

Guidelines for Mid-Term review of Celtic projects

1. General

The Mid-Term-Review (MTR) is carried out by Celtic to assure that the project is progressing according to the Project Description that is the reference document for the project during its existence. The aim of the MTR is to look more deeply into the projects and the project deliverables, and to check the conformity of the work. A second very important aspect of the MTR is to identify weak points (if any) and to find ways that allow improvements. An eye will also be kept on the dissemination activities of the project for making sure that the public will know about good work that is being realized.

2. Time schedule of the Mid-Term-Review process

Time (before) the MTR Meeting	Action to be taken	Who takes the action
3 Months	The reviewers are contacted (NDA, MTR Guidelines, ToR)	Celtic Office
3 Months	The Coordinator is contacted and the name and companies of the reviewers are communicated.	Celtic Office
3 Months	The date and location of the MTR meeting is agreed (Main reviewer and Celtic Office)	Project Coordinator
2-3 Months	Agreement on how to prepare the MTR	Coordinator, Partners
2 Months	Invitation of Public Authorities	Celtic Office
1-2 Months	Additional invitation of Public Authorities of the host country where the MTR takes place.	Project Coordinator
2-4 Weeks	The Self-assessment, the Project Description, the Deliverables and if necessary other Project Documents are sent to the reviewers and to the Celtic Office	Project Coordinator
2-4 Weeks	The date for the Phone conference of the reviewers is agreed.	Reviewers, Celtic
2-4 Weeks	Assessment of the project documents	Reviewers, Celtic
1-2 Weeks	A Phone Conference Off-line review is realised.	Reviewers, Celtic
Mid Term Review	The MTR meeting takes place at the agreed location during about 4 hours usually starting in the morning at 9h00.	Project partners, Main reviewer, Celtic rep.
1-2 Weeks after MTR	The MTR is finalized and is sent to the project coordinator and the PA's.	Reviewers, Program Coordinator

3. Inquiry to the reviewers for agreement to carry out the MTR

2-3 Months before Mid-term, the Celtic office contacts the selected reviewers. They are invited to carry out the review as the Main-Reviewer or as Off-Line Reviewers of a Celtic project coming to mid-term. Off-Line reviewers will participate in the 'reviewers phone conference' that generates a first

status of the project. The main reviewer and the Program coordinator, who will attend the physical MTR meeting, will use this information for the review.

Confidentiality

Celtic assures that a Non-Disclosure Agreement is in force for each of the reviewers that will be active in the MTR of the project. However, not all documents that a project produces are confidential. The documents that contain confidential information should therefore be clearly marked as "CONFIDENTIAL".

4. Announcement to the project coordinator and project partners

After the reviewers have been selected, Celtic contacts the project coordinator. The Coordinator is invited to get in contact with the main reviewer and the Celtic Office for fixing the date and place of the MTR as soon as possible. He further contacts all reviewers and Celtic confirming that date when the MTR documents will become available.

The coordinator assures that the project partners are informed about the review process and that the identities of the reviewers are known by the consortium.

5. How to prepare the MTR meeting

The MTR 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 MTR 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 MTR should respect the following aspects:

- ⇒ the agenda should plan a meeting of 3-4 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 was existing at the beginning of the project, what results have been produced by the project so far and what will be the likely outcome and the results at the end of the project (gained knowledge).
- ⇒ the level of details should be such that it can be understood by experts in telecom who are not experts in the field of the project. What is needed on one hand is a high level view of the project, some sort of executive view. On the other hand it must 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 if available are of course very welcome.
- ⇒ 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 is working together, what are the contributions of the partners and to what extend all partners are participation actively in the project.
- ⇒ Strong points should be highlighted and weak points or missing achievements should be discussed and measures for improvements should be worked out.
- ⇒ the expected impact should include the available and planned results, the degree of innovation, the technological advances, the market, competitive advantages and the impact on business and jobs.
- ⇒ The likely achievements of the project should always be discussed in the light of following questions from the Public Authorities:
 - 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?

- Results: What is the expected business impact and will there be prototype for new or improved products. Has the project produced results so far that will be useful for standardization bodies? Knowledge on societal impact of new services and variable coverage? Dissemination and availability of results outside the project group?

6. MTR Self-assessment and other review documents

The Self-assessment 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 for the MTR and it should be worked out with a sufficient level of detail that a first opinion can be gained where the project stands. A template of the Self-Assessment is attached in Annex 1 of this document.

The other project documents should be made available to the reviewers and should be edited such that the reviewers can get a clear view of the documents with a reasonable amount of work. 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 reviewers 2-4 weeks before the MTR meeting.

7. Announcement to the concerned Public Authorities

2 Months before the MTR the PA's of the involved countries are informed about the MTR of the project. They have the possibility to transmit question to the reviewers that would be raised during the MTR meeting. The PA's are also invited to participate in the MTR meeting. The project coordinator should also invite at least the Public Authority from the country where the MTR takes place.

