

Guidelines for Final reviews of Celtic projects

1. General

The Final Review (FR) is realized after the end of the project or just before the project terminates. It is carried out to verify that the project achieved the goals that were laid down in the Project Proposal and in the Project Description. The project has the possibility to present the achievements and to show the demonstrations that the project has realized. A second very important aspect is to discuss with the project partners the outcome of the project focussing on technical achievements, on the product development and on business related aspects. The project shall demonstrate the impact that the project already had or that is expected to achieve in the next 2 to 3 years (see Impact Table).

New: A one page summary of very good projects will be published on the Celtic-Plus homepage.

The main reviewer from the MTR and the Celtic Programme Coordinator carry out the Final Review. The representatives from public authorities from the participating countries are also invited to the FR.

Ideally, the FR should be combined with a regular project meeting. However, it is not just a normal project meeting and is should provide a high level view of the project. The FR meeting preferentially takes place in a meeting room around a table as this arrangement allows a better communication between the attending people.

2. Time schedule of the Final-Review process

Time (before) the FR Meeting	Action to be taken	Who takes the action
3 Months	The Coordinator is contacted	Celtic Office
3 Months	The Main-reviewer from the MTR is contacted	Celtic Office
3 Months	The date and location of the FR meeting is agreed (Project partners, Reviewer and Celtic Office)	Project Coordinator
1-2 Month	Invitation of Public Authorities	Celtic Office
1-2 Months	Additional invitation of Public Authorities of the country where the MTR takes place	Project Coordinator
2 Weeks	Self-assessment, PD and Project Documents are sent to the reviewer and to the Celtic Office	Project Coordinator
1 - 2 Weeks	The project documents are assessed and discussed	Main-reviewer and Celtic Prog. Coordinator
1 Week	The agenda should be communicated to the reviewers	Project Coordinator
1 Week	A publishable one page summary of the project achievements is realized	Project Coordinator
Final Review	The FR meeting takes place at the agreed location	Project partners, Celtic reviewers and PA representatives
Few days after the Final Review	High impact project results will be published on the Celtic Web using the one page summary	Celtic Main-reviewer, Programme Coordinator
1-2 Weeks after the Final Review	The FR-report is finalized and is sent to the project coordinator and the PA's.	Celtic Main-reviewer, Programme Coordinator

3. Overall organisation of the Final Review meeting

Ideally, the FR should be combined with a regular project meeting. However, it is not just a normal project meeting and it should provide a high level view of the project. The FR meeting preferentially takes place on a Thursday, Tuesday or Wednesday and should take place in a meeting room around tables as this arrangement allows a better communication between the attending people.

In particular the FR should respect the following aspects:

- ⇒ the agenda should allow a meeting of 4 hours and there should be sufficient time for discussions.
- ⇒ it has turned out that a meeting in the morning 9h00 to 13h00 with the arrival of the reviewers the evening before is more suitable because more tolerant to flight delays.
- ⇒ the reviewers should have the possibility to get a clear view on what knowledge (SoA) was existing at the beginning of the project, what results have been produced by the project and what are the outcomes of the project, the results and the knowledge that have been gained.
- ⇒ the level of details should be at high level that it can be understood by experts with limited experience in the field of the project. It must however show a sufficient level of details, that the achievements and the results of the project can be clearly appreciated. Details are needed where this shows clearly the added value of the project. Demos, are of central importance for appreciating the outcome of the project.
- ⇒ Project organization: How have changes in the consortium relative to the original project proposal affected the scope and work of the project? Changing roles, objectives, and ambitions?
- ⇒ It should be shown that the work that was carried out, was done according to the plans laid down in the Project Description and that the deliverables are of high quality.
- ⇒ It should highlight the way the consortium has been working together, what were the contributions of the partners and to what extent all partners have been participating actively in the project.
- ⇒ Strong points should be highlighted and weak points or missing achievements should be discussed.
- ⇒ Results: Has the project produced results that will be submitted for standardization bodies? Has the project realized patents? Knowledge on societal impact of new services that were developed? Validation vs. real scenarios? Dissemination and availability of results outside the project group?
- ⇒ The impact evaluation should include the available planned and expected results, the degree of innovation, the technological advances, competitive advantages in the market, and most importantly the impact on business and jobs.

4. FR Self-assessment and other review documents

The Self-assessment is the first document that is studied by the reviewers and it should describe the achievements of the project, but it should also indicate the difficulties and problems that the project encounters. The self-assessment is the only document that has to be produced by the project just for the FR and it should be worked out with sufficient detail that a first opinion on the achievements of the project can be gained. A template of the Self-Assessment is attached in **Annex 1** of this document.

