



tively Market I I company.

Convertium

Risk mitigation







Impacto económico T to M Temas regulatorios Comercialización Usuarios Explotación

Plan financiero

Value for money Generales TRL State of the art

#### Fast track to innovation

Piloto en 2015 y 2016 para proyectos pequeños de Innovación cercanos al mercado de cualquier sector

Presupuesto anual: 100 M€ ~ 15-20 proyectos por corte



#### Las reglas







#### La propuesta

La evaluación













# Fast Track to Innovation H2020

Muchas gracias por su atención.

¿Preguntas?

Esther Casado Moya
División de Programas de la UE
CDTI. Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad

@eCasado\_CDTI

## Fast track to innovation

Piloto en 2015 y 2016
para proyectos pequeños
de Innovación
cercanos al mercado
de cualquier sector

Presupuesto anual: 100 M€

~ 15-20 proyectos por corte



# Las reglas

Temática bottom-up.



**Todo tipo** de entidades elegibles

3 fechas corte/año (**1 dec 2015**, 15 Mar 2016, 01 Jun 2016, 25 Oct 2016)

Time to grant: 6 meses

Gestionado centralmente por **EASME** 

Proyectos pequeños < 3M€ presupuesto EC cont 1-2M€ aprox. (70%, IA, TRL 6)



## El consorcio (3,4,5)

(MS o AC)





## Time to market=36M







GxA disponible - 30 hojas

Business plan logic + **Estrategia de despliegue en**mercado

EU added value

**CONVENCER** 



## La evaluación

Remota por 4 expertos en negocio Sin reuniones de consenso Umbral de 12, 4 en impacto

#### En caso de empate:

- 1) nota de impacto
- 2) presupuesto de PYME
- 3) n° de first-time applicants
- 4) nº de socios industriales
- 5) Equilibrio de género en el personal del consorcio.

Briefing evaluadores del FTI:

www.youtube.com/watch?v=7miDLwcOfs4&feature=youtu.be



#### Convocatoria Abril/2015

#### Datos generales de participación

264 propuestas evaluadas

48 superan umbral (12)

16 financiadas (12,92 nota corte)

6.1 % tasa éxito (1/3 de las que superan umbrales )



Keywords

FIXED KEYWORDS	PANELS	# proposals	Financiadas	% financ sobre presentadas	% Del total
Information and Communication Technologies	ICT	56	2	4%	13%
Nanotechnologies	NANO	7	0	0%	0%
Advanced materials	Adv Mat	11	2	18%	13%
Biotechnology	BIO	8	0	0%	0%
Advanced manufacturing and processing	MANUF	49	2	4%	13%
Space	SPACE	0	0	0%	0%
Health, demographic change and wellbeing	HEALTH	46	2	4%	13%
Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy	FOOD	18	1	6%	6%
Secure, clean and efficient energy	ENERGY	26	3	12%	19%
Smart, green and integrated transport	TRANSPORT	26	3	12%	19%
Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials	ENV	15	1	7%	6%
Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens (critical infrastructure)	SEC SOCI	1	0	0%	0%
Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies	SOCI	5	0	0%	0%
TOTAL		268	16	6%	

FIXED KEYWORDS	PANELS	# proposals	Financiadas	% financ sobre presentadas	% Del total
Information and Communication Technologies	ICT	56	2	4%	13%
Nanotechnologies	NANO	7	0	0%	0%
Advanced materials	Adv Mat	11	2	18%	13%
Biotechnology	ВІО	8	0	0%	0%
Advanced manufacturing and processing	MANUF	49	2	4%	13%
Space	SPACE	0	0	0%	0%
Health, demographic change and wellbeing	HEALTH	46	2	4%	13%
Food security, sustainable agriculture and forestry, marine and maritime and inland water research and the bioeconomy	FOOD	18	1	6%	6%
Secure, clean and efficient energy	ENERGY	26	3	12%	19%
Smart, green and integrated transport	TRANSPORT	26	3	12%	19%
Climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials	ENV	15	1	7%	6%
Secure societies - protecting freedom and security of Europe and its citizens (critical infrastructure)	SEC SOCI	1	0	0%	0%
Europe in a changing world - inclusive, innovative and reflective societies	SOCI	5	0	0%	0%
TOTAL		268	16	6%	



El consorcio (3,4,5); Ppto ind >60% Proyectos < 3M€ presupuesto EC cont 1-2M€ aprox.

#### Consorcio típico financiado

- 4.3 participantes por proyecto
- 46.3 % participación son PYMES
  - 9 PYMEs coordinadoras
- ~ 2.97 M€ presupuesto / 2.23 M€ EC contribution

#### Criterion 1 - Impact

Score: (Threshold: 4/5.00, Weight: -)

Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

The section is well articulated in all aspects.



