

COST Action FA1306
(Action 01/09/2014 – Action 31/08/2015)

Title

PROGRESS REVIEW 1
(Action start date 01/09/2014 – 07/12/2015)

This report assessing the period stated above is submitted by the Rapporteur and is validated by the Scientific Committee of the COST Association

Confidentiality: the Progress Review will be made available to the COST Association (Committee of Senior Officials, Scientific Committee, and Administration) and Action Management Committee only. The Summary assessment below will be included in the Progress Report which will be made publicly available on the Action page on the COST website.

Summary assessment of progress (for publication):

Action Rapporteur enters 500 word summary monitoring the progress of the Action here.

The main objective of the Action is to build an interdisciplinary network in plant phenotyping and to use this network to (i) characterize gene bank collections and breeding programs, (ii) get insight into the basis of tolerance and (iii) to apply the knowledge for agricultural management. This directly addresses the aims of COST, to coordinate nationally-funded research at a European level. Europe is notable for its advanced activities in plant phenotyping, so the formation of this COST action is very good and likely to generate good added value.

The necessary working groups have been established, to enable the members of this Action to meet the Objectives of the original MoU. The Action has built a good website, held three substantial meetings and a paper has been published in an international refereed journal. Four calls for STSMs have been made.

This network is still in its early days, and I think they have done well to get established as they have and to have already undertaken the activities they have done. They are now well positioned to undertake a lot of work in the coming one to two years, and I am sure that their next Progress Report will be much more substantive as they capitalise on their solid start.

Validation by Scientific Committee

This report was validated by the Scientific Committee on: <COST Association inserts SC validation date>



Confidential to COST Association and Action Management Committee

I. Review of Progress					
MoU objectives					
The Action is doing well in addressing the Objectives, having held meetings and they are working towards the STSMs.					
MoU deliverables					
The Action appears to be delivering as promised, no fundamental concerns.					
Co-authored publications and FP7/ H2020 proposals/ projects					
The report describes one publication that has emerged so far. This was reasonably inclusive, with six authors from four countries on it. The paper was provided a good summary of some of the Action proposals, although did not report new results. Assess the quality, quantity, relevance and inclusiveness of the Action's FP7/ H2020 proposals and projects. There was an interesting-looking 2020 proposal by Sebastien on conservation of some tropical crops, this is good. However, it was not funded.					
Additional Outputs and achievements					
There were no further outputs or achievements reported.					
General assessment of progress					
To make the overall assessment of progress:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Select the overall level of risk that best corresponds to that of the MoU objectives and deliverables¹ (high/ moderate/ low) at the time the Action was approved and Select the statement that corresponds to the level of progress with achievement of these objectives, delivery of deliverables and any additional outputs. Policy as well as scientific/ technological outputs and impacts must be addressed. 					
Correlate the selected options in order to arrive at the overall assessment (which is a result of the combination of achievement level and risk/ ambition level).					
	Level of MoU objective achievement, MoU deliverable delivery and additional outputs		General risk/ ambition level of Action MoU objectives and/ or deliverables (at the time of submission)		
			<input type="checkbox"/> High	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Moderate	<input type="checkbox"/> Low
Scientific/ technological and policy outcomes and impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of MoU objectives and delivery of MoU deliverables and delivery of multiple valid additional outputs, contributing to the COST mission of "COST enables break-through scientific developments leading to new concepts and products and thereby contributes to strengthen Europe's research and innovation capacities."	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of MoU objectives and delivery of MoU deliverables and delivery of at least one valid additional output	Excellent	Excellent	Very Good
	<input type="checkbox"/>	Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of all MoU objectives and delivery of all MoU deliverables OR Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of most MoU objectives and delivery of most	Excellent	Very Good]	Good

¹ When assessing achievement of MoU objectives and delivery of MoU deliverables any changes approved by the (Scientific Committee/ CSO) must be considered the base against which the assessment is made.

