

Weaknesses

Excellence

- The description of some of the projects is very brief
- The degree of **innovation** is limited as the project is a continuation of several previous and continuing projects
- The main technical objectives do not contain significant innovative aspects
- The proposal is not convincing regarding its novelty
- The proposal fails to explain the **originality** and the innovative aspects of the research programme
- The proposal fails to describe the innovative aspect in the development of existing technology
- The project fails in addressing general research challenges
- A clear description of the state of the art as well as an appropriate list of references are missing
- A description of how the current shortcomings in the technology will be overcome, in at least a sketchy manner, is missing
- The proposal inadequately describes the **research methodology**
- The methodology of the research programme is rather restricted to commercial products PRIVATE PARTNERS OK, BUT NOT ONLY!
- The information about the research methodologies to be used in the programme is insufficiently described in the appropriate section
- Multidisciplinary is rather limited
- Specific research topics assigned to ESRs are not sufficiently detailed in the proposal. The proposal insufficiently outlines necessary methodology for research objectives, especially in the light of the ambitious project goals
- The specific **research objectives** are poorly presented and not well structured in the text
- Some of partner organisations have overlapping **expertise** with the beneficiaries and thus their unique advantage is not fully clear
- Past supervision experience of some of the partners is insufficiently described
- Experiences of some supervisors with PhD students are not always sufficiently described
- Research training is rather limited due to the almost exclusive focus on *OMISSIS*
- Some details of **training program** are lacking credibility
- The content of the training programme does not adequately describe whether the ESRs will get any specific training in particle physics per se, although the main motivation of this proposal is to provide training in instrumentation and data analysis in particle physics
- The structure of the training to be offered lacks the contribution from all institutions. Even if the network activities are well described, the local activities are insufficiently shown and explained
- Some proposed training events are short (1-2 days) and scattered around the network
- The proposal has only one industrial beneficiary (partly compensated however by beneficiaries at the interface between academy and commercial productions)

- The participation of the two non-academic organisations in training activities is rather modest
- The **role of the non-academic sector** is not sufficiently explained, and the non-academic sector is not leading any of the planned training schools
- Only some of the ESRs will have exposure to the private sector
- Several ESRs will not benefit from non-academic secondments, and some will only benefit from very short 1-month non-academic secondments
- The extensive external visiting scientist plan insufficiently demonstrates how the individual ESRs will benefit
- Only the ESRs at non-academic sites will have a second supervisor/mentor UNCLEAR WHY THIS SHOULD BE MANDATORY FOR ETN
- The interaction among participating organizations is weakly described; for instance, joint supervision is not well addressed AGAIN!
- Arrangements for continuous joint supervision are neither well-explained nor clear AGAIN!
- The rationale of the candidates is not developed enough, neither justified I DO NOT QUITE UNDERSTAND THIS COMMENT
- Indication of the success rate of previous related programs is insufficiently described IS IT WORTH REFERRING TO PAST PROGRAMS?

Impact

- The **role of the non-academic partners** especially in terms of the training of complementary skills is not adequately specified
- The participation of the non-academic sector to the training activity is not sufficiently developed
- Too specialized and focused **training program**
- The implementation of necessary training is not sufficiently explained
- The emphasis on specific soft-skills is too large and not realistic when compared to the limited scientific aspect of the training
- The researcher will have limited exposure to wide research concepts
- Need for such specialists is insufficiently justified IS THIS COMMENT SOMEWHAT BIASED?
- The description of the project contribution to structuring ESR training at the European level is not convincing UNCLEAR TO ME
- The proposal is not sufficiently demonstrating how it is structuring Early Stage Researchers Doctoral training at EU level AGAIN
- The proposal lacks a clear description of the plans for a stable structure for the training network after the end of the project
- The **communication** plan is demonstrated but lacks necessary details
- The important aspect of communication and interaction inside the collaboration has not been adequately taken into consideration
- The number of planned scientific publications is not sufficiently outlined in comparison with the ambitious goals and the involvement of academic organisations in the consortium
- Dedicated **dissemination** by the trained ESRs is insufficiently discussed, in particular regarding presentations by the students at conferences and publication of their results in refereed journals
- The exploitation plan and IPR strategy are not sufficiently detailed

Implementation

- The risks briefly refer to the non-performance of ESRs, and no other potential risks at project level have been adequately identified
- Risk management is only discussed in general terms and lacks relevant detail
- There is no information provided in the proposal on the actual status and planning of the *OMISSIS* facility, and whether the necessary beam time is secured throughout the duration of the proposed ITN. A **risk management** strategy taking into account availability and access to the facility is missing
- The risk management plan is insufficient given the possible complications of this involved project that has several interdependent tasks
- Planned recruitment procedure for some of the ESRs leave little margin for risk and contingency planning is not sufficiently addressed
- The procedures for quality management have not been considered in sufficient detail
- While some beneficiaries describe the department of the main investigators others only describe the institute **CONSISTENCY!**
- Recruitment strategy: selection procedure is only the responsibility of host institution, not of a broader group of interviewers
- The proposal lacks the work packages description, including the tasks, which makes difficult to evaluate the **coherence and the logic of the work plan**. In particular, the most important TABLE 4.1a "WORK PACKAGE DESCRIPTION" is missing. Hence, several projects are unclear
- The deliverables list (Table 4.1b) is neither exhaustive nor satisfactory
- The relation of the secondments to the tasks and deliverables is not clearly addressed
- Descriptions of tasks in work packages are too generic and lack necessary details
- The work package leaders are not yet identified and there is no procedure foreseen for selecting them
- *OMISSIS* materials proposed in WP1 are not described comprehensively in the project. There is no correlation between this type of materials and the envisaged applications for *OMISSIS* in WP2
- The description of training and management WPs is sketchy
- The role and infrastructure of one of the partner organisation (providing five PhD degrees) and the involvement of the academic supervisors are not sufficiently described
- The proposal inadequately describes the **synergies/complementarities among the partners**
- An ESR representative is missing on the supervisory and/or executive board
- Management of consortium is good but unbalanced in terms of **gender**