



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate D - The human factor, mobility and Marie Curie activities  
Unit D3 - Research training networks  
*The Head of Unit*

Brussels, 24.03.2004  
BS D(2004) 510432

Dr. Barbara Erazmus  
Centre National de la Recherche  
Scientifique  
Institut National de Physique  
Nucléaire et de Physique des  
Particules  
Laboratoire de Physique  
Subatomique et des Technologies  
Associées SUBATECH Ecole des  
Mines  
La Chantrerie, rue Alfred Kastler, 4  
BP 20722  
44307 Nantes  
France

**Programme “Structuring the European Research Area – Human Resources and Mobility” – Marie-Curie Research Training Networks**

**Call Identifier : FP6-2002-Mobility-1      Deadline: 19<sup>th</sup> November 2003**

**Subject : Quick Information concerning evaluation of Proposal FP6 - 512431**

Dear Dr. Erazmus,

I would like to inform you that the Commission services, with the help of independent experts, have recently evaluated the proposal “RTN” submitted in the context of the above mentioned call. You will find attached a copy of the Evaluation Summary Report on your proposal, including the marks awarded, as produced by the independent experts.

The ESR includes comments and scores for each of the evaluation criteria and shows whether your proposal passed all the thresholds. You will notice that the thresholds applied to the different individual criteria as well as to the overall threshold are mentioned after the criteria identification.

Those proposals which passed the evaluation thresholds, will normally be invited to enter into contract negotiations with the Commission services. However, the number of such invitations will depend on the Community funding available for supporting proposals under this call. It is expected that the invitations will be sent out during April 2004. Depending on the budget availability and the expected outcome of the negotiations, a reserve list may be established of the next highest ranking proposals.

Postal address : Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels, - Belgium.  
Telephone: Direct line (32-2) 295.05.14; Standard 299.11.11.  
Fax: (32-2) 296.21.36.  
E-mail: [bruno.schmitz@cec.eu.int](mailto:bruno.schmitz@cec.eu.int)  
Internet site : <http://www.cordis.lu/improving/networks/home.htm>

For those proposals which did not pass an evaluation threshold (as mentioned in the "Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Selection Procedures"<sup>109</sup>), a Commission rejection decision will be taken in due course.

Note, however this letter only provides information about the preliminary outcome of the evaluation of your proposal. An official and final decision on your proposal will be taken by the Commission in the near future

I would be grateful if you could inform the other partners in this proposal of the content of this letter. For any further inquiries please contact Stephen Davies tel: 00.32.2.296.32.48, e-mail: Stephen.Davies@cec.eu.int.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bruno Schmitz', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Bruno SCHMITZ

Encl.                      Evaluation Summary Report

---

<sup>109</sup> Available on <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc.htm>.

# Evaluation Summary Report for a Marie-Curie Research Training Network

<b>Proposal No. :</b> 512431	<b>Acronym :</b> EUROP-RTN	<b>Panel:</b> PHY-1-2
------------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------

