



# Project Applications: do's and don'ts







#### **Similarities**

<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 1</b>	<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 2</b>
12 partners in 4 countries	10 partners in 5 countries
Budget: EUR 4,5 million	Budget: EUR 6 million
5 work packages	5 work packages







# Results

<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 1</b>	<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 2</b>
<ul> <li>4 cities linked to businesses and universities by the end of the project lifetime</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>8% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions within the region by the end of the project lifetime</li> </ul>
<ul> <li>Some innovative ways for some partnerships to get together and brainstorm utopian policies in the NSR by 2025</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>10,000 fewer trips by semi-trailers per year by end of project lifetime</li> </ul>
- More utopian policies	





### **Differences (part 1)**

<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 1</b>	<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 2</b>
Isolated pilots and activities	Work plan incorporating connected pilots that lead to logical end
Questionable transnational cooperation angle	Clear need for transnational cooperation in order to achieve objectives
Vague, un-quantified results and/or actually outputs in disguise	Specific, realistic, quantified results





## **Differences (part 2)**

<b>PROJECT APPLICATION 1</b>	PROJECT APPLICATION 2
Communications activities that don't take project objectives, audience or stakeholders into account	Specific communications activities that target specific organisations and groups
Partnership ranging from highly committed organisations to those with little idea about the project and their role	Hand-picked partnership, all with a clear role and a diversity of experience to cover the necessary topics
'Back of the envelope' budget	Carefully calculated budget





#### Moral of the Story...

- Focused approach ('red thread')
- Transnational cooperation and relevance
- Specific, quantified, realistic results
- Well thought-out communications plan
- Highly relevant partnership
- Sufficient, realistic budget

