ARES (2011) 77662
26/01/2011

EUROPEAN COMMISSION
Information Society and Media Directorate-General

ICT addressing Societal Challenges
ICT for Health

Brussels, 24 JAN. 2011
H1/RB ARES (2011)86747

Ms Jessica Michel (ACGT)
ERCIM
Route des Lucioles, 2004
F-06902 SOPHIA ANTIPOLIS
FRANCE

REGISTERED MAIL

Subject: Contract No. IST-2004-026996 Project ACGT
Outcome of the Final Review held in Heraklion on 22-23 September, 2010

Dear Ms Michel,

I refer to the final review of ACGT project which was held in Heraklion on 22-23 September, 2010. The review report, giving in full the findings of the review session, is enclosed. In their report, the reviewers' overall assessment for ACGT is a good to excellent project and the reviewers confirm all the submitted and reviewed Deliverables are approved.

The Commission is in agreement with the review report.

In view of the above, the Commission considers that the consortium has performed well and that the project has successfully finalised its work.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter and inform your partners of its content.

Yours sincerely,

Ragnar Bergstöm
Project Officer

Enclosure: Review report

c.c.: *Mrs Tuula Hyorinen, Mr Ilias Iakovidis*

Commission européenne/Europese Commissie, 1049 Bruxelles/Brussel, BELGIQUE/BELGIË - Tel. +32 22991111
Office: BU31 6/46 - Tel. direct line +32 229-56415 - Fax +32 229-60181

ragnar.bergstrom@ec.europa.eu

ARES (2011) 47662
24/01/2011

Consensus

Project Review Report

Project no	IST-2004-026996
Project acronym	ACGT
Title	Advancing Clinico-Genomic Trials on Cancer: Open Grid Services for Improving Medical Knowledge Discovery
Instrument type	Integrated Project
Thematic Priority	Information Society Technologies – ICT for Health
Start date of project	1 February 2006
Duration of project	48 months
Total Budget	16,747,206€
EC contribution	11,887,000€
Date of review	22-23 September, 2010
Place of review	Heraklion
Period covered by review	from 1 August 2009 to 31st July 2010
Coordinator name	Jessica Michel Assoumou
Coordinator organisation	GEIE ERCIM
Name(s) of reviewer(s)	Elena Tsiporkova - Olle Björk – David Ingram
Name of rapporteur	David Ingram

Introduction

The following template should be used by the independent reviewer(s) to draft the review report with the conclusions and recommendations following a project review.

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

Questions to be answered by the reviewer(s)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With a short description on what the project is about. Includes key results and overall comments on the project's technical progress, management, and exploitation and whether it should: proceed as is, or proceed with some modifications, or whether remedial action is needed.

The goal of the ACGT project was to design, develop and deliver an integrated and Grid-based ICT infrastructure, to support clinico-genomic trials for the cancer research community. Progress has been demonstrated at each Review, through a series of exemplar applications that have progressively realised the elements of a first full implementation of the innovative approach proposed by ACGT, covering data capture, integration, analysis and retrieval, and underpinned by a new high-level master ontology and common metadata management. A key feature of the infrastructure is the advanced security management operating throughout, underpinned by thorough consideration of data subject consent issues, and legal responsibilities and contractual issues affecting different actors, arising there-from, in multi-centre clinical trials.

The resources developed by the project have been tested in three ongoing cancer clinical trials and evaluated through evolving partnerships with key related international clinical trials organisations. A portal for accessing the ACGT resources and related training materials have been tested with new users.

The strengths and weaknesses of the approach and achievements to date have been clearly defined and Consortium members have secured significant new project funds to sustain and further develop elements of the current ACGT infrastructure.

The Consortium has responded very fully and well to the guidance provide by the Review panel, who express their appreciation of the culture and achievement of the project.

Final Deliverables have been approved, with the exception of the Dissemination Report, where some additional material is required. Progress has been made towards pilot implementation of the new Centre for Data Protection and the STarC initiative, as previously supported.

