Version: 15/10/2026

FFplus Call-3 Type-1: Check-Lists for Proposals

Contents

Evaluation Criterion: Impact including business relevance and exploitation plans 1

Evaluation Criterion: Soundness of concept, technical competitiveness, business innovation and quality of the work plan 3

Evaluation Criterion: Quality of the consortium as a whole and of the individual proposers 5

Evaluation Criterion: Effective and justified deployment of resources 6

Evaluation Criterion: Impact including business relevance and exploitation plans

Check-List:

- **Overall Impact**
  - Would a high business impact for the main participant SME(s) be expected through its(their) adoption of advanced HPC services, for example in terms of the exploitation plans presented?
  - Does the proposal demonstrate the potential to raise the technical innovation capacity of the main participant SME(s)? If so, is this due to their first-time adoption of technologies using HPC resources or services?
  - Would the experiment, if successful, be able to demonstrate the business benefits to be realised by addressing the business challenge addressed?
- **Industrial Relevance**
  - Are the industrial sectors or market segments addressed by the main participant SME(s) clearly defined?
  - If successful, would the experiment have a significant impact on the market(s) targeted by the main participant SME(s); either by the provision of new or enhanced services or products?
- **Quality of the exploitation plans**
  - Is the business potential of the main participant SME(s) and also the targeted markets described in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of the expected impact and likelihood of achieving the business benefits targeted by the proposal?

- Are key indicators defined such as: revenue generated over recent years and/or expected revenue in the coming years; or the existence of a (current or potential) customer base beyond the academic realm?
- Does the proposal present a vision of success, i.e. how addressing the business challenge using HPC will lead to positive business impact? Are the value propositions and the process of value creation defined?
- Are there potential compliance issues with national or European regulations (e.g. the EU AI Act) that would obstruct or limit commercial exploitation of the results of the experiment?

- **Relevance to the objectives of the call**
  - Is the proposal driven by a business challenge of the main participant SME(s) that has(have) no prior use of, or experience with, HPC services for its business?
  - Does the proposal substantiate the need for HPC resources in order to address the targeted business challenge and do the computational needs clearly exceed potential of a single high-core-count workstation or a compact, single-node multi-core server?
  - Is the proposed experiment sufficiently complementary to past Fortissimo experiments in the sense that its results do not simply duplicate or extend those of past business experiments? In particular, would it provide valuable additional demonstrations to the European SME ecosystem of the benefits to be obtained by using HPC systems or HPC-based services?
  - Is it clear from the proposal that the main participant SME(s) does(do) not have an academic focus? Noting that business models around R&D services based on HPC software, or activities with a potential impact only in the long term, such as fundamental research, are out of scope of the call.

Evaluation Criterion: Soundness of concept, technical competitiveness, business innovation and quality of the work plan

Check-List:

- **Feasibility (technical and management aspects)**
  - Is the proposed experiment, as described in the proposal, feasible in both technical and management sense?
  - Are risks properly described and mitigation actions defined?
  - Can the software components to be adapted or (further) developed be expected to make effective use of the proposed HPC computing resources or services and does the proposal establish that that use is feasible?
- **Business Innovation**
  - Does the proposal clearly prioritise developments that will address the main participant SME's business challenge and the use of HPC to address that challenge? Are software and technology developments aligned with that priority, as opposed to R&D on basic methodologies?
  - Does the proposal define specific objectives that must be achieved to successfully address the business challenge?
  - Would the proposed technical approaches and methods lead to economically viable, competitive advantages for the main participant SME?
  - Where applicable, have the proposers explained appropriate strategies, and the related consequences for the proposed technical developments, to ensure the compliance of planned products and services with relevant national or EU regulations (e.g. EU AI Act)?
- **Quality of the work plan & presentation of the technical approach**
  - Is the work plan sufficiently clear and coherent instilling confidence that the proposed work will be carried out effectively and delivering on the proposed objectives within the fixed time-frame?
  - For multi-partner consortia, is it clear what each organization contributes to each task?
  - Are results (deliverables and outputs) specified for all tasks and with defined deadlines?
  - Does the proposal include measures to support the FFplus project in the generation of publishable success stories – including in multi-media form – which discuss how

the SME’s real-world problems were addressed and clearly identify the business benefits realised or obtained?

- Does the proposal declare any data protection issues that might impact its proposed work plan, or does the proposal involve use of data covered by the EU General Data Protection Regulation or national regulations implementing these? If yes, does the proposal specify adequate protection measures to be used in the framework of European law, and ensure that the operation of the experiment adheres to these.?

Evaluation Criterion: Quality of the consortium as a whole and of the individual proposers

Check-List:

- **Multi-partner consortia**
  - **Quality & Completeness of the Consortium as a whole**
    - Does the consortium contain the necessary partners with all the skills required to carry out the proposed work?
    - Is the consortium as a whole well qualified to carry out the proposed work?
  - **Clarity of partner roles**
    - Are the roles of all partners clearly described and does each partner have a significant and well-justified role?
    - Are the contributions of supporting participants, for which funding is requested, limited to engineering/technical activities?
    - Is the role and effort of the main participant SME(s) balanced with respect to other partners?
  - **Quality and capability of the individual participants**
    - Is each consortium member as presented in the proposal qualified to carry out the work they are assigned?
    - On the basis of information presented in the proposal, does each organisation clearly have the capacity to perform all tasks assigned to it?
    - Are key personnel clearly identified and described?

- **Single-organisation consortia**
  - Is the participant well qualified and has all the necessary skills and experience required to carry out the proposed work?
  - On the basis of information presented in the proposal, does the organisation clearly have the capacity to perform all tasks defined in the proposed work plan?
  - Are key personnel clearly identified and described?
  - Are there any tasks planned for 3rd parties? (Noting that sub-contracting is not eligible for funding.)

Evaluation Criterion: Effective and justified deployment of resources

Check-List:

- **Allocation of appropriate resources**
  - Does the proposal define the resources and the associated costs needed to achieve the experiment objectives?
  - Have appropriate resources (effort and budget) been allocated to members of the consortium in such a way that each of them has the required resources needed to carry out their part in the work effectively? Is the effort of each partner required for specific tasks clearly described?
  - Has at least 50% of the requested budget been allocated to the main participant(s)?
- **Justification of the proposed resources**
  - Are the proposed resources (effort, budget, software licences or any other services) clearly justified, duly described and quantified in the proposal?
  - Does the proposed work make economic use of the requested resources?
- **HPC resources**
  - Does the proposal plan to use computing resources provided (free of charge) directly by the EuroHPC JU's various access schemes or through national actions and does it quantify and justify the computing resources required?
  - Otherwise, does it identify, and budget for, alternative resource providers and justify the decision for using such providers?
  - Where the proposal intends to use the computing resources of a Supporting Participant, are these budgeted based on actual costs arising (not commercial rates) and included in the "other direct cost" budget of the Supporting Participant?
  - Is the computing infrastructure requested commensurate with the targeted software to be used in the proposed experiment and is that adequately described in the proposal?