Assessment Sheet

1. Identification

1.1.	Name	Baltic Sea Region Urban Forum for Smart Cities
1.2.	**Number and acronym**	R1.075 BUF
1.3.	**Priority**	1. Capacity for innovation
1.4.	**Specific objective**	1.3 Non-technological innovation To advance the Baltic Sea Region performance in non-technological innovation based on increased capacity of innovation actors
1.5.	**Programme result**	Increased capacity of innovation actors (innovation intermediaries, authorities, research institutions, enterprises) to improve conditions for non-technological innovation
1.6.	**Total project duration**	36 months

1.7.	**Project summary** (imported from the section 2. of the concept note)

The objective of BUF project is to strengthen the innovation capacities of BSR local authorities and related innovation actors for the implementation of sustainable urban development by providing the model for smart city early dialogue model and implementation throughout the BSR. The underlying rationale is that cities and towns are increasingly becoming focal points for development and application of new technologies and innovations and it is particularly important to support cities and towns in pursuing innovations that enable green growth and sustainable development. The project helps to identify, adapt and multiply good practices in order to build capacity and exchange knowledge, thus enabling the cities to become truly smart. This will happen by facilitation of dialogue, experience sharing and joint action on identification and application of existing and new green technologies and/or social innovations in urban areas and, thereby, supporting strongly the smart growth of BSR.

1.8.	**Financial resources** [all amounts in euro]

Budget of partners included in the concept note	
Planned ERDF budget	3,280,000.00
Planned NO budget	0.00

Budget of partners to be included in the next step	
Planned ERDF budget	300,000.00

Planned NO budget		0.00
Total project budget		3,580,000.00
of it investments		450,000.00

1.9.	**Project partnership**		
No.	**Organisation**	**Country**	**Estimated total partner budget [in EUR]**
1.	Smart City Lab (SCL)	EE	500,000.00
	Smart City Lab		
2.	Union of the Baltic Cities (UBC)	PL	300,000.00
	Union of the Baltic Cities		
3.	Baltic Environmental Forum Deutschland e.V. (BEF)	DE	180,000.00
	Baltic Environmental Forum Germany		
4.	The Permanent Secretariat of the Council of the Baltic Sea States (CBSS)	SE	100,000.00
	The Permanent Secretariat of the Council of the Baltic Sea States		
5.	Balti Uuringute Instituut (IBS)	EE	200,000.00
	Institute of Baltic Studies		
6.	Technische Universität Wien (TU Wien)	Other Austria	150,000.00
	Vienna University of Technology		
7.	Turun kaupunki	FI	300,000.00
	City of Turku		
8.	Tartu linn	EE	250,000.00
	City of Tartu		
9.	Malmö stad	SE	300,000.00
	City of Malmö		
10.	Landeshauptstadt Kiel	DE	250,000.00
	City of Kiel		
11.	Riga	LV	250,000.00
	City of Riga		

12.	Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, Senatskanzlei	DE	200,000.00
	Free and Hanseatic City of Hamburg, Senate Chancellery		
13.	Kauno miesto	LT	250,000.00
	City of Kaunas		
14.	Positium LBS OÜ	EE	50,000.00
	Positium LBS Llc		

1.10.	Main outputs

- Smart city roadmaps
- Documented toolkit and guidelines for Smart City Early Dialogue Model
- Social innovations/new services
- Prepared documentations/studies in the cities or procurement for innovation or indicative smaller-scale outputs/investments (e.g. prototypes, control systems, planning tools, technological solutions)
- Knowledge produced during the project will be captured in the Massive Open Online Courseware available on various internet platforms

2. Final conclusion and requirements

FINAL CONCLUSION
The concept note **demonstrates sufficient relevance and potential** to become a good quality project in the Programme. The concept note addresses a challenge of high relevance to the Programme and the selected target group. The partnership is addressing the challenges associated with the development of smart city solutions. However, the proposed approach is not sufficiently explained in the concept note and thus it is not yet fully clear how the expected results will be achieved. The project has to improve the presentation of how the outputs will be put in practice by the relevant target groups. In addition, the description of involvement of target groups and other relevant organisations in project's activities has to be improved.
REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL DECISION
None

3. Admissibility check

OUTCOME OF ADMISSIBILITY CHECK
The concept note passed the admissibility check.

4. Quality assessment

Scoring system: 3 (good), 2 (sufficient), 1 (insufficient)

I. RELEVANCE OF THE PROPOSAL	SCORE	2

1. The concept note is in line with the thematic focus of the Programme and the given call:
- Do the challenges addressed in the concept note match the thematic focus of the selected specific objective as set out in the CP?
- Is the concept note in line with the focus of the given call as specified in the announcement note of the call?

The concept note is partly in line with the thematic focus of the Programme and the given call.

The challenge addressed partly matches the thematic focus of the selected specific objective as set out in the CP. The partnership is addressing the challenges associated with the development of smart city solutions. The gaps are identified and listed, such as lack of understanding, lack of competence, lack of tools etc. to boost smart city solutions. The partnership, however, has not been clear about whose understanding, competence and tools need the project's support. The partnership has not clearly outlined the needs of the target groups. Yet, the constellation of the partnership proves the interest of the cities in addressing the challenge.

2. The concept note contributes to one of the expected results of the Programme:
- Will institutional capacity of the project's target groups be enhanced?
- Are the selected target groups relevant to the selected specific objective?

The concept note partly contributes to the selected expected result of the Programme.

