

TECHNICAL REVIEW REPORT

Grant Agreement number: 607418

Project Acronym: CLIPC

Project title: Climate Information Platform for Copernicus

Funding Scheme: FP7

Project starting date: 1 December 2013

Project duration: 36 months

Name of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator and organisation: Martin Juckes STFC UK

Project web site: www.clipc.eu

Type of technical review:

- Periodic regular/foreseen technical review
- Unforeseen Technical Review

Period covered by the technical review report, from 1 December 2013 to 31 August 2014.

Date and place of review meeting (if applicable): REA Brussels

Name(s) of expert(s):

- Anna Pirani
- Pascal Lecomte
-

Name of expert drafting the report: Pascal Lecomte

- Individual report
- Consolidated report

Name of the Project Officer: Monika Kacik

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Comments, in particular highlighting the scientific/technical achievements of the project, its contribution to the State of the Art and its impact:

CLIPC is an ambitious and complex project aimed at developing a portal to address the climate information needs of a large user community, from Climate Scientists to Societal end users. The portal will facilitate access Climate datasets from a variety of sources and enable interactive analysis and visualization through Climate Indicators and tools to help the user interpret the data and use the resulting information in their specific context. The project also aims to integrate advances from various Copernicus precursor projects. As such, the success of CLIPC is expected to achieve considerable impact.

- Excellent progress (the project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period or has even exceeded expectations).
- Good progress (the project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations).
- Acceptable progress (the project has achieved some of its objectives; however, corrective action will be required)
- Unsatisfactory progress (the project has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or is not at all on schedule).

b. Overall recommendations (e.g. on overall modifications, corrective actions at WP level, or re-tuning the objectives to optimise the impact or keep up with the State of the Art, or for other reasons, like best use of resources, re-focusing...).

The Interim Review report is of mediocre quality and does not do justice to the progress that has been achieved in some aspects of the project.
The deliverables of WP 3, 4 and 5 are delayed with respect to the initial schedule, and the quality of the deliverables D 4.1 and D 5.1 is not at the expected level.
More generally, the complexity of the project (both in terms of scope and in terms of project design) has not been matched by a sufficiently stringent project management.
Additional information was requested for the review on the use of resources and on project status and outlook. The project implementation has been slower than expected, affected by underspent person months, except for WP 2 and 7. This and the associated delays in delivery have not been sufficiently justified. The holiday period is not considered a valid reason for delay. Other problems encountered, such as task leadership changing between beneficiaries, has not been explained, nor the impact quantified.

As stated in the Review documents, 2015 will be a critical year for the success of the project. An important milestone is the February 2015 User Requirement Workshop and a clear demonstration of the preliminary results, in particular of Work Packages 3-5, is absolutely needed to support the discussion with the large user community. During the review, the consortium did not clearly demonstrate that all the elements needed will be ready in time for this important milestone.

It is therefore recommended that the work plan for the coming few months is consolidated and closely managed to ensure all contributions are made. The resource usage status, with various beneficiaries as yet to make their allocated contributions, raises the need to ensure commitment to the timely delivery of respective tasks.

Recommendations:

- a. As a first step, recommend that a one-pager is prepared by each of the Work Packages within two weeks after the review report is received by the consortium to identify their actions required in preparation for that Workshop.
- b. Prepare an updated report of resource usage is recommended for Month 12 and 18, as a means to track progress in the project and beneficiaries' commitment.
- d. Improve and finalize deliverables D 4.1 and D 5.1.
- e. Recommended that a report is prepared, following the Feb 2015 Workshop, on the project status, the Workshop recommendations and providing a strategy to consolidate the Work Plan, ensuring that the forthcoming tasks and deliverables are met ahead of the 18 month evaluation.
- f. Participation at meetings of the project user communities, for example with a CLIPC booth.
- g. Recommend that, once finalized, project deliverables are be made available through the public project web site.

2. OBJECTIVES and WORKPLAN

- a. Progress towards project objectives: Have the objectives for the period been achieved? In particular, has the project as a whole been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the grant agreement)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

The project has made some good progress in relation to the Description of Work in particular with respect to WP 2. The deliverables seem to be late in particular for WP 3, 4 and 5 and are not giving credit to the progress accomplished in these work packages. This needs to be consolidated before the User Workshop in February.

