



TEMPLATE FOR FP6 PROJECT REVIEWS

This template can be downloaded from the Internet at
<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm>

<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Individual report
Consolidated report

Thematic Priority/Activity	Priority 5 - Food Quality and Safety
Instrument type	Integrated Project
Project no and acronym	036272 BIOTRACER
Project full title	Improved bio-traceability of unintended microorganisms and their substances in food and feed chains
Project start date	01.01.2007
Project duration	48 months
Project coordinator name and organisation	Prof. Jeffrey Hoorfar (first period) Now: Mrs Solveig Lind Bouquin, DTU Technical University of Denmark
Period covered by report (from - to)	From 01.01.2009 to 31.12.2009
Date of (review) meeting	22.03.2010
Name(s) of reviewer(s)	Prof. Dr. Roger Stephan, Dr. Rohtraud Pichner
Name of reviewer drafting the report	Prof. Dr. Roger Stephan, Dr. Rohtraud Pichner

Introduction

This template provides the structure for the review report that needs to be prepared after the project review. It can be completed on-line via the SESAM reporting tool (CIRCA username and password are required). Please go to <http://webgate.cec.eu.int/sesam> and click on “Review reports” on the upper left corner of the page. Alternatively, the template can be found in Word format at <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm> and be completed off-line.

In completing Sections 2-8 of the report, independent reviewers should keep in mind that, in case they feel that they do not have the competence or the information to answer a question, they do not need to tick any of the boxes ‘Yes’, ‘Partially’, ‘No’ for that question, but they must complete the ‘Comments’ box.

If several reviewers are involved, it is preferable that a consolidated report be prepared by one reviewer chosen as ‘rapporteur’.

The reporting requirements for FP6 projects are described in detail in the “Guidance notes on Project reporting in FP6” (downloadable from <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc-management.htm#reporting>).

Questions to be answered by the reviewer(s)

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Comments:

This review meeting was organized together with the annual biotracer meeting. This helped the reviewers to discuss ongoing work with more people.

For another year a substantial progress was reached in the third period of this project. The objectives and technical goals of the third year were reached with marginal exceptions. But the reasons for the delays were well explained and comprehensible.

The communication is well-organized between the groups of the consortium. A lot of work was performed for training and dissemination activities. The mobility grants increased the technology and knowledge transfer among the partners. Following the recommendations of the reviewers regarding to the last reporting period, there is now a project-border collaboration with other EU-funded traceability projects. This will enhance the sustainability of all traceability projects.

The integration of stakeholders into the project and the communication with legislative/advisory authorities (like the contact with EFSA) are two of the important outcomes of the third year.

The consortium maintained the close cooperation of modellers and microbiologists. The models were adjusted to the field data and to the data on strain typing and stress responses.

The satellite tasks are a valuable enrichment for the project.

x

Good to excellent project (The project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period and has even exceeded expectations)

b. Recommendations

The project partners should maintain the close collaboration of modellers and microbiologists and continue to make efforts for the validation of their models.

It is important, that the models will be further fed with field prevalence data as well as data on strain typing and stress response (proof of concept for the models).

There should be enough time (maybe a prolongation of the project duration should be considered) to disseminate all the data that were accumulated during this project to legislative/ advisory authorities as well as to other stakeholders.

2. OBJECTIVES

a. Have the objectives for the period been achieved?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

b. Are the overall objectives (i) still relevant and (ii) still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?

(i)

Yes

Partially

No

(ii)

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. Do you recommend changes in objectives in order to keep up with the current state-of-the-art?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

3. WORKPLAN AND RESOURCES

a. Has the project as a whole been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the contract)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

This large integrated project is running well without major problems.

b. Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the contract)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

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

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

There were marginal delays regarding to the deliverables, but the reasons for these delays were comprehensible explained.

d. Have resources been deployed as foreseen in Annex I, overall and for each participant?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

e. Have costs incurred, i.e., personnel costs and other major cost items, been 1) necessary for the implementation of the project and 2) economic. Note that both aspects 1) and 2) have to be covered in the answer.

