



Assessment Sheet

1. Identification

1.1	Name	Multiplatform Advanced Long Line Aerial Robotic Delivery
1.2	Short name	Mallard
1.3	Programme priority	3. Climate-neutral societies
1.4	Programme objective	3.3 Smart green mobility
1.5	Project implementation	36 months

1.6	Project summary (imported from the application)
<p>Project Mallard aims to develop an ecosystem for multimodal transportation fostering smart green mobility systems and increasing accessibility to BSR countries by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Harmonising mobility systems across borders by development of novel standards and policy roadmap for green and harmonised multimodal transportation. It is envisioned to promote green solutions in terms of mobility systems and energy sources for resilient, unobstructed, effective and low-emission transportation within BSR 2. Mobilising transport companies and citizens to use smart green solutions by creating an ecosystem for multimodal transportation utilising green mobility systems and energy sources, validated by digital simulations and real demonstrations, including transnational drone flights. This ecosystem is aimed at supporting transport companies and citizens by delivering clear solutions that are planned to minimise traffic, increase transport connectivity and accessibility and enhance its economic and environmental aspects 3. Supporting public authorities in introducing smart green solutions in everyday operations by tailoring the ecosystem for public airfields/airports on local, regional and national level as well as transport hubs. Green solutions are planned to be designed and implemented into the multimodal transportation ecosystem, increasing economic importance of public entities in the transport industry <p>Our target groups are public authorities, LSMEs, infrastructure and public service providers.</p>	

1.7	Financial resources (all amounts in Euro)	Planned project budget
	ERDF co-financing	2,348,089.13 €



Own contribution EU partners	587,022.30 €
ERDF budget	2,935,111.43 €
NO co-financing	0.00 €
Own contribution NO partners	0.00 €
NO budget	0.00 €
Total Programme co-financing	2,348,089.13 €
Total own contribution	587,022.30 €
Total budget	2,935,111.43 €

1.8 Project partnership						
No.	Organisation		Partner budget	Programme co-financing	State aid relevance	Took part earlier
1	Łuksiewicz Research Network - Institute of Aviation	PL	833,053.70 €	666,442.96 €	Yes	No
	Higher education and research institution					
2	ABI GreenTech Ltd	PL	374,026.84 €	299,221.47 €	Yes	No
	Small and medium enterprise					
3	CAFA Tech OU	EE	395,165.00 €	316,132.00 €	Yes	No
	Small and medium enterprise					
4	Green and Smart Technology Cluster	LV	292,656.00 €	234,124.80 €	Yes	No
	NGO					
5	Hanken School of Economics	FI	442,526.56 €	354,021.24 €	Yes	No
	Higher education and research institution					
6	Hochschule Wismar, University of Applied Sciences: Technology, Business and Design	DE	597,683.33 €	478,146.66 €	Yes	Yes
	Higher education and research institution					

1.9 Associated Organisations		
No.	Organisation	Country



1	Liepaja Municipality Authority	LV
	Local public authority	
2	Polish Air Navigation Services Agency	PL
	Infrastructure and public service provider	
3	Polish Chamber of Forwarding and Logistics	PL
	Business support organisation	
4	CSL Internationale Spedition Spółka z o. o.	PL
	Small and medium enterprise	
5	DSV A/S	DK
	Large enterprise	
6	Finnair	FI
	Large enterprise	
7	Digital Accelerator of Latvia	LV
	Business support organisation	
8	Hanko City	FI
	Local public authority	
9	Ministry of Economics of the Republic of Latvia	LV
	National public authority	

1.10 Project's contribution to the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region

planned	PA Transport
---------	--------------

1.11 Horizontal principles

Horizontal principles	Project's impact
Sustainable development	positive
Non-discrimination including accessibility	positive
Equality between men and women	positive

1.12 Output

- Evaluation report of digital and real demonstrations of smart green mobility ecosystem

2. Admissibility check

OUTCOME OF ADMISSIBILITY CHECK

The project passed the admissibility check.



