



JORNADA INFORMATIVA: SME INSTRUMENT FAST TRACK TO INNOVATION

M^a LUISA REVILLA

Punto Nacional de Contacto Reto Energía H2020

División Programas de la UE

Dirección de Programas Internacionales

CDTI

Instrumento PYME

➤ Business innovation support

➤ Completely bottom-up – all areas of the Energy Challenge covered

➤ Only open to SMEs – also single-beneficiaries possible

➤ 3 phases of support (no need to start with phase 1)

- 1. Business innovation grants** (feasibility studies, lump sum of EUR 50,000 per project);
- 2. Business innovation grants for innovation development & demonstration purposes** (between EUR 0.5 – 2.5 million / project)
- 3. Free-of-charge business coaching**, access to a wide range of innovation support services and facilitated access to risk finance to facilitate the commercial exploitation of the innovation.

➤ 4 submission deadlines per year for phase 1 and 2

SME-1	SME-2
24-feb-16	03-feb-16
03-may-16	14-abr-16
07-sep-16	15-jun-16
09-nov-16	13-oct-16



EN

Horizon 2020

Work Programme 2016 - 2017

7. Innovation in SMEs

Instrumento PYME

➤ Budget :

- **SMEInst-09-2016-2017:** Stimulating the innovation potential of SMEs for a low carbon and efficient energy system:
 - ✓ **46 M€ in 2016**
 - ✓ **50 M€ in 2017**
- **SMEInst-11-2016-2017:** Boosting the potential of small businesses in the areas of climate action, environment, resource efficiency and raw materials :
 - ✓ **25 M€ in 2016**
 - ✓ **27,5 M€ in 2017**

FAST TRACK TO INNOVATION

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

➤ Temática libre: **BOTTOM-UP approach**

➤ Presupuesto anual: **100 M.€**

➤ Fecha presentación: **Convocatoria abierta continua** desde 06/1/2015 con 3 fechas de corte: 15 Marzo 2016
01 Junio 2016
25 Octubre 2016

➤ **Time-to-grant:** 6 meses

➤ **Umbral evaluación: 12/15.** Primer criterio a evaluar IMPACTO (4/5), seguido de EXCELENCIA e IMPLEMENTACION.

FAST TRACK TO INNOVATION

➤ **Acción de Innovación: 70% CD**

- **< 3M.€**
- **3-5 socios ***, obligatoria la participación de la industria, en especial PYMES y primeras aplicaciones industriales:
 - **Mínimo 60% presupuesto** de la industria
 - **0 mínimo 2 socios industriales**, en consorcios de 3-4
 - 3 socios industriales**, en consorcios de 5
- **Plan de negocio + Estrategia de despliegue en mercado.**
Llegada a mercado máximo **3 años** desde inicio proyecto.
- **Mínimo TRL 6:** tecnología ya probada en un entorno relevante.

* Puede participar todo tipo de participante

FTI-Datos generales de participación. Call Abril 2015

268 propuestas presentadas

48 superan umbral (12) – (18,2% tasa de aprobación)

16 financiadas -

– 12,92 nota corte

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

FTI-Datos generales de participación. Call Sept-2015 (provisionales)

230 propuestas presentadas

51 superan umbral (12) – (22,2% tasa de aprobación)

15 financiadas - 3 lideradas por España, y en 8 proyectos hay presencia española.

– 12,9 nota corte

– 6.5 % tasa éxito

Keywords – call Abril 2015

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%	

ESR Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 1 – Impact (1)

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.

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.

Explain how **customers will be reached**.

Strategy to **get Key stakeholder** (Authorities, Citizens, NGOs) participation is insufficiently addressed.

ESR Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 1 – Impact (2)

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 financials.

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.

The time required for the clinical trials is underestimated.

The dissemination plan is not comprehensive.

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 results** could be better explained.

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

ESR Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 1 – Impact (3)

T to M

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

ESRComments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 2 - Excellence

Generales

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, and mostly in terms of vehicle positioning technologies.
Not enough progress between the existing situation and the proposed solution.
The comparison to state of the art solutions is not sufficiently addressed.
The comparison with state of the art solutions, from a financial perspective, is not sufficient.
Sustainability of the proposed solution in comparison with current state-of-the-art solutions 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**.

ESRComments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation (1)

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**
Periodic and final reports should be delivered.

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

There is a **high number of milestones**, which might turn out impossible to track.

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 impact of the mentioned risks are **neither detailed nor scored**.

The risk assessment is poor /looks below the expectations.

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
 One aspect that is not covered in enough detail in the proposal is **the strategy to obtain regulatory approval** in Europe and Internationally.

Financial risks are not duly considered.

ESRComments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation (2)

Consortium

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.

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.

Some aspects related to selection of unknown subcontractors remain unclear. Foreseen subcontractors are **not identified** nor the subcontracting procedure presented. The **procurement of the equipment process is not clarified**.

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 management structure lacks WPLs and an interim committee

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

ESHORIZONTE2020

Portal español del Programa Marco de Investigación e Innovación de la Unión Europea

MUCHAS GRACIAS

M^a Luisa Revilla

Punto Nacional de Contacto - Reto Energía – Horizonte 2020

División Programas Europeos- CDTI

Luisa.revilla@cdti.es