8. MTR Phone Conference

A phone conference between the reviewers is held in the 2 weeks before the MTR meeting. This off-line review is based on the documents that the project has provided. This review assesses the management and the technical aspects of the project. The points that are discussed will be the basis for the discussions during the MTR meeting.

9. Cornerstones for the Agenda

Again the main guideline has to be that the reviewers can reach a clear view of the project in the given time of the meeting of about 4 hours. For practical reasons the meeting starts in the morning and the target for its ends is 13h00. The level of details should be such that a high level view of the project can be gained. Technical details for specialist should be avoided unless this is necessary for showing the achievements of the project. Celtic proposes the following agenda for the MTR meetings:

Consortium

- Presentation of the partners in the consortium (no lengthy description of the partner organisations)
- The role and responsibilities of the partners in the consortium.
- Achievements (from a project view, not individual partner presentations but mentioning their contributions)
- So far achieved results and quality of deliverables
 - Contributions to standards

- Dissemination and availability of results outside the project group
- Demos
- Problems that have been encountered
- Missing points or deliverables
- Comments on the progress on the next deliverables
- Question and answers

This agenda proposal can of course be adapted to the needs of the project, the needs of the Main reviewer and/or to the needs of the representative from the Public authorities if he attends the meeting.

10. 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.
- 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.

11. Common mistakes that should be avoided

- Do not hide problems or short comings. By doing so the reviewers usually remark that the communication is not realised in an open way. The result of the review can be much worth than when the difficulties are openly discussed.
- Put yourself in the place of the reviewer, who is an expert in telecommunications but not necessarily in the field of the project. Start with a comprehensive high level view and come to the technical details when you are sure that the technical goals of the project are well understood.
- Write a meaningful Self-assessment and Executive summaries. These documents are the entry point to the project and should allow a good understanding of the project and its overall goals and achievements.
- Concentrate on what is important; details can be left for the discussions if the reviewer wants to go into a given direction. Presentations with hundreds of slides are not useful; limit your presentation to a number of 50 slides at most. Keep in mind that the slides should support the discussions, which are the most important part of the review.
- Do not waste time with lengthy partner presentations. Usually a round table at the start of the meeting is sufficient.

12. MTR Report

The mid-term review report will be realized by the reviewers and the program coordinator 1-2 Weeks after the MTR meeting. It is addressed to the Project Coordinator and is copied to the PA's from the countries that are participating in the project. The template of the MTR Report is provided in Annex 3

13.Complementary Information about Funding

The MTR is also a good occasion for exchanging information between the projects and Celtic about the results of the funding applications in the different countries. The successes and the difficulties in the national application process for funding are important information and allow a closer monitoring of the situation in different countries.

Celtic proposes to the project to assemble for each of the participating countries the following information:

- When was the Application filed to the national contact?
- When was the funding decision communicated to the participants?
- Was the decision positive or negative?
- Was it for the current year or for the full duration of the project?
- What is the percentage of funding that was received?

14.Annexes

9.1. Self-Assessment Template

9.2. Guidelines for executive summaries

9.3. MTR Report Template

PROJECT MID-TERM REVIEW

SELF-ASSESSMENT

Acronym:	
Project title:	
Planned start date	Real start date
Planned finish date	Expected finish date
Involved partners (current status)	
Project status and current achievements	
Produced deliverables so far:	
Types of deliverables (software, prototypes, documents, demos, etc)	
Perceived quality of produced results	
Perceived quality of current consortium	
Dissemination activities so far:	
Missed milestones (not produced deliverables, etc	
Self assessment of overall situation and impression of project quality and efficiency:	
Encountered or expected problems in the project	
Proposals for further improvements	

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. Executive Summary of a deliverable

The executive summary should summarize the results of the deliverable, it should explain the perspectives opened by these results and the consequences for the project and if applicable for the business.

3. 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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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.

PROJECT MID-TERM-REVIEW REPORT

Acronym:				
Project title:				
Start:	Duration	Months	Budget k€	Effort PYs
This mid-term review was carried out by (name, company):				on (date):
1)	, Main Reviewer			
2)	, Off-Line Reviewer			
3)	, Celtic Programme Coordinator			

1) Attendance *(Participants from the project and if applicable the representative from the Public Authorities)*

2) Main scope of the project *(Short description of the main scope of the project)*

3) Review Summary

(Express the impression the overall judgement of the reviewers. What are good/ bad points? Is the project still 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

4) Recommendations to the project

(What should be improved to overcome detected problems?)

5) The conclusion of the MTR was based on the following input documents and results

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

6) 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?)

7) Quality of the results provided so far

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

8) Expected impact of the results

(Available and planned results; degree of innovation, technological advances, market, competitive advantages, impact on business and jobs)

9) 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?)

10) Missing achievements

(What results should have been expected but are missing. What is the impact of those missing achievements?)

11) Unacceptable points

(What is acceptable from the reviewer's point of view and what must be changed urgently?)