



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

## Open Call II 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><b><u>Benefit of the Service for VICINITY</u></b></p> <p><b>Is the proposed service relevant for VICINITY? Does it support existing or new use-cases, services, etc.?</b>  <i>Please rate how the concept described is aligned with the VICINITY vision.</i>  </p> <p><b>How large is the benefit for the customers?</b>  <i>Please rate the amount of benefit that could be achieved for the potential customers.</i>  </p> <p><b>How large is the benefit for the society, environment, etc.?</b>  <i>Please rate the amount of benefit that could be achieved for the society, environment.</i>  </p> <p><i>Please rate the quality of the co-creation plan</i>  </p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>
<p><b><u>Business Model</u></b></p> <p><b>Is explained convincingly how the service is going to make money (the sales and marketing strategy)?</b>  <i>Please rate the overall business strategy described in relation to the proposed solution</i>  </p> <p><b>Are the customer segments adequately explained?</b>  <i>Please rate if the customer segments are correctly and adequately explained</i>  </p> <p><b>Is the proposal's value proposition per each customer explained satisfactorily?</b>  <b>Please rate if the proposal's value proposition is clearly outline.</b>  </p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 9/15)</i></p>
<p><b><u>Excellence and soundness</u></b></p> <p><b>Does the proposal address a concrete problem or limitation? Is the solution</b></p>	<p><b>Score:</b>  <i>(Threshold 12/20)</i></p>

<p><b>appropriate?</b> Please rate how clearly the problems to be solved are described. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Is the concept provided or the services enabled as described in the proposal innovative?</b> Please rate the innovative approach of the proposal. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Is the technical plan for implementation as described in the proposal sound?</b> Please rate the soundness of the technical approach for implementation. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Soundness of approach with respect to management of sensitive/private data.</b> 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? ★★★★★</p>	
<p><b>Capability of the proposer</b></p> <p><b>Quality of the team involved in the proposal (adequate resources, knowledge and availability)</b> Please rate the adequacy of the team involved in the proposal. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Is the technical proposer's capacity correctly explained? (Availability of infrastructures at proposer or VICINITY, availability of resources, etc.)</b> Please rate the proposer's technical capacity. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Are the requested deliverables (Intermediate and final technical and management reports, test plan and implementation, data management plan, evaluation plan, exploitation ) well planned and described ?</b> Please rate how sound and correct are the deliverables described. All the deliverables mentioned should be described. ★★★★★</p> <p><b>Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks, budget and resources to complete the expected result.</b> Please rate how feasible is the work plan based on the requested duration, budget and timing of deliverables. ★★★★★</p>	<p><b>Score:</b> (Threshold 12/20)</p>