



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Energy
Fission Energy

Brussels, 20/05/2019

Dr. Thomas JUNG
BUNDESAMT FUER
STRAHLENSCHUTZ
Willy-Brandt-Strasse 5
38226 SALZGITTER GERMANY

Subject: Result of the Review of your H2020 project 662287 — CONCERT
Final project review report

Dear Sir,

I am writing in connection with the above-mentioned review procedure for your grant.

We would like to inform you that we have finished our analysis. The review is closed and we wish to thank you for the support provided to the review experts.


I would be grateful if you could inform the other members of your consortium of this letter.

For any questions, please contact us via your [Participant Portal account](#).

Yours faithfully,

Rita LECBYCHOVA

Head of Unit

 Please note that this letter only concerns the outcome of the project review. We have NOT yet examined whether there is any need for follow-up measures. If yes, you will be informed and given another opportunity to take position.



Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz

Dr. Thomas Jung

Coordinator of CONCERT - European
Joint Programme for the Integration of
Radiation Protection Research

Bundesamt für Strahlenschutz (BfS)

Ingolstaedter Landstr. 1
85764 Oberschleissheim
Deutschland

Phone: 0049 30 18 333 – 2100
E-Mail: CONCERT_BfS@bfs.de

Oberschleissheim, 20.05.2019

Subject: Result of the Review of your H2020 project 662287 — CONCERT

Dear Mr Jouve,

While taking note of the content of your letter, we wish to comment the two points given:

“A significant number of deliverables will need to be updated or submitted before the end of the project. The consortium should take into account the need to increase the pace of deliverable submission.”

With a view to the significant number of still outstanding deliverables, the coordination of CONCERT wants to point out that most of these are related to CONCERT funded projects. Since projects will end a couple of months before the scheduled end of the CONCERT project, it can be assured that all pending deliverables will be submitted in the time that remains.

“The eligibility of the costs claimed will be assessed by the Commission services on the basis of the financial statements submitted by each beneficiary. Additional information will be sent at the time of payment execution. All costs declared by a beneficiary can be subject of a financial audit pursuant to article 22.1.3 of the grant agreement.”

The CONCERT coordination is aware of article 22.1.3 *Right to carry out audits*. The coordination will sensitise all partners for this matter by explicitly pointing out once again that the Commission may — during the implementation of the action or afterwards — carry out audits on the proper implementation of the action and compliance with the obligations under the Agreement.

Yours faithfully,

Thomas Jung
CONCERT coordinator



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Energy
Fission Energy

Brussels,

Dr. Thomas JUNG
BUNDESAMT FUER
STRAHLENSCHUTZ
Willy-Brandt-Strasse 5
38226 SALZGITTER
GERMANY

Subject: Result of the Review of your H2020 project 662287 — CONCERT

Dear Madam, Sir,

I am writing in connection with the previously announced review carried out for the above-mentioned project.

Following the review meeting of your project held in Brussels on 27/03/2019 and based on the enclosed review report drafted by the expert(s), the Commission considers the project implementation satisfactory.

The assessment of the use of the resources made by the experts does not imply the acceptance of the corresponding costs by the Commission.

To improve the implementation, the following changes should be made:

A significant number of deliverables will need to be updated or submitted before the end of the project. The consortium should take into account the need to increase the pace of deliverable submission.

The eligibility of the costs claimed will be assessed by the Commission services on the basis of the financial statements submitted by each beneficiary. Additional information will be sent at the time of payment execution. All costs declared by a beneficiary can be subject of a financial audit pursuant to article 22.1.3 of the grant agreement.

According to article 22.1.2 of the grant agreement, you may make observations on the result of the review of your project within 30 days of reception of this letter.

