



REVIEW REPORT OF FP6 PROJECTS

This document may be downloaded from the Internet at
<http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm>

X

Individual report
Consolidated report

Thematic Priority/Activity

Life Sciences, genomic and biotechnology for health

Instrument type

Integrated project

Project no and acronym

LSHC-CT-2003-506803

Project full title

Identification of Novel Targets for Cancer Therapy

Project start date

1/1/2004

Project duration

4 years

Project coordinator name and organisation

Kristin Helin, University of Copenhagen

Period covered by report
(from - to)

1/1/2006 - 31/12/2006

Date of (review) meeting

15/2/2007

Name(s) of reviewer(s)

Alan Ashworth

Name of reviewer drafting
the report

Alan Ashworth

Introduction

This template provides the structure for the review report that needs to be prepared after the project review.

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

A general outline of the review process is given in a separate document on 'Project reviews in FP6 for project coordinators and external reviewers' (downloadable from <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/project-management.htm>)

The reports and deliverables of the project were prepared according to the Guidance notes on Project reporting in FP6 (downloadable from <http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc.htm#reporting>)

Questions to be answered by the reviewer(s)

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Please follow the order of the individual sections of this report

Comments:

Overall, this project has achieved many of its objectives and can be judged a success. Over the remaining period it seems likely that most of the remaining objectives could be achieved.

- ☐ Good to excellent project (The project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the period and has even exceeded expectations)
- ☒ Acceptable project (The project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations)
- ☐ Unsatisfactory project (The project has failed to achieve critical objectives and/or is not at all on schedule)

b. Recommendations

No recommendations are made as the project is only 3 months from completion.

2. OBJECTIVES

a. Have the objectives for the period been achieved?

☐
Yes

☒
Partially

☐
No

Comments:

In general the objectives have been achieved. Some parts have moved more slowly than the rest but the expectation is that most will be complete during the time frame.

b. Are the overall objectives (i) still relevant and (ii) still achievable within the time and resources available to the project?

(i)
☒
Yes

☐
Partially

☐
No

(ii)
☐
Yes

☒
Partially

☐
No

Comments:

See above.

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

☐
Yes

☐
Partially

☒
No

Comments:

The project is largely still state-of-the-art.

3. WORKPLAN AND RESOURCES

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

☒
Yes

☐
Partially

☐
No

Comments:

See the detailed comments below.

b. Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work (Annex I to the contract)?

☐
Yes

☒
Partially

☐
No

Comments:

WP1,2: These are now complete. However, it is not clear how widely used the barcode screening technology has been in the consortium (also see WP12) or how the mouse siRNA library is to be made available.

WP3: This is complete but again how useful this has been is not entirely clear.

WP4: The development of retrovirus-based living cell microarrays has been delayed/abandoned due to technical difficulties. This seemed to be a promising approach and it is unclear why this was not pursued further. Instead immuno-cell arrays are being developed which although they may prove to be of merit are somewhat removed from the original aims.

WP5: Good progress has been made here.

WP6: A large amount of activity in the WP. A number of tasks remain unfulfilled but reasonable prospects of achieving them in the time frame.

WP7-13: A number of screens have been performed and hits identified. These are likely to provide interesting new insights into biochemical pathways. It is not clear why barcode screens have not been used as they were developed in WP1. This is particularly surprising in the case of WP12.

WP14-20: Reasonable progress has been made.

WP21-23: Excellent progress has been made in WP21. Good progress in WP22. Only modest progress in WP23 which is still in the early stages. No screen has yet been performed.

WP24-26: Good progress in these projects.

WP27: Good progress, as far as one can judge. Unclear how this work co-ordinated with the rest of the WPs apart from in a very general way.

WP28: Ended.

WP32: Good progress given the limited time this has been running.

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

☐

Yes

☒

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

See above.

d. Have resources been deployed as foreseen in Annex I, overall and for each participant?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

e. Have costs incurred (personnel costs and other major cost items) been 1) necessary for the implementation of the project and 2) economic. Note that both aspects (1 and 2) have to be covered in the answer.

☐

Yes

☒

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

Some projects seem to have huge consumable costs relative to salaries which has not been explained (e.g. Partner 3 compared to Partner 1). Otherwise seems fine.

f. For Networks of Excellence (NoEs) only:

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

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

4. WORK PLANNED FOR THE NEXT 18-MONTH PERIOD (NoEs and IPs only)

Is the proposed update to the Implementation Plan (IPs) or Joint Programme of Activity (NoEs) for the next 18-month period satisfactory

a. from a scientific/technical point of view?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

It is important to note that the draft plan was prepared on 15/2/07 and is being reviewed 31/8/07.

The project will end 31/12/07 i.e. in 3 months time.

The plans are in general logical extensions of the work presented in the report. Given the time frames there seems little point in reviewing individual plans as these are by now almost complete.

b. from a management point of view including use of resources?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

No issues.

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

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

No issues.

5. CONSORTIUM PARTNERSHIP

a. Has the collaboration between the participants been effective?

☐

Yes

☒

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

There is evidence of collaboration between some of the participants. However, there is not really the feel of a completely integrated programme. In part this reflects the nature of the framework 6 programmes: funding is distributed to many participants with each receiving only a small amount of funding. Inevitably projects may become extensions of existing activities. Nevertheless many participants have benefited from access to siRNA screening technology.

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

☐

Yes

☒

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

See above.

c. Do you identify any conflicts or evidence of underperforming partners, lack of commitment or change of interest of any partners? Do you recommend any changes in responsibilities?

☐

Yes

☐

Partially

☒

No

Comments:

It is too late to change the programme.

6. MANAGEMENT

a. Has the scientific/technical management been performed as required?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

b. Has the administrative and financial management been performed as required ((including proper handling of contractual matters, maintenance of the consortium agreement, intellectual property rights, technical collective responsibility, sub-contracting, competitive calls)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

Seems fine.

c. Have (electronic) information and communication networks been established as required to support interactive working between the teams involved (if relevant)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

d. Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related 5th and 6th Framework projects or other R&D national/international programmes (if relevant)?

☐

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

Can't comment.

7. USE AND DISSEMINATION OF KNOWLEDGE

a. Does the project have significant use potential (if applicable)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

Provision of new knowledge about cancer pathways.

b. Is the Plan for the Use and Dissemination of Knowledge developing in a satisfactory manner?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

c. 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

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

d. Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved (if applicable)?

☐

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

n/a

8. OTHER ISSUES

a. Have policy-related and/or regulatory issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

No issues.

b. Have ethical issues been appropriately handled (if applicable)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

No issues.

c. Have safety issues been properly handled (if applicable)?

☒

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

No issues.

d. Has progress on the Gender Action Plan been satisfactory (if applicable for this reporting period)?

☐

Yes

☐

Partially

☐

No

Comments:

n/a

Name (s) of the reviewer(s): Alan Ashworth

Date: 3rd September 2007

Signature(s):



APPENDICES (optional)

a. Status of project reports and deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Workpackage no.	Date due	Actual/Forecast delivery date	Estimated indicative person-months *)	Used indicative person-months *)	Lead contractor	Status	Resubmission Date	Remarks

*) if available

b. Visibility Actions (to be completed by the Project Officer)

Mark which actions would be appropriate for follow-up by EC programme policy units:

- ☐ Exploitation Strategy Seminar
- ☐ Contact the Innovation Relay Centres
- ☐ Promote / highlight as a success/case story

Flag this project for in case the programme looks for projects with certain characteristics:

- ☐ 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