3. Final conclusion and requirements

FINAL CONCLUSION
<p>The proposal does not demonstrate sufficient quality to be approved.</p> <p>The project aims to introduce drones for transporting high-value, low-volume goods in urban areas to improve delivery speed, cut costs, and reduce environmental impact. The project has significant shortcomings that lower its quality. It fails to clearly identify the needs of the target groups or actively engage them. The partnership is research-dominated, and the work plan is overly academic, with insufficient real-life pilot testing. Moreover, the long-term viability and uptake of the solutions appear unrealistic due to weak collaboration with the relevant target groups.</p>

REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL
As the project does not demonstrate sufficient quality, no requirements are listed.

Quality assessment Scoring system: 5 (very good), 4 (good), 3 (sufficient), 2 (weak), 1 (insufficient)		
I. Relevance of the proposal	SCORE	3
Thematic focus <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the challenge tackled by the project match the selected Programme objective and the focus of the call? 		



The proposal sufficiently matches the selected Programme objective and the focus of the given call.

The challenge addressed sufficiently matches the selected Programme objective as set out in the Programme Document (PD). The project aims to revolutionise the transportation and shipping of High-Value-Low-Volume (HVLV) goods by leveraging multimodal transport and unmanned drones for faster, cost-effective, and eco-friendly deliveries, particularly in emergency situations. It identifies a critical gap in the current cargo transportation ecosystem that this innovative approach seeks to address. By utilising drones, the project intends to enhance delivery speed, reduce costs, and minimise environmental impact.

This initiative aligns with the selected objectives of the Programme, though the challenge description is somewhat broad and lacks a specific focus on the needs of the target group within the context of multimodal transport. In the relevance section, the project outlines the global challenges and opportunities for BSR countries to improve the efficiency of transporting specific goods. However, it falls short in pinpointing particular problem area countries in the region are facing and addressing those concrete needs and deficiencies faced by the target groups.

The application sufficiently addresses the focus of the call, i.e., the topic of climate change.

The project aims to explore the introduction of alternative, eco-friendly transport modes for HVLV goods to address climate change, aligning with Priority 3 of the Programme Document. While the challenge description lacks a detailed explanation of its climate change connection, the proposal's focus on integrating alternative transport modes into multimodal systems shows promise for contributing to climate change mitigation. However, the project's overall aim and structure are primarily focused on ecosystem analysis with some demonstration actions. As a result, the project's expected impact on climate change goals is moderate. Additionally, the application does not clearly outline how it addresses the specific thematic challenges mentioned in the announcement note (adopting and implementing better integrated and more systemic approaches to planning processes in sectors key to mitigating climate change; mainstreaming a climate-conscious perspective through participatory and inclusive approaches; implementing effective strategies to combat climate change by improving the generation, distribution, utilisation and storage of energy; promoting circular practices as a means to address climate change, e.g. supporting businesses and communities in taking up circular approaches).

Target groups

- Are the selected target groups relevant to tackle the identified challenge, e.g. regarding geographical coverage and types of sectors involved?
- Are the needs of the target groups clearly described?

The selected target groups are clearly relevant to tackling the identified challenge. However, the application does not clearly describe the needs of the target groups.

The selected target groups include national public authorities, local public authorities, large enterprises, SMEs, and infrastructure and service providers. Their role in establishing the legal and structural framework for large-scale drone transport is outlined. However, the described needs of the target groups only partly align with the identified challenge. Specific gaps and challenges in developing and implementing this framework are not clearly identified. For instance, the need to investigate the optimal



legal framework for operating the planned transport mode seems relevant for these target groups. Nevertheless, the project has left many aspects open and kept descriptions generalised, such as the specific markets and goods to be targeted first, potential regulatory hurdles, technological requirements for integrating drones into existing transport networks, and strategies for stakeholder engagement and public acceptance.

The geographical coverage of the target groups seems to be appropriate for the proposed challenge. The project covers target group members from Finland, Poland, Latvia and Estonia without further explaining the selection of the countries in this section. The section on transnational value includes basic information on the selection. Since the project objective is "to develop an ecosystem for multimodal transportation fostering smart green mobility systems and increasing accessibility to all BSR countries" the lack of involvement of the target groups of the other Programme countries is not explained.

The defined field of responsibility and economic sector of the selected target groups seem to be relevant to tackling the identified challenge.

