

**COST Action TU1401  
(16 10 2014 – 15 10 2018)**

**Title**

**PROGRESS REVIEW AT MONTH 24**

**This report assessing the period stated above is submitted by the Rapporteur.**

**Confidentiality:** This report, other than the Summary Assessment, is confidential to the Management Committee and the COST Association (including the Committee of Senior Officials, Scientific Committee and Administration). The Summary Assessment is non-confidential.

**Summary assessment of progress (for publication):**

This Action aims to investigate the inter-relationships between renewable energy production and landscape quality, and the role of public participation for the acceptance of renewable energy systems. The Action has grown during the first two years, with more than 170 participants, from 37 countries. This demonstrates the high level of interest and relevance of the Action. The MC should consider how this relatively large Action should be managed in relation to its objectives. In the first two years (Oct 2014 to Oct 2016) there were around 12 meetings organised and around 10 STSMs. A training school was carried out in Ireland (2016) and a second one in Iceland (2017), although this seems to be outside the first 2-year period. There were 7 publications attributed to the Action (with 4 out of 7 being journal publications), and an eLecture series “Renewable Energy and Landscape Quality”. There have been 2 research proposals, one of which was successful. A 1st Action conference was planned in the MOU for month 9. This does not seem to have taken place, but the Action did jointly organise the “Energy Landscapes” conference in Dresden. The Action has developed links with the COST Action WINERCOST (TU1304) but it is not clear of the extent of this collaboration. The MOU stated that the Action aimed to produce Annual Action reports combining the findings of all WGs. These do not seem to be referenced in the Actions Progress Report and are apparent on the Action’s web site. The ‘added value’ reported, including training schools, conferences and projects, is significant. There appear to have been good dissemination activities through conferences, the eLecture series and the Action’s web site. The Actions website would benefit from some evaluation, for example, number of ‘hits’. No impacts nor success stories have been reported. In general, the Action appears to be making good progress towards its deliverable outcomes. It is good to see joint publications emerging from the Action and participation of the Action in conferences. It might be expected that more activities in these areas will occur in the second period of the Action, especially more journal publications.



*Confidential to COST Association and Action Management Committee*

<p><b>I. Review of Progress</b></p> <p><b>MoU objectives</b></p> <p>Assess the extent to which the Action is making progress with the objectives stated in the MoU, in the case of any seem to be in danger or not being achieved please assess the validity of the justification given by the Action in this regard and/ or specify remedial measures that should be implemented to secure achievement.</p> <p>The Progress Report states that all the objectives have been partially achieved and it relates to the list of publications as evidence some of which are still in preparation. It does not identify specific publications in relation to each objective. It would be advisable to briefly summarise the evidence for ‘partially’ achieving the objectives in the Progress Report, otherwise it is difficult to make a full assessment of progress.</p>
<p><b>MoU deliverables</b></p> <p>Assess the extent to which the Action is making progress with delivering the deliverables stated in the MoU. In the case of any that seem to be in danger or not being delivered please assess the validity of the justification given by the Action in this regard and/ or specify remedial measures that should be implemented to secure achievement.</p> <p>The Progress Report states that deliverables have been partially achieved and it again relates to the list of publications as evidence, some of which are still in preparation. It does not identify specific publications in relation to each objective. It would be advisable to briefly summarise the evidence for ‘partially’ achieving the deliverables in the Progress Report, otherwise it is difficult to make an assessment of progress.</p> <p>The multilingual glossary is stated to have been achieved. It is available in English, with a translation of the headings, but not the descriptions. Is it intended to translate all the descriptions?</p> <p>A 1st Action conference was planned in the MOU for month 9. This does not seem to have taken place, but the Action did jointly organise the “Energy Landscapes” conference in Dresden.</p> <p>The MOU stated that the Action aimed to produce Annual Action reports combining the findings of all WGs. These do not seem to be referenced in the Actions Progress Report and are apparent on the Action’s web site</p>
<p><b>Co-authored publications and FP7/ H2020 proposals/ projects</b></p> <p>Assess the quality, quantity, significance and inclusiveness<sup>1</sup> of the Action’s co-publications. Assess the quality, quantity, relevance and inclusiveness of the Action’s FP7/ H2020 proposals and projects.</p> <p>There were 7 publications attributed to the Action (with 4 out of 7 being journal publications; 3 are peer reviewed). Only 2 of the papers clearly reference the COST Action. The quality of the papers appears to be satisfactory.</p>
<p><b>Additional Outputs and achievements</b></p> <p>Assess the relevance and significance of any additional outputs and/ or achievements generated by the Action.</p> <p>An eLecture series “Renewable Energy and Landscape Quality” was produced, a poster exhibition was exhibited at a number of venues and an Action flyer has been produced. The eLecture series of short slide presentations in particular appears to be a good output; it would be interesting to assess its impact in terms of numbers of ‘hits’.</p>
<p><b>General assessment of progress</b></p> <p>To make the overall assessment of progress:</p>

<sup>1</sup> The Action participants involved in the publication are listed in column 4 of the Co-authored publications table in section I.B. In particular the presence of Action participants from Inclusiveness Target Countries (see Annex) must be assessed.