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

f. For Networks of Excellence (NoEs) only:

f1. Is there evidence of real integration and restructuring of activities between partners (to be evaluated against Indicators of Integration, e.g., exchanges of personnel, shared infrastructures, joint research and training activities, changes of research orientation of individual partners to better integrate into the NoE, etc).

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

Not applicable for "Biotracer". It is an integrated project.

f2. Does the joint research performed under the NoE as a whole continue to qualify as excellent?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

Not applicable for "Biotracer". It is an integrated project.

4. WORK PLANNED FOR THE NEXT 18-MONTH PERIOD (NoEs and IPs only)

Is the proposed update to the *Implementation Plan (IPs)* or *Joint Programme of Activity (NoEs)* for the next 18-month period satisfactory

a. from a scientific/technical point of view?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

b. from a management point of view including use of resources?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. concerning non-scientific activities (dissemination, exploitation, training, science-society issues, further integration etc)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

There should be enough time (maybe a prolongation of the project duration should be considered) to disseminate all the data that were accumulated during this project to legislative/ advisory authorities as well to other stakeholders.

5. CONSORTIUM PARTNERSHIP

a. Has the collaboration between the participants been effective?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The mobility grants provided a further increase of the technology and knowledge transfer.

b. Have the partners contributed as planned to the project and tasks assigned to them?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. Do you identify any conflicts or evidence of underperforming partners, lack of commitment or change of interest of any partners? Do you recommend any changes in responsibilities?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

6. MANAGEMENT

a. Has the scientific/technical management been performed as required?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

In face of this large integrated project with more than 40 participants Biotracer is running without major problems. This is induced by the excellent work of the scientific and technical management.

b. Has the administrative and financial management been performed as required ((including proper handling of contractual matters, maintenance of the consortium agreement, intellectual property rights, technical collective responsibility, sub-contracting, competitive calls)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The maintenance of the consortium agreement could not be reviewed, because the report does not include information about the agreement.

c. Have (electronic) information and communication networks been established as required to support interactive working between the teams involved (if relevant)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The consortium established a sustainability-platform, which integrates with other EC-funded traceability projects, brings together the training and dissemination activities of BIOTRACER (within and beyond the project), ensures that these activities are integrated and coordinated and creates sustainability of the project beyond the funding period.
The BIOTRACER-website offers regularly newsletters about the project, information, publications and activities and is an excellent communication tool for the consortium.

d. Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related 5th and 6th Framework projects or other R&D national/international programmes (if relevant)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

During the third year of the project Biotracer continued to work with other EC-funded projects to promote and disseminate results from the projects. This collaboration was documented by a presentation made by several traceability projects at a press event held during the EC's Research Connection conference in Prague, 7-8 May 2009. Achievements and results from BIOTRACER, TRACE, TRACEBACK, Σ -CHAIN, PROSAFEBEEF, and CHILL-ON were presented to attending press.

7. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

a. Does the project have significant use potential (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

b. Is the Plan for the Use and Dissemination of Knowledge developing in a satisfactory manner?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

The publication of results through scientific journals, conferences and other dissemination media is an integral part of this project. For mid-2010, a journal supplement in the International Journal for Food Microbiology is planned. Organised by chain, approximately 26 manuscripts were submitted to be a part of this journal supplement.
Keep patent issues in mind!

c. Have the contractors disseminated project results and information as foreseen by the contract and the plan for dissemination and use of knowledge (publications, conferences...)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

In 2009, more than 40 manuscripts were submitted for publication.

d. Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

In the third year, efforts have continued to engage stakeholders. Two participants took matters to a national level and hosted national stakeholder events. More events such as these are planned for 2010.

8. OTHER ISSUES

a. Have policy-related and/or regulatory issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

b. Have ethical issues been appropriately handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

c. Have safety issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

d. Has progress on the Gender Action Plan been satisfactory (if applicable for this reporting period)?

Yes

Partially

No

Comments:

Name (s) of the reviewer(s): Dr. Roger Stephan, Dr. Rohtraud Pichner

Date: April, 18th, 2010

Signature(s): Stephan, Plchner