

Proposal Evaluation Form

	EUROPEAN COMMISSION Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme	Evaluation Summary Report - Coordination and support actions
---	--	--

Call: H2020-GARRI-2015-1
Funding scheme: Coordination & support action
Proposal number: 710032
Proposal acronym: SPLICE
Duration (months): 36
Proposal title: SPLICE—An experimental approach towards a web-native publication format
Activity: GARRI-4-2015

N.	Proposer name	Country	Total Cost	%	Grant Requested	%
1	Life Science Network gGmbH	DE	1,218,750	78.88%	1,218,750	78.88%
2	RUPRECHT-KARLS-UNIVERSITAET HEIDELBERG	DE	326,250	21.12%	326,250	21.12%
Total:			1,545,000		1,545,000	

Abstract:

Following the emergence of printing press, scientific journals have been created with the aim to improve the dissemination of knowledge. As a consequence, paper-based publication has dominated science for 350 years. Now, a new kind of technology is stimulating a change in scholarly communication and a shift towards a web-native publication system. While most stakeholders agree that web-native publication is inevitable, the opinions differ in how exactly this new form of communication should look and how it should be implemented. Unlike most projects, we propose a holistic approach that will address multiple aspects of the scientific process simultaneously.

One of the key assumptions of our proposal is that in order to increase the speed and quality of research and knowledge sharing, the elementary publishing unit must be reduced in size when compared to a classical paper-based publication. Our first goal is to build a prototype of a platform that will enable: i) creation and sharing of such elementary publishing units, each of which carries a single piece of information or statement (data objects); ii) deeply structured characterization of data objects in multiple dimensions (metadata); iii) integration of data objects into larger sets with accompanied narrative articles, similar in size to current publications; iv) integrated review features; v) integrated reputation system. The prototype will be optimized through perpetual iteration considering the feedback of the scientific community. When finished, the platform will enable an integrated scientific work-flow resulting in web-native scientific knowledge management and dissemination. Second, by studying feedback and analysing the behaviour of early platform users, we plan to create a road-map towards the implementation of Open Science. It will provide guidelines, not only on implementation of technical tools and features, but also identify points of intervention for policy makers and funding agencies.

Evaluation Summary Report

Evaluation Result

Total score: 5.50 (Threshold: 10)

Form information

SCORING

Scores must be in the range 0-5.

Interpretation of the score:

- 0–** The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1– Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2– Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3– Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4– Very good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5– Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Criterion 1 - Excellence

Score: **1.50** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent that the proposed work corresponds to the topic description in the work programme. If a proposal is partly out of scope, this must be reflected in the scoring, and explained in the comments.

Clarity and pertinence of the objectives

The proposal poorly addresses the topic description in the work programme and fails to present the high and multi-layered complexity of the issue at stake. The objectives themselves are neither clear nor pertinent.

Credibility of the proposed approach

The credibility of the proposed approach is undermined as many pertinent issues (for instance, peer review, analysis of existing indicators and testing of emerging ones, reputation systems, science quality and current needs by scientists, funders, society and other stakeholders) are not

elaborated sufficiently. In addition, actions to secure active engagement by stakeholders are not clearly specified. The intended area of application of the prototype is specified only in very general terms, and there are insufficient details as to how to ensure high levels of quality for maintaining research results, or the identification of indicators in order to measure their quality.

Soundness of the concept

The concept is very unfocused and lacks clarity. The benefits, context, trans- and interdisciplinary perspectives of the concept are not fully analysed. The proposal fails to properly address key issues (for example, the importance of measuring the quality and impact of research with indicators), and lacks the understanding and the framework to embrace all aspects of the problem and their interrelations. It also fails to address many Horizon 2020 cross-cutting issues and the Call topic is not fully developed. The proposal does not provide a full picture of the existing problem, nor does it propose a comprehensive agenda to tackle it.

Quality of the proposed coordination and/or support measures

The proposed coordination and support measures are insufficient. The proposal fails to adequately describe appropriate coordination and support actions (e.g. networking, standardisation, dissemination, awareness-raising and communication, coordination or support services, policy dialogues and studies and knowledge exchange), and it is not clear which support measures are to be realised in order to successfully realise the project aims.

Criterion 2 - Impact

Score: **2.00** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account, to the extent to which the outputs of the project should contribute at the European and/or International level:

The expected impacts listed in the work programme under the relevant topic

The proposal poorly addresses the expected impacts described in the work programme. The potential impact of the results and tools (on all actors of the society, not only researchers, but also industries and citizens) is not well formulated. In addition, the question of how the proposed project will contribute to the development of gender-sensitive ways of conducting research and fostering innovation is not convincing. Furthermore, the proposal does not adequately cover the European dimension.

Effectiveness of the proposed measures to exploit and disseminate the project results (including management of IPR), to communicate the project, and to manage research data where relevant

The proposal fails to adequately describe a dissemination and exploitation strategy and there is insufficient information on activities to be devoted to promoting the project widely and encouraging dynamic participation. As a consequence, the potential effectiveness of both proposed actions and expected outcomes is only partially convincing. In addition there is insufficient consideration of how the IPR of the research results will be managed.

Criterion 3 - Quality and efficiency of the implementation

Score: **2.00** (Threshold: 3/5.00 , Weight: -)

Note: The following aspects will be taken into account:

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan, including appropriateness of the allocation of tasks and resources

The work plan is insufficiently clear, and its effectiveness is compromised by the narrow scope of the work packages. The implementation plan is further undermined by a lack of detail and clarity regarding, for example, work packages design, execution and deliverables. It also provides only generic information about the planned workshops, communication and outreach efforts and engagement of the research community. As a result, the allocation of tasks and resources is not adequately justified.

Complementarity of the participants within the consortium (when relevant)

The justification for the composition of the consortium is weak, and the complementarity of the participants is inadequate.

Appropriateness of the management structures and procedures, including risk and innovation management

Management structures and procedures are generally adequate for a consortium of this size, although information about the structure and function of the management team is not fully compelling. While some risks have been determined, neither the risk indicators nor the proposed risk-mitigations actions are sound.

Scope of the proposal

Status: **Yes**

Comments (in case the proposal is out of scope)

Not provided

Operational Capacity

Status: **Operational Capacity: Yes**

If No, please list the concerned partner(s), the reasons for the rejection, and the requested amount.

Not provided

Exceptional funding of third country participants/international organisations

A third country participant/international organisation not listed in [General Annex A to the Main Work Programme](#) may exceptionally receive funding if their participation is essential for carrying out the project (for instance due to outstanding expertise, access to unique know-how, access to research infrastructure, access to particular geographical environments, possibility to involve key partners in emerging markets, access to data, etc.). (For more information, see the [Online Manual](#))

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should exceptionally be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Based on the information provided in the proposal, we consider that the following participant(s)/international organisation(s) that requested funding should NOT be funded:

(Please list the Name and acronym of the applicant, Reasons for exceptional funding and the Requested grant amount.)

Not provided

Use of human embryonic stem cells (hESC)

Does this proposal involve the use of hESC?

No

If yes, please state whether the use of hESC is, or is not, in your opinion, necessary to achieve the scientific objectives of the proposal and the reasons why. Alternatively, please also state if it cannot be assessed whether the use of hESC is necessary or not because of a lack of information.

Not provided

Overall comments

Not provided