Yours faithfully,

Andre JOUVE

Project Officer



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Energy
Fission Energy

Brussels,

REVIEW REPORT

Grant Agreement (GA) number:	662287
Project¹ Acronym:	CONCERT
Project title:	European Joint Programme for the Integration of Radiation Protection Research
Type of Action:	COFUND-EJP
Start date of the project:	01/06/2015
Duration of the project:	60
Name of the primary coordinator contact and organisation:	Dr. Thomas JUNG (BFS)
Period covered by the report:	from 01/06/2015 to 14/05/2019
Periodic report:	Intermediate assessment not linked to the end of a reporting period
Date of first submission of the periodic report (if applicable):	Not applicable
Date of latest version of Annex 1 to the GA (Description of the Action - DoA) against which the assessment is performed	14/08/2018
Date of meeting with consortium (if applicable):	27/03/2019
Name(s) of monitors assisting in the project assessment (if applicable)	Hans Gerhard RIOTTE Michael WALIGORSKI Marie-Line Elise Marcelle PERRIN
Name of Project Officer drafting the report:	Andre JOUVE

¹ The term ‘project’ used in this template equates to an ‘action’ in certain other Horizon 2020 documentation

1. Overall assessment

Overall assessment
Project has achieved most of its objectives and milestones for the period with relatively minor deviations.
Significant results linked to dissemination, exploitation and impact potential
<p>Project has delivered exceptional results with significant immediate or potential impact (even if not all objectives mentioned in the Annex 1 to the GA were achieved).</p> <p>An important and effective element of the dissemination effort of CONCERT is the well-organized and regularly updated web-page, readily guiding the reader to all aspects and partners of this EJP. Apart from information addressed to the advanced reader, basic information, such as, e.g., on effects of exposure of man to ionizing radiation is also available to the lay reader.</p> <p>The exploitation of the project's intermediate results has been greatly facilitated through the CONCERT integrative activities. CONCERT has prepared and made available a data base of relevant key research infrastructures operated in EU member countries, a list of existing data bases, including banks of biological material – aiming at facilitating access to RP research infrastructures and to strengthen and expand cooperation between RP stakeholders in Europe. Overarching Strategic Research Agendas developed within CONCERT will direct long-term RP research, engaging the stakeholders – researchers, regulators and the general public and concentrate joint education and training programs around the most relevant topics. Within its E&T effort, CONCERT has set up a system of student travel grants to attend relevant training courses at other institutions, to present their work, and to attend conferences. A call for short courses in topics important for radiation protection research, aimed particularly at students entering the field or young researchers has also been launched. This will further develop and sustain expertise and competence of research scientists in the general area of radiation protection.</p> <p>The project is on track to fully accomplish the impact envisaged by its objectives. Already at this intermediate step important results have been achieved in line with its objectives, in particular regarding the coordination of the European RP Research Platforms, the development of SRA's and of short-term research priorities that have been guiding the open calls and the selection of the CONCERT research projects, and the draft long-term road maps.</p>
General comments
<p>As specified in the DoA, CONCERT EJP pursues five major objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">to bring together the elements of the European scientific communities in fields relevant to radiation protection;to strengthen integrative activities and mobilise synergies between the various areas of expertise; including by fostering the use of existing infrastructures and through E&T activities;to stimulate and foster scientific excellence through advanced research programmes;to exchange and communicate with all stakeholders; andto foster the harmonious application of available scientific basis for radiation protection practices. <p>During the reporting period the project has made important progress in all these directions. At about three quarters of the project's term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the number of beneficiaries has increased by about 30%, including universities, research labs and entities with roles in regulation and policy making;• R&D priorities and of joint roadmaps have been agreed across the established disciplinary co-operation structure of European RP research platforms, including the medical platform EUROMED;• the role of participating national programme owners/managers has been strengthened and their number in the project increased to secure the participation of new and small entities (e.g. universities) in the EJP that are neither beneficiaries nor linked third parties;• two calls for R&D proposals have been organised, leading to 36 eligible proposals of which nine have been selected;• a stakeholder group has been established comprising members from NGOs, international organisations, operators, regulators and university to organise changes with researchers; and progress has been made to engage more widely using a range of channels;• to foster access to research infrastructures a web-handbook and a widely spread bulletin (nearly 40 issues) have been issued and the data basis of the STORE platform has been considerably enlarged and the platform integrated into a more sustainable infrastructure;• Education and Training has been well integrated in all research projects, complemented by targeted activities on the CONCERT EJP level for courses, summer schools and travel grants.