1. Select the overall level of risk that best corresponds to that of the MoU objectives and deliverables<sup>2</sup> (high/ moderate/ low) at the time the Action was approved and
  2. 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"/> 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 breakthrough 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 MoU deliverables AND delivery of at least one valid additional output	Excellent	Very Good	Good
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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	Very Good	Good	Fair
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Action is progressing appropriately with achievement of half of the MoU objectives and delivery of half of the MoU deliverables.	Good	Fair	Poor
	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	Fair	Poor	Fail
	<input type="checkbox"/>	The Action is not progressing appropriately with the achievement of any MoU objectives, or delivery of any MoU deliverables or any valid additional outcomes	Poor	Fail	Fail

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<b>II. Review of the Networking</b>	
<b>Added value of the networking</b>	
1. Comment on the Action's description of the added value of the networking	
The network appears to be successful in bringing a large number of participants together, including early career researcher, and has carried out 2 Training Schools. It has achieved a good record of publications and conference activities. It should be more specific about what national projects were made possible.	
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:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Action statement is valid
<input type="checkbox"/>	Action statement is not valid for the following publications for the following reasons
	<input type="text" value="(specify which publications and justify/ explain)"/>

<b>III. Review of Impacts<sup>3</sup></b>	
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 Progress Report does not provide any information on impacts. However, it should generate significant impacts by the end of the Action.	
<b>Overall assessment of impacts</b>	
Select the statement that best describes the Action's impacts:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multiple highly significant impacts are reasonably foreseen, at least one of which is already observed [Excellent]
<input type="checkbox"/>	Multiple highly significant impacts are reasonably foreseen for the future OR one highly or moderately significant impact is already observed [Very Good]
<input type="checkbox"/>	One highly significant or multiple moderately significant impacts are reasonably foreseen for the future [Good]
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	One moderately significant impact or multiple impacts of low significance is/ are reasonably foreseen for the future OR one impact of low significant 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]

<b>IV. Review of Dissemination and exploitation of Action results</b>				
1. Assess the effectiveness of the Action's dissemination and exploitation approach.				
There have been a range of dissemination activities which appear effective but no specific results are given in relation to evaluation.				
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
Web Site	Professionals and general public	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
PR statement	Professionals and general public	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
Action Flyer	Professionals and general public	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
Action Posters	Professionals and general public and conference	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y

<sup>3</sup> Scientific/ technological, Economic, Societal



	participants			
Article in International Innovation	None identified	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
Series of Articles / Hungarian Journal of Landscape Ecology	None identified	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
Special Session COST Action RELY at the Energy Landscapes Conference – Perception, Planning, Participation and Power in Dresden	None identified	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y
Special Session “Renewable energies in mountain landscapes: conflicts and synergies” at the PECSRL Conference 2016	None identified	No specific results given	See Progress Report	Y

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

- There were many highly effective Action activities focusing on dissemination<sup>4</sup> and exploitation of Action results [Excellent]
- 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]

<sup>4</sup> 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.

- 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.

No information given in Progress Report under this heading.

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)

## VI. Review of the management of the Action budget

### Funds spent outside of the COST countries

1. If the Action spent 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 please assess the value of these activities to the Action.

The STSM funding seems appropriately spent.

2. If the Action spent funds on any "Invited Speakers" for meetings and/ or Training Schools or on Dissemination meetings please assess the value these added to the Action

The Training School funding seems appropriately spent. There is no cost information on other aspects.

### General comments on Action management

The Action appears to be well managed. However, more details are needed under certain headings, for example, to explain more about progress on objectives being achieved, impacts and success stories. If there are none to date for the latter two points, some statement of likely future achievements would be beneficial. It would have been useful to have received the Annual Action Reports promised in the MOU. The MC should consider how this relatively large Action should be managed in relation to its objectives. There appears to have been lots of activity during the Action's first 2 years, but impression is that this has not been fully covered in the Progress Report.

## Action Rapporteur details and procedures

Action Rapporteur Phil Jones  
Affiliation Cardiff University  
Country UK  
Telephone 44 (0)2920 874078  
Email address jonesp@cardiff.ac.uk

In completing the Assessment Report the Action Rapporteur

- reviewed the following documents:
  - Action MoU (emailed by COST)
  - Draft Action Achievement Report
  - Web Site
  - Publications that could accessed
  - Selection of eLectures



■ used the following methodology: Accessed all information through emails and internet.

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.



COST is supported by  
the EU Framework Programme  
Horizon 2020

**COST Association**  
Avenue Louise 149 | 1050 Brussels, Belgium  
t: +32 (0)2 533 3800 | f: +32 (0)2 533 3890  
office@cost.eu | www.cost.eu

## Annex 1

### Definitions:

<b>COST Action Challenge (main aim)</b>	“The research question addressed by the COST Action targeting scientific, technological, and / or socioeconomic problems”
<b>COST Action Innovation</b>	“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”
<b>COST Action objectives</b>	“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.”
<b>COST Action research coordination objectives</b>	“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.”
<b>COST Action capacity building objectives</b>	“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.”
<b>COST Action networking activities</b>	“any activities organised by the COST Action (whether or not directly funded by COST) in order to achieve research coordination and capacity building objectives.”
<b>COST Action networking tools</b>	“instruments through which eligible activities can be funded”
<b>COST Action outputs</b>	“direct results from the COST Action activities. These can be codified knowledge, tacit knowledge, technology, and societal applications.”
<b>COST Action impact</b>	“the short- to long-term scientific, technological, and / or socioeconomic changes produced by a COST Action, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.”
<b>COST Action deliverable</b>	“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.”
<b>COST Action milestones</b>	“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)”
<b>Inclusiveness Target Country (ITC):</b>	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.