

EFP CONSENSUS RESULTS FOR

Proposal reference **oc-2008-1-1932**

Title: Plant biodiversity and high-quality animal products from mountain grassland systems.

	A1	A2	B1	B2	B3	C1	C1-A	C1-B	C1-C	C2	C3	D1	D2	D3	E1	E2	E3	Totals
Consensus	3	3	3	3	3	C			3	3	3	3	2	3	2	3	4	41

1. Comments

Consensus 1 Sep, 2008 4:57 pm The proposal is very suitable for networking of European national research teams and takes into consideration both social and economic factors of the use of European mountain areas and scientific aspects concerning the fate of plant components and secondary metabolites through the food chain towards meat and milk products.

In principle, the topic can be suitable for building a network. However, the proposal is difficult to read and lacks focus. The initial paragraphs contain many problems to be addressed and goals to be achieved, but the actual way how to achieve the goals and how to set up the COST action is not described. Only in the last sections the authors get more specific, but again the systematic approach is missing. The title is misleading as the emphasis clearly is on high-quality animal products rather than plant biodiversity.

B. SCIENCE

The project, which involves many scientific fields, and addresses current problems, is ambitious. The scientific but, also more important, the social background of this project is very interesting. Farmers are leaving the mountain grassland cultivation because it provides an ever decreasing income. Innovative scientific-social strategies to counteract the abandonment of these areas are necessary.

Some aspects of the scientific programme remain elusive. The methodological spectrum seems to be rather narrow, with the main focus on NIR spectroscopy. While a common database seems to make sense in any network, its particular purpose in this proposal is not convincingly explained. What is the use of primary data being publicly available on the website?

It has not been made sufficiently clear where all the samples will come from. National peculiarities, such as traditions and habits, which would require different approaches are not discussed.

C. IMPACT

The following COST countries have actively participated in the preparation of the Action or otherwise indicated their interest: Austria:AT; Belgium:BE; Bulgaria:BG; Czech Republic:CZ; Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia:MK; France:FR; Germany:DE; Greece:GR; Israel:IL; Italy:IT; Norway:NO; Poland:PL; Romania:RO; Serbia:RS; Slovak Republic:SK; Slovenia:SI; Switzerland.

The potential social, economic and cultural impact of the project on many mountain regions may be strategic.

D. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION

The project is intended to promote coordination while avoiding any potential duplication. Most of the potential members are participating to EU Framework Programmes or other international projects related to defined segments of the whole food/feed chain, including PASTO in Switzerland (preservation of the landscape and bovine meat extensive production in alpine region), PIRINEOVI in Spain (lamb food chain network in the Pyrenees), SCOPES in Bulgaria (sheep milk quality in the Rhodope mountains), EATING BIODIVERSITY in Great Britain (links between quality food production and biodiversity protection), PROALPE in Italy (valorisation of alpine terroir for the promotion and the protection of summer grassland cheese), PDO GRASSLAND in France (trade-off between production, biodiversity and cheese quality in the Massif Central) and ARCTIC LAMB MEAT in Norway (from grassland plants through animal to consumers and marketing strategies).

The project is not well organized in some parts. There is a rather high number of experts from many different countries, which may cause some difficulties in the overall management.

While the main objective is contained in a single sentence, the secondary objectives seem too detailed and poorly focused.

Specific instruments of COST are not sufficiently incorporated.

E. CONTRIBUTION TO WIDER COST GOALS

It responds to most COST criteria.

F. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION

This proposal is not recommended for funding.

F.1 Strength of proposal

This action attempts to merge scientific, economic and social issue related to grasslands and mountain regions of Europe. The project is innovative since it considers different facets of the same topic including health, cultivation, technology, sciences, sustainability, and tourism.

The basic ideas underlying the proposal are promising and relevant.

F.2 Weakness of proposal

Some of the objectives are probably too ambitious. In particular the development of the scientific basis of the traceability and the identification of the chemical markers of the products require combination of chemical-instrumental methods with multivariate statistical analysis whose success is often not assured. The description of the analytical methods is too generic and the expectation on NIR performances too optimistic.

An efficient management of this action would probably require a decreased number of participants, while maintaining heterogeneity at a reasonable level.

2. Rated Questions

A - CRITICAL CRITERIA

A1 IS THIS RIGHT FOR COST? Is COST the right funding mechanism for achieving the proposal's objectives?

4. Proposal is very suitable for networking of European national research teams.
3. Proposal is quite suitable for networking of European national research teams; any defects can be easily remedied (specify in Comments).
2. Proposal is unsuitable for networking of European national research teams; includes ineligible or inappropriate aspects (specify in Comments); .
1. Proposal is completely unsuitable for networking of European national research teams.