The significant present and potential impact of CONCERT in the next reporting period and in the future beyond, results from the coordinated and multidisciplinary approach of the CONCERT EJP Consortium, bringing together research and radiation protection (RP) stakeholders in the fields of low dose radiation effects and risks, radioecology, nuclear emergency preparedness, dosimetry and medical radiation protection. Results of this joint effort will significantly stimulate and further enhance development of RP across Europe. The five research platforms (MELODI, ALLIANCE, NERIS, EURADOS and EURAMED) within CONCERT have developed their Strategic Research Agendas (SRAs), formulated and developed topical research needs and roadmaps, and established long-term Research and Technology Development (RTD) roadmaps based on these SRAs. These activities provide important input and a strong basis to guide future research and to laying out a joint road-map for RP in Europe. CONCERT has organised and followed up the progress of the nine research projects funded in the two CONCERT open calls. All the nine selected projects have continued to perform the scientific work needed to reach the fixed goals.

The main CONCERT activities of joined programming have been complemented by the CONCERT integrative projects on research infrastructure, education and training, and stakeholder involvement providing for a multi-level effort towards a co-ordinated European research area in radiation protection.

The performance and intermediate results of CONCERT EJP over the period evaluated in this review demonstrate that the CONCERT EJP is working well and will deliver the aims of the European joint programme (programme co-fund action) in relation to the effective and efficient management of research in the field of radiation protection.

Recommendations concerning the period covered by the report

With view to the upcoming final phase of the EJP, CONCERT is encouraged to start to include, and emphasize, in its activity reports and deliverables the link of the reported activity and its contribution to the overall objectives of CONCERT. Indicators, examples or other aspects demonstrating the impact and the added value of a specific reported activity could be helpful to increase the visibility and understanding of the EJP instrument within the policy sphere and broader research community.

Recommendations concerning future work, if applicable

Sustainability of CONCERT past its present operation needs also to be considered, in the context of active MELODI, ALLIANCE, NERIS, EURADOS and EURAMED European research platforms.

Means of sustaining the structure created by CONCERT should be investigated and possibilities provided through the upcoming call for proposals for the EURATOM Work Programme 2019-2020 should be explored. The objectives and expected impacts of the call as stated e.g. in NFRP-12, NFRP-13, and FFRP-14 are in line with those of the CONCERT EJP. Therefore, CONCERT should continue to stay involved and support activities including joint research proposals. To demonstrate the sustainability of this interdisciplinary integration and to ensure the sustainability of the structural basis already established by CONCERT, consortium participants should reproduce the same structure to provide a unique answer to the EC Work Programme 2019 recently published, instead of competing individually.

The interdisciplinary integration aspect of CONCERT is one of its key assets. Another is including the medical exposure aspects of RP within the EURAMED platform. Establishing close cooperation between EURAMED and the MEDIRAD EURATOM project (<http://www.medirad-project.eu>) under the CONCERT umbrella would likely enhance European RP research in the medical area.

