EUROPEAN COMMISSION
RESEARCH DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate D - The human factor, mobility and Marie Curie activities
Unit D3 – Research training networks
The Head of Unit

- 4. VIII. 2003

Brussels,
BS D(2003) 544175

Professor Feliks Przytycki
Institute of Mathematics at Polish
Academy of Sciences
Institute of Mathematics
Sniadeckich 8
Box 21
00-956 Warsaw
Poland

Programme "Structuring the European Research Area – Human Resources and Mobility" – Marie-Curie Research Training Networks
Call Identifier : FP6-2002-Mobility-1 Deadline: 3rd April 2003

Subject : Quick Information concerning evaluation of Proposal FP6 - 504921

Dear Professor Przytycki,

I would like to inform you that the Commission services, with the help of independent experts, have recently evaluated the proposal **"Conformal Structures and Dynamics"** submitted in the context of the above mentioned call. You will find attached a copy of the Evaluation Summary Report on this proposal, including the marks awarded, as produced by the independent experts.

The ESR includes comments and scores for each of the evaluation criteria and shows whether your proposal passed all the thresholds. You will notice that the thresholds applied to the different individual criteria as well as to the overall threshold are mentioned after the criteria identification.

The highest ranked proposals, which passed the evaluation thresholds, will normally be invited to enter into contract negotiations with the Commission services. However, the number of such invitations will depend on the Community funding available for supporting proposals under this call. It is expected that the invitations will be sent out towards mid-August 2003. Depending on the budget availability and the expected outcome of the negotiations, a reserve list may be established of the next highest ranking proposals.

Postal address : Rue de la Loi 200, B-1049 Brussels, - Belgium.
Telephone: Direct line (32-2) 295.05.14; Standard 299.11.11.
Fax: (32-2) 296.21.36.
E-mail: bruno.schmitz@cec.eu.int
Internet site : http//www.cordis.lu/improving/networks/home.htm

For those proposals which did not pass an evaluation threshold (as mentioned in the "*Guidelines on Proposal Evaluation and Selection Procedures*"[25]), a Commission rejection decision will be taken in the near future.

Note, however that this letter only provides information about the preliminary outcome of the evaluation of your proposal. An official and final decision on your proposal will be taken by the Commission in due course.

I would be grateful if you could inform the other partners in this proposal of the content of this letter. For any further inquiries please contact Maria Georgiadou tel: 00.32.2.295 98 46, e-mail: Maria.Georgiadou@cec.eu.int.

Yours sincerely,

Bruno SCHMITZ

Encl. Evaluation Summary Report

[25] Available on http://www.cordis.lu/fp6/find-doc.htm

4. Management and Feasibility *(Threshold 3/5)* **Strengths:** The teams have the necessary experience, and the project is feasible and credible. The organizational structure of the network is divided into vertical and horizontal management. Both of them are presented in details by flowcharts, attached to the proposal. The vertical component consists of the steering committee, which will include the scientific coordinators of all involved teams. The horizontal management is assumed to be organized on the local basis – each team is going to elect two members to assist the team leader. The network coordinator and the local coordinators at all nodes have good experiences with the organization of research and training. This seems adequate, though not outstanding. **Weaknesses:** Maybe not sufficient administrative structure will be in place to manage this large network. As many of the participants will be involved in other activities I doubt they will be able to devote the kind of effort necessary to manage the frequent movements of researchers this network wants to support. There should be an overall administrative plan in place, also dealing with fund distribution (which will be administered centrally). This seems lacking in the proposal.	**Mark:** 4
5. Relevance to the Objectives of the Activity *(No Threshold)* This is a broadly ambitious research project that would encompass many areas of modern analysis, and create a true network of collaborations between different areas of specialisation in what is now one of the leading trends in mathematical analysis. One of the strengths of the proposal lies in the interaction between apparently very different areas of mathematics and physics which have a common denominator in the notion of conformal and quasiconformal structure. The discussed area on the border of mathematics and theoretical physics, involving deep understanding of fractals and chaos, is assumed to attract talented young people from all over the Europe. These topics are closed to different applications and their training can result in highly and broadly educated people. The project will have a positive impact on a researcher's career. The network certainly reduces fragmentation of european research and will contribute to the creation of a class of well-trained young researchers. As such the relevance is high.	**Mark:** 4.3
6. Added Value to the Community *(No Threshold)* This is a well organized network in a very important interdisciplinary topic. It is likely to attract gifted young people and provide a platform for an internationally recognizable scientific education. This can be achieved by the expertise of top scientists, by organizing many meetings of different character, and by excellent research conditions at the nodes of the proposed network. The networking of many countries with varying degree of strength and expertise in the subject as well as the integration promoted by the proposed network would certainly be beneficial to the community. The coordinating team of the network is in Poland, and overall the emphasis of the networking activity is on the mobility of all involved, and on transfer of expertise from the strongest centres around the network. There is also an effort to broaden the technological and industrial contacts, though the success of this is more problematic.	**Mark:** 4.2