Remota por 4 expertos en negocio
Sin reuniones de consenso
Umbral de 12, 4 en impacto
Criterion 1 – Impact
Criterion 2 - Excellence
Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

ESR Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)



Impacto económico

Criterion 1 – Impact

Mercado

Generales

T to M

Creación de empleo

Competidores

Temas regulatorios

Comercialización

Explotación

FTO

**Usuarios** 

Plan financiero



Criterion 1 - Impact

#### Generales

The project is **not focussed** enough. A number of target groups and a series of services/products are intended to be developed in parallel.

The project has a limited innovation value as it appears to be an incremental improvement on existing technologies and targets conventional markets.

Old documents written before the economic crisis.

Not described how the innovation will increase the capacity of consortium partners.

It would be welcome to have letters of support of interested investors, users, stakeholders...

#### Mercado

The impact on the market and on two of the partners could be low.

The European dimension does not become sufficiently clear.

The main impact appears to occur outside the EU and it looks like the main beneficiary belongs to a third country based company.

The opportunities for wide market deployment are not convincingly and in details explained.

The consortium has **not** sufficiently **analysed** the **target market** 

Targeting a quite limited market

Ambiguous figures related to market penetration

#### Competidores

The proposal does not provide enough information to conclude that the envisioned solution is vested with a **better commercial potential than the alternatives**.

There are many competitors with a customer base.

The **analysis** of competition is **not sufficiently** elaborated.

The **positioning** of the proposed product is **not well described** towards the competitors' products price competitiveness" which is not sufficiently addressed

Competitors are not named.

#### Usuarios

Potential buyers are not explicitly identified.

The **willingness to purchase** the solution are **not** sufficiently **motivated**.

The description of user needs and preferences is not supported by any official data, e.g. results of market studies or desk researches conducted

No clear description of **user needs** is provided and it is not clear if the new technology will specifically address these user needs.

Not explained how customers will be reached.

Strategy to get key stakeholder (Authoritiies, Citizens, NGOs) participation is insufficiently addressed.



Criterion 1 - Impact

#### Impacto económico

Furthermore, the estimate of the **potential economic impact on each company** of the consortium is **not supported by evidence** on the potential **demand**. The **economic impact on the partners** cannot be fully assessed because turnover expectations have not been adequately indicated.

Lack of the numerical growth of the companies involved in financial.

The **projections** on the business benefits for the participants are just introduced, **without sufficient details** and justifications.

#### Creación de empleo

Job creation was not described, not mentioned.

There is no major focus on the creation of new jobs.

Ambiguous figures related to job creation.

#### Comercialización

Commercialization **objectives** have been defined but **commercialization strategies**, marketing and sales efforts need further development.

The **commercialisation plan** is **poorly** detailed / is **not clearly** described / is **missing** / is **premature** and **optimistic** in terms of the time to market / is **not comprehensive**.

The time required for the clinical trials is underestimated.

#### Explotación

The question how to raise additional funds for market sale and implementation and further development after project end should have been more clearly resolved.

The **budget to cover the total costs for the development** of the project was mentioned with **insufficiently** detailed information.

There should also be an explanation about the criteria applied for the estimation of the future sales price.

The **exploitation route** is not clear, also the actual sales/marketing activity to be undertaken by the project partners, is vague - this should be specified in detail.

The **exploitation of the result**s could be better explained.

There is a lack of detailed information about how the product will be exploited.



Criterion 1 – Impact

#### Time to Market

It is noted that the wide market deployment will probably not be obtained in the expected time period of the FTI pilot.

Commercial take-up 12 month after project end (Project duration: 30 months)

Details are **missing** concerning a thorough discussion of the **steps needed** at the end of the project **to reach the market** and associated efforts/responsibilities.

Unclear how the first clients will be reached.

It is not clear if there is **sufficient time for the establishment of new production facilities** towards the end of the project. Insufficient information is provided on the time plan for scaling up production and for market deployment.

#### Plan financiero

The proposal does **not show convincing numbers** regarding the **ROI**. The description and the **justification** for the estimates of ROI is unclear. **Error** in the ROI formula.

ROI, costs and profit analysis and projections are not sufficient.

The **pricing model** presented in the proposal is not clearly justified. Revenue model could be explained in a more clear way to fully understand

It is not clear how mass production of the system will be addressed and **financed**.

The general financial plan has **not been presented** in due detail / is **not quite clear**. There is **no real financing plan**.

The financial plan not detailed and not connected to commercialization strategy.

The economic viability of the entire project is not fully convincing. It lacks the break even analysis for the product.

#### Temas regulatorios

The project is depending on the evolution of the **regulatory framework** within EU that may influence the effective market take-up.

There is a lack of information on the specific regulatory and legal conditions that will affect commercialisation in individual markets.

Environment: The expected **environmental impact** will be significant.