2. ORGANISATION AND LOGISTICS

Comments on the review meeting: Were timing and schedule adequate? Were copies of the slides distributed in advance? Were demonstrations performed well?
Comments on the reports and deliverables received: timely reception, completeness, had the reviewers enough time to study the documentation?

Comments on the partners present at the meeting: were all there? (See list of participants, list of reports and deliverables & agenda (appended to this report)).

Comments:

All aspects of the review meeting were excellently managed. The completion of the project was a notable administrative challenge and this was well accomplished. The presentations were well-constructed and were clearly linked to previous recommendations of the review panel. The deliverables for review were available to reviewers later than desirable, one or two arriving only one day before the review. Demonstrations were well coordinated and informative. There was a good attendance of Partners. The dialogue with reviewers worked well.

3. OVERALL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT

Have the main objectives for the period been achieved?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The project is complete and the full set of Deliverables has been submitted and accepted, subject to some additions required in one case. The self-assessment provided by the Consortium at the conclusion of the project is impressive, notably in relation to the limitations of the current state of the art for integrating heterogeneous data sources. The difficulty experienced in modularising the component services of the ACGT infrastructure, arising from the complex security management required, is an important lesson, as is the learning about interaction of master ontology and metadata management, neither of which are fully resolved at the current state of ACGT development. It is a notable achievement of the project that resources have been secured so that the valuable achievements and the teamwork built up through working together can be sustained and taken forward in follow-on projects – notably P-Medicine, Integrate and Dicode (Objective 4.3, Intelligent Information Management, Call 5).

Are the project's objectives (a) still relevant and (b) still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?

(a) Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

(b) Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The relevance is indisputable but robustness and usability of the resources, particularly when migrating existing clinical trials to the ACGT system, remain an issue for the future.

The project's outputs must be sustained in order for the progress it has made to be consolidated in the field. Some key components, including the Obtima and security modules, are capable of independent continuing development. A comprehensive business and scientific plan for sustaining the full current team and infrastructure, within a single activity, has not been achieved and, as noted in previous Reviewer reports, was always bound to be a difficult challenge. The ethico-legal framework developed in ACGT has made an important contribution and the Centre for Data Protection that has been created, embodying lessons learned in ACGT, is an important initiative. The training materials, including wiki, video and project handbook, are welcome, but the ACGT resources are complex and will probably always require a good deal of hands-on and experienced trainer input, in bringing on new users.

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

Yes ☐ No ☒ Partially ☐

Comments:

Not applicable at completion of project

4. PROJECT WORKPLAN AND RESOURCES

A. WORKPLAN

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

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The project has been brought to a satisfactory conclusion

Is the work planned in each work package (WPs) on schedule for the reporting period?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See above

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

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See above

Future workplan: Is the work-plan coherent and are the timing of milestones and future activities of the project still valid?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

Not applicable at completion of project

B. RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURES

Have resources been deployed as foreseen in Annex I, overall and for each participant (**see Table 3 - Budget vs. Actual Costs and Table 4 - Person-months Status Table from the Periodic Management Report**)?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The resources appear to have been well managed, with remaining funds well distributed in relation to the work outstanding. The Management and Coordination have worked impressively well, especially given the detailed work required in extending the project and approving resource reallocations within the Consortium.

Have expenditures been demonstrated as being economic and necessary for the work performed (Are expenditures consistent with the work achieved? Are the major cost items appropriate?)

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

5. WORKPLAN OF NoEs and IPs

A. WORK CARRIED OUT IN THE PREVIOUS REPORTING PERIOD

Has the overall *Implementation Plan* (IPs) or *Joint Programme of Activity* (NoEs) been adhered to as described in the *Description of Work (Annex I of contract)*?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

Comments:

See above

For NoEs: 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 ☐ No ☐ Partially ☐ Not applicable ☒

Comments:

B. WORK PLANNED FOR THE NEXT 18-MONTH PERIOD

Is the proposed update to the *Implementation Plan* (IPs) or *Joint Programme of Activity* (NoEs) for the next 18-month period satisfactory
a. from scientific/technical point of view

Yes ☒ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

Comments:

Not applicable at completion of project.

b. from management point of view including use of resources

Yes ☒ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

Comments:

Not applicable at completion of project.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐ Uncertain ☐

Comments:

This work will continue within the context of the new Projects secured by Consortium members.