Transnational value

- Does the application clearly explain the need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge?

The application sufficiently explains the need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge.

The application addresses a global challenge: the lack of efficient, quick and environmentally friendly transportation and shipping of High-Value-Low-Volume (HVLV) goods and the aim to revolutionise this by leveraging multimodal transport and unmanned drones in the context of transportation between BSR countries. This challenge, in general, is of high transnational value. However, the application does not specify the extent to which the activities target international transportation. The primary focus appears to be investigating the legal and economic potential of integrating drones into the existing transport system, rather than carrying out activities in the same context to enhance international trade of particular goods among the BSR countries. In this sense, the project's transnational impact seems moderate.

The choice of the involved countries is sufficiently explained. The project refers to the fact that the selected countries (Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Poland and Germany) foresee the development of drone-based transportation systems.

Project objective

- Is the planned project objective in line with the needs of the target groups?

The planned project objective is sufficiently in line with the needs of the target groups.

It is sufficiently explained how the project aims to address the needs of the selected target groups. The objective of the project is very ambitious and includes developing novel standards and policy roadmaps, mobilising transport companies and citizens to use smart green mobility solutions (the project does not specifically mention drones here, which makes this point vague in the context of the project), and



supporting public authorities in introducing smart green solutions into everyday operations. The project seems to map the potential and increase target groups' awareness of the benefits of integrating drones into multimodal transport systems and outline the necessary requirements. However, it is difficult to conclude how the objective addresses the needs related to the challenge. For example, the project does not specify market demand, the specific goods to be targeted, or the competition and advantages of drones compared to other environmentally friendly land-based transport methods.

Contribution to the policies and strategies

- Does the project plan to contribute to the implementation of the Action Plan of the EU Strategy for the Baltic Sea Region (EUSBSR)?
- Does the project plan to contribute to achieving specific goals or implementing actions of other strategic documents relevant to the Programme area?

The proposal seems to sufficiently contribute to policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area.

The application sufficiently describes how the project plans to contribute to implementing the Action Plan of the EUSBSR. It contributes to the Policy Area Transport through the actions:

- Improve connectivity of the regions and cooperation with third countries (the contribution to this action from the description is not clear);
- Development of measures towards climate-neutral and zero pollution transport;
- Facilitate innovative technologies & solutions in the Baltic Sea Region.

The project also indicated contributing to EUSBSR PA Innovation and Safe.

The project plans to contribute to achieving specific goals or implementing actions of other strategic documents relevant to the Programme area. The project plans to contribute to the following strategic documents:

- Flightpath 2050. Europe's vision for aviation
- Fly the Green Deal - Europe's vision for sustainable aviation
- European Green Deal

Additional value

- Is it clearly explained how the project plans to build on the outcomes of other projects?
- Does the application demonstrate additional value to implemented and running projects, in particular to the projects of Interreg Baltic Sea Region?
- Is cooperation with other projects planned?

The proposal demonstrates high additional value to current or already completed projects relevant to the Baltic Sea region.

The application clearly explains how outcomes of other projects have been taken into consideration. It highlights the achievements of various projects whose results have been incorporated. For instance, it refers to specific outputs and explains how these will be utilised within different Groups of Activities. An



example is the ASSURED-UAM project, where the developed regulatory framework will contribute to GoA 1.2.

The application demonstrates high additional value to implemented and running projects financed by Interreg BSR or other Programmes and initiatives. The project did not mention the currently running Interreg BSR project CITYAM, which focuses on improving airspace management in dealing with emerging urban air mobility and scaling drone operations. Nevertheless, the proposal does not seem to duplicate activities planned in CITYAM.

The project does not plan to cooperate with other projects.

II. Partnership

SCORE

2

Partnership

- Does the partnership have the necessary competence to implement the planned activities and to achieve the planned objective?
- Are the selected target groups involved as partners?
- Are the roles of all partners in project implementation clearly explained?
- Is the involvement of the partners planned in accordance with the requirements of the Programme?
- Are the involvement and responsibilities of the partners in the project planned in a balanced way?
- Are the roles of the associated organisations clearly explained?
- Do the partners have sufficient human and financial capacity?

