Oggetto: Re: Approved Review Report for the DECIDE review
Mittente: Fulvio Galeazzi <fulvio.galeazzi@garr.it>
Data: 6/1/12 2:15 PM
A: Athina.ZAMPARA@ec.europa.eu
CC: INFSO-RI-261593@ec.europa.eu, Enzo Valente <enzo.valente@garr.it>, federica tanlongo <federica.tanlongo@garr.it>, Marta Mieli <marta.mieli@garr.it>, Luigi Rossi <luigi.rossi@garr.it>

Hallo Athina!

Please find below our comments to the letter with results from the interim review.
I have repeated your comments, and appended reply to each point just below.

As for D2.4, we believe that during the Review no specific deadline was indicated, hence such deliverable is not ready yet to be resubmitted: however, relevant work is ongoing and we aim at resubmitting it in 1 month.
As for other deliverables and QR6, for various reasons all partners have been a bit overwhelmed recently, so we ask you to extend the deadline by 10 days.

Detailed responses:

1. It is still recommended (since the 1st review) the option of a cost-neutral prolongation of the project duration by 6 months. Moreover, redistribution of funding between partners and reallocation of resources, as well as partial outsourcing should be considered.

Request for extension has been included in request for opening an amendment session, which you should have received a few minutes ago.

Reallocation of resources and partial outsourcing has taken place already (for example, Matlab/Octave issue) and we are ready to do the same when needed (currently, this is happening for the legal disclaimer and business market analysis).

2. It is recommended to develop and introduce a set of quality metrics (quantitative and qualitative) to the deliverable D 1.2 (Quality assurance plan) (regarding for example the number of expected participants at training events, number of organisations using the system, etc). This should also include metrics for Web statistics (number of visits, time of visit per page etc.). The project should report on these metrics at each year's review.

Deliverable will be updated with additional metrics, as suggested, and results will be reported at each year's review.
D1.2 will be resubmitted shortly: were aiming at end May but had some delays (as said), apologies.

3. The findings of the 1st review led to a request for risk assessment and corrective actions plan. The consortium has not presented yet such a document and it is recommended to include it into the deliverable D 1.2 (Quality assurance plan) to be resubmitted by the end of May 2012. The risk assessment plan, to be added to D 1.2, should involve usage of measurements by the proposed quality metrics.

Deliverable D1.2 will be complemented with the risk management plan, explaining how the monitoring of quality metrics will translate into actions.

4. It is recommended to include a strategy for a helpdesk and user support into deliverable D 1.3 (Sustainability Plan) for the future deployment of the system in order to deal with the related additional work load. The sustainability plan should also include a survey on funding opportunities for Alzheimer across Europe. The sustainability plan (D1.3) should be resubmitted until the end of May. Moreover, by the end of May 2012, the project should have taken a decision as to whether aiming at creating a new legal entity, or at backing an existing one.

> Survey of funding opportunities for Alzheimer across Europe
> will be part of ongoing market analysis, which will materialize
> as an update/appendix to D1.3, to be delivered by PM24.
>
> As for the strategy for the helpdesk, and the decision about
> the legal entity, we are investigating with our partners what
> is the best way to proceed: we think that it's a bit early
> to take a decision now, and we would benefit from the outcome
> of the business market analysis, due by PM24 as said, to better
> understand what the expected numbers of users may be.
> A possibility, to be discussed at forthcoming PMB meeting
> around 20th June, would be to have one partner take
> responsibility for this task, after having signed some
> agreement for the exploitation of the system with other
> partners.

5. Deliverable D2.4 (Ethical and Legal Issues addressing guidelines) should include a survey of all EU Member States on their legal and ethical guidelines and not only some of them. It should cover also legal aspects of reimbursement to be included at least for major EU countries - legal framework and players. The deliverable should be resubmitted by the end of May 2012.

> D2.4 will be expanded as requested. It will also include a
> section on legal aspects of reimbursement for the major
> European countries, to verify whether the DECIDE service
> may be configured as a "medical device" or "clinical exam"
> which may be eligible for reimbursement by National Health
> Systems.

6. Deliverable D3.7 (Dissemination, training and outreach plan) needs to be complemented with quality metrics regarding e.g. the projected number of participants at training events. It should specify format and duration of training events. Moreover, in the deliverable it should be outlined how non-scientific forums will be approached and used. The outreach and dissemination plan should incorporate how DECIDE plans to utilise other "dissemination" and "user-community" channels.

> D3.7 will be expanded with requested metrics, will include
> the description of the format of the training events. It will
> also include a section discussing participation to
> non-scientific (e.g. technical or strategical) events.

7. The project should consider introducing a certificate for successful completion of DECIDE training modules. It is recommended to investigate if it is viable to obtain a European certification (or certifications in several countries) for the training, as well as to add a training manager (separate function from those of lead and regular trainers) as a part of the business model. S/he could take care of marketing, financial and organizational aspects.