6. CONSORTIUM PARTNERSHIP

Is there evidence of meaningful cooperation and integration between all the partners?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

Again, this is a very commendable feature of the Consortium, its Partners, leadership and culture.

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

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See above comment

Do you identify any conflicts or evidence of underperforming partners, lack of commitment or change of interest of any partners?

Yes ☐ No ☒ Partially ☐

Comments:

Do you recommend changes in partnership?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Comments:

Not applicable at completion of project.

7. MANAGEMENT

Has the technical management performed as required (efficient, effective accomplishment of planned technical management tasks)?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The project has, throughout, exhibited very strong and effective leadership.

Has the administrative and financial management performed as required (efficient, effective accomplishment of planned tasks, including proper handling of the consortium agreement, intellectual property rights, technical collective responsibility, sub-contracting, competitive calls)?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

These aspects were excellently managed, as evidenced by an almost complete absence of visible problems within the Consortium, in this area.

Has (electronic) information and communication networks been established as required to support interactive working between the teams involved?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The website, published material and BSCW server all seem to have worked well. The web site content has been enhanced and the portal functionalities for accessing ACGT services have continued to improve the point of entry for new users.

Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related 5th and 6th Framework projects or other R&D programmes addressing aspects of ERA, e.g., EUREKA, eTPs, etc)?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

There has been active participation with projects, such as ContraCancum, and in new and follow-on proposals in FP7.

8. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

Does the project have significant exploitation potential?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

As fully discussed in previous reviews.

Is the Plan for the Use and Dissemination of Knowledge [please refer to the Guidance notes on Project Reporting in FP6 (Appendix 1) (see http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc.htm#reporting)] developing in a satisfactory manner?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially ☒

Comments:

The scope of the project was extremely ambitious and it is important, now, to communicate more widely about lessons learned and provide guidance on discrete, clear and demonstrable modules of the ACGT infrastructure that can already bring specific added value to wider research communities, to guarantee that the results are exploited in an appropriate manner. The Portals for users engaging with the system are valuable in providing access to the work. The Consortium's plan for a published paper, later in 2010, comparing and contrasting the achievements to date and future potential of the ACGT and CaBIG infrastructures, is very important.

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 ☐ No ☐ Partially ☒

Comments:

See previous comments

Where relevant, are potential users and other stakeholders in the research being suitably involved in the project?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The dialogue and joint work with EORTC, ECRIN and neoBIG, the creation of CDP and STarC, and the successful follow-on projects have provided important signposts for future ways to develop and disseminate the ACGT project results.

9. OTHER ISSUES

Can you identify any policy-related regulatory issues emanating from the project at this stage?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

The creation of the Centre for Data Protection by ACGT partners deserves support at both policy and implementation levels, as does the STarC initiative to provide a home for supporting the ACGT framework, over the coming years.

Has promotion of gender equality been successful?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See previous review comments

Have the science and society issues related to the topics of the Integrated Project been adequately handled?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See previous comments

Has the training programme being adhered to as described in the contract?

Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially ☒

Comments:

There have been improvements in the training resources and the manner in which ACGT supports users, but there is still limited formative evaluation of the effectiveness and usability of the ACGT resources, in meeting users' needs.

Is the project fulfilling its contractual commitments, if any, concerning ethics and safety?

Yes ☒ No ☐ Partially ☐

Comments:

See previous comments.

10. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

☐ Unsatisfactory project (The project has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or is not at all on schedule)

☐ Acceptable project (The project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations)

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

Recommendations

☐ the project should continued without modifications

☐ the project should continue with the following modifications (technical or administrative):

☐ the project should be terminated (list main reasons):

Not applicable at completion of project.

Are there other issues you wish bring to the attention of the Consortium and/or the Project Officer?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Comments:

We wish to record, here, once more, our admiration and appreciation of the work of the ACGT Consortium, its team spirit and culture, and its continuing energy and success in carrying the initiative forward, in what was always bound to be more like a ten year than a five year project.