- b. Progress in individual work packages: Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I of the grant agreement)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

WP 1: Consortium Management: the project seems to be late and the management shall be re-enforced to make sure that the schedule is respected.

WP 2: User Requirements: A good effort has been made to analyse the user requirements and a very good document has been produced.

WP 3: User Interface and Knowledge base: The current development has been presented but there is no deliverable attached to that task yet.

WP 4: Visualisation and Integration: A presentation of the various tasks has been made. The first deliverable for that WP is late and not acceptable in its current form.

WP 5: Climate Data Access. The first deliverable for this task was rejected.

WP 6: Transforming Climate Data: The three tasks were presented and seem to be running up to speed. The first deliverables are expected at M18 and M24, very late in the project.

WP 7: Impact Indicators and Functions: Some good and interesting work has been presented. The first deliverable has been delayed to after the review.

WP 8: Impact Aggregation and Exploration: The current activities in this WP have been presented. First deliverable of WP 8 expected at M12.

WP 9: Scientific and Technical Coordination: Very little was presented and no deliverable was associated to this WP.

WP10: Dissemination: A flyer has been presented and Approved. It is suggested to better communicate with the project user communities, for example with a CLIPC booth in appropriate conferences or events.

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

Improvements to some of the deliverables are needed (see below).
The supplementary report that was provided on the progress expected between Oct 2015 and the Feb 2015 Workshop confirms that considerable work is needed to meet all expected milestones and deliverables.

DELIVERABLES LIST STATUS			
No.	Title	Suggested Actions (To be Approved/Rejected)	Remarks
D 1.1	Administrative Procedure	Approved	An update of that document shall

			be issued to cover the financial elements
D 2.1	User Requirements part 1	Approved	Very good document
D 4.1	Toolbox Interface Specification version 1	Rejected	This document is still in draft form (see cover page). In many places the wording “we propose” is used. This is not adapted to a specification document. More generally the description is too simplistic for such a complex system. Resubmit by M12
D 5.1	Climate Dataset Inventory	Rejected	This document is still in draft form (see cover page). The document shall clarify that this is the subset of Climate Dataset that will used for the demonstration of the project. Presented as it is in that document the potential operator may challenge the scalability of the system. Resubmit by M12
D10.4	CLIP Flyer	Approved	
D11.1	Coordination plan	Pending	The preparation of the report is not in the direct control of the CLIP-C consortium. It will be reviewed at the next review.
D11.2	Common web pate	Pending	The preparation of the report is not in the direct control of the CLIP-C consortium. It will be reviewed at the next review.

d. Relevance of the objectives in the coming periods: Are the objectives for the coming period(s) i) still relevant and ii) still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?

i

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	Partially	No

ii

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Yes	Partially	No

Comments

The completion of the first 9 months' objectives is achievable through close management and coordination and a strong commitment by all beneficiaries. Close monitoring is recommended to address problems or delays as they emerge. See Part 1 for recommendations.

e. For Networks of Excellence (NoEs) only:

Has the Joint Programme of Activities been realised for the period, with all activities foreseen satisfactorily completed?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

N.A.

f. For ERA NET only:

Has the Joint Programme of Activities been realised for the period, with all activities foreseen satisfactorily completed?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

N.A.

3. RESOURCES

a. Assessment of the use of resources: To the best of your estimate, have resources used, i.e. personnel resources and other major cost items, been (i) utilised for achieving the progress, (ii) in a manner consistent with the principle of economy, efficiency and effectiveness¹. Note that both aspects (i) and (ii) have to be covered in the answer.

i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	Partially	No
ii	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes	Partially	No

Comments

As previously described, the resources, both person months and budget, have been underspent, with a few exceptions. The delay in hiring experienced by three beneficiaries is not sufficient to cause this underspend. Inadequate justification has been provided to explain this status. Some beneficiaries have not provided the required information. An updated report of resource usage is recommended for Month 12 and 18, as a means to track progress in the project and beneficiaries' commitment. There is no indication of overspend relative to person months used. It would be helpful in future reporting to identify where good housekeeping enables the cost effective spending of resources.

b. Deviations: If applicable, please comment on large deviations with respect to the planned resources.

Comments

See above.

The principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness: refers to the standard of “good housekeeping” in spending public money effectively. Economy can be understood as minimising the costs of resources used for an activity (input), having regard to the appropriate quality and can be linked to efficiency, which is the relationship between the outputs and the resources used to produce them. Effectiveness is concerned with measuring the extent to which the objectives have been achieved and the relationship between the intended impact and the actual impact of an activity. Cost effectiveness means the relationship between project costs and outcomes, expressed as costs per unit of outcome achieved. Guide to Financial Issues, Version 30/06/2010p.37.

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROJECT

a. Management: Has the project management been performed as required?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

The project management should be strengthened to ensure the timeliness and the quality of all the deliverables. See recommendations in section 1b.

b. Collaboration between beneficiaries: Has the collaboration between the beneficiaries been effective?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

The review showed a good cooperation between the beneficiaries despite the large variety of backgrounds. This cooperation is a prerequisite for the success of the project.

c. Beneficiaries' roles: Do you identify evidence of underperforming beneficiaries, lack of commitment or change of interest of any beneficiaries?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

A review of the project status in the coming months (12, 18), including the provision of information by beneficiaries on resource spending and progress for reporting purposes, and close monitoring of deliverable timeliness and quality will be indicative of beneficiaries' commitment.

5. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF FOREGROUND

- a. Impact: Is there evidence that the project has/will produce significant scientific, technical, commercial, social, or environmental impacts (where applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Not applicable

Comments

If successful, the project will produce significant impacts in the provision climate services.

- a.1. Is there an impact on participating Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs)?

Yes

Partially

No

Not applicable

Comments

Some of the SMEs involved in the project might benefit from a successful project through some support to the exploitation of the project.

- a.2. Is there an exploitation potential for the participating SMEs?

Yes

Partially

No

Not applicable

Comments

See above.

- b. Use of results: Is the plan for the use of foreground, including any update, appropriate? Namely, please comment on the plan for the exploitation and use of foreground for the consortium as a whole, or for individual beneficiary or groups of beneficiaries and its progress to date.

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

Not applicable.

The objective of the project is to develop a demonstrator. This demonstrator might be then be use in whole or in part in the context of the Copernicus Climate Change Service (CCCS).

Discussion with CCCS have not been initiated yet and therefore no plan for the use of the foreground have been proposed and discussed.

c. Dissemination: Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results and information adequately (publications, conferences...)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

Yes, considering this is only the first phase of the project and a limited amount of results and information have been made available so far.
The project has been presented in a variety of conferences and symposium. This should be re-enforced when results will be made available. CLIP-C should participate with a CLIPC booth at meetings of the project user communities.
Once finalized, project deliverables should be made available through the public project web site.

d. Please identify potential information that should be disseminated to:

- Policy makers

- The scientific community

- The general public

- A specific group of end users

- e. Involvement of potential users and stakeholders: Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Not applicable

Comments

An extensive user survey is being undertaken to identify the user requirements for CLIPC. A User requirement Workshop will be organised. This includes the Climate Scientists as well Societal end users (policy makers, decision makers).
This aspect of the project is well managed.

- f. Links with other projects and/or programmes: Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related Framework Programme projects and/or other R&D national/international programmes, standardisation bodies (if relevant), existing relevant networks?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

The consortium has liaised with other Framework programme as well as other R&D programmes. This shall be continued during the rest of the project. This is particularly important with the CCCS which is the potential user of the CLIPC Portal.

6. OTHER ISSUES

If applicable comment on whether other relevant issues (e.g ethical, policy-related/regulatory, safety and gender issues) have been handled appropriately.

Yes

Partially

No

Comments

N.A.

7. FLAG THE PROJECT

- Highlight as a success/case story
- High visibility/media attractive project
- Substantial R&D breakthrough character
- Project linked to R&D national/international programmes
- Project with an impact on EU policies (click on which EU policy: http://ec.europa.eu/policies/index_fr.htm)
- Project with an impact on promoting Joint Programming (especially for ERA-NET)
- Outstanding Use/Exploitation of results
- Significant R&D participation from outside EU
- Involvement of non-RTD actors in the field (economic, policy makers, civil society, end-users, standardisation bodies...)
- Good innovation potential
- No Flag
- Other

Comments

Name (s) of the expert(s): Anna Pirani, Pascal Lecomte
Date: November 25th, 2014
Signature(s):  