

## **Q&A WEBINAR 18 May 2020 – INNOWWIDE Experts Information Session**

Link to INNOWWIDE Call 2 documents: <https://innowwide.eu/resources/innowwide-project-documents/>

### **EVALUATOR / CONSENSUS REVIEWER / RESERVES**

In the invitation you receive by email, it is specified if you have been selected as evaluator or consensus reviewer (rapporteur).

If you haven't received any invitations by email to evaluate a proposal, it means you are in the reserve list. You could eventually be contacted in the coming days as we are re-assigning some proposals.

You only need to review the proposals in your portal. There may be extra projects mentioned in your SoW which do not appear in the portal. These are reserve projects and can be ignored until further instruction.

### **TIMELINE**

The evaluation timeline was delayed slightly due to the extended deadline of the INNOWWIDE Call 2 that closed on 7 April (instead of 31 March).

The deadline to complete the Stage 1 project evaluation reviews is 25 May 2020. Both experts assigned to each VAP, including the rapporteur are expected to deliver their evaluation reports until this date.

Rapporteurs will need to wait until the other expert has submitted the review in order to write the Consensus Report. This should be done until 25 May. Rapporteurs should check regularly their account to see if the consensus report form is available to be performed.

In the case the other expert only submits the review on the deadline date – 25 May – rapporteurs will be given additional time to complete their work until the end of May.

### **SOW/MSA**

You will need to accept a SoW (sent to you by email) covering each proposal you review. You also need to provide a signed MSA. If either of these steps are not completed you cannot be paid for any work done.

If the SoW you receive does not exactly reflect the projects you are assigned in the portal, you may accept the SoW and ignore the extra projects (these are reserve projects which will probably not be assigned to you). Alternatively contact [experts@eurekanetwork.org](mailto:experts@eurekanetwork.org) and ask for a new SoW to be sent.

### **EXPERTS REMUNERATION**

The correct fee is 120 euros for each completed evaluator assignment and 150 for each completed rapporteur assignment (review + consensus report).

### **CONSENSUS REPORT**

Please refer to the video for an overview of how to use the review platform.

The consensus rapporteur can copy text from the first reviews to speed up the completion of the consensus report, and may also take an average of the two first review scores to establish final scores

for the proposal. However, the consensus report should be a coherent consensus view of the two initial reports. Furthermore, there is no obligation to use exact average scores.

## FRUGAL INNOVATION

In the context of INNOWWIDE (Call text, Call Guidelines & Call Evaluation Guidelines section 1.2) frugal innovation is intended as “the process of innovating in conditions of constraint, to produce solutions that are substantially more affordable than alternatives, and accessible to a broader range of people, while also meeting user needs as – or even more – effectively”. It is especially appropriate for open innovation schemes with lower end developing countries and should be considered for VAPs targeting them. **To sum up, frugal innovation encompasses low-cost, low resources consumption design & development of innovative solutions first and foremost accessible to low income market segments. It also comprises “reverse innovation” schemes, i.e. such low-cost innovative schemes transferred to developed countries.**

For more information please visit <https://www.frugal-innovation.com/what-is-frugal-innovation/>

## TRL

No problem receiving VAPs with associated technologies at low TRLs (2-3) . The only limit would be very high starting point TRLs. Starting TRLs above 8 are not desirable because not further RTDI could be expected after VAP implementation.

## SUBCONTRACTOR – RTDI

*Can you please confirm that it is well understood that the proposal must include subcontractor performing RTDI in the 3rd country?*

Yes, it is requested to take forward the activity “Definition of a future International Cooperation RTDI project for co-creation or technology adaptation (including where appropriate frugal Innovation) with the local strategic subcontractor” **which is compulsory**

*I understand that if the main subcontractor is not capable to perform RTDI, then I should score as non eligible, right? In one of my proposals, there are 2 subcontractors, but only the minor one is RTD-performing*

VAP proposals with low RTDI capability main local subcontractor are to be underrated in the appropriate sections of the evaluation form (excellence, impact, implementation)

*If the VAP does not demonstrate that the collaborator is qualified to or is providing any meaningful RTDI input to the VAP (eg. the collaborator is a broad-based service consultancy) do we need to evaluate all the other criteria and sub criteria?*

Yes. VAP proposals with low RTDI capability main local subcontractor are to be underrated in the appropriate sections of the evaluation form (excellence, impact, implementation), but evaluation must be wholly completed

*Concerning RTDI target, though two countries (EU/non EU) identified in my proposal, future RTDI can envisage further countries, non participating now?*

Yes, VAP can and should envisage future product-market development activities beyond the initial target third country, which is used at VAP implementation stage as a pilot third country

*Again, RTDI future project can already envisage and identify future partners? Should be commented this maturity stage of consortium in the Implementation part?*

Yes, in fact it is desirable having a well bound main subcontractor at VAP implementation stage And of course envisaging and identifying new partners adds up

*It was mentioned that a consultant could also be a strategic partner (or subcontractor) in the third country. But a consultant will not be a future R&D partner. How to deal with that?*

If the consultant has not got proper RTDI capabilities and it is just a service provider it cannot qualify as main subcontractor. Should it be the case the proposal must be underrated in the appropriate section (excellence, impact, implementation).

