

Proposal Evaluation Form



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme

Fast Track to Innovation (FTI) pilot - Evaluation summary Report

Call: H2020-FTIPilot-2016-1
Funding scheme: IA
Proposal number: 730672
Proposal acronym: SIMILAR
Duration (months): 36
Proposal title: Optimization and market launch of a global standardization service for milk analyses (Mid Infrared spectral responses) across labs regardless the brand or model of spectrometers.
Activity: EC Ranking

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	European Milk Recording EEIG	BE	471,400	34.40%	329,980	29.66%
2	CENTRE WALLON DE RECHERCHES AGRONOMIQUES	BE	511,625	37.34%	511,625	45.98%
3	IfM GmbH & Co. KG	DE	141,625	10.34%	99,138	8.91%
4	SERVICE ICAR SRL	IT	245,625	17.93%	171,938	15.45%
Total:			1,370,275		1,112,680	

Abstract:

In the dairy sector, the labs use Mid Infra-Red (MIR) spectrometry for milk analysis. In addition of classical milk components like fat and protein, this technology is more and more utilized to develop new algorithms for the detection of new molecules and the prediction of complex indicators related to animals' physiology. Dairy farmers, extension workers or vets have thus new opportunities for decision making tools in farm management (animal health, feeding, breeding, ecological footprint...), and the milk industry has new opportunities for specifications, labelling, etc. The problem is that an algorithm built on a specific MIR spectrometer cannot be transposed on another apparatus even if same model and same brand in the same lab. Algorithms are thus specific to each single MIR apparatus. CRA-W and EMR EEIG developed an innovative prototype service to standardize the spectra overtime, across models of machine, and across brands of machine, and based on a transnational approach (Grelet et al., 2015, Journal of dairy sciences). This innovation reaches TRL6 through OptiMIR project (INTERREG) and allows to develop transposable algorithms and to obtain accurate indicators regardless the brand or model of the spectrometer. The objective is now to deliver a marketable standardization service to milk laboratories, Milk Recording Organizations, dairy industries and other stakeholders who use MIR technology for milk analysis. The project will optimize the different processes of the standardization service, to professionalize it and to reduce its overall costs. It will achieve the international validation of the methodology and protocol (ISO/IDF and ICAR validation). It will finally disseminate the standardization service for milk MIR spectra with 3 commercial arguments: (1) Comparable results in time across labs, brands and models of spectrometers (2) Development of algorithms which are accurate everywhere (3) Potential utilization of the same algorithms everywhere

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 10.41 (Threshold: 12)

Form information

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

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.

Criterion 1 - Impact

Score: **3.30** (Threshold: 4/5.00 , Weight: -)

Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Projected revenues and ROI are too low for the project to be suitable for FTI Pilot funding. They are modest as a result of the target market size and number of customers being low.

Project funding will be used in part to pay the costs of the existing quality control network from which the project will be replicated, this suggests that the business proposition may not be financially viable.

There is no detailed description of the market, the main user needs or how the innovation could address them.

Criterion 2 - Excellence

Score: **3.42** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

The market for the exploitable product is limited and so not aligned with the aims of the FTI programme. The proposal is for duplication and roll out of an existing approach to quality control; so it is relevant and useful to its market but is an incremental improvement and not a significant innovative.

The commercialization of the technology would require more dissemination and proactive activities.

A more detailed analysis of the major economic or environmental benefits compared to current state of the art is not provided.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of implementation

Score: **3.69** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

Comments (relating to main weaknesses identified only)

Neither the project work plan nor the gantt chart breaks down the project time scale sufficiently, to activity level.

The proposal lacks an analysis of commercial and financial risks; risks are not assessed for their likelihood or impact.

The project's approach to risk management is not described.

Scope of the proposal

Status: **Yes**

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

If No, please list the concerned partner(s), the reasons for the rejection, and the requested amount.

Not provided

Exceptional funding of third country participants/international organisations

A third country participant/international organisation not listed in [General Annex A to the Main Work Programme](#) may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the [Online Manual](#))

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should exceptionally be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should NOT be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?

No

If yes, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please also state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not because of a lack of information.

Not provided