The ACGT results are a considerable achievement, but, as the partners recognise, these are still at an early stage of dissemination. The securing of funding for two major follow-on projects, p-Medicine and Integrate, is an important achievement, in this context.

Given the structure and constituencies of p-Medicine and Integrate, there is, however, a risk that these will pull, or be pulled, in different and incompatible directions. This could result in further fragmentation of international collaborations, by creating incompatible or inconsistent data infrastructures for different domains of new clinical-genomics trials in cancer research. The Partners have a special responsibility to ensure that this does not happen.

As scientific understanding grows and treatments improve, the integration of the ACGT research infrastructure with life-long electronic health records will become more important, as cancer, in some cases, becomes akin to a chronic condition. The ongoing projects should maintain a clear and objective view of the wider data and clinical record standardisation issues in healthcare, across clinical practice and research, implied by this trend. We recommend that further attention be given to mutual alignment of the two projects, perhaps through the definition of a common use case scenario, which integrates requirements, methods, tools and results from the two projects and demonstrates achievements on real world problems arising from cancer clinical trials.

In view of the strategic importance of the field addressed, it is a high priority to find ways of supporting and sustaining the pioneering contribution of ACGT, to date. It is especially important to broaden its dissemination and formative evaluation, within wider clinical research communities. A continuing ACGT Partners Forum might prove valued and valuable, for all involved.

11. VISIBILITY ACTIONS

Please flag characteristics of the project which may be of interest to the Commission's services and visibility actions:

☐ high visibility/media attractive project

☒ project with an impact on EU policies

☒ project with a major role for women

☐ project with a significant impact on health, safety, environment

☒ project with ethical issues associated

☒ substantial breakthrough character

☐ significant impact on employment

☒ significant participation from outside EU

☒ involvement of the top researchers in the field

☐ involvement of the top economic actors in the field

Comments:

The contribution to EU/Japan cooperation is noteworthy

Name(s) and signature(s) of the reviewer(s):

Olle Björk

David Ingram

Elena Tsiporkova

Date: October 10th , 2010

12. 3 APPENDICES

Appendix 1
Status and approval of project reports and deliverables

Deliv. number	Title	Status (submitted/ delayed)	Accepted/ Rejected/To be modified	Comments	Deadline for (re) submissions
	Periodic Activity Report				
D1.1.8	Six Monthly Progress Report (month 42 to 48)	submitted	accepted	It would have been appreciated if the activities and the advancements have been presented per WP task and per partner and not general per WP.	
D1.1.9	Six Monthly Progress Report (month 49 to 54)	submitted	accepted	Similar remark as above.	
D2.6	Report on ObTiMA as a GCP conformant Software Application	submitted	accepted	The deliverable is not explicit enough about the concrete actions to be taken and the timeline of finalizing the GCP certification of ObTiMA..	
D3.4	The ACGT technical architecture: Final Specification	submitted	accepted		
D3.5	Grid Interoperability report	submitted	accepted		
D4.5	Service based access to Oncosimulator –report	submitted	accepted		
D5.8	Investigation of providing support to users concerning the exploration of available data sets	submitted	accepted	Excellent expose on the topic of heterogeneous data integration, including open issues and relevant state-of-the-art.	
D5.9	Report concerning lessons learnt and synergies with external initiatives	submitted	accepted	The deliverable provides an in-depth analysis of the neoBIG data platform requirements and convincingly motivates in this context the necessity of a new initiative INTEGRATE, as a follow up project of ACGT.	
D6.6	Interoperability of ACGT knowledge discovery services with existing bioinformatics tools	submitted	accepted		
D6.7.1	Prototype and report of the final ACGT analysis interface	???			