The partnership seems to have weak potential to realise the planned activities and to achieve the planned objective.

The partnership seems to possess sufficient competences for implementing the planned project.

The partnership consists mainly of higher education and research institutions, two SMEs and one NGO. These partners certainly have the competence to make the scientifically relevant version of the multimodal transport model. However, the partnership lacks the appropriate authorities to adopt suitable measures and implement at least parts of the results. Although some target group representatives are engaged as associated organisations, their role descriptions and planned participation do not assure their commitment to using the planned tools in everyday work and to start designing laws and the technical infrastructure for developing the improved multimodal transport network.

The project's selected target groups are partly involved in the partnership. Only SMEs are represented by the target groups in the partnership. National authorities, local authorities, infrastructure and service providers, and large enterprises are missing in the partnership.

The roles and tasks of all partners in the project implementation are not clearly explained. The role descriptions of the partners are generalised. In most cases, they do not provide information on the role of



the partner in the project but rather on their expertise, which can be used in the project to develop the outputs. Their role in initiating the real-life implementation, testing, adapting or transferring the project results is not explained.

The involvement of the partners is planned in accordance with the requirements of the Programme.

The involvement and responsibilities of the partners in the project are partly planned in a balanced way. For example, there do not seem to be imbalances in the roles of the individual partners (e.g. involvement of the partners from different countries in the implementation of activities). However, in the work plan the leadership of seven out of the eleven Groups of Activities are allocated to higher education and research institutions which suggests a strong academic orientation of the project. In the budget section, this is underlined by the large share (64%) of the total budget planned for higher education and research institutions.

The roles and tasks of associated organisations are not clearly explained. Even though from the type of organisation, the involvement of the associated organisations is relevant and seems to bring additional value to the proposal, the descriptions of their role are vague and do not provide information on how they will be engaged in the project in practical terms and how they plan to use the outputs in their everyday work during and after the project ends.

It seems that there are risks in relation to the project partners (private partners in particular). Project partners number no. 1, 5 and 6 did not provide any financial data and therefore their human and financial capacity cannot be assessed. The partner no. 2 ABI GreenTech Ltd has provided financial data but he does not seem to have sufficient financial capacity to implement the planned activities. The Annual turnover/operating profit is far lower than the planned partner budget. The human capacity seems to be formally given (11 headcounts), but still, there are no regular employees, all the staff members have different kinds of engagement (subordinated staff, owner-managers, partners). Also, the annual turnover is so low that actually no regular staff can be financed. In case of the partner no. 4, the annual turnover is higher and with 5.2 staff headcount, the partner should have sufficient human capacity. Still, also this partner seems not to have any regular employees.

III. Work plan

SCORE

2

Preparing, piloting and evaluating, transferring solutions

- Do the planned solutions address the identified specific challenge?
- Is there a clear approach on how the project plans to develop or adapt solutions?
- Does the project plan pilots to validate the usefulness of the solutions?
- Does the project evaluate and adjust solutions?
- Does the application present a realistic plan how to communicate and transfer the ready solutions?
- Does the project encourage active and continuous use of the solutions after the project end?

The overall quality of the work plan presented in the application is weak.



It seems that the planned solutions partly address the identified challenge. The challenge is the lack of transportation systems for shipping High-Value-Low-Volume (HVLV) goods, allowing their effective quick/emergency delivery. To respond to this, the project aims to develop a model multimodal transport ecosystem. Even though the project presented a detailed plan for developing the ecosystem in a scientific environment, numerous shortcomings regarding the approach do not make the applications suitable for the requirements of Interreg BSR.

On the one hand, the project only plans to develop and simulate the ecosystem digitally and in some parts of real life. However, the project has no plan for adapting the solution for the target group. Adaptation of the solution by the target group could be, for example, the commitment of the relevant national or regional authorities in changing the legal framework or at least initiating a legal framework change based on the standards of policy framework or developing plans for upgrading existing mobility hubs for the reception and management of UASs etc. Such practical implementation elements are missing from the application and the descriptions. It seems that the ecosystem will be a theoretical model after the end of the project rather than a tool that the target groups can use in their daily work to improve the multimodal green and smart transport in the BSR.

