

## Key Action 2: Strategic Partnerships

### Assessment Feedback

**Project title:** Digital Transformation of European Micro enterprises

**Reference number:** 2016-1-UK01-KA202-024362

Please find below the scores awarded and overall feedback provided by independent assessors in respect of the above application. It is important that you read the comments carefully, as you may be required to address any recommendations before or during the lifetime of your project.

| Award Criteria | Relevance of the Project | Quality of Project Design and Implementation | Quality of the Project Team and the Cooperation Arrangements | Impact and Dissemination | Total |
|----------------|--------------------------|--|--|--------------------------|-------|
| Maximum Score  | 30                       | 20   | 20   | 30                       | 100   |
| Threshold*     | 15                       | 10   | 10   | 15                       | 60    |
| Score Awarded  | 23                       | 16   | 17.5   | 25                       | 81.5  |

*\*To be considered for funding, proposals must score at least 60 points overall AND at least half of the maximum points for each of the award criteria outlined above. For more information, see p.116 of 2016 Erasmus+ Programme Guide.*

#### Feedback summary:

This is a good project proposal, contributing to the development of micro-enterprises across Europe. The project partnership combines relevant organisations with recognized experience in international project work and specific expertise in key topics, related to current project.

The innovation is to upgrade current existing state-of-the-art in the field, which is complimentary. This aspect would be further strengthened by explaining the concrete links of the training planned in the context of C-VET provision in partner countries and at European

level.

The process for the overall management and co-ordination of the project is well defined and the timetable and phases of the project are logical. The process for developing the Intellectual Outputs is clear and the resources allocated are appropriate although the justification for the high number of manager days is weak. The multiplier events are appropriately timed and the transnational training event is relevant to the project outcomes. However, more detail and a full description of the planned programme would have strengthened this section of the application.

The potential for impact is good and the strategy for dissemination should maximise the opportunities for exploitation both during and after the project. The applicant could further strengthen this section by elaborating on possible scenarios for ensuring sustainability. For example, outlining how the project outputs can be sustained through Erasmus+ funding opportunities.

It would be recommended that the applicant avoids the interchangeable use of terms such as MEs and SMEs. The applicant emphasizes that one of the innovative aspects of the current proposal is focusing on needs, solutions and impact on micro enterprises (MEs). It is recommended to keep this focus throughout the whole application form in order to keep coherence between the goals set and the final impact and results envisaged. In the impact sections, including impact evaluation the applicant refers to effects on SMEs.

### **Comments on budget, including any budget reductions:**

Due to the inclusion of managerial and teacher/trainer/researcher time in the Intellectual Output 2 (IO2), all costs associated with these staff categories were removed for this IO, as the requested days and costs do not appear justified enough in the application form: the content for inclusion on the platform is all being developed as part of other IOs and therefore the inclusion of managers and teacher/trainer/researcher days in IO2 can be covered under the Project Management and Implementation budget. Moreover, managerial time should normally be co-financed by the Project Management and Implementation budget, unless clearly justified. A large number of manager days was requested (almost 100 across all IOs) and although these are explained, and referred to as a small number in Section I.7, they would have demonstrated a more effective use of resources and value for money if these had been related to the lead responsibilities for each Intellectual Output.

The NA has therefore removed all costs associated with manager days (8,896) and

teacher/trainers/researcher (58,897) staff categories from all partners requested under the IO2 budget. Total: 8,896 + 58,897 = 67,793 Euro

Moreover, all costs associated with a room hire requested under the Exceptional Costs budget were deemed ineligible. Room hire is not considered an eligible cost under the Exceptional Costs budget and should be co-financed by the Project Management and Implementation budget. Moreover, this cost did not meet the definition of costs permitted under this budget heading as real costs related to subcontracting or the purchase of goods or services that could not be delivered or provided by the organisations participating in the project, for duly justified reasons. Although some justification was provided within the application, this suggests that it is normal practice for the partners concerned to hire rooms for meetings involving 8-14 people. As such, these costs are standard office overheads and are not considered justified to be claimed as Exceptional Costs for this project. The NA therefore has removed all costs associated with room hire from the Exceptional Costs budget. Total: 750 Euro.

The total budget reductions are: 68,543 euro. These reductions will need to be co-financed via the Project Management and Implementation budget.