## **OTHER**

*I assume that the fundamental data of the applicant (such as location, turnover, number of employees, products, website, etc) are available. But: are those data also available (or should they be available) of the main subcontractor, because this subcontractor plays a major role in the process, hence this information is important.*

Basic technical and financial data of the main subcontractor are requested in the application form, there is a specific section for it. Should not they be there the proposal must be underrated in the appropriate section (excellence, impact, implementation)

*Proposal has been already funded by different H2020 action. Is it OK to apply second time?*

No EC linked double financing for VAPs is allowed (EC financial regulation)

*Should the proposals be evaluated solely on the documents provided with the proposal? Or can information outside the proposal (e.g. applicant SME's website, LinkedIn profiles, etc.) be used? The evaluator should make use of the documents provided but can also look for additional information outside if it helps fundament better their judgement and scores. Also to verify veracity in certain cases.*

Additional information on the applicant SME and subcontractors can be found on the web and documentation repositories (e.g. DDBB, platforms etc.). No additional information can be provided by the applicant

*A case: the subcontractor has installations which are used by the company in the country of origin of the company, concerning the project in view*

No problem as long as the main local subcontractor is not bound to EC/EC ACs entities and the majority of work is performed in the target third country. There must be predominantly field work in the target country.

*If not all sections of application are filled in, how we evaluate this?*

VAP proposals with lack of appropriate information are to be underrated in the appropriate sections of the evaluation form (excellence, impact, implementation), but evaluation must be wholly completed

*Could you please give some examples of early adopter customers/users?*

First customers assuming higher product maturation validation risks, i.e. users incorporation beta SW solutions to validate their performance before commercialization

*A related question: are there rules for potential prolongations, funded or not funded?*

This does not apply at proposal evaluation stage. It is a matter of VAP implementation and only on duly justified grounds. VAP with a duration of more than 6 months (i.e. 24-30 weeks) are not eligible. No further duration is allowed at VAP evaluation stage.

*What are you expecting under "impact" section/question only a qualitative answer or also quantitative? could it be an estimation of market?*

Quantitative & qualitative. VAP proposals with lack of appropriate information are to be underrated in the appropriate sections of the evaluation form (excellence, impact, implementation), but evaluation must be wholly completed

*Can you clarify this question from the evaluation form? "Have important target third country early adopter customers / users been engaged?"*

First customers assuming higher product maturation validation risks, i.e. users incorporation beta SW solutions to validate their performance before commercialization. Their presence adds up to VAP higher scoring

*Difficulty in evaluation is that the proposals mixing the present VAP with the future (after VAP) project when describing excellence and impact. How we should evaluate then? Both or only try to evaluate this VAP regardless of the merits of the future project?*

VAPs must be judged in a medium-long term perspective of their proposed business model. In the shorter term main impacts would be defining future collaborative RTDI, setting up long lasting linkages with local subcontractors, identify and devise how to overcome product-market barriers etc.

*What is the third country? I know the funding applicant is first country and the RTDI is conducted in a second country but which is the third country requirement? What is 3rd? You mean 3rd world economy (developing nation) not a third country participant.*

There is a list of EU/EU ACs in the guidelines, evaluation guidelines and FAQs. Any other country out of them is a third country.

*If a proposal considers a main subcontractor in third country whose budget is 30k€ and, an additional subcontractor in home country whose budget is 18k€...then, as home subcontractor has a budget higher than 5k€ as you suggested, should it be translated in a lower score?*

Yes, home country minor subcontractors are only intended for *lower value tasks*. As stated in the Innnowide Call-2 FAQs EU entities may also be subcontracted but with a minor role and need to be duly justified (i.e. low-value contracts – less than 5.000 € or slightly above if duly justified – and minor tasks e.g. publishing, preparation of promotional material, trade fair participation support, basic matchmaking support, clerical support, etc.). VAP proposals with lack of appropriate information are to be underrated in the appropriate sections of the evaluation form (excellence, impact, implementation), but evaluation must be wholly completed.