	X	<p>MoU deliverables AND delivery of at least one valid additional output</p> <p>The Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of the majority of MoU objectives and delivery of the majority of MoU deliverables and no valid additional outputs</p>	Very Good	Good	Fair
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of half of the MoU objectives and delivery of half of the MoU deliverables.</p>	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Action is progressing appropriately with achieving few if any of the MoU objectives and delivering few if any of the MoU deliverables although there is progress with some other valid outputs</p>	Fair	Poor	Fail
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<p>The Action is not progressing appropriately with the achievement of any MoU objectives, or delivery of any MoU deliverables or any valid additional outcomes</p>	Poor	Fail	Fail

II. Review of the Networking

Added value of the networking

1. Networking seems to be balanced and broad and this will provide added value, as described in the report. In fact, material evidence of this is already emerging, as shown by the co-authored publication, where it is said (correctly) that the added value of the Action Networking was necessary for the publication.

Enter comment here.

2. Assess the validity of the Action's statement regarding the necessity of the added value of the Action networking for the Action co-authored publications:

Action statement is valid

X

Action statement is not valid for the following publications for the following reasons

I could not see a statement about the necessity of the added value of the Action network.

III. Review of Impacts²

1. With reference to the definition of impacts in Annex 1 comment on the validity, relevance and significance (in particular importance and timeliness) of the impacts (Scientific/ technological, Economic, Societal) claimed by the Action (in Section I.D of the Achievement Report).

2. Indicate any additional possible impacts not considered by the Action.

The foreseen impacts that are described in the progress report are realistic. No impacts as yet are claimed, which is reasonable.

Overall assessment of impacts

Select the statement that best describes the Action's impacts:

Multiple highly significant impacts are reasonably foreseen, at least one of which is already observed [Excellent]

Multiple highly significant impacts are reasonably foreseen for the future OR one highly or moderately significant impact is already observed [Very Good]

² Scientific/ technological, Economic, Societal

X	One highly significant or multiple moderately significant impacts are reasonably foreseen for the future [Good]
<input type="checkbox"/>	One moderately significant impact or multiple impacts of low significance is/ are reasonably foreseen for the future OR one impact of low significance is already observed [Fair]
<input type="checkbox"/>	At least one impact of low significance may occur in the future [Poor]
<input type="checkbox"/>	No impacts have occurred or can be foreseen to occur in the future [Fail]

IV. Review of Dissemination and exploitation of Action results

1. Assess the effectiveness of the Action's dissemination and exploitation approach.

The report describes the publication of one paper and the establishment of the website. Both of these look to be fine and to address their respective aims, as described in the progress report.

2. Indicate whether each initiative implemented by the Action was effective and added value or not.

Item/activity	Target audience	Result	Hyperlink	Effective and added value Y/N
Website	Scientists/Breeders/Collection managers	created	http://www.phenomen-all.eu/	Y
paper	Scientists	published	http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpls.2015.00448/abstract	Y

3. Select which of the following statements best describes the Action

- There were many highly effective Action activities focusing on dissemination³ and exploitation of Action results [Excellent]
- X All Action activities focusing on dissemination and exploitation of Action results were effective [Very Good]
- Most Action activities focusing on dissemination and exploitation of Action results were effective [Good]
- A few Action activities focusing on dissemination and exploitation of Action results were effective [Fair]
- The activities undertaken focusing on dissemination and exploitation were ineffective [Poor]
- The Action did not undertake any valid activities focusing on dissemination and exploitation of Action results [Fail]

V. Review of Action Success(s)

COST regularly communicates the successes of Actions. Please comment on the validity of the aspect(s) identified by this Action as its greatest successes (see Final Achievement Report Section I.G).

There were no success stories reported in the progress report. The Action is still in an early phase.

If you believe that another aspect(s) (outcomes and/ or impacts, rather than activities) of the Action should be considered its greatest success(es) please define these below (maximum two).

