

Market deployment prospects are analyzed and quantified annual energy savings and avoided emissions are presented for the retrofits at the three demonstrations. Exploitable results with associated business plans of industrial partners are discussed and targeted groups are identified for dissemination and exploitation purposes along with relevant actions and dissemination / replication tools (including a Smart City Toolkit). This is positive.

Job creation is addressed and societal considerations are being considered. The proposal would deliver investment in low carbon buildings and transport which in turn could generate jobs as well as delivering energy savings, increased renewable energy capacity, CO2 emissions reductions and lower energy bills.

The communication and dissemination strategy is well developed but is rather standard. There are however elements that actively engage citizens and other local actors in the cities concerned such as dialogue events with citizens and a series of local stakeholder workshops.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **3.00** (Threshold: 3.00/5.00 , Weight: 100.00%)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

The WP structure is coherent and well organized in its allocation of tasks and specific involvement of the companies but the approach is quite sequential though and maybe some results could be achieved in a shorter period of time. The milestones list is very extensive with 62 milestones for 60 months duration which could cause confusion to the project management.

It is also noted that of the 135 suggested deliverables (which are considered too many) about 87% have a "confidential" dissemination level which is not in line with objectives of the call . The budget is reasonable and in line with the work programme but spread among a lot of partners with many having a very small contribution especially the follower cities. Also there needs to be more justification of the need for subcontracting costs especially in a consortium with 34 partners.

The coordinating organization CENER (National Renewable Energy Centre) is credible and experienced in similar undertakings. The consortium contains all relevant players and the full value chain of stakeholders (RTD institutions, industry, technology providers, local SMEs, city planning authorities, municipalities, etc). Their exact roles and responsibilities in the project are not sufficiently described though and in some cases the main tasks for a partner are not stated.

The management structures are clearly set out, as are the roles of the respective bodies. There is an outline of a risk management approach, which is sensible, but basic. A list of risks is also provided some of which seem to be unnecessarily detailed (e.g. cycling signage in WP3) while others are missing, e.g. with all of the elements being implemented in WP5 only six generic risks have been identified. Resources allocated to Zapara (WP4) and Siemens may not be adequate, this needs to be specified and is negative.

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

Not provided

Proposal content corresponds, wholly or in part, to the topic description against which it is submitted, in the relevant work programme part

Status: **Yes**

Not provided

Overall comments

Not provided