The concept note partly describes the target groups to be addressed by the main project. The project intends to involve a variety of organisations representing fields of

energy, transport, housing, urban planning, social services and education, as well as other stakeholders in smart urban development, such as business representatives, research institutions, civil society organisations, and regional development and planning agencies/institutions, business support structures (CN, section 4). It is understood that the project is setting up a wide dialogue in order to gather "a critical mass" to strengthen the acceptance of the smart city notion and generation of smart city solutions. As outlined in the section 5.2, the partnership has planned to use the reserved project partners' option for involvement of business partners, as well as there is a plan for wide outreach activities.

The outputs are not fully clear—what is meant in practice and who and how will use them? The outcomes of pilots would need a better explanation as well. Yet, the constellation of the partnership proves the commitment to taking over the results. Therefore, the concept note demonstrates sufficient potential to enhance institutional capacity of the project's main target groups.

3. The concept note contributes to the implementation of the policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area:

- Does the concept note contribute to any of the policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area? For example, Europe 2020, the European Union Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR), Socio-economic Development Strategy of the Russian Federation (Russian North-West Strategy) or other policy document relevant to the Programme area, e.g. sectoral policies/strategies, (TEN-T, Water Framework Directive).

The concept note is in line with the policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area.

The concept note is supported by a Letter of Commitment by EUSBSR HAL Sustainable Development confirming that the proposed project is helping realising the objectives of HA.

4. The concept note is of transnational value:

- Does the concept note justify the need for transnational cooperation (does the proposed approach - activities, outputs and their use - and the partnership demonstrate the need for transnational cooperation)?
- Does the concept note demonstrate additional value?

The concept note demonstrates partial transnational relevance.

The proposed approach (activities, outputs and their use) and the partnership partly demonstrate the need for transnational cooperation. The project intends to bring

together a variety of stakeholders, yet the partnership has not explained how it will build on joint exchange of know-how. The cooperation and competence-combining element in the project's approach is missing. Furthermore, the partnership has not clearly demonstrated the need and benefits of addressing the topic on a transnational level. The approach description creates an impression that most of activates are local, and that on the transnational level mostly the exchange of experience will be done. Nonetheless, the produced outputs seem to be relevant in the transnational context and of benefit for all the cities involved in the project and outside.

Due to the unclear transnational context, the concept note partly demonstrates additional value to the current or already completed projects financed by the Interreg BSR transnational cooperation programmes. Nevertheless, it seems that similar activities were not carried out and similar outputs were not produced in previous project financed by the Interreg BSR programmes.

II.	PARTNERSHIP	SCORE	2

5. The planned partnership has sufficient potential to implement the main project proposal:
- Is the composition of the partnership appropriate to carry out the proposed activities and reach the results (does the partnership possess the competences needed for the project implementation; does the partnership have sufficient geographical coverage)?
- What are the missing competences and which geographical areas are missing?
- Are the plans to include further partners sufficient?

The current and planned partnership seems to have partly sufficient potential to implement the project.

The current partnership listed in the concept note—city administrations, a business support organisation as a lead applicant, universities, and environmental organisations—seem to partly possess the competences needed to address the topic of smart cities and ensure the wide participation of the stakeholders. The missing competences are representatives of the various fields. The missing competences are partly explained. Based on the concept note, the current partnership plans to look for further partners fulfilling the gaps: the reserved project partners' option will be used for involvement of business partners, as well as there is a plan for wide outreach activities. Unfortunately, the approach presentation is not clearly portraying the involvement of the parties needed. In addition, the budget allocated for further partners is significantly smaller. Thus, it seems only partly realistic that the gaps can be fulfilled by further partners.

As the challenge and result descriptions miss clear geographical references it is difficult to assess if the partnership has sufficient geographical coverage to implement the project proposal.

III. COHERENCE OF THE APPROACH	SCORE	2

6. There is coherence between the expected results and the proposed approach.
- Can the results described in the concept note be achieved through the proposed approach (do the planned outputs and activities lead to the described results; is the proposed approach realistic)?
- Does the concept note include demonstration actions and/or investments? If yes, do they support the achievement of the project's results?

It seems that there is partial coherence between the expected results and the proposed approach.

The activities, main outputs and proposed approach (methodology) are partly described. The project is developing and testing a new urban cooperation format that boosts the innovation readiness of cities and thus fosters the adoption of smart urban solutions to environmental and societal challenges around the BSR. To do so, a variety of stakeholders need to be involved, yet the current presentation of the approach does not provide a clear picture of the work method, especially its transnational context. Furthermore, the outputs would have to be better presented of what is meant in practice and who and how will use them. In addition, the concept note includes pilots and investments. The pilots partly support the achievement of the expected results—the outcomes are not fully clear. Are those fully fledged and functional social innovations/new services? As for the investments, they are not explained. The pilots demonstrate partial transnational relevance. Thus, the tangible impacts are not fully explained and therefore it seems that the expected results will be only partly be achieved through the proposed approach.

IV. BUDGET	SCORE	2

7. The planned budget of the main project is adequate in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results, and involvement of current and planned partners:
- Is the planned budget realistic in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results and involved partners?

It seems that the planned budget is partly adequate in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results, and involvement of current and planned partners.

The budget allocated to the future partnership is rather low in comparison to the current partnership. In addition, the lead applicant has significantly higher budget the rest of the partners.

1st Call for Step 1: Concept Note
1 April 2015