



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

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

24 03. 2004

Brussels,  
BS D(2004) 510432

Professor Piet J. Mulders  
Vrije Universiteit  
Department of Physics and  
Astronomy  
Faculty of Sciences  
De Boelelaan 1081  
1081 HV Amsterdam  
Netherlands

**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 - 512392**

Dear Professor Mulders,

I would like to inform you that the Commission services, with the help of independent experts, have recently evaluated the proposal “**Hadronic Physics Network in Experiment and Theory**” 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.

For those proposals which did not pass an evaluation threshold (as mentioned in the "*Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Selection Procedures*"<sup>105</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,



Bruno SCHMITZ

Encl.                      Evaluation Summary Report

---

<sup>105</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> 512392	<b>Acronym :</b> HAPNET	<b>Panel:</b> PHY-1-2
------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------

<p><b>1. Scientific Quality of the Research Training Area</b> (<i>Threshold 3/5</i>)</p> <p>Exploitation of data and link between data and first principles description is difficult, due to the non-perturbative nature of low-energy QCD.          Most of the theoretical analysis has to rely heavily on intermediary, ad-hoc models.          A connection with first principles is expected to come through lattice gauge theory, but the time scale for this is far from obvious.          The experimental part appears better focused and planned than the theoretical part, but there is no indication that a real breakthrough can be achieved.          Integration of complementary techniques is questionable, since the network consists of many scattered institutions with or without prior collaborations.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 3.7</p>
<p><b>2. Quality of the Training Activities</b> (<i>Threshold 4/5</i>)</p> <p>The training achieved through research would be supplemented by courses offered at the different nodes (which are rather different from place to place), and network-wide schools, but the planning of these is not clearly detailed (Network-level schools mentioned, but use of existing schools or specific one not decided).          There are network activities concerning lecture courses, schools, graduate schools, and workshops, but not a robust plan for longer-term visits and secondments, as the network mobility is based on very short-term exchange. Most of the training stays local.           However, the training will obviously benefit from complementarity between theory and the experiment.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4</p>
<p><b>3. Quality/Capacity of the Host</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>The very large number of institutions, (14nodes , but ..10 institutions in node 10, 5 in node 9,3 in 13.4 in 14....may result in extreme dilution of EU effort.          Many network nodes have good experience in training ESRs, but they are of uneven quality. Several nodes have only a moderate commitment at the 20-30% level.          The quality of the involved teams is quite good, but the effective international collaboration aspect of the network is rather weak.          It is not clear how it has benefited from 2 previous networks, to develop partnership relations and common projects.          The facilities and the infrastructure are adequate, but the collective power of the network is missing.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 3.8</p>
<p><b>4. Management and Feasibility</b> (<i>Threshold 3/5</i>)</p> <p>The practical arrangements for the implementation of the management have been well taken care of. There exists equal opportunity policy, but it could be described in a bit more detail. The budget and dissemination aspects of the project seem to be adequate.          The 30 percent involvement of the network coordinator seems very little as compared to his responsibilities: a Management Assistant is a good idea, especially in view of the extreme fragmentation.          The project is feasible but the added value to unification and collaborative efforts is not always obvious. The balance of the numbers of the ESR's and the ER's is good.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 4</p>
<p><b>5. Relevance to the objectives of the Activity</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>The project represents physics which is somewhat narrow and specialized, thus limiting the relevance and the likely impact on the researchers' careers. The size is well matched to the total pool of researchers in this area. Positive impact on a researcher's career is enhanced by the network's versatile lecture course, workshop, school, etc. program.          The final contribution to overcoming fragmentation of European research is not clear, especially in view of previous networks in this area.          Given the prospects, it is not clear at the Community level, that it is the best time to increase the volume of this particular line of research.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 3.8</p>
<p><b>6. Added Value to the Community</b> (<i>No Threshold</i>)</p> <p>The project contributes towards the objective of a European Research Area, but suffers from not being in an area that is of wide interest. The synergy aspects and structuring effects of the presently proposed network seem minor. The increase of attraction and competitiveness of Europe, caused by the planned network, could be larger with better integration of the teams. There might be some possibility to improve the gender balance. There exists some potential in the network to contribute to the Community's cohesion policy, if some collaborative actions could emerge within the network.</p>	<p><b>Mark:</b> 3.8</p>

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

This project is devoted to basic research issue, to relate the results of high energy collisions and the comparison with the fundamental quantum chromodynamics theory. Exploitation of data and link between them and first principles description is however difficult, due to the non-perturbative nature of low-energy QCD, and has often to rely instead on relatively ad-hoc models. The network would study a wide range of topics, most of them loosely connected to the HERMES and TJLAB experiments. Many of the nodes are multiple, resulting in a very composite network, and many groups have only a moderate commitment.

**Total score:**  
3.855 (77.1%)

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?

NO

YES