Evaluation Summary Report for a Marie-Curie Research Training Network

Proposal No. :504921	Acronym : CODY

1. Scientific Quality of the Project *(Threshold 3/5)* **Strengths:** Project in mathematical analysis, centred around conformal and quasi conformal structures and tools, but rather broader in scope. The proposal is of very high quality, on very modern themes in mathematics. It is not a truly multidisciplinary proposal, but it is a cutting edge modern analysis program. The proposal itself has very helpful structure, highlighting which of the mathematicians responsible for the advances quoted participate in the network. They do not all participate with the full commitment of their time, but most important ones do. The experts from all participating organizations have significantly contributed to the research area in the past. There is a detailed description of the future research methods and an appropriate work plan included in the proposal. **Weaknesses:** In what seems an attempt to be as multidisciplinary as possible, the proposers claims that the research has some physical applications, but this section is the least detailed of the proposal, although its development is in the charge of a world leading group. The claimed impact on connections with industry is not strongly supported by the description of the research topics and may well be marginal.	**Mark:** 4.3
2. Quality of the Training / Transfer of Knowledge Activities *(Threshold 4/5)* **Strengths:** Most of the teams in the proposed network are very experienced in both scientific matters and organization of training programmes. The plan of hiring young researchers is well justified by documenting the abilities of each node and describing their research infrastructure, and the list of planned schools and workshops is sufficiently detailed and realistic. The overall description of section B2 of the proposal is convincing and credible. The research fellowships are equally distributed among younger and more experienced researchers and the announced recruitment strategies seem appropriate, implying that the impact on a researcher's career can be expected to be positive **Weaknesses:** The level of mobility which is necessary to keep up with the intended level of training will be far too time consuming, and in the end unrealistic. It is doubtful that many and frequent seminars will be held among many of the nodes. The training in each team does not seem to have been thought out collectively, except for the plan that researcher will travel a lot. A bit more uniformity and formal organisation would strengthen the training program.	**Mark:** 4.5
3. Quality/Capacity of the Network Partnership *(No Threshold)* The teams in this network collectively make up an impressive list of some of the most outstanding analysts in Europe and worldwide. There is no doubt that the expertise of this network is of outstanding quality. Many teams, but not all, are already linked by collaborations. If these collaborations will be fostered as described, more collaborations should start and develop There is a detailed description of the research results already obtained by their staff in the proposal, and the percentages of their participation in the study of the topics to be covered by the proposed network look reasonable. Even the research teams focusing on slightly different tasks are assumed to collaborate due to the interdisciplinary character of the proposed network activities and due to parallel seminars exchanging experience. Overall, this has the potential for being a very effective research network.	**Mark:** 4.3

Overall remarks *(Threshold 70%)*

Strenghts:

This is a very high quality proposal for a network for collaboration in research in a broad area of mathematical analysis, of a very active and modern kind. A very broad group of countries is involved, mostly not at centre of the European research stage but making up an impressive pool of expertise.

While the natural scientific centre of the research proposed is in France, the coordinating team of the network is in Poland, and overall the emphasis of the networking activity is on the mobility of all involved, and on transfer of expertise from the strongest centres around the network. How this is to be achieved is not detailed carefully, but it seems convincing that the network will reinforce this goal.

The project is interdisciplinary due to its connection with physical processes, although the topics in mathematical physics are treated in a slightly marginal manner with respect to the mathematical issues.

The research method and workplan are described in great detail and show a very good scientific organization.

Weaknesses:

The training activities planned for the young researcher appear very effective, though the individual training lacks homogeneity across the network and is not explained in much detailed. Also, the overall management, which will be very demanding, is not sufficiently described.

The claimed impact on connections with industry and applications can not be deduced from the description of the research topics and seems to be rather marginal.

Total score:
85.8

Recommendations for project negotiation, *(if all thresholds passed)*:

Has the proposal passed all evaluation thresholds?		YES