The other project documents should be made available and should be edited such that the reviewers can get a clear view of the documents. Deliverables or reports should have an **executive summary** that allows appreciating the results. Based on this a reviewer may decide which of the documents he wants to study further. Guidelines how to prepare Executive Summaries are given in **Annex 2**

The review documents together with the latest Project Description should be sent to the Celtic office not later than 2 weeks before the FR meeting.

5. Announcement to the Public Authorities from participation countries

About 1 month before the FR the PA's of the involved countries are informed about the FR of the project. They have the possibility to transmit question to the reviewers that would be raised during the FR meeting. The PA's are also invited to participate in the FR meeting.

6. Demonstration

Demos are often the turning point of a review where the experts fully understand the added value of the technology developed in the project. It is therefore important that this part is structured and that the demo is explained before the demo is actually shown. A demo should:

- have a title that gives a first indication what the demo is about.
- include a short summary explaining the goals and the achievements of the demo.
- have a schema that shows the functionalities of the main building blocks, their interactions and the partners that have contributed to the different elements.
- tell the reviewers about elements that represent an innovation beyond the SoA.

7. Video

The project is invited to realize a short Video (3-5 min) from the Demos and to publish this Video on the Celtic Web-Site.

8. Publishable Project Summary on the Celtic-Plus Web

The Project coordinator contributes a publishable one page summary of the project achievements and expected impact. This should be used by the projects to communicate their results. For projects that are considered to achieve high impact, the reviewers will use this one page summary as input document to realize a Web publication on the home page of the Celtic-Plus Web.

This summary should concentrate on one or two key-achievements with the highest expected impact. The goal is to share the results with a larger community and not to demonstrate the complexity of the achieved results. It should include one figure that shows the key achievement of the project. It must be written as a story in an easy understandable language for technically interested people but not for specialists and it should avoid abbreviations. If abbreviations can't be avoided they must be defined when they are used for the first time.

9. FR Report

The final review report will be produced by the reviewers 1-2 Weeks after the FR meeting. It is addressed to the Project Coordinator and it is copied to the PA's from the countries that are participating in the project and to the Celtic Core-Group representatives from the companies that are participating in the project. The template of the FR Report is attached in **Annex 3**.

10.Expected impact of the project results (Project Impact Table)

Industry driven projects in the EUREKA framework will be measured, especially by the public authorities, on the impact of the project. At the end of the project it is therefore very important to show its (future) impact due to new developments that have become possible by the project results. To quantify this impact is therefore a main goal in the final review of a Celtic project and should show (for private companies) new products that were created or existing products that were improved and the impact on employment. This part should also include the information on publications and patents, contributions to standards and for educational organisations the impact on their teaching program.

Type of Impact	Number	Short Description
Number of new products that have been developed based on the project results.		
Number of products that have been improved using the result of the project.		
Expected return of investment (RoI) within the next 3 years; (please give statement <u>related to the cost of the project</u> : 0, 1x, 10x, 100x, 1000x etc.).		
Number of new companies that were created commercializing project results.		
Number of new permanent employees hired or expected to be hired by the partner organisations or spin-of companies due to activities generated by project results.		
Cross domain cooperation (example: Telecom-Power or Telecom-civil engineering, Health)		
Patents, trademarks, registered design, etc.		
Prototypes / Field Trials		
Number of contributions to standards based on results of the project.		
Standard implementations / Workability trials of new standards.		
Numbers of Journal publications.		
Number of Conference papers.		
Number of PhD thesis contributing to and using project results.		
Number of Master thesis contributing to and using project results.		
Open source Software Users – Software developed in the project.		
Future prove Networks		
Techno-economics		
Home Network/gateway concepts		
Web – Telco convergence		
Other		

11. Web hosting of public results on the Celtic Web Site

Project web sites have often only limited lifetimes and there were Celtic projects where the public results were no more accessible soon after the end of the project. For Celtic projects that decide to keep their public information accessible, Celtic offers to host their public results on the Celtic web. Celtic will link this result to your Celtic project website and will guaranty that the information remains accessible during several years after the end of the project.

