



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. Subir Sarkar
University of Oxford
Department of Physics (Theoretical
Physics)
1 Keble Road
Oxford OX1 3NP
United Kingdom

**Programme "Structuring the European Research Area - Human Resources and
Mobility" - Marie-Curie Research Training Networks**
Call Identifier : FP6-2002-Mobility-1 Deadline: 19th November 2003

Subject : Quick Information concerning evaluation of Proposal FP6 - 005723

Dear Dr. Sarkar,

I would like to inform you that the Commission services, with the help of independent experts, have recently evaluated the proposal "The Origin of Our Universe" 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"⁵⁸), a Commission rejection decision will be taken in due course.

⁵⁸ Available on <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc.htm>.

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

Evaluation Summary Report for a Marie-Curie Research Training Network

Proposal No. : 005723	Acronym : UNIVERSENET	Panel: PHY-1-2
<p>1. Scientific Quality of the Research Training Area (Threshold 3/5) Important and timely project to bridge the gap between particle theorists and cosmologists: thus, multidisciplinary. Six key topics are investigated. The project lacks however originality and innovation: almost all of the ideas described are more than 20 year old (some even older) neither proven nor disproven. Also, it adheres too closely to a popular orthodoxy (supersymmetry, string and inflation) without invitation for new ideas. Neglecting alternative particle physics theories. (If these ideas are right, the great science has already been done, and there will be little value added in advance of experimental confirmation. And if they are wrong, then that will not be discovered by this low risk proposal.) No expected major breakthroughs are highlighted. The strength of the proposal is that it contains many very well known and accomplished scientists. It is very predictable that the network will do good science. New concepts and methods are likely to be created during the course of the project.</p>		Mark: 4.3
<p>2. Quality of the Training Activities (Threshold 4/5) The training program is generally good. But the selection too narrowly restricts the field of applicants to those having a good grounding in supersymmetry. Its primary aim should be to select and mentor those young people who show the most promise in terms of originality, creativity, independence, ambition and initiative. The adherence to (yet to be demonstrated) orthodoxy and avoidance of mention of alternatives is a weakness as regards training: it communicates to young people that adherence to an orthodoxy (not established by experiment). The training programme is well distributed between ESR (49%) and ER (51%) Some reservations about definition of Career Development Plan, management skills for the ESR. The common training remains sketchy: how many schools?, how many meetings? where? Good balance between the ESR's and the ER's. The mobility, including visits, could have been discussed in more detail. The impact of the training in the project is most likely rather strong.</p>		Mark: 4.2
<p>3. Quality/Capacity of the Host (No Threshold) The teams of the proposed network are of high level and (partly) of leading edge in their field of expertise. Schedule and milestones are not specified. The multidisciplinary is a strong aspect when trying to join the particle physics. The offered mentoring/tutoring capacity is very good. The teams involved in the proposal have already rather extensive existing mutual collaborations. The development of new collaborations has good potential. Most part of the collaboration is integrated nicely into the network providing platform to achieve the objectives of the project.</p>		Mark: 4.6
<p>4. Management and Feasibility (Threshold 3/5) The teams have the collective expertise to achieve the project objectives. The intensity of the networking is high. The network has a host of previous experience in running successfully a network. The usual ways of dissemination of project results are in use. The management competence of the network is outstanding. The project is both feasible and credible. The training offered matches perfectly the envisaged ESR/ER balance. However, The plans for the visits and secondments could be more accurate. For some teams the existing collaborations are not explicitly indicated. No training coordinator. No outreach coordinator. The management is confused with scientific potentiality. Budget not well developed. How post-docs are to be chosen is not clear, although much of the funds for this proposal go to the support of post-docs. Does one emphasize problem solving skills and the ability to work as a part of a team on projects of senior scientists? The equal-opportunity policy could be made more active.</p>		Mark: 4.2
<p>5. Relevance to the objectives of the Activity (No Threshold) The young researchers will benefit from the scientific complementary skills (astrophysics or cosmology and particle physics) developed in the present network, with positive impact on the researcher's career. There is definitely need for promotion of the project's area of research at the Community level. The involvement of the Korean team is justified by their possibility to apply for national funding based on the involvement.</p>		Mark: 4.5

<p>6. Added Value to the Community (No Threshold) The project acts along the lines of the ERA. The impact of the proposed project on the synergies and structure of the involved field of research is potentially high. The attractiveness and the competitiveness aspects are strong in the proposed project. Improvement of the gender balance will be hard for the project. The importance and relevance to the Community's cohesion policy and European integration is minor.</p>	<p>Mark: 4.3</p>	
<p>Overall remarks (Threshold 70%) highlighting strengths : links between particle physics and cosmology weakness in the schedule of the training. The network contains many good and well known researchers. It is very predictable that the network will do good science. However -There is too much adherence to established popular and orthodox-but totally unproven-ideas such as supersymmetry and inflation-and little or no mention of or support for alternative well studied hypotheses. The proposal seems to provide no room or invitation for new ideas or for the kind of young people who are likely to ignore orthodoxy in the pursuit of ideas of their own.</p>	<p>Total score: 4.35 (87%)</p>	
<p>Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?</p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>