A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 MEANS REJECTION

A2 DOES THE PRESENTATION MEET THE STANDARD OF A COST MoU? Is the proposal presented in a clear, convincing, and appropriate way?

4. Very clearly written with compelling argument; fully appropriate format.
3. Well written; argument is easy to follow; appropriate format but may need minor changes for MoU (specify in Comments);
2. Poorly written, but argument can be followed with effort; and/or defective format.
1. Poorly written; argument is unclear; and/or inappropriate format.

A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 MEANS REJECTION

B - SCIENCE

B1 Does the proposed Action address real current problems/scientific issues?

- 4: Highly exciting and interesting proposal on a very important and/or timely topic.
3. Interesting proposal on an important topic.
2. Some interesting aspects, but not clearly an important or timely topic.
1. Serious lack of substance and/or relevance.

B2 Does the proposed Action show awareness of the state-of-the-art of the relevant scientific/ technical fields?

- 4: Excellent and up to date awareness of relevant scientific/technical fields
3. Good awareness of relevant fields.
2. Defective awareness of relevant fields.
1. Serious lack of awareness of relevant fields.

B3 Is the proposed Action innovative?

4. Highly innovative: identifies a significant new problem and/or a significant new approach.
3. Innovative in some notable aspects.
2. Not very innovative: the topic is already well-studied and/or the proposal largely follows a

well-trodden approach.
1. Not at all innovative.

C - IMPACT

C1 A COST Action may make impacts in various valuable directions. This Action mainly aims at impacts in :

- (1) meeting European economic or societal needs [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1A
- (2) developing the scientific or technological field [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1B
- (3) both (1) and (2) [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1C

NOTE: Score only ONE of the three alternatives

C1- **If the proposed Action aims primarily to meet European economic or societal needs, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
A

- 4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
- 3. Some notable impacts likely.
- 2. May be some minor impacts.
- 1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.

C1- **If the proposed Action aims primarily to contribute to the development of the scientific or technological field, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
B

- 4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
- 3. Some notable impacts likely.
- 2. May be some minor impacts.
- 1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.

C1- **If the proposed Action aims BOTH to meet European economic or societal needs, AND to contribute to the development of the scientific or technological field, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
C

- 4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
- 3. Some notable impacts likely.
- 2. May make some minor impacts.
- 1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.

C2 **Are there clear plans for stimulating the production of high quality outputs?**

- 4. Plans for outputs are clear, wide-ranging and ambitious.
- 3. Plans for outputs are reasonable.
- 2. Plans for outputs are unambitious or defective.
- 1. Plans for outputs are minimal or absent.

C3 **Is attention given to the potential application of results (including, where appropriate, fostering their commercial exploitation)?**

- 4. Plans for application of results are clear, wide-ranging and ambitious.
- 3. Plans for application of results are reasonable.
- 2. Plans for application of results are unambitious or defective.
- 1. Plans for application of results are minimal or absent.

D - STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION

- D1 Are the workplan and organisation appropriate?**
4. Workplan and organisation make full, productive and cost-effective use of COST opportunities.
 3. Workplan and organisation are reasonable.
 2. Workplan and/or organisation show some defects.
 1. Workplan and/or organisation are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
- D2 Are the time schedule and the setting of milestones appropriate?**
4. Schedule and milestones are well-defined and practical.
 3. Schedule and milestones are reasonable.
 2. Schedule and/or milestones show some defects.
 1. Schedule and/or milestones are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
- D3 Are appropriate plans made for monitoring and evaluating the achievement of objectives?**
4. Monitoring and evaluation plans are well-defined and practical.
 3. Monitoring and evaluation plans are reasonable.
 2. Monitoring and evaluation plans show some defects.
 1. Monitoring and evaluation plans are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
-

E - CONTRIBUTION TO WIDER COST GOALS

- E1 How well does the proposed Action aim to involve early stage researchers?**
4. Extensive and substantive plans for involving early stage researchers including the organisation of Training Schools.
 3. Reasonable and substantive plans for involving early stage researchers.
 2. Promises to involve early stage researchers, but no substantive plans.
 1. No attention given to early stage researchers.
- E2 How well does the proposed Action aim at gender balance?**
4. Extensive and substantive plans for gender balance.
 3. Reasonable and substantive plans for gender balance.
 2. Promises to achieve gender balance, but no substantive plans.
 1. No attention given to gender balance.
- E3 Will the proposed Action attract interest from a wide range of European countries?**
4. Proposers reflect a wide range of countries, and the topic is likely to attract very wide interest.
 3. Proposers reflect a reasonable range of countries, and the topic will attract wide interest.
 2. Proposers reflect a quite narrow range of countries, and/or the topic is of quite limited interest
 1. Proposers are from a narrow range of countries, and/or the topic is of only narrow interest.
-