There is a partly clear approach as to how the project plans to develop the solutions. For example, the project does not specify the target region for data collection and analysis. Through the application, the whole BSR region is mentioned, but this task seems unrealistic in the absence of the relevant representatives of all programme countries. There is a partly clear approach to the project's steps in developing the planned ecosystem, e.g., the elements are named and marked as deliverables in the work plan. In WP1 GoA 1.1, however, there is a significant amount of analysis planned to understand the state of affairs that should have been carried out already so that WP1 can solely focus on the development of the solution.

The project does not plan pilots to validate the usefulness of the solutions. The project plans digital simulations and real-life demonstration flights, but these actions do not qualify pilots as defined by the Programme. Pilots should test the developed solutions in natural working conditions with the target group, i.e. the same conditions the solution has to be used after the project, to test its usefulness, pinpoint and fix shortcomings so that the final output responds to the needs of the target groups. The project did not plan activities to do this. Without the piloting activities, the project's output also does not qualify as a solution, which is an essential core project requirement.

In GoA 2.1 the project plans a digital ecosystem simulation, which does not qualify as a pilot. The project is writing that these tests are necessary before the actual implementation of the tool. Further, in the project, however, there is no time and space for rolling out the system in real-life scenarios. In GoA 2.2 UAS mobility system validation in BSR countries within multimodal transportation systems the project only offers generic information on the tests. There is no information on the location or routes. The project explains the necessity of the planned activities but not how they will be carried out.

The project insufficiently plans to evaluate and adjust solutions. In WP2, the project will assess how the ecosystem behaves with the provided data and identify potential improvements in the ecosystem as a mathematical model. However, no activity has been planned for the joint evaluation and adjustment of the solution with the target groups. The activities in WP2 are designed to prove the model's effectiveness



and robustness in representing the ecosystem dynamics, setting the groundwork for future collaborative evaluations.

The project insufficiently plans to communicate and transfer the ready solutions. The project intends to inform about the results at conferences and international events. However, the target is mostly the academic environment. There are no activities planned for the actual transfer to the identified target groups.

The planned timeline seems realistic when preparing the solution. Activities to pilot, evaluate, and adjust the solution are not planned according to the definitions of the Programme. Communication activities are planned and seem realistic with the timeline however, transfer activities are missing. Furthermore, given the late delivery of the project output during the final implementation period, there are concerns about whether there would have been enough time for transfer activities, even if they had been adequately planned.

The project does not seem to encourage active and continuous use of the solutions after the project end. The project does not provide information on how the target group members are engaged in the overall project implementation process. Therefore, it is unclear how the solution will be used within or after the project. Beyond the communication activities planned in WP3 there are no events or meetings planned to cooperate with the target groups, which also indicates that the use of the product after the project ends is not ensured.

Target groups

- Is the involvement of the target groups well planned in each work package?

The involvement of the target groups is weakly planned in the work plan.

In the preparation/piloting and evaluation/transfer of the solutions, the involvement of the target groups is weakly planned. The project mentions participating in the data collection and analysing some target group members (e.g. large companies). Still, the descriptions do not provide concrete details on the role of these organisations in the tasks. The engagement of other target groups, especially the public authorities, is only generically described, e.g., they will support the project by making infrastructure for landing and starting drones available. However, they do not seem to have an active role in the project in developing or testing the solution.

Transnational cooperation

- Does the project plan to implement activities and outputs in a transnational setting?

The project does not clearly plan to implement activities and outputs in a transnational setting.

The collaboration among the partners and associated organisation in preparing/piloting and evaluating/transferring solutions is weakly planned transnationally. The tasks in the work plan are



allocated to different individual partners, so there is a distribution of tasks planned, but the project does not mention how the joint implementation will take place.

Output and result indicators

- Does the project contribute to the output and result indicators defined by the Programme?
- Are the targets set by the project realistic?

The project contributes to the following output and result indicators defined by the Programme.