D7.9	Formal procedures and protocols for the semantic integration of clinical trials in ACGT	submitted	accepted	Hopefully the developers of the ACGT Master Ontology would pursue the further ontology evolution (e.g. redundancy reduction) even after the ACGT end.	
D7.10	The ACGT Generic Multilevel data integration approach	submitted	accepted		
D8.4	Report on the clinical adaptation and validation procedure of the Oncosimulator and its integration into the ACGT architecture	submitted	accepted		
D9.5	Report on the Final ACGT Workflow Environment	submitted	accepted		
D9.6	Report on the Final specifications of meta-data for the ACGT data, tools, services and workflows	submitted	accepted		
D10.6.2	First results of the international and national empirical survey on patients'	submitted	accepted		
D10.8	Risk analysis concerning the data security and data protection framework	submitted	accepted	An additional background on the current status and role of the CDP or link to a deliverable containing such information would have positively contributed to the discussion on sustainability.	
D11.4	Requirements and guidelines for developing secured ACGT services	submitted	accepted		
D11.6	ACGT guide with administrative documentation of ACGT security and VO Management	submitted	accepted		
D12.7	Final Report on the clinical benefits delivered by the ACGT project	submitted	accepted	The deliverable is not sufficiently concrete about the potential clinical benefits delivered by ACGT. The exposition is centred around the different technical steps of clinical data analysis within the ACGT platform.	
D13.2b	Final Evaluation Report (Part B) Ontology based trial management tool	submitted	accepted	The deliverable supplies valuable information about the	

	(ObTiMA) ACGT data mining tools			usability of ObTiMA and ACGT data mining tools. Unfortunately, the conclusion one can derive from it is that the user-friendliness and usability issues have not received sufficient attention during the ACGT platform development.	
D13.5	Specification of scenarios for a range of integrated demonstrators of the ACGT platform	submitted	accepted		
D14.4	Report on training of end-users and service providers on ACGT Technologies & Methodologies	submitted	accepted	Theoretically the training approach is sound. However, the deliverable does not provide evidence that much training activities have been performed in practice within the ACGT project.	
D14.7	The ACGT Educational Video Report	submitted	accepted		
D14.8	The final ACGT portal, and online training modules development and evaluation	submitted	accepted	The deliverable does not explicitly discuss evaluation results as suggested by its title.	
D15.6	Final report and analysis of project dissemination activities	submitted	accepted	The ACGT scientific output is impressive!	
D16.4	The ACGT Competition Report	submitted	accepted	Really pity that the competition was cancelled.	
D16.5	The ACGT Exploitation Plan Update 3 – Final (2010)	submitted	accepted	The deliverable provides an extensive overview of the various exploitation paths and strategies followed by the ACGT consortium and an in-depth analysis of the lessons learnt.	

Appendix 2

22-23 September 2010
FORTH, 1st Floor Conference Room "Alkiviadis Pagiatakis"
Heraklion, Crete

AGENDA, Wednesday 22nd September 2010	
	SESSION I – Integrated presentation of the Project
	In this session the Consortium will present a global overview of the Project while summarizing the research objectives, the major achievements and challenges encountered.
8:30	Bus picks participants from Hotels ➲ 8:30 – Candia Maris Hotel ➲ 8:40 – Santa Marina Hotel
09:00 – 09:10	Welcome (Manolis Tsiknakis)
09:10 – 09:30	Welcome and short presentations by the Directors of FORTH's Institutes participating in ACGT (Institute of Computer Science and Institute of Molecular Biology and Biotechnology)
09:30 – 09:40	Opening of review meeting [Ragnar Bergström]
09:40 – 10:00	Overview of Project's technical and scientific achievements and results. [Manolis Tsiknakis] ➲ 15" presentation ➲ 5" discussion *Relevant deliverable: Fourth Periodic Activity Report*
10 :00 – 10 :45	The final ACGT architecture and its Security and VO management services and its contextualization within the established legal framework. [Juliusz Pukacki, Brecht Claerhout, Nikolaus Forgo] ➲ 30" presentation ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D3.4, D11.4, D11.6, D10.8*
	SESSION II – Technical presentations of key project domains and demonstrations
10 :45 – 11 :15	Semantic Data Integration in ACGT: The ACGT Master Ontology, Data Access Services, Semantic Mediation Tools and processes

