



# IT<sup>2</sup>Rail Success Story

How to increase the chance  
of a Project to get a grant

*Petr Buchníček – OLTIS Group  
(Member of the Preparatory team)*

# Contents

- General rules of how a proposal is evaluated
- Evaluation criteria
- Examples of scoring
- Practical recommendations for writing a proposal

# IT<sup>2</sup>Rail general description

- Under the MG2.2-2014 'Smart Rail Services' open call, within the 'Mobility for Growth' call of the Horizon 2020 work plan (1<sup>st</sup> step towards the long term IP4 of the Shift<sup>2</sup>Rail R&I programme)
- Executed by the consortium of 27 partners from May 2015 for the next 30 months
- The main goal is to implement solutions that respond to customer needs and thus meet their requirements, such as an integrated end-to-end solution from transaction support to en-route assistance
- The chosen approach aims to give the traveller the full control of the door-to-door travel experience across transport modes and services, both before and during the journey
- Expected outcome – to ensure the sustainable development of public transport through increasing the attractiveness of transport systems while maintaining the effectiveness of their operation

# General evaluation rules

- Each proposal is **evaluated as submitted**  
*(not on its potential if certain changes were to be made)*
- Identified **shortcomings** *(other than minor and obvious typos)* to be **reflected in a lower score** for the relevant criterion
- Shortcomings are to be **explained, but without any recommendations** *(i.e. no suggestions for additional partners, additional work packages, resources cut...)*
- Proposals with **significant weaknesses** that prevent the project from achieving its objectives or with **resources being seriously overestimated** must **not receive above threshold scores**

# Interpretation of the score

- 0 The proposal **fails to address the criterion** or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are **serious inherent weaknesses**.
- 2 **Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are **significant weaknesses**.
- 3 **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but **a number of shortcomings** are present.
- 4 **Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but **a small number of shortcomings** are present.
- 5 **Excellent.** The proposal **successfully addresses all relevant aspects** of the criterion. Any **shortcomings are minor**.

# First stage evaluation

- Fulfillment of the evaluation criteria in the **first stage** of a **two-stage** procedure:
  1. **Excellence** (relevance to the description of the call or topic)  
*description based on IT<sup>2</sup>Rail proposal* – ambitious project with high innovation potential beyond the state of the art
  2. **Impact** (contribution of the project outputs at the EU/int. level)  
*description based on IT<sup>2</sup>Rail proposal*
    - enhancing **innovation capacity** and integration of new knowledge
    - effectiveness of the proposed **measures**
    - **dissemination** of the project results (incl. management of IPR)

*(Minimum score 4 of 5 each)*

# Second stage evaluation

- Fulfillment of 3 evaluation criteria (more technically based):
  1. **Excellence** (relevance to the description of the call or topic)
  2. **Impact** (contribution of the project outputs at the EU/int. level)
  3. **Implementation** (quality and efficiency)  
*description based on IT<sup>2</sup>Rail proposal* – coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

*(Minimum score 3 of 5 each, at least 10 together – then ranking from above)*

# Proposal in the Mirror of Excellence

- Project implementation **objectives cover most aspects** of the Call.
- **Objectives are presented well**, including key **measurable indicators**.
- The **concept is sound** and **clearly explained**. It takes into account...
- The whole proposal description is **well structured** and demonstrates awareness of the current issues in the field of...
- The pilot phase (*if prescribed*) introduces a **very interesting concept of...**
- It takes into account **necessary prerequisites**, including the ... issues in an adequate manner.
- The proposal clearly and comprehensively **considers the current state of the art** and well describes the ambition of...
- The described concept of ... is **ambitious with a clear innovation potential** in...
- The **approach** towards the project objectives is **credible** and described with a **high level of detail** including...

# Examples of **bad** scoring (1. criterion)

## Excellence

- The concept is **not described in** a sufficiently **clear manner**.
- **Neither** the overall nor the specific **objectives of the proposal are fully clear**.  
For example, it is not clear, whether the proposed solution...
- Overall, the proposal mentions features it aims to achieve.  
However, it **lacks details of** the way how to achieve them, e.g. the...
- The proposal **lacks adequate detail** in terms of...
- In addition, it **doesn't provide a sufficient description of technologies and methodologies** that will be used and implemented, e.g. how...
- The innovation potential is in the approach to...  
However, the **proposed solution is limited to...**
- The **approach** towards the project objectives **is not fully credible**.  
It is **not clear how** it will...

# IT<sup>2</sup>Rail in the Mirror of Excellence

- The **objectives** of the proposal **are clear and fully address the goals** set out in topic MG.2.2...
- The proposal's **objectives are in line with** the related EC White Paper on transport (2011) and the objectives of the Shift2Rail initiative (IP4)...
- **The concept of ... is very sound. On the other hand,** there does not appear to be an initial survey to make a detailed assessment of travellers' needs.
- **The proposal ... is attractive. Nevertheless,** certain services for the first/last mile (e.g. car/bike sharing, taxi) **are not sufficiently addressed.**
- Trans-disciplinary integration **is not sufficiently addressed,** although **business analytics** are soundly addressed.
- The proposal **does not sufficiently take into account** that some countries already have fairly advanced multimodal info/ticketing systems, while others have nothing.
- The proposal **does not fully reflect the state of the art** in interoperability frameworks among all modes as there exist multimodal interoperability frameworks already holistically covering all modes.
- The different steps set out in **the approach and methodology lend considerable credibility to the proposal.**

# Proposal in the Mirror of **Impact**

- The proposal **credibly addresses** the impacts listed in the Work Programme...
- The proposal and the consortium itself have a **large innovation capacity**.
- The proposal **clearly details** how the ... will offer a substantial set of core services and tools for ... and how this will not only strengthen the consortium companies, but also 3rd parties through...
- The proposal will **stimulate societal benefits** that arise from ... and **other environmental and socially important impacts** are adequately addressed.
- **Dissemination and communication activities** are well elaborated. A set of modern communication and knowledge management tools will be used and a list of relevant dissemination channels has been presented.
- The **Exploitation Plan** is presented with a **good level of detail**.
- The **IPR Strategy and Management** is well described.

