

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

Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools

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

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

1. Relevance and impact (Weighting = 3.0)	
<p>Objectives:</p> <p>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>KNOWLEDGE ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS (KEPs) are projects within the general field of safer Internet and online technologies. The aim of these projects is to strengthen the knowledge base relevant to the Programme.</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>ACTION 4.2: IDENTIFYING CHILD FRIENDLY SEARCH/BROWSER TOOLS</p> <p>The 2012 Work Programme calls for a KEP which identify the technical capability for being able to find content suitable for children and make it available through child-friendly search/browser tools.</p> <p>The project should include the issue of continuous quality control of the content provided to children and provide an EU gateway to good content from trusted tools and sources.</p>	
<p>See in particular point 1 "Rationale and objectives" of Part B of the proposal</p>	

**Evaluation call Safer Internet
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools**

1. Relevance and impact (Weighting = 3.0) (cont.)	
<p>Proposers should provide a clear description of the expected impact of the subject chosen.</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>The results of the project should be made available in order to provide topics for further actions and studies.</p> <p>Proposers should describe the activities planned to disseminate the achievements of the project to ensure optimal use of the project results, also beyond the participants in the project and beyond the end of the project. It should be coherent with the summary information provided in the corresponding work package description.</p> <p>See point 3.2" Results, dissemination and exploitation" of Part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Adequacy of the <u>exploitation and/or dissemination plans</u> to ensure optimal use of the project results, also beyond the participants in the project.</p>

1. Mark:

--

**Evaluation call Safer Internet
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools**

2. Quality of the technical part of the proposal (Weighting = 3.0)	
<p>Proposers should provide a clear description of current underlying knowledge and research on which it builds.</p> <p>A list of most recent research results in the chosen subject should be attached as an annex</p> <p>See point 1.1 "Description of the subject chosen and proposed objectives" of Part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Clear description of the current underlying knowledge/research.</p>
<p>Proposers should describe the subject chosen and the project to be undertaken.</p> <p>See point 1.1 "Description of the subject chosen and proposed objectives" of Part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- Clear description of the problems addressed and the assessment/study/survey to be undertaken.</p>

**Evaluation call Safer Internet
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools**

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

Specific requirements for action 4.1:

Proposers will be expected to make use of methodology (qualitative and/or quantitative) and work plan appropriate to the proposed objectives, including their applicability in practical terms, for example staff expertise relevant to carrying out the project (e.g. their expertise in handling sensitive situations and issues) and how focus groups will be selected and approached and give their consent to the study at hand, taking into account the possible sensitivity of the subject to be investigated

See in particular point 6 "Project work plan" of Part B of the proposal

- Adequacy of the methodology and work plan for achieving the objectives stated in the proposal, including their applicability in practical terms (e.g. how possible target groups will be selected, approached, and give their consent to the study at hand).

2. Mark:

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

Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools

3. Partnership, resources, management and co-operation with stakeholders (Weighting =2.0)

See part B of the proposal:

- **point 4 "Description of consortium and key personnel"**
- **point 6.3 - table "Work Package and Labour Effort Overview".**

- **Quality of the partnership in terms of relevance and expertise of the applicant organisation(s), size of the consortium, combination of complementary expertise and task distribution among the participants.**

Resources:

The standard funding model for KEP is at 100% of direct eligible costs (as defined in the model grant agreement), but without indirect costs (overheads).

The key personnel (brief CV) foreseen to work on the project should be described as well as the relevant expertise of the staff to carry out the project (e.g. if appropriate their expertise in handling sensitive situations and issues).

See in particular :

- **part B of the proposal– section 4 "Description of consortium and key personnel"**
- **Form A3 – "estimated budget"**

- **Extent to which the project provides for the resources necessary for carrying out the proposed work.**

**Evaluation call Safer Internet
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools**

3. Partnership, resources, management and co-operation with stakeholders (Weighting =2.0) (cont.)

This section should describe the envisaged management structure, the means for communicating within the consortium, 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

- Adequacy of the management, decision-making structures, communication flow and cooperation mechanisms within the consortium.

3. Mark:

**Evaluation call Safer Internet
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)
Knowledge Enhancement Project – Action 4.2 – Identifying child friendly search/browser tools**

4. European added value (Weighting = 2.0)		
<p>The European added value of the proposal must be clearly demonstrated, i.e. how the expected results will be of use to and might reflect a wider European situation and/or provide cross-border cooperation within the project. The issues addressed should have a European dimension, and the ways proposed to tackle them Europe-wide should benefit a large number of people in the largest possible number of EU countries.</p> <p>See point 2 "European dimension" of part B of the proposal</p>	<p>-European dimension of the issue(s) addressed, and extent to which the proposed action would contribute to tackling them at European level.</p>	
<p>The European added value of the proposal and of the consortium will have to be clearly demonstrated. The consortium should cover 3-4 Member States.</p> <p>See in particular point 5 "Description of consortium" of part B of the proposal</p>	<p>- European added value of the consortium behind the proposal.</p>	
<p>The links foreseen to be established with relevant external organizations or project should be described.</p> <p>See point 2 "European dimension" 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).