



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

Community Research



Guidance notes and templates for Project Technical Review involving Independent Expert(s)

**FP7 Collaborative Projects, Networks of Excellence, Coordination and
Support Actions**

Version 18/12/2007

Disclaimer

The information and advice contained herein is not intended to be comprehensive and readers are advised to seek independent professional advice before acting upon them. The Commission does not accept responsibility for the consequences of errors or omissions herein enclosed.



CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. MANDATE OF THE INDEPENDENT EXPERT(S)	3
2.1. Objectives.....	3
2.2. Outline of the review process.....	3
2.3. Review material.....	4
2.4. Reporting.....	4
3. PROJECT REPORT ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMISSION.....	4
4. TEMPLATE FOR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW REPORT.....	5

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of a technical audit or review is to assess the work carried out under the *project* over a certain period and provide recommendations to the Commission. Such review may cover scientific, technological and other aspects relating to the proper execution of the *project* and *EC grant agreement* (ECGA) in line with its article II.23 (General Conditions).

This document provides guidance for the reviewers on the review process as well as on the content of their report to the Commission.

2. MANDATE OF THE INDEPENDENT EXPERT(S)

2.1. Objectives

The reviewer's task is to give external advice to the Commission on the *project*, with respect to the following issues:

1. the degree of fulfilment of the *project* work plan for the relevant period and of the related deliverables
2. the continued relevance of the objectives and breakthrough potential with respect to the scientific and industrial state of the art
3. the resources planned and utilised in relation to the achieved progress, in a manner consistent with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness
4. the management procedures and methods of the *project*
5. the beneficiaries' contributions and integration within the *project*
6. the expected potential impact in scientific, technologic , economic, competitive and social terms (where relevant), and the plans for the use and dissemination of results.

The reviewer(s) will also assist the Commission by recommending any reorientation that may be required, but the final decision on recommendations and reorientation is taken only by the Commission.

2.2. Outline of the review process

If a review meeting is scheduled, the expert(s) will read all relevant documents before the meeting and will attend the review meeting. He/she will then provide an assessment of the *project* based on the written material and information provided at the meeting. In the case of remote review, the assessment will be based on written documents only.

2.3. Review material

The documents to be reviewed should normally include the following:

- Annex I (contractual Description of Work)
- Progress report for the period under review
- Deliverables necessary for the assessment of the work, due in this period, according to the deliverable table in Annex I,
- For a final technical review, the following additional documents should also be part of the material to review:
 - The final publishable summary report
 - The report covering the wider societal implications of the *project*, including gender equality actions, ethical issues, efforts to involve other actors and spread awareness as well as the plan for use and dissemination of foreground¹.

2.4. Reporting

At the end of the review exercise, the expert will prepare a report with his/her findings, containing an assessment of the facts as well as suggestions for further actions or changes. A template for the *project* review report is included in this document. This document has to be completed and returned to the Project Officer within the requested deadline.

When more than one expert is involved in the *project* review, they might be asked to issue a single consolidated report.

3. PROJECT ASSESSMENT OF THE COMMISSION

On the basis of the experts' formal recommendations, the *Commission* will inform the *coordinator* of its decision (which may differ from the experts' recommendations):

- to accept or reject the deliverables;
- to allow the *project* to continue without modification of Annex I or with minor modifications;
- to consider that the *project* can only continue with major modifications;
- to initiate the termination of the *grant agreement* or of the participation of any *beneficiary* according to Article II. 38 of the *grant agreement*;
- to issue a recovery order regarding all or part of the payments made by the Commission and to apply any applicable sanction.

¹ In FP7, the term "Foreground" means information and results arising from the project, as opposed to "Background" which is information and rights prior to accession to the grant agreement

4. TEMPLATE FOR THE TECHNICAL REVIEW REPORT

The template hereafter provides the structure for the technical review report that needs to be prepared by the expert(s) after the review. It may be completed on-line via the IT reporting tool (username and password are required). The template can be found at <http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7...> by.....

In case the expert feels that he/she does not have the competence or the information to answer a question, he/she must declare it in the corresponding sections.

TECHNICAL REVIEW REPORT

Grant Agreement number:

Project Acronym:

Project title:

Funding Scheme:

Project starting date:

Project duration:

Project coordinator name and organisation:

Period covered by the report, from to

Date of review meeting (if applicable):

Name(s) of expert(s):

-
-
-
-

Name of expert drafting the report:

Individual report

Consolidated report

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Comments, in particular highlighting the scientific/technical achievements of the project, its contribution to the State of the Art and its impact:

- Good to excellent progress (the project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period and has even exceeded expectations).
- Acceptable progress (The project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations).
- Unsatisfactory progress (The project has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or is not at all on schedule).

b. Overall recommendations (e.g. on overall modifications, corrective actions at WP level, or re-tuning the objectives to optimise the impact or keep up with the State of the Art, or for other reasons, like best use of resources, re-focussing...).

2. OBJECTIVES and WORKPLAN

a. Have the objectives for the period been achieved? In particular, has the project as a whole been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the grant agreement)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

b. Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I of the grant agreement)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

c. Have planned milestones and deliverables been achieved for the reporting period?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

DELIVERABLES LIST STATUS			
No.	Title	Status (Approved/Rejected)	Remarks

d. Are the objectives for the coming period(s) i) still relevant and ii) still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?

i
Yes Partially No

ii
Yes Partially No

Comments

e. For Networks of Excellence (NoEs) only:

Has the Joint Programme of Activities been realised for the period, with all activities foreseen satisfactorily completed?

Yes Partially No

Comments

3. RESOURCES

a. To the best of your estimate, have resources used, i.e. personnel resources and other major cost items, been (i) utilised for achieving the progress, (ii) in a manner consistent with the principle of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. Note that both aspects (i) and (ii) have to be covered in the answer.

i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	Partially	No
ii	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	Partially	No

Comments

b. If applicable, please comment on large deviations with respect to the planned resources.

Comments

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

a. Has the project management been performed as required?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

b. Has the collaboration between the beneficiaries been effective?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

c. Do you identify evidence of underperforming beneficiaries, lack of commitment or change of interest of any beneficiaries?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

5. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF FOREGROUND²

a. Is there evidence that the project has/will produce significant scientific, technical, commercial, social, or environmental impacts (where applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

b. Is the plan for the use of foreground, including any update, appropriate? Namely, please comment on the plan for the exploitation and use of foreground for the consortium as a whole, or for individual beneficiary or groups of beneficiaries and its progress to date.

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

c. Have the contractors disseminated project results and information adequately (publications, conferences...)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

d. Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

e. Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related Framework Programme projects or other R&D national/international programmes, standardisation bodies (if relevant)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

6. OTHER ISSUES

a. Have policy-related and/or regulatory issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

b. Have ethical issues been appropriately handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

c. Have safety issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

d. Has progress on Gender Equality Actions been satisfactory (if applicable for this reporting period)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

Name (s) of the expert(s):

Date:

Signature(s):