# Examples of **bad** scoring (2. criterion)

## Impact

- **Impacts** listed in the Work Programme and in the Call are **addressed in a weak way**. The proposed solution is **not described in sufficient detail**. The core idea of ... is **not adequately explained**.
- The **indicators and the method of measurements do not** sufficiently **identify the envisaged impacts**.
- The proposal **does not present clear explanation of** its potential to enhancing **innovation capacity** and integration of new knowledge.
- The proposal generally describes how companies could potentially benefit in commercial terms through the opening up of potential new markets. However, the **business model is not clear**.
- Dissemination and communication plans are adequately addressed in the proposal. However, the **exploitation plan is limited and the IPR issues have not been adequately addressed**.

# IT<sup>2</sup>Rail in the Mirror of Impact

- *The proposal identifies impacts not only for the traveller but also for the retailer and the operator.*
- *One **shortcoming** is that **the quality** of the product delivered **is dependent on** the quality of the underlying information coming from the operator and retailer. If that information is poor then the passenger experience will also be poor, no matter how good the Travel Companion application is. **Measures** to guarantee consistency and accuracy of such underlying information **are not sufficiently addressed** in the proposal.*
- *The proposed **project does not directly address environmental impacts**. **Social impacts** are intrinsically linked to the related topic.*
- *The work package devoted to **dissemination activities addresses the matter** in a very comprehensive way. Target groups for communication have been identified and the means by which they will be reached are set out. A Data Management Plan will be established which will continue beyond the life of the project.*
- *Due to the foreseen integration into S<sup>2</sup>R, **exploitation** and the **management of IPR** **are not clearly addressed** in the proposal.*

# Proposal in the Mirror of **Implementation**

- The **work plan is coherent and effective**. All resources are allocated at task level (both partners and total person months). Activities and tasks are **described with sufficient detail**.
- The **allocation of resources** in terms of partners' expertise is **appropriate**.
- The **consortium consists of relevant complementary participants**. Overall, the consortium is a very good combination of players in ... with a proven experience in ... and sound management ability.
- A **good management structure**, supported by an advisory committee, exploitation and innovation boards and a forum, is presented.
- **Critical risks** for implementation and contingencies are **well addressed and carefully considered**.
- All partners in this proposal possess the **basic operational capacity to carry out the proposed work**.

# Examples of **bad** scoring (3. criterion)

## Implementation

- The work plan is provided in sufficient detail. However, the **description of the overall strategy** and the **role of individual partners** within each WP and at the task level are **not fully clear**.
- The **allocation of resources is not adequately explained**, especially the...
- The **consortium has** a predominant presence of ... which is **not justified**.
- The **management structure and procedure description are not properly described**.
- A risk table is provided, but **innovation management and the IPR description lack sufficient detail**.
- **Critical risks for implementation and contingencies are not adequately addressed**.
- The **allocation of resources is not fully explained**, especially the effort estimation for the ... that will be subcontracted...

# IT<sup>2</sup>Rail in the Mirror of **Implementation**

- *The overall **work plan** is good, following a clearly elaborated and effective structure.*
- *A small number of concerns have been identified regarding **the allocation of tasks and resources.***
- ***The consortium is adequately set** with strong involvement of key European industrial providers of...*
- ***Work packages and task leaders are clearly defined...**  
**The managerial structure is well elaborated.***
- ***Critical risk for implementation are adequately considered.***

# Success was expected, because...

- The proposal strictly **followed the Call** requirements!
- The proposal was **clear, straightforward, convincing and realistic!**
- In the proposal there was written not much more, but definitely **nothing less!**
- **No word was wasted** on what the Call does not prescribe (evaluators know the situation, environment, reasons for the Call)!
- The proposal addressed duly **all required criteria!**
- Of concisely **supported arguments!**

# Success was expected, because...

- **The proposal explained all ideas** sufficiently (and supported them as adequately as possible)!
- **The proposal was supported** with analyses (already performed) and no simplifications like “There is a clear demand for...” were stated!
- **The proposal was supported** from potential stakeholders, authorities etc.!

# Success was expected, because...

- During the preparatory phase of the proposal the team always tried to match the proposal **against the evaluation grid** by itself!
- “Implementation” criterion (i.e. work plan, resources, consortium, management, IPR etc.) **can always** be of very good quality because it is the most easily “recyclable” part (once perfectly elaborated)!
- The team understood, that if **all necessary information are not provided in the proposal**, it is only the fault of the team if not well scored!

# Complementary facts of success

- Simply as possible there was written in the proposal:  
**What, Why, When, How, For how much, ...**  
How the outcome will be better and more efficient than in other proposals!
- **What the proposal promised has to be and is now fulfilled!**
- **Gender balance** and the excellent **track records of the key personnel** was taken into account!
- The proposal was **credible** and **feasible!**

# Contacts

**Petr BUCHNÍČEK**

E) petr.buchnicek@oltisgroup.cz

M) +420 604 223 193

OLTIS Group a.s.

Polní 780/92

639 00 Brno

Czech Republic

[www.oltisgroup.cz](http://www.oltisgroup.cz)