

**Evaluation call 2012 Safer Internet
DRAFT Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Thematic network – Action 3.1 Promoting positive online experiences for young children**

Proposal Acronym:	Proposal No.:
--------------------------	----------------------

Score 1="Unsatisfactory" to 10="Excellent". Half marks may be given.

1. Relevance and impact (Weighting = 2.5)	
<p>Objectives: Safer Internet:</p> <p>To promote safer use of the Internet and new online technologies, to educate users, particularly children, parents and carers in this regard and to fight against illegal content and harmful conduct online.</p> <p>Thematic networks bring together stakeholders to ensure action throughout Europe and to facilitate coordination and knowledge transfer between countries.</p> <p>Action 3.1:</p> <p>Based on the input of the EC focus group on positive content which in 2009 and 2010 gathered around 20 European stakeholders in this field there are some innovative initiatives like browsers for children and white lists at national level, but currently there are very few links among stakeholders at European level.</p> <p>Therefore the 2012 Work Programme calls for the set up of a Thematic network for promoting positive online experiences for young children</p>	<p>- Contribution to achieving the <u>objectives</u> of the Safer Internet programme and of the relevant action as set out in the call.</p>
<p>Impact</p> <p>Proposers should provide a concise and precise description of the expected impact and results of the network proposed.</p> <p>The results should be specific, measurable, attainable with the available resources and realistic within the time span of the project</p> <p>See point 3 "Impact" of Part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Expected <u>impact</u> of the proposed action</p>
<p>Dissemination and awareness</p> <p>Proposers should describe the activities planned to disseminate the achievements of the project. It should be coherent with the summary information provided in the corresponding work package description.</p> <p>See point 3.3 " Dissemination and awareness" of Part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Adequacy of the <u>dissemination plans</u> to ensure optimal use of the project results, also beyond the participants in the project.</p>

1. Mark:

--

**Evaluation call 2012 Safer Internet
DRAFT Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Thematic network – Action 3.1 Promoting positive online experiences for young children**

2. Quality of the technical part of the proposal (Weighting = 3.0)

Specific requirements for Action 3.1:

The issues to be discussed and the aim of the actions of the thematic network must be clearly identified.

The proposal should provide an analysis of the specific problems that are going to be addressed by the network and show how they relate to the overall objectives of the Safer Internet programme and the relevant action as set out in the call.

See point 1.1 of Part B of the proposal "Description of the issues and proposed solutions"

- Clear description of the problems and the proposed solutions.

The network will be expected to:

a) Exchange good practices, issues and challenges in provision of content to young children, including the business model and make recommendations to enhance production and dissemination of positive content across Europe (including localisation). This activity will include a discussion forum gathering producers and providers in a dialogue on online content for children.

b) Discuss feasibility and requirements of a safe browser for kids / collation of white lists including suggestions on moderation and rating of websites for children. Requirements should take into account accessibility needs of disabled children. Please note that new or enhanced technical solutions in this area will not fall under this thematic network. They will be explored by a knowledge enhancement project (see section 6.2).

c) Make proposals for the roll over of a European wide competition.

d) Provide a report with overview on the market for positive content for children in Europe. **See point 6 of Part B of the proposal "Project work plan"**

- Adequacy of the methodology and work plan for achieving the objectives stated in the proposal

2. Mark:

--

**Evaluation call 2012 Safer Internet
DRAFT Individual Assessment Report (IAR)**

Thematic network – Action 3.1 Promoting positive online experiences for young children

3. Resources and management (Weighting =2.0)

<p>The coordinator of the consortium must convincingly show that they have support from the other members of the network by, for example, providing letters of support.</p> <p>The proposal should describe the envisaged management structure, the means for communicating within the network, for monitoring work progress, for assuring quality and resolving conflicts. It should be coherent with the summary information provided in the corresponding work package description</p> <p>See part B of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - point 5 "Management" - Point 6.3 Workpackage 1 – Planning, management, reporting <p>Resources: The direct costs for the network co-ordinator of co-ordinating and implementing the network are covered at a rate of 100% of direct eligible costs. Network members cover their own running costs except travel to network meetings which can be reimbursed under the network budget. A thematic network should be open to new members and the estimated budget should be calculated to allow for this.</p> <p>See in particular :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form A3 – "estimated budget" 	<p>- <u>Quality of the coordinating team and partnerships</u> to achieve the co-ordination envisaged as well as the adequacy of <u>the management</u>, decision making structures, communication flow and cooperation mechanisms within the network and <u>resources</u> available.</p>
<p>The proposal should describe specific indicators and quantified targets against which the progress of the project towards the achievement of its objectives and its expected results can be measured</p> <p>See in particular part B of the proposal :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • point 3.2 – Success indicators • point 7.3 - Workpackage 2 "Project assessment" 	<p>- The adequacy of the <u>measures and indicators</u> for monitoring progress and assessing results and impact.</p>

3. Mark:

**Evaluation call 2012 Safer Internet
DRAFT Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Thematic network – Action 3.1 Promoting positive online experiences for young children**

4. Quality of the proposed network and European added value (Weighting = 2.5)

<p>Competences:</p> <p><u>Specific requirements for action 3.1:</u> The network should consist of public and private producers of online content for children and gateways (browsers/white lists), researchers, parents associations programme.</p> <p>The proposal should describe each network member and their role in the project, highlight their specific expertise for the project and indicate the key personnel foreseen to work on the project</p> <p>See in particular :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • part B of the proposal– section 4 "Description of partners and key personnel" 	<p>- Adequacy of the organisations participating in the network in terms of relevance, competences, combination of complementary expertise.</p>
<p>Membership should cover the majority of EU Member States and be open and proactive in attracting new partners.</p> <p>Proposers should show how the issues addressed have a European dimension, and the ways proposed to tackle them impact a large number of users in the largest possible number of EU countries</p> <p>See point 2 "European added value and international co-operation" of part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- European added value of the network.</p>
<p>Proposers should provide information on the cooperation with other organisations and networks active in the field, both those funded by the programme and others</p> <p>See point 2 "European added value and international co-operation" of part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Links with relevant external organizations or projects.</p>

4. Mark:

Evaluator:	Signature¹:	Date:
-------------------	-------------------------------	--------------

¹ By signing this evaluation form I declare that I have no conflict of interest with this particular proposal (point 4 of the Code of Conduct for Independent Experts Appointed as Evaluators).