2. Objectives and Workplan

Is the progress reported in line with objectives and work plan as specified in the DoA? If there are significant deviations, please comment.	Yes
<p>In line with the DoA-specified work plan, per consecutive amendments, the program of work and the timetable of deliverables have been adhered to, with some minor delays (deliverables D9.83, D9.84, D9.124, D9.125, D9.134 and D9.135, as of April 10, 2019 – were overdue by about 1-2 months). These delays reflect some start-up difficulties in the open call research projects that have been overcome and the current status of the delivery of the Work Programme does not indicate any risk to finish CONCERT in time.</p> <p>As confirmed by the Review meeting held in Brussels on March 27, 2019, delivery of D9.60 was moved from Month 44 to Month 50.</p> <p>In all, this shows excellent coordination and management efforts of the general coordinator, BFS.</p>	
Are the objectives of the project still scientifically and /or technologically relevant?	Yes
<p>The objectives for CONCERT are still scientifically and technologically relevant and continue to be pertinent to establish joint programming and an integrated European research area in radiation protection.</p>	
Are the critical implementation risks and mitigation actions described in the DoA still relevant?	Yes
<p>In general, the critical implementation risks and mitigation measures described in the DoA part A chapter 1.3.5 are still relevant; however, the smooth operation of CONCERT so far and the experience gained in collaboration of the actors and in coordinating such a big project have reduced significantly the probability for these risks to materialise and proved the adequacy of the mitigation measures described.</p>	
Have the pilots/case studies started to showcase innovative results as described in the DoA?	Not applicable
<p>The CONCERT DoA does not define explicit goals for technological innovation and /or pilots/case studies to this end.</p>	
Have the ethics related deliverables and/or requirements due for the current period been adequately addressed and approved?	Yes
<p>In the ethics part of the grant review the CONCERT EJP got a “conditional ethics clearance” because of possible ethics issues in areas of humans, humans cells/tissues, protection of personal data and animals. The ethics screening recognised that CONCERT EJP is “structurally different from other R&D projects as the project will launch calls and award grants” and that “therefore it must be structurally ensured on a governance level” that the research projects launched via the Open Calls comply with the ethics requirement. To that end the project provided for reports (D.81-D.85) addressing these issues which have been approved.</p>	
Have the comments and recommendations from previous assessments been taken into account?	Yes
<p>The current monitoring is the first intermediate review of CONCERT EJP; however, CONCERT had also been covered by the EURATOM 2014-2018 Interim Evaluation of indirect actions.</p> <p>At the start of the project CONCERT had to deal with some significant delays in the execution of the programme of work which partly have been due to the fact that CONCERT was the first EJP (outside of fusion) launched in the Euratom area of H2020. The EURATOM 2014-2018 Interim Evaluation noted on CONCERT that “there have been initial ‘teething’ difficulties in the operation of CONCERT but it is too early to judge whether these are of concern”. These “initial teething difficulties in the operation of CONCERT” have been fully overcome and are of no further concern for the project.</p> <p>The EURATOM 2014-2018 Interim Evaluation also recommended (Recommendation 11) that the “Commission should carry out a review of how CONCERT is working, to satisfy itself that the aims of the European Joint Programme (programme co-fund action) in relation to the effective and efficient management of research in the field of radiation protection are being delivered.”</p> <p>This project monitoring report constitutes the requested review (see also Overall assessment, 3. General comments, above).</p>	

3. Impact

Does the work carried out contribute to the expected impacts detailed in the DoA?	Yes
<p>The activities carried out in CONCERT so far already show an important impact and match the expectations detailed in the DoA. They contributed to creating a European research area in the field of RP by reducing disciplinary and geographical barriers; encouraging Member states to maintain their co-fund input; attracting further member states and scientific organizations into the integration process and promoting E&T of young scientists and the use of RP research infrastructures; improving integration with other relevant scientific disciplines and interaction with stakeholders; and facilitating scientific breakthroughs in areas important for the future development of RP including the development of radiation protection tools.</p>	
Does the work carried out follow the plan detailed in the DoA to enhance innovation capacity, create new markets opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, address industrial and/or societal needs at regional level or bring other important benefits for society? Give information on the relevant innovation activities carried out (prototypes, testing activities, standards, clinical trials) and/or new product, service, reference materials, process or method (to be) launched to the market, if any.	Not applicable
Does the work carried out contribute towards European policy objectives and strategies and have an impact on policy making?	Yes
<p>The work carried out in the CONCERT EJP during the current period and including the research projects launched under the CONCERT Open Calls contributes to European policy objectives and will impact on European policy making in the areas of radiation protection, emergency preparedness and response, radioecology and medical application.</p>	
Does (or will) the work carried out have an impact on SMEs?	Not applicable
<p>There is no specific SME dimension in CONCERT.</p>	
Have the beneficiaries aimed at a gender balance at all levels of personnel assigned to the action? If beneficiaries could not achieve the balanced participation of women and men in their teams despite active recruitment efforts, have the reasons been explained in the periodic report?	Yes
<p>The DoA provides a general description of measures to be applied to ensure gender equality in recruitment (DoA part B pg18 (3.2.4 Management of human resources)). The project's continuous reporting shows that about 45% of the researchers at the beneficiaries involved in CONCERT (f:194; m:233) are female, proving that the envisaged measures have been applied successfully.</p>	