	[Alberto Anguita, Anca Bucur, Mathias Brochhausen] ➲ 20" presentation ➲ 10" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D5.8, D7.9, D5.9*
11:15 – 11:45	**Coffee break and Poster Session**
11:45 – 12:15	Semantic Data Integration in ACGT (cont.) with relevant Demonstrations.
12:15 – 12:45	The ACGT analytical framework: Services, workflows and metadata [Stefan Rueping, Stelios Sfakianakis] ➲ 20" presentation ➲ 10" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D6.6, D6.7, D9.5, D9.6,*
12:45 – 14:00	**Lunch**
14:00 – 14:30	Visit in labs of FORTH ➲ Group A: FORTH/ICS labs ➲ Group B: FORTH/IMBB labs
14:30 – 15:00	The ACGT analytical framework (cont.) with relevant Demonstrations.
15:00 – 15:45	ObTiMA ➲ 15" presentation ➲ 15" demonstration ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D2.6*
15:45 – 16:15	**Coffee Break and Poster Session**
16:15 – 17:00	ACGT: final evaluation and clinical benefits. [David Bernasconi, Desmedt Christine, Norbert Graf, Francesca Buffa] ➲ 30" presentation ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D13.2b, D12.7*
17:00	**End of Day - Bus leaves for the Hotels of participants**
19:30	**Bus picks participants from Hotels**
20:00	**Dinner**

AGENDA, Thursday 23rd September 2010	
	Session III – Exploitation and Management
8:30	Bus picks participants from Hotels ➲ 8:30 – Candia Maris Hotel ➲ 8:40 – Santa Marina Hotel
09:00 – 10:30	The ACGT modelling, simulation and visualisation services (Oncosimulator, Recipe Sheet, and their transformation into ACGT compliant services) [George Stamatakos, Aran Lunzer, Robert Belleman, Juliusz Pucacki] ➲ 30" presentation ➲ 45" Demonstration ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D8.4*
10:30 – 11:15	Exploitation of ACGT tools and services and Dissemination of Results [Manolis Tsiknakis, Samuel Keuchkerian] ➲ 30" presentation ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: D16.5, D5.9, D15.6*
11:15 – 11:45	**Coffee break and Poster Session**
11:45 – 12:20	Project Administrative and Financial overview [Jessica Michel Assoumou] ➲ 25" presentation ➲ 15" discussion *Relevant deliverable: Draft Periodic Management Report*
12:20 – 13:00	Closing discussion.
13:00 – 14:30	**Lunch**
14:30 – 17:00	***Session V – Reviewers' response***
	Reviewers' discussion (External evaluators and Commission only)
	Feedback
17:00	**Conclusion of the Meeting**

Appendix 3 (needs to be updated)

List of Participants:

NAME	ORGANISATION
Anguita Alberto	UPM SPAIN
Roberty Belleman	UVA
Anca Bucur	PHILIPS
Dorothea CARAMAN	SIVECO
Brecht CLARHOUT	CUSOTDIX
Christine DESMEDT	JULES BORDET INSTITUTE
Alberto DONOFRIO	IEO
Nikolaus FORGO	INSTITUTE FUR RECHTSINFORMATIK LEIBNIZ UNIVERSITY OF HANNOVER
Norbert GRAF	USSAR
Samuel KEUCHKERIAN	HEALTHGRID
Lefteris KOUMAKIS	FORTH
Vangelis KRISOTAKIS	FORTH
Micke KUWAHARA	UHOK
Aran LUNZER	UHOK
Jessica MICHEL ASSOUMOU	ERCIM
Florence PRESCE	ERCIM
Juliusz PUKACKI	MSNC
Stefan RUEPING	FRAUNHFER IAIS
Stelios SFAKIANAKIS	FORTH
Jonas SJOBERGH	UHOK
George STAMATAKOS	NTUA
Holger STENZHORN	USAAR
Yuzuru TAKAKA	UHOK
Manolis TSIKNAKIS	FORTH
Jasper VAN LEEUWEN	PHILIPS