



Project Acronym:	VICINITY
Project Full Title:	Open virtual neighbourhood network to connect intelligent buildings and smart objects
Grant Agreement:	688467
Project Duration:	48 months (01/01/2016 - 31/12/2019)

Open Call I Evaluation Criteria

The VICINITY Consortium

1. TU Kaiserslautern (Coordinator) (Germany)
2. ATOS SPAIN SA (Spain)
3. Centre for Research and Technology Hellas (Greece)
4. Aalborg University (Denmark)
5. GORENJE GOSPODINJSKI APARATI D.D. (Slovenia)
6. Hellenic Telecommunications Organization S.A. (Greece)
7. bAvenir s.r.o. (Slovakia)
8. Climate Associates Ltd (United Kingdom)
9. InterSoft A.S. (Slovakia)
10. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid (Spain)
11. Gnomon Informatics S.A. (Greece)
12. Tiny Mesh AS (Norway)
13. HAFENSTROM AS (Norway)
14. Enercoutim – Associação Empresarial de Energia Solar de Alcoutim (Portugal)
15. Municipality of Pylaia-Hortiatis (Greece)

© Copyright 2018, the Members of the VICINITY Consortium

For more information on this document or the VICINITY project, please contact us in the following [link](#)









Evaluation Criteria









Evaluation Categories:

(Number of rating stars = 5; threshold for each question = 3/5)

Request to Evaluators:

Please provide detailed comments justifying the provided scores

<p><u>Benefit of IoT Infrastructure for VICINITY</u></p> <p>Is the proposed IoT Infrastructure relevant for VICINITY? Does it support existing or new use-cases, services, etc. <i>Please rate how the concept described is aligned with the VICINITY vision.</i> </p> <p>How large is the benefit and value for VICINITY? <i>Please rate the amount of benefit that could be achieved for VICINITY.</i> </p> <p>Are concrete use-cases, services, business models identified? <i>Please rate how concrete the proposal describes the value of the IoT infrastructure.</i> </p> <p>Is there a strategy or co-creation elements in the activities that strengthen the value of the proposal? <i>Please rate the strategy to integrate IoT infrastructure in value-added services etc. and maybe a co-creation strategy described in the proposal.</i> </p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>
<p><u>Long-term impact</u></p> <p>Is the impact on VICINITY and beyond well described? <i>Please rate the overall impact described in relation to the proposed solution</i> </p> <p>Will the IoT infrastructure be available/accessible beyond the project's run-time? <i>Please rate the availability beyond the project's run-time.</i> </p> <p>Will the IoT infrastructure enable new or strengthened existing business models in VICINITY? </p> <p>Can the idea be maintained or developed beyond VICINITY? <i>Please rate the sustainability of the idea in relation to the proposed solution</i> </p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>

<p><u>Excellence and soundness</u></p> <p>Does the proposed address a concrete problem or limitation? Is the solution appropriate? <i>Please rate how clearly the problems to be solved are described.</i> </p> <p>Is the concept provided or the services enabled as described in the proposal innovative? <i>Please rate the innovative approach of the proposal.</i> </p> <p>Is the technical plan for implementation as described in the proposal sound? <i>Please rate the soundness of the technical approach for implementation.</i> </p> <p>Soundness of approach with respect to management of sensitive/private data. Is there a data management plan? <i>Please rate how sound is the (planned) approach of the described IoT solution to manage the involved sensitive/private data, in relation to the respective EU legislation. Or is it clearly explained why it is not necessary?</i> </p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>
<p><u>Capability of the proposer</u></p> <p>Is the technical proposer’s capacity correctly explained? (IoT infrastructure, availability of resources, data management plan, etc.) <i>Please rate the proposer’s technical capacity.</i> </p> <p>Quality of the team involved in the proposal (adequate resources, knowledge and availability) <i>Please rate the adequacy of the team involved in the proposal.</i> </p> <p>Is the evaluation plan adequate for the proposal? <i>Please rate the evaluation plan proposed</i> </p> <p>Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources to complete the expected result. <i>Please rate how feasible is the work plan based on the requested duration, budget and timing of deliverables</i> </p>	<p>Score: <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>