Description of the success story	Dimension of the success Breakthrough: scientific, technological or socioeconomic Policy implementation (specify which policy) Capacity building)

³ Dissemination activities could include: Action website, co-authored publications listed at Section I.B of Action's Progress Report, other Action publications, attendance at Dissemination Meetings listed at Section II.B.2 of Action's Progress Report.

--	--

<p>VI. Review of the management of the Action budget</p> <p>Funds spent outside of the COST countries</p> <p>1. There was no declaration of the spending of funds on STSMs to approved institutions in International Partner Countries (IPC) or Near Neighbour Countries (NNC) and/ or STSMs from an approved institution in a NNC.</p> <p>Add comment here</p> <p>2. There was no declaration of the spending of funds on any "Invited Speakers" for meetings and/ or Training Schools or on Dissemination meetings.</p> <p>Add comment here</p> <p>General comments on Action management</p> <p>The budget is modest and there seem to be good outputs for this size of budget.</p>
--

<p>Action Rapporteur details and procedures</p> <p>Action Rapporteur name Mark Tester Affiliation KAUST Country Saudi Arabia Telephone +966 544 700396 Email address mark.tester@kaust.edu.sa</p> <p>In completing the Assessment Report the Action Rapporteur</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ reviewed the following documents: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Action MoU - http://w3.cost.eu/fileadmin/domain_files/FA/Action_FA1306/mou/FA1306-e.pdf ■ Draft Action Achievement Report ■ The website and the paper published in Frontiers in Plant Science ■ used the following methodology: - read all documents supplied and completed report.

Please remember to write a summary assessment of progress on the first page of this report. This summary will be made public, while the rest of this report will not.

Annex 1

Definitions:

COST Action Challenge (main aim)	"The research question addressed by the COST Action targeting scientific, technological, and / or socioeconomic problems"
COST Action Innovation	"The creation and / or development of new or improved concepts, products, processes, services, and / or technologies that are made available to markets, governments and society"
COST Action objectives	"COST Action objectives are the results that an Action needs to achieve in order to respond to meet its challenge. These are SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timely) and twofold: research coordination objectives and capacity building objectives."
COST Action research coordination objectives	"Achieving these objectives turns COST Actions from initially scattered teams into one transnational team and leverages the existing funded research. These objectives entail the distribution of tasks, sharing of knowledge and know-how, and the creation of synergies among Action participants to achieve specific outputs."
COST Action capacity building objectives	"Achieving these objectives entail building critical mass to drive scientific progress, thereby strengthening the European Research Area. They can be achieved by the delivery of specific outputs and / or through network features or types and levels of participation."
COST Action networking activities	"any activities organised by the COST Action (whether or not directly funded by COST) in order to achieve research coordination and capacity building objectives."
COST Action networking tools	"instruments through which eligible activities can be funded"
COST Action outputs	"direct results from the COST Action activities. These can be codified knowledge, tacit knowledge, technology, and societal applications."
COST Action impact	"the short- to long-term scientific, technological, and / or socioeconomic changes produced by a COST Action, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended."
COST Action deliverable	"a distinct, expected and tangible output of the Action, meaningful in terms of the Action's overall objectives such as a report, a document, a technical diagram, a software etc. Action deliverables are used to measure its progress and success."
COST Action milestones	"Control points in the Action that help to chart progress. They are also needed at intermediary points so that, if problems have arisen, corrective measures can be taken. A milestone may be a critical decision point in the Action where, for example, the MC must decide which of several technologies to adopt for further development (e.g. core group and MC meetings, mid-term reviews)"
Inclusiveness Target Country (ITC):	Current COST Member Countries targeted by the COST inclusiveness Policy ("Inclusiveness Target Countries" (ITC)): EU 13 (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Croatia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia), EU candidate countries (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Republic of Serbia, Turkey) and potential EU candidate countries (Bosnia and Herzegovina). In addition, to comply with the EC criteria for 'Spreading Excellence and Widening Participation', Portugal and Luxemburg are included.