in particular, based on the PO evaluation feedback from reviewers and Public Authorities).

2.4.1. Cooperation added value: business level

(Recommended length: maximum 1300 words)

Position the consortium partners in the market value chains as described in §2.1.1. Explain the business rationale behind the consortium composition, providing convincing elements regarding the consortium legitimacy in terms of the business:

- *describe the core idea motivating the partners to collaborate and explain how this consortium helps them achieve their business goals;*
- *describe how the cooperation is adding value;*
- *explain why the international collaboration (and in particular the ITEA frame) is the best way to reach the targets;*
- *in the event that the consortium does not cover the whole value chains for the respective markets, explain why this is not an issue for the project, and how the consortium intends to overcome this missing link.*

For the software engineering focused projects, highlight the participation of the software tool vendors or, otherwise, justify why such partners are missing.

In any case, it is strongly recommended to involve (directly or indirectly) end-users and potential future costumers in the project, and to set up (whenever possible with these end-users) strong business cases which will derive in business-oriented demonstrations.

This subsection should convince the evaluators that the consortium has enough business power to have an impact on the market.

<Text to be inserted here>

2.4.2. Cooperation added value: technology level

(Recommended length: maximum 1300 words)

Describe who among the partners will achieve the technological innovations and detail the technological added value of the consortium collaboration. Focus on unique selling propositions that generate value.

Explain the interactions between the key technology-oriented players. Refer to the targeted technological architecture (cf. §2.1.2), and position the partners in that architecture while underlying their specific role, added value and relevance here.

Explain the technological rationale behind the consortium composition:

- *describe the core idea motivating the partners to collaborate and explain how this consortium helps them achieve their technological goals;*
- *describe what the key partners bring in, how their expertise is complementary, i.e. what makes them relevant partners.*

This subsection should convince the evaluators that there is enough R&D competence in the consortium, that the consortium is appropriate and that value will be created from a technological point of view.

Both business and technological sleeping partners must be avoided.

<Text to be inserted here>

3. Work description

3.1. Project structure

(Recommended length: maximum 28 pages)

Provide a global overview of the technical work to be performed and of the Work Breakdown Structure (work packages) envisaged towards it. Use diagrams where possible and do not hesitate to separate the hierarchical view (organisation of WPs and tasks in a tree) from the process view (e.g. interdependency between WPs, yearly processes, etc.).

Explain the interfaces and interactions between work packages, and between consortium members.

Justify how the project structure supports the project objectives.

Do not provide detailed Work Package and Task descriptions in the Project Outline. The detailed Work Package descriptions are only requested in the Full Project Proposal and will be fully discarded for the PO evaluation. Where possible, try to avoid describing task contents in a PO and focus on how the WPs relate to each other.

This section should convince the reviewers that the project structure helps the consortium achieve its goals.

<Text to be inserted here>

3.2. Main milestones

Present the project milestones in the following table. A milestone should represent a significant intermediate achievement, a date by which major results form the basis for a subsequent phase of work (e.g. finalisation of the data processing algorithms, integration of the semantic modules in the common framework, finalisation of the first version of the prototype, compliance with end-user requirements in terms of performances, etc.), or by which decisions are needed (for example, concerning which of several technologies will be adopted as the basis for a subsequent phase of the project). Major demonstrations should also be considered as project milestones.

It is recommended to consider no more than 6 milestones in a project (i.e. on average not more than a milestone every 6 months).

Milestone titles (descriptions) should be self-explanatory. For each milestone, indicate the Key Performance Indicator (KPI) that will be used to state its achievement, as well as its completion date.

This subsection should give a good overview of the different phases of the project.

<If relevant and needed, text to be inserted here>

Exhaustive list of project milestones:

ID	Description	KPI	Completion month
<MS1>	<e.g. implementation of prototype v1>	<e.g. software module implementing 95% of the specifications integrated and running in the common framework>	<e.g. M24>
<MS2>	<e.g. targeted use-case performance needs achieved>	<e.g. 99% success rate in detecting intrusions and less than 1 false alarm per hour>	

3.3. Work package descriptions

(Recommended length: maximum 11000 words)

For each Work Package (WP), describe:

- *the timeline;*
- *the starting point, objectives and expected results;*
- *the WP tasks;*
- *the detailed contributions of the partners involved in the WP;*
- *the type, content, confidentiality and planned delivery date of deliverables.*

Deliverables can be:

- *either textual deliverables, i.e. documents (pdf, docx, etc.) (cf. "Doc." in the second column of the deliverable tables);*
- *or software deliverables (executables, packages, libraries, compiled or source code, etc.) (cf. "SW" in the deliverables tables); software deliverables do not have to be uploaded to the ITEA Community website and remain in the hands of the consortium.*

Make sure deliverable titles (descriptions) are self-explanatory.

