



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate B - Structuring the European Research Area
Research infrastructures

Brussels, 30 April 2007
RTD-B.3 /DP(2007)D/517948
506395 - CARE

EXPRESS MAIL

COMMISSARIAT A L'ENERGIE
ATOMIQUE - CEA
Mr. Roy ALEKSAN, CEA Saclay,
F-91191 Gif sur Yvette Cedex
FRANCE

Subject: Contract 506395 CARE
Review Results - Mid Term Review of 13.04.07

Dear Dr. Aleksan,

On the basis of the report submitted by the Commission in accordance with the requirements of the Contract and after evaluation of the results obtained to date, the research is conforming to the targeted achievements.

The review report, giving the full findings of the review session and recommendations is enclosed.

Please could you inform your partners of the content of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

Daniel Pasini

Encl.: MTR Report



TEMPLATE FOR FP6 PROJECT REVIEWS

*This template can be downloaded from the Internet at
<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm>*

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Individual report
Consolidated report

Thematic Priority/Activity

INFRASTR-2.1

Instrument type

IA-I3, Integrated Infrastructure Initiative

Project no and acronym

RII3-CT-2003-506395 CARE

Project full title

Coordinated Accelerator Research in Europe

Project start date

01.01.2004

Project duration

60 months

Project coordinator name and
organisation

Roy ALEKSAN, CEA/France

Period covered by report (from -
to)

01.01.2004 - 30.03.2007

Date of (review) meeting

13.04.2007

Name(s) of reviewer(s)

Daniel Pasini, Christian Kurrer

Name of reviewer drafting the
report

Daniel Pasini

Introduction

This template provides the structure for the review report that needs to be prepared after the project review. It can be completed on-line via the SESAM reporting tool (CIRCA username and password are required). Please go to <http://webgate.cec.eu.int/sesam> and click on "Review reports" on the upper left corner of the page. Alternatively, the template can be found in Word format at <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm> and be completed off-line.

In completing Sections 2-8 of the report, independent reviewers should keep in mind that, in case they feel that they do not have the competence or the information to answer a question, they do not need to tick any of the boxes 'Yes', 'Partially', 'No' for that question, but they must complete the 'Comments' box.

If several reviewers are involved, it is preferable that a consolidated report be prepared by one reviewer chosen as 'rapporteur'.

The reporting requirements for FP6 projects are described in detail in the "Guidance notes on Project reporting in FP6" (downloadable from <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc-management.htm#reporting>).

Questions to be answered by the reviewer(s)

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Please follow the order of the individual sections of this report

Comments:

The CARE I3 is organised to help increase the technological base for the operation, design and construction of accelerators, increase the knowledge in the physics and technology of these systems and start research in possible new methods of particle acceleration. The key contributors consist of a variety of national accelerator laboratories (CEA, CRNS, INFN, DESY, etc). The 1st, 2nd and 3rd annual reports for this project have been considered as the mid-term review report, together with updated activity reports presented by the coordinator at the time of the MTR. The MTR meeting confirmed that CARE has been a great success in setting up a coordinated European wide effort in the field of accelerator R&D and that the project is on track to achieve all its objectives.

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

b. Recommendations

We recommend continuing as foreseen in the initial objectives.

2. OBJECTIVES

a. Have the objectives for the period been achieved?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

All activities are on target to achieve their objectives.

b. Are the overall objectives (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:

c. Do you recommend changes in objectives in order to keep up with the current state-of-the-art?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

3. WORKPLAN AND RESOURCES

a. Has the project as a whole been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the contract)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The work is in line with Annex I.

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

Where minor delays or bottlenecks were encountered, CARE quickly took measures to address and solve the issues.

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

d. Have resources been deployed as foreseen in Annex I, overall and for each participant?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

e. Have costs incurred, i.e., personnel costs and other major cost items, been 1) necessary for the implementation of the project and 2) economic. Note that both aspects 1) and 2) have to be covered in the answer.

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

f. For Networks of Excellence (NoEs) only:

f1. Is there evidence of real integration and restructuring of activities between partners (to be evaluated against Indicators of Integration, e.g., exchanges of personnel, shared infrastructures, joint research and training activities, changes of research orientation of individual partners to better integrate into the NoE, etc).

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

f2. Does the joint research performed under the NoE as a whole continue to qualify as excellent?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

4. WORK PLANNED FOR THE NEXT 18-MONTH PERIOD (NoEs and IPs only)

Is the proposed update to the *Implementation Plan* (IPs) or *Joint Programme of Activity* (NoEs) for the next 18-month period satisfactory

a. from a scientific/technical point of view?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

b. from a management point of view including use of resources?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. concerning non-scientific activities (dissemination, exploitation, training, science-society issues, further integration etc)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

5. CONSORTIUM PARTNERSHIP

a. Has the collaboration between the participants been effective?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

Very effective. CARE like other I3s are increasingly taken as the good example to imitate outside the EU.

b. Have the partners contributed as planned to the project and tasks assigned to them?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. Do you identify any conflicts or evidence of underperforming partners, lack of commitment or change of interest of any partners? Do you recommend any changes in responsibilities?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

6. MANAGEMENT

a. Has the scientific/technical management been performed as required?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The management of the program, with the establishment of a governing board and co-ordinators for each project and additional systems to optimise the efficiency of the collaboration is excellent. Progress is followed during Steering Committee meetings (3 per year), during Dissemination Board meetings (3 per year), Quarterly reports (3 per year), CARE Annual meetings, Governing Board meetings (1 per year), NA/JRA steering committees and using CARE documentation and deliverable databases.

b. Has the administrative and financial management been performed as required ((including proper handling of contractual matters, maintenance of the consortium agreement, intellectual property rights, technical collective responsibility, sub-contracting, competitive calls)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The management team is effective and has a good overview of the project situation at all times.

c. Have (electronic) information and communication networks been established as required to support interactive working between the teams involved (if relevant)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

d. Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related 5th and 6th Framework projects or other R&D national/international programmes (if relevant)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

7. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

a. Does the project have significant use potential (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

N/A

b. Is the Plan for the Use and Dissemination of Knowledge developing in a satisfactory manner?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. Have the contractors disseminated project results and information as foreseen by the contract and the plan for dissemination and use of knowledge (publications, conferences...)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The quality of the CARE website and in particular of the CARE publication database is worth noticing.	
---	--

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

8. 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:

N/A

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

d. Has progress on the Gender Action Plan been satisfactory (if applicable for this reporting period)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

N/A

Name (s) of the reviewer(s): Daniel Pasini

Date: 13 April 2007

Signature(s):

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pasini". The signature is stylized with a large, circular flourish at the beginning.