The origin of the processed biomass is not fully clear what might cause an environmental impact related with its transportation.

#### FTO

Freedom to operate issues are not properly covered.

Lack of a freedom-to-operate analysis



Criterion 2 - Excellence

# Value for money Generales TRL State of the art



Generales Criterion 2 – Excellence

The **assumptions** should be **better explained**.

The **innovative aspects** are **not documented** in a fully convincing manner.

The concept seems to be developed by the main applicant and **not so much jointly in a consortium.** 

#### Value for money

The value for money are **not** made entirely **clear** in the proposal Value for money is **not demonstrated** clearly enough.

#### State of the art

The **review** of the state-of-the-art has been provided in a **brief** and **generic way.** 

Not enough progress between the existing situation and the proposed solution.

The comparison to state of the art solutions is **not sufficiently addressed**.

**Sustainability** of the proposed solution **in comparison with current state-of-the-art solution**s are **not** made entirely **clear** in the proposal.

The proposal should have included a clear analysis of the results obtained from previous research and projects.

#### **TRL**

**Initial TRL** is **not convincingly 6** or higher.

It is at a relatively early stage of TRL.

In some text passages one has the impression that TRL6 has not been reached yet.

It is also unclear what the basis of the claimed TRL6 level is in terms of data and clinical trials.

The clinical validation of the product is not addressed in sufficient detail.

The clinical pilot studies with low patient numbers may not be suitable to clinically validate the innovation



Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

Risk mitigation

Generales

Consortium

Project implementation

Resources



Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

#### Generales

**IPR** issues, one still has a doubt concerning potential inclusion of a partner.

Limited information has been provided about **foreground IPs**.

**Innovation management** are not sufficiently addressed considering the complexity of the project.

#### **Project implementation**

Stating that the project will start in June 2015 is unrealistic

The **management structure** lacks WPLs and an interim committee. **Periodic and final reports** should be delivered.

The implementation plan is highly fragmented. There are too many deliverables and milestones (20!).

The **Gantt chart** show a major **error**. CE certification is scheduled before the conclusion of clinical trials

The large allocation of effort to WP6 is not justified and the lead participant name is not provided.

#### Risk mitigation

The risk mitigation plan is presented just as a **short summary** / does **not include measures to minimize** potential **market risks** and barriers.

The risk assessment is **poor** /looks **below the expectation**s.

Risks and associated countermeasures mainly related to delays in **go-to-market** plans are **not sufficiently covered**.

The risks related to the possible refusal of the **regulatory approval** of the medical device are not duly addressed

Financial risks are not duly considered.



#### Consortium

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

**Consortium as a whole** - does not offer detailed info.

The Consortium composition may be ideal for RTD activities, but is **not structured properly for market entry activities.** 

The **marketing expertise** needed to exploit the opportunity is **not adequately demonstrated** in the proposal. The description of the companies and the personnel does not highlight commercial skills. The **sales network** for commercial exploitation of the technology is somewhat **limited**.

The weakness of the consortium is that the members while excellently technically qualified show an insufficiently small base of business, commercialization skills.

The reason for the involvement of participant No X should have been expressed more clearly in order to justify its presence in the team.

A **partner** for the large scale production has **not been identified**. This can be a risk of the project that needs to be addressed.

The capability of the coordinator has not been sufficiently described in the proposal.

It could be better explained how this small number of partners gathers the available resources and knowledge needed for the success of the project.

The industrial partners are big enough to be able to develop a business plan by themselves.

Main weakness is about resource allocation. **Appears** that the **project is dominated by** the presence of the **coordinator** and the two other partners play a minor role.



Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

#### Resources

The **costs** of the project appear to be **underestimated**.

The **costs for equipment** are significant for the majority of partners and only **partly justified** with respect to the delta of existing infrastructure the partners have. The **procurement** of the **equipment** process is **not clarified**.

Some aspects related to selection of **unknown subcontractors** remain **unclear**.

Foreseen subcontractors are not identified nor the subcontracting procedure presented.

The budget includes publicity costs, which are **not eligible**.

The proposed tasks and the **amount of persons**/months do **not exactly match**.

The **specific roles** of the different participating partners and potential subcontractors are **not defined in** enough **detail**.

The marketing phase of this project is not well developed.

There are too many participants and subcontractors in this project with occasional overlaps in competences.

The proposal does not mention clearly who is the fist-time applicant or participant in the formed consortium.



**Operational Capacity** 

**Status: Operational Capacity: No** 

The capacity of the main applicant as a SME is not clear at all. It is not possible to get enough information form the application as to how the mass production of the device will be handled





# Fast Track to Innovation H2020

Muchas gracias por su atención.

¿Preguntas?

Esther Casado Moya
División de Programas de la UE
CDTI. Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad

@eCasado\_CDTI