Refrain from planning too many deliverables and look for quality and relevance rather than for quantity: avoid duplicating the textual deliverables with different versions and report in this proposal only deliverables that are relevant at the overall project level. It is thus recommended to avoid defining more than 20 textual deliverables (except when it is highly pertinent and properly justified) and to focus on a reasonable and limited set of deliverables.

NB: no textual deliverable needs to be attached to software deliverables: code documentation (e.g. Doxygen) and how-to documents are considered as part of software deliverables.

It is highly recommended to provide during or at the end of the project a public deliverable consisting of an update/extension of the State-of-the-Art described in the project proposal.

This section should convince the reviewers that the planned work is precisely known and that the roles and contributions of each and every partner are clearly defined.

3.3.1. WP 1: <work package title>

Describe here the leadership, timeframe, as well as the overall WP objectives and expected results.

Detail also in the appropriate tables the task descriptions, the contributions per partner (every partner that indicates costs and effort on a given WP should have a proper description of its contribution in the related table) as well as the WP deliverables.

Please add lines to each table by selecting an existing line and by using the built-in Word functionality "insert new lines": it will guarantee that the formatting of the table follows the predefined rules (e.g. with the automatic switching between light grey and white background for odd and even lines). You should never have to adjust the table formatting yourself.

Leadership	<Company name>: <contact name>	
Timeframe	Start: M<X>	End: M<Y>

Objectives and expected results

<Text to be inserted here>

Task descriptions

Task	Description
<T1.1>	<FPP only>

Contributions per partner

Partner	Contribution
<FPP only>	<FPP only>
	<FPP only>

Partner	Contribution
	<FPP only>

Deliverables

ID	Type	Description	Access	Due month
<D1.1>	<SW, Doc.>	<FPP only>	<Public, Confidential>	M<X>
		<FPP only>		
		<FPP only>		

3.3.2. WP 2: <work package title>

Instructions are the same as for WP1. Copy the template content of WP1 as many times as you have Work Packages in your project

3.3.3. Etc.

<...>

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: if relevant, you have to detail the collaboration amongst the national sub-consortium, how cross-fertilisation between the various participants is achieved and, if applicable, what the national use cases are, how they are organised and how they are linked with other or previous national projects;
- 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), three specific descriptions are requested:

- relevance of the partner within the project by describing its main role in the project, tasks and the main added value (technological and in terms of market access) it will bring to the international consortium and vice versa;
- Strategic importance of the project for the partner, i.e. how envisioned project results (if successful) fit in, and contribute to, its innovation and business strategy, or complete previous projects (with a particular focus on the publicly funded ones);
- market access, i.e. how the partner intends to exploit the project results (e.g. new product, new service, licensing, etc.) 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.

NOTE: this part is crucial for the national funding agency to evaluate the chances for funding for the individual partners within the project. Please try to be as concrete as possible.

Furthermore it is key 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 that are not member of the ITAC, the contact persons are National Project Coordinators (NPCs); <http://www.eurekanetwork.org/eureka-countries>).

Annex A: Summary of costs & effort breakdown

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.

This annex will contain a comprehensive summary of the costs and effort, by providing 1) costs & effort per country per WP (with totals), and 2) costs & effort per partner type. This data is automatically computed based on the detailed figures of costs & effort provided online by each partner on the Community website: it is therefore crucial that all partners provide relevant input for both costs & effort, and do not leave blank fields, which would generate erroneous breakdowns.

Detailed costs & effort per partner are provided in the related country perspective section of §4.

Annex B: Consortium feedback on the PO evaluation

Auto-generated section: input to be provided only on the Community website.

This annex will be filled in only at FPP stage, and will remain empty at PO stage.

The STG PO evaluation will be provided after the PO submission. It is highly recommended to take into account the comments and recommendations of reviewers, and to adapt accordingly your proposal. Your feedback should be described concisely in this section: inputs are to be provided on a special page of the ITEA Community website, which will be provided together with the PO evaluation itself.