<p><b>1. Scientific Quality of the Research Training Area</b> (<i>Threshold 3/5</i>)</p> <p>Serious, very well written proposal for large collaboration (20 nodes) to study in a cohesive way (theory and experiment) quark-gluon plasma state realized in the early Universe. A sound knowledge of current state-of-art is demonstrated. Challenging project and breakthrough very likely, since there was already some evidence for creation of such state. The technological competence was proved by designing detectors used in various fields (e.g. medicine). The objectives, closely related to existing and future experiments, cover simultaneous and parallel data analyses and new approach of common analyses of data by theorists and experimentalists, are realistic, timely and scientifically relevant. The research methods are appropriate, working groups have detailed individual objectives and well distributed tasks among teams and principal researchers, milestones and deliverables are also given.</p> <p>However, the novelty of the involved methods and concepts is not clearly formulated, and the combination of the existing ones seems to be the main line of the philosophy.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4.6</p>
<p><b>2. Quality of the Training Activities</b> (<i>Threshold 4/5</i>)</p> <p>The training programme seems well planned and thought over. The notion of two supervisors from different nodes seems promising. Tutoring of the ESR's by the ER's is a good idea. Otherwise, the project implements the complimentary skills in the usual ways. The short- to long-term visits bring flexibility and versatility to the training and knowledge transfer. Special attention has been paid to integrate some less-experienced teams to the project. Observation of geographic factor in gender balance leads to a realistic expectation for positive impact from an exchange of researchers.</p> <p>The training is – on the other hand – also supported from other sources (like CERN, where European countries contribute).</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4.0</p>
<p><b>3. Quality/Capacity of the Host</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>The quality of the involved teams is excellent in terms of the overall training aspects needed for a network. The mentoring/tutoring capacity of the teams is high. On the other side, the network is rather fragmented and no emphasis is laid on establishing new networks, but rather fostering the old ones. The composition of the network seems sufficient to achieve the objectives of the project. Also, the participation of the BNL (USA) is quite well justified. The network teams have the collective capacity and infrastructures to successfully carry out the proposed research project. The visits of the researchers are very much discussed, yet without concrete examples (e.g., the time to spend by individual principal researchers in the project is missing, and also the fact that some staff members are counted in two nodes may lead to a confusion). Meaningful and mutually beneficial collaborations are foreseen, at least for large part of the involved nodes. Good potential for a collective training/knowledge transfer within the network exists.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4.7</p>
<p><b>4. Management and Feasibility</b> (<i>Threshold 3/5</i>)</p> <p>The distribution of responsibilities and management tasks is excellently taken into account, a good example is the provided organization chart. The equal opportunity policy is weaved with realism, additional boost is given by the fact that the network coordinator is female. The size of the network is huge and, accordingly, the requested amount of money (really expensive project!) is sizable. The networks' collective management plan is very good with the overall coordination activities being very well organized. This makes the project feasible and credible. The training/knowledge transfer potential of the network matches well the envisaged balance of the ESR's and the ER's but the amount of person-months requested (1612 person-months) is a concern.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4.7</p>
<p><b>5. Relevance to the objectives of the Activity</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>Whilst a positive impact on a researcher's career would be expected through the quality and relevance of the project and it would be expected that the individual nodes will benefit from the increased training capacity offered by the network, it is not clear that the proposed MCRTN would significantly enhance already existing programmes or foster longer-term collaborations. The Community of the heavy ion ultrarelativistic collisions is already very large in Europe and the panel does not see any special interest or need to increase its volume further at the Community level through this MCRTN proposal.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 1.0</p>
<p><b>6. Added Value to the Community</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>The proposal outlines how such a project could contribute to the objectives of the ERA through integrating researchers and teams across Europe, addressing 'brain-drain', overcoming fragmentation, increasing the attractiveness of European research and improving the gender balance. However, the Panel was not convinced that this MCRTN proposal would enhance or add value to existing funding/projects already supported at national and European level.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 1.0</p>

**Overall remarks** (*Threshold 70%*)

Proposal is dealing with ultra-relativistic heavy ion collisions, mainly aimed to the search of the quark-gluon plasma. It consists of both theory and the experiment, which are extremely well balanced here. Also the instrumental part and necessary software are included.

This type of science is presently being pursued with the highest priorities at CERN, RHIC and GSI. All experiments are funded at a multi-million euro (or dollar) level per year with thousands of researchers from all over the world involved.

The quality of physics, the groups, the networking, the work plan etc. are without question. WG are defined as super-structures with specific and well-defined tasks; these are further broken down into subgroups, in which usually 5 to 7 laboratories collaborate intensely. Work plans for every WG are given together with their schedules and allocations. Each node refers to a particular WG, where it would contribute.

However, the potential for fostering longer-term collaborations through supporting such a MCRTN is not so clear from the application. The Community of the heavy ion ultrarelativistic collisions is already very large in Europe and the panel does not see any special interest or need to increase its volume at the Community level through the MCRTN activity. The Panel is also concerned whether it would be Added Value to the Community to invest the amount of money required (some €10million for 1612 person-months) through this MCRTN proposal to increase the total European effort for this project by only 15%.

**Total score:**  
3.25 (65%)

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?

**NO X****YES**