12. Annexes

- 9.1. Self-Assessment Template
- 9.2. Guidelines for executive summaries
- 9.3. FR Report Template

--

PROJECT FINAL REVIEW

Acronym: SELF-ASSESSMENT (BY THE PROJECT COORDINATOR)	
Project title:	
Contributor:	
Planned start date:	Real start date:
Planned termination date:	Real termination date:
Involved partners:	
Executive assessment on the project achievements: <i>(Express your overall judgement: what are good/ bad points?)</i>	
Conformity of the work compared to plans: <i>(How much does the project adhere to the project plans; are there any important deviations from plan? Were the promised results obtained? Are there differences? What consequences can be derived? Were the necessary actions taken?)</i>	
Perceived quality of produced results: <i>(Appreciation of the technical results and documents that were produced)</i>	
Perceived quality and efficiency of current consortium: <i>(What is the overall impression on the quality (expertise, engagement, type of knowledge) of the project consortium? Are the produced results in acceptable relation to the effort and budget used?)</i>	
Mid Term Review: <i>(How did the project react on the conditions and recommendations that were expressed by the experts during the MTR)</i>	
Produced deliverables and other project results: <i>(Types of deliverables (software, prototypes, documents, demos, etc)</i>	
Missed milestones: <i>(indicate achievements that were planned but could finally not be obtained)</i>	
Standardisation and dissemination activities: <i>(indicate contributions and articles in standardisation bodies and journals and their contributors)</i>	
Encountered problems in the project: <i>(indicate if difficulties have been encountered and the measures to overcome these)</i>	
Expected impact of the results: <i>(Please use the impact qualification list from page 4 of these Guidelines)</i>	
New: A publishable one page summary of the project achievements is realized: <i>(This should be used by the projects to communicate their results; for very good project with high impact it will be used as input for a publication on the home page of the Celtic-Plus Web)</i>	

Guidelines for Writing an Executive Summary

1. Purpose

Executive summaries are needed for managers who have neither the time nor the inclination to read a lengthy document but who want to scan the primary points quickly and get the main messages of the achievements that are discussed in the document. The executive summary should not exceed 2-3 pages and should be clear and comprehensive.

2. Capture the essential meaning of the original document

A good summary will tell the reader about the basic motivation for the work, significant points, major conclusions and recommendations. The essential message is the minimum that the reader needs to understand the shortened version of the whole. The essential meaning does not include background information, lengthy examples or long definitions.

3. Write at the lowest level of specialisation

If the executive summary is part of a report, more people may read the summary than the entire report. It should be written at the lowest level of technicality and specialised terms and abbreviations should be translated into plain English. If the audience that is addressed by the executive summary is known, the level should be adapted for them, otherwise oversimplify.

4. Avoid introducing new data into the summary

Represent the original faithfully. An executive summary's is not a publicity document. Avoid qualifying comments such as "interesting report", "good results", "the author thinks". The content of the report should be described as neutral as possible and should not put the work into a particular perspective.

5. Write you executive summary so that it can stand alone

The Executive summary should be a self-contained message that allows getting a high level view of the content in the full document. It should allow the reader to decide, whether he wants to have more information about the report and to read the full document. It should not hide critical informations or key pieces of the puzzle that allow having the coherent overview of the entire subject.

6. Executive Summary of a deliverable

A good executive summary summarizes the results of the deliverable, the perspectives opened by these results, the consequences for the project and if applicable also the implications for the business.

--

Acronym:			
Project title:	PROJECT FINAL-REVIEW REPORT		
Start:	Duration Months	Budget k€	Effort PYs
This Final Review was carried out by (usually the Main reviewer from the MTR and the Celtic Programme Coordinator):			on (date):
1)			
2)			

1) Attendance

(The participants from the project, The Celtic Programme Coordinator and if applicable a representative from the public Authorities)

2) Overall impression

(Express the impression the overall judgement of the reviewers. What are good/ bad points? Was the project worth the money?)

In this part the main criteria are:

1. Overall impression gained about the project
2. Business relevance
3. High level view on the technology
4. Quality of the documents and the presentations
5. Consortium
6. Other important aspects

3) The conclusion of the FR was based on the following input documents and results

(Self-assessment, Project descriptions, Deliverables, Milestones, Project reports, FR presentation during the FR and Demonstrations)

4) Conformity of the work done compared to plans

(How much does the project adhere to the project plans; are there any important deviations from plan? Were the promised results obtained? Are there differences? What consequences can be derived? Were the necessary actions taken?)

5) Reaction on Mid Term Review

(How did the project react on the conditions and recommendations that were expressed by the experts during the MTR)

6) Quality of the results

(Appreciation of the results based on the evaluation of the project documents and the results shown during the FR meeting)

7) Quality and efficiency of the project consortium

(What is the overall impression on the quality (expertise, engagement, type of knowledge) of the project consortium. Are the produced results in acceptable relation to the effort and budget used?)

8) Expected impact of the results

(degree of innovation, technological advances, market, competitive advantages, expected or already achieved commercialisations of the results: New products, new business, new jobs...)