

**THE INNOVATION FUND
(TAP) TECHNOLOGY ADVANCEMENT PROGRAMME
EVALUATION TEMPLATE**



Project Number	T50024
Project Title	Comprehensive Pneumatically Actuated Exercise Platform operating within a greater electronic fitness management system
Evaluator (Title, Name and Surname)	US Evaluator
ID Number	
Indicate whether business or technical evaluator (or both)	Technical
Contact telephone number and e-mail	
Place of work	
Report submission date	April 13 th , 2005

Indicate Evaluation Phase

Evaluation	Mark with an X
1. Pre-Proposal	
2. Site Visit	
3. Presentation	
4. Full Proposal	X

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Rank each criterion on a scale of 1-5

- 1: Poor
- 2: Fair
- 3. Good
- 4. Very Good
- 5. Excellent

The product of the mark and weighting equal a score per criterion

e.g. Mark = 2, Weighting = 20, Score = $2 \times 20 = 40$

Criterion	Mark	Weighting	Score
1. Technology, Novelty	4.5	30	135
2. Market need, competitiveness and commercialization potential	4	30	120
3. National/Social benefits	5	20	100
4. Consortium	5	20	100
Total		100	455
Overall rating			

Overall Rating

Poor: 100-150

Fair: 151-250

Good: 251-350

Very Good: 351-450

Excellent: 451-500

Please comment on each of the criteria below in relation to the scores allocated (include comments on project risks). The comments recorded below will serve as verbatim feedback to applicants.

1. TECHNOLOGY, NOVELTY

The most novel aspects of this project are (i) that all the major muscle groups could be exercised in a manner that is specific to each individual user, and (ii) the fact that a database could eventually be developed to compare groups of people. Some of the deliverables that are mentioned are “overkill” (for instance, in my opinion, the benefit of adding electromyographic technology is questionable---certainly, this is something that most users will not find useful. In addition, I would have liked to have seen some discussion of safety---especially since a high pressure compression chamber is part of the system.

Finally, the addition of Dr. Tim Noakes as a consultant adds considerably to the project since he is a leader in the field and would almost certainly help direct the team towards a product that is both technically sound and of benefit to the health care industry.

2. MARKET NEED/COMPETITIVENESS AND COMMERCIALIZATION

The developers of this concept have done a thorough review of competing products and have shown how their product will fill a void in the market. They also have a comprehensive plan for commercializing their system---with five separate components that could be sold. The fact that they are using many “off-the-shelf” devices for their system has the advantage that the final price should be very competitive.

3. NATIONAL/SOCIAL BENEFITS

The developers of the product have wisely decided to initially focus on the South African market---this means they should be able to prove the concept locally before moving into the global arena. In terms of benefits to individuals, there is obviously an urgent need to address health care issues related to obesity. The new exercise system may very well help many people become physically fitter---without them having to participate in outdoor

activities and/or switch from one exercise platform to another. Finally, the idea of providing data to medical aids is interesting---it is novel, but does come with issues related to data confidentiality and safeguards need to be in place to maintain each individual user's privacy. Nevertheless, nationally, if there was a database that could relate health care benefits to using the new exercise system, there is no doubt medical aids would be very interested.

4. CONSORTIUM

This is a particular strength of the proposal---the combination of talent that SSISA, University of Cape Town, CPUT and ProVekta can bring to bear on the project is impressive. The addition of Dr. Tim Noakes is especially noteworthy---and his research unit should be included in the project as it progresses further.

COMPLETE SECTION 5.1 or 5.2

5.1 Comments in support of the project advancing to the next stage of the business process

This is a very thorough proposal and should be advanced to the next step of the process. My only slight hesitation is that I think there should be a safety review of the compression chamber and its connections that form part of the system.

OR

5.2. Comments in support of the project being rejected at this stage

6. Highlight any concerns with respect to the project budget

My only concern relates to the lack of justification for specific items in the budget---for instance, the subcontracts to UCT are not clearly justified---are these expenses for Dr. Noakes' research unit? If so, what exactly do they cover?

|



Deleted: ¶

¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶
¶