CONSENSUS EVALUATION REPORT

GENERAL OVERVIEW

Open Call Collection	*OC-2018-1*
Proposal Reference	*OC-2018-1-22872*
Proposal Title	*European Digital Objects network*
Proposal Acronym	*EUDOn*
Review Panel	*RP2 Science, Technology and Data to power Society, Economy and Health*
Evaluation Status	*Final*

EVALUATION

SUMMARY TABLE

S&T EXCELLENCE					IMPACT				IMPLEMENTATION				Marks
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Q11	Q12	Q13	Total
5	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	2	5	3	5	4	49

COMMENTS

S&T EXCELLENCE
Soundness of the challenge

Q1 - Is the challenge relevant and timely?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner. Main strengths: The proposal addresses all aspects that need attention towards enabling multidisciplinary Open Science, namely: - Understanding the bottlenecks in cutting-edge data-intensive science - Identifying missing data specifications - Defining a common data exchange platform architecture - Stimulating the creation of test-beds - Mobilizing the relevant communities - Addressing training and capacity development issues. There is a clear need for improved data curation and standardisation and the proposal makes a clear case for it. Better access to data and meta-data one of the main challenges facing EOSC. Improved accessibility of data is a precondition for further development in areas of machine learning, deep learning, computational modelling. Some comments about the new European role on the data protection and its effect could be added, mainly for Research Data Alliance and possible sensible data.	5

Q2 - Are the objectives presented clear and pertinent to tackle the challenge?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a good manner. Main strengths: The objectives of the proposed Action are clearly stated, and special attention is given to attracting young data scientists. They show many aspects and fit well within the work-packages. The research coordination objectives are well structured and include a SWOT/GAP analysis for the Digital Object architectures and then cover applications addressing possible open solutions. Challenges with lack of testbed projects and training are properly identified. The proposal has some weaknesses and the following improvements are necessary: The objectives are not specific enough. For capacity building objectives more discussions and definitions should be included; similar to Objective 1. The relation to industry should be described in a greater detail. While the proposal mentions the need to mobilize relevant groups, the way this challenge and possible approaches to it are described is inadequate. It is a difficult problem not addressed properly for years if not decades. However, successful attempts at solving this problem can be found in existing or recent research projects and these are not mentioned in the proposal.	3

Progress beyond the state-of-the-art and innovation potential

Q3 - Does the proposal advance the state-of-the-art and introduce an innovative approach to the challenge?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a good manner. Main strengths: The current state-of-the art is adequately described. Authors are aware of SOTA on the European level. Many references have been checked and the work of the references is shown. The proposal has some weaknesses and the following improvements are necessary: In comparison vs the state-of-the-art, the proposal is similar and it offers an open global space. The references of this proposal show similar ideas, but the proposal wants to facilitate faster broad interactions. It is rather an architecture and programming problem, and not about Digital Object. SWOT/GAP analysis should have been performed before the project and serve as a guidance for proposed actions. Proposed actions are quite general and so it is difficult to guarantee their impact. Although the vision is solid, the proposal does not explain clearly how it builds on the existing offerings of EOSC initiatives and European Research Infrastructures. What is the relation to the existing EGI / EUDAT services? How does the concept of DOs affect the existing ESFRI data platforms? Moreover, although there is a mention to other regions e.g. US and China, the proposal does not explain to which initiatives from these regions the Action will make a liaison.	3

Added value of networking

Q4 - Is networking the best approach to tackle the challenge?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a very good manner. Main strengths: The challenge at hand will clearly benefit from a networking approach. The Action foresees a network of delegates and experts from 47 different European research infrastructure projects. The proposal would benefit from certain improvements: The proposal treats to propose approaches based on Digital Object, but the idea is very open covering various areas. It is very difficult to have general solutions applying to all these areas. More details and real and specified solutions have to be added.	4

Q5 - What is the added value of the proposed network in relation to former and existing efforts at European and/or international level?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a very good manner. Main strengths: The proposal describes clear added value in relation to existing efforts at European and/or international level, especially in RDA and GO FAIR initiatives. Many countries are covered by the network. The relation with the actual and previous EU Framework Programme for Research is addressed. The proposal would benefit from certain improvements: To improve networking and communication with companies, it is preferable to seek their feedback in advance before proceeding to solutions.	4

IMPACT

Scientific, technological and/or socio-economic impact

Q6 - Does the proposal clearly identify relevant, and realistic short-term/long-term impacts?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a good manner. Main strengths: Identified impacts are relevant in general. The overall impact of FAIR data is well described. The proposal has some weaknesses and the following improvements are necessary: Impacts are not clearly described. There is a lack of separation between short and long term impacts. Some of the impacts do not fit a networking project, but pose certain technical challenges and rely on achieving other impacts beforehand. Although it is difficult to describe concrete long-term impacts, for specific domains that the Action targets, like Health, Humanities, Materials, and Biodiversity, more concrete short-term impacts could be presented.	3