The project plans a contribution to the following indicators:

RCO 84 – Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in project 2

RCO 116 – Jointly developed solutions 1

RCO 87 - Organisations cooperating across borders 15

RCR 104 - Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations 1

PSR 1 - Organisations with increased institutional capacity due to their participation in cooperation activities across borders 23

The set targets do not seem to be realistic. Since the planned output does not seem to be piloted according to the Programme rules the indicators for RCO 84, RCO 116, RCR 104 cannot be achieved. When it comes to the PSR 1, the described plans only generally mention the type of organisations that the project could contact but there does not seem to be a clear plan at this stage of the project on how to engage with them.

IV. Durability

SCORE

1

Durability of the outputs

- Is the use of the developed solutions well planned by partners and other organisations in different countries, also beyond the project end?
- Does the developed durability concept include institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project end?

The use of the developed solutions in different countries, also after the project end, does not seem to be planned in the application.

It seems unlikely that the solution will be used by the target groups beyond the implementation phase in their daily work. As elaborated in the sections above, the project does not plan to introduce the output into practice by the selected target groups during or after the implementation phase. The practical uptake of the solution remains unrealistic due to the lack of engagement from the target groups. Although some have been listed as associated organisations, they do not actively participate in the project implementation. Without deeper involvement and commitment, the toolkit's long-term impact and scalability will remain limited. The project should have addressed these gaps to ensure meaningful and lasting outcomes.



The durability concept is not clearly described. It does not include institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project ends.

V. Budget

SCORE

2

Budget adequacy

- Is the budget appropriate in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results, and involvement of partners?

The planned budget seems to be weakly in line with the planned activities, outputs, results and involvement of partners.

The planned partner budgets seem partly adequate considering their involvement and responsibilities in the project. The project partners have relatively high budgets above the average of partners in other applications. At the same time, the roles of partners are not well described, the focus is rather on their competencies but not on their actual tasks in the project. Therefore, the justification for the high partner budgets is missing.

The planned shares of management and work packages do not seem adequate considering their importance for the planned outputs/solutions and results. Main part of the budget (40%) is planned for the preparatory activities in the WP1. For WP2 35% is planned, which confirms that obviously no piloting of solutions is planned. For the dissemination in the WP3 only 20% is planned.

The planned total does not seem adequate considering the planned outputs and results. The planned outputs are not sufficiently described, the work plan as such is prepared weakly. The durability of the project is questioned. At the same time, the project requests a budget, which is above the average of other applications, which seems not to be justified.

Eligibility

- Are the cost category specifications (external services, equipment, infrastructure and work) precise, clear and justified?
- Are there any indications of ineligible costs in the work plan and/or ineligible project partner structures?
- Have the relevant rules for productive investments/infrastructure been followed?
- Have the State aid rules been followed?

**The relevant eligibility rules seem to be partly followed.**

The cost categories specifications (external services, equipment, infrastructure and works) are partly not precise, clear and justified. Some descriptions are repetitive (identical for several partners), very general, and sometimes very different types of services are combined and amended by “etc.” The planned expenditures in these categories are partly not eligible from the financial point of view. Some items in the CAT4 and CAT5 seem to be allocated to the incorrect cost category.

There are no indications of ineligible costs in the work plan/activities. There are no indications of ineligible project partner structures (e.g. umbrella partnership, hidden partner organisations).

Productive or infrastructure investments are not planned in the project.

The State aid rules relevant to the application stage have been followed.

The basis for the State aid assessment is the ex-ante assessment of State aid risks associated with the types of project partners and their activities. Furthermore, the MA/JS carried out a partner and plausibility check in accordance with the rules of the Programme Manual.

As part of this procedure, the MA/JS looked at the State aid relevance of project partner no. 4, which has a low risk of implementing State aid-relevant activities, to ensure that these partners indeed comply with the State aid rules. Further, the MA/JS carried out plausibility checks for project partners no. 5, which has a medium to high risk of implementing State aid-relevant activities as requested in the application. The MA/JS did not carry out plausibility checks for project partners no. 1 and 6 with medium to high risk for implementing State aid relevant activities as they did not request it in the application.

The MA/JS concluded that the project partners listed as State aid relevant in section 1.8 of the Assessment sheet carry out State aid relevant activities.