4. Implementation

Has the project been efficiently and effectively managed?	Yes
<p>The project management (organised under Work Package 1) has succeeded in coordinating and managing the collaboration of about 30 participants and some 40 project leaders in an efficient and effective manner. Clear management processes have been implemented at all levels within the CONCERT EJP; this includes running the CONCERT governance structure, integrating new beneficiaries, managing the integrative activities like joint programming, access to infrastructure and E&T, and in particular organising the two open calls and following up (within Work Package 9) on the progress of the nine research projects selected.</p> <p>The CONCERT EJP is on track and all the activities that were envisaged for the fourth year have been accomplished so far. The fourth summary progress report and draft annual work plan D1.4 has been provided to the EC on time in accordance with the provisions of the consortium contract.</p>	
Is the management of the project in line with the obligations of beneficiaries (including ethics and security requirements, risk and innovation management if applicable)?	Yes
<p>The management of the project is in line with the obligations of beneficiaries.</p>	
Is the contribution of each beneficiary in line with the work committed in the DoA? (applicable only to multibeneficiary projects)	Yes
<p>The management of CONCERT succeeded in establishing an effective network between CONCERT beneficiaries ensuring that all beneficiaries followed their obligations.</p> <p>The contribution of each beneficiary for the current period is in line with the work committed in the DoA. The contribution of each Work Package for the current period is described in the deliverable D1.4 and has been presented at the Review meeting held in Brussels on March 27, 2019.</p>	
Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results (foreground) in scientific publications as planned in the DoA, including the deposition of publications in open access repositories? Has the dissemination plan been updated? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Yes
<p>The research projects launched in the two calls are still work in progress. So far, four articles have been published in peer reviewed journals; however, as explained at the review meeting held in Brussels on March 27, 2019, several scientific publications are presently under review.</p>	
Have the beneficiaries disseminated and communicated project activities and results by other means than scientific publications (social media, press-release, the project web site, video/film...) as planned in the DoA? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Yes
<p>A public website which is efficient, well-designed, regularly updated and attractive, is managed by WP1 to keep the audience informed and ensure continued interest in the project, and to attract new visitors. This public website is used effectively as an important outreach tool and a vehicle to communicate project activities and results.</p>	
Has the plan for exploitation of results, in particular as regards intellectual property rights, been appropriately planned and executed, as described in the DoA?	Not applicable
Has the dissemination and exploitation plan been appropriately executed and updated? Give details if an update of the D&E plan is needed.	Yes
<p>The public website is being updated by WP1 on a regular basis to keep the audience informed and ensure continued interest of already attracted visitors. In collaboration with WP5, information of interest to the public on radiation protection was collected during the current period. The dissemination and exploitation plan has been appropriately executed, so there is no need to do more for updating it.</p>	

Has the Data Management Plan (DMP) been appropriately drafted and, if applicable, executed? Give details if an update of the DMP is needed.	Not applicable
Have the proposed institutional changes been appropriately promoted?	Not applicable

5. Resources

Were the resources used as described in the DoA and were they necessary to achieve its objectives? If there are deviations from planned budget, have they been satisfactorily explained? Have they been used in a manner consistent with the principle of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy, efficiency and effectiveness?	Yes
<p>The resources were used as described in the DoA. The resources committed to the individual working packages are in line with the current status of the project; the future needs of the open-call related research projects will shift the resource balance towards the planned 60% assigned to these research tasks. The resources spent for CONCERT project management are about 10% and in line with the planned budget.</p>	

Annex 1 - Expert's opinion on deliverables

Del. no.	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D9.14	Published dataset on transfer in Mediterranean ecosystems	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.60	Guidance to reduce sampling uncertainty	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.62	Methodology to quantify improvement	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.124	Characterisation of exosomes from control, irradiated and shielded tissues	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.125	Progress report from 1st Periodic Meeting of SEPARATE	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.134	Stakeholders feedback report on proposed tools and protocols	Accepted	to be validated by project officer
D9.135	Consensus workshop report on ethical issues	Accepted	to be validated by project officer

Annex 2 - Expert's opinion on milestones

Miles. no.	Milestone title	Achieved	Comments
MS6	Annual work programme for year 5	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS12	Annual SRA platform statements 2018	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS17	Validation of the first road map	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS22	Midterm evaluation of granted proposals from 1st call finished	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS23	Midterm evaluation of granted proposals from 2nd call finished	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS28	Public survey assessed and published	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS31	Criteria for research infrastructure – data banks/ biomaterial banks - evaluation established	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS39	4th Annual call for E&T initiatives	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS44	4th Annual meeting of interest groups	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS47	Complete selection of mentees and assignation of mentors	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS48	Formation of an organising committee to manage career days	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS49	Formation of an organising committee to manage “Meet the Professor” lunches	Yes	to be validated by project officer
MS50	Nomination of the NEWS network committee to prepare dialogue meetings	Yes	to be validated by project officer