Measures to maximise impact

Q7 - Does the proposal identify the most relevant stakeholders and present a clear plan to involve them as Action's participants?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a very good manner. Main strengths: The proposal identifies and addresses many stakeholders. Main EU initiatives are included. The proposal presents a clear plan to involve all relevant stakeholders. The proposal would benefit from certain improvements: In general, relevant stakeholders adopt general Digital Object approaches, but all these stakeholders could share knowledge, needs, etc., to have a bigger impact. The strategy can change to bilateral or common points of view, between this proposal and stakeholders.	4

Q8 - Is there a clear and attainable plan for dissemination and/or exploitation of results?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a very good manner. Main strengths: Most relevant channels are identified. The proposed dissemination plan is clear, and provided that there is adequate representation in the Action from European Research Infrastructures it is also feasible. The dissemination plan is well-done from a learning point of view. The proposal would benefit from certain improvements: There is no clear exploitation plan. The focus is on Dissemination. The proposal shows a soft relation with industrial sector and besides, it is not considered on the exploitation. Another kind of strategies can be used, to include video, multimedia data, the use of social network, etc. The dissemination plan could be extended.	4

Level of risk and level of potential innovation/breakthroughs

Q9 - How well does the proposal succeed in putting forward potential innovation/ breakthroughs with a convincing risk/return trade-off?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a fair manner. Positive aspects: The proposal shows the possible potential of its application. The identified risks are relevant and described in a good manner. Addressing the data fragmentation across borders and across disciplines is a great challenge, that has potential for future innovation/ breakthroughs. The proposal has significant weaknesses: The proposal shows the success of other references but the innovation on the different social structures is not clear. No elements of innovation are specified. There is a risk that despite excellent work by project partners the results will not be adopted due to missing incentives. It is something the proposal sort of alludes to with the term "mobilise", but does not properly describe. This risk has been fatal to similar projects in the past, but it is not even mentioned in the proposal. Although the proposal deals with a theme that acts as enabler of future innovation (via facilitating the open science paradigm), it does not describe the relevant risk/return trade-off. It is inferred, but it is not clear.	2

IMPLEMENTATION

Overall Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

Q10 - Is the work plan (WGs, tasks, activities, timeframe and deliverables) coherent, realistic and appropriate to ensure the achievement of the objectives?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner. Main strengths: The work plan is well structured and appropriate to ensure the achievement of the objectives. Tasks are identified and correctly described. The work-packages are well-worked and fit with the objectives of the proposal. The planned deliverables, tasks and activities are adequate to develop this proposal.	5

Q11 - Does the proposal identify the main risks related to the work plan and have a plan for contingencies?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a good manner. Main strengths: The proposal identifies risks and contingency plans about the use of Digital Object. The proposal identifies the critical risks related to the work plan and provides relevant contingency actions. The proposal has some weaknesses and the following improvements are necessary: More analysis of the missing components of this relatively new paradigm, would ensure that all potential risks have been taken into account. Most of the tasks overlap fully which is a major risk in general and leaves little space for contingencies. The risks for some objectives are not represented. The grade of participation is an important risk on industry, researching, and social points of view, which is not properly identified. Another important risk is the relation, transfer and collaboration with the industrial sector and it only is shown on one item on the contingency plans.	3

Appropriateness of management structures and procedures

Q12 - Are the management structure and procedures appropriate?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner. Main strengths: The division into Core and Working Groups seems the right choice. The management structure is appropriate for a project of this size (in terms of participating partners). The structure and organization of the network is fine.	5

Q13 - Does the proposed Network envisage the critical mass, expertise and geographical distribution for addressing the challenge and the objectives? If not, does the proposal identify the gaps in the Network and present a clear plan for overcoming the gaps? Are mutual benefits clearly ascertained in case of involvement of NNC and IPC institutions?	Mark
The proposal addresses this question in a very good manner. Main strengths: The network has a critical mass and is in general well balanced. The proposal foresees a critical mass of proposers, geographically balanced across Europe. It foresees the participation of 24.5% females, as well as, an adequate number of early career investigators. The composition of the proposal is good in term if geographical distribution and number of partners. The proposal would benefit from certain improvements: The composition of this proposal is not well-balanced to reach efficient results. More industry partners can be added. There is a certain bias to three particular countries in terms of amount of partners. They are also quite central to already existing efforts, so the project could do more to spread the effort to other countries.	4