> The possibility of introducing a certificate for the "product"
> training will be investigated: the Consortium will report on it
> at PM24, in the business market analysis report.

8. The testing of the infrastructure and applications should not only address reliability but also scalability and availability (e.g. time for execution; estimated top load).

> Metrics will be expanded as requested. On top of usual
> availability/reliability metrics (from GEANT, EGI, SmokePing)
> we will also measure quantities more specific to the SG:
> - number of jobs/application
> - number of users registered to the SG (per profile, per
>   application)
> - number of active users
> Moreover, for what concerns scalability, we will perform
> bulk job submissions from 1 to N users at the same time and

measure:
- distribution of total job execution time (from submission to result), per application
- distribution of job real time for execution (extracted from job logfiles)
- CPU/RAM/network usage of the SG for the whole duration of the test, to highlight projected maximum tolerable load

9. Quarterly Report 6 (QR6) is still not submitted. It should contain additional pieces of information, such as (1) technical description of the new, 5 application; (2) new version of the project publishable executive summary; (3) data (from measurements due end of PM19) on reliability, scalability, and availability of the provided services; (4) definition of how many trainees/events are expected and of the format of trainings. It should be submitted by the end of May at the latest.

QR6 will be expanded and be submitted by "end May".
In particular:
- technical description of the 5th application, and strategy for its porting to the infrastructure will appear in QR7 due end June, since strategy is being finalized these days
- QR6 will contain new version of the project publishable executive summary
- data, as per previous point 8)
- information on training events, as per point 6)

10. The web page and service portal should be extended to provide: (1) statistics for the use of the service; (2) guidance for scientific and medical users, concerning parameter adjustments that may be required for individual applications in the list of 5 offered; (3) legal disclaimer, to be added also to relevant print documents and automatically generated reports.

Statistics on the usage of the generic web and the service portal will be added to QR6 and regularly updated for each QR, with some comments: these will be gathered using Google Analytics tools.

More guidance will be provided in the Science Gateway, making sure the user is properly guided each time her interaction is needed (buttons, input boxes,...). This information will also be available to users not yet authorized for the use of the service, together with an explanation of the requisites for qualification, steps needed to qualify, user profiles, etc.

Legal disclaimer will be, once available, clearly highlighted in the web page and added to the reports produced by the service. It should be ready in 1-2 months time.

11. Further deliverables and amendments to already submitted ones should reduce the part of motivation, background, general recommendations and the like to a minimum. Said amendments of deliverables shall contain, at their beginning, a list of changes made (as in software documentation) with short descriptions of the change intent and content, and if appropriate, its location in the text. Formatting means to help identifying the changes inside the document text body would be welcome.

Suggestion will be implemented in future deliverables and amendments.

12. The 2nd year's progress report should include the anticipated and achieved impact of the project also with respect to important developments in the US.

Just to make sure we got the message clearly...
We can provide an update on what is going on in Europe and US in the field of Alzheimer's disease, for example for what concerns adoption and updates of the guidelines for diagnosis,

trends in research on biomarkers, overview of activity of major initiatives (CBRAIN, LONI), and developments of the National Alzheimer's Plan in the US.
Is this what was meant, or something different?

Best regards

Fulvio

On 05/04/2012 05:37 PM, Athina.ZAMPARA@ec.europa.eu wrote:

> Dear Fulvio,
> As you have seen, we have just sent you the letter with the results of the interim review. If you have any comments, please send them to me as soon as possible. Although the overall evaluation is positive, there are a lot of recommendations to implement.
> You have also sent me a tentative list of amendments which I have not examined yet unfortunately due to work overload. Now my priorities are the amendments, and I will send you my comments next week.
> Thank you in advance for your understanding.
> Have a nice weekend.
> Best regards,
> Athina
>
> _____
> *From: *HEINDRYCKX Patricia (INFSO)
> *Sent: *Friday, May 04, 2012 4:21 PM
> *To: *'enzo.valente@garr.it'
> *Cc: *ZAMPARA Athina (INFSO); INFSO-RI-261593; MARCHAL Isabelle (INFSO); 'Fulvio Galeazzi'
> *Subject: *Approved Review Report for the DECIDE review
> Dear Prof. Valente,
> Please find attached the electronic copy of the approved review report and cover letter for the interim review of project DECIDE that will be sent to you by registered mail.
> << File: Review Results_Interim Review DECIDE.pdf >> << File: 2012-03-30 Technical Review Report - DECIDE - Interim Review_Final approved.pdf >>
> Best regards,
> Patricia
> **Patricia HEINDRYCKX***
> Secretary to Mrs. Athina ZAMPARA
> **
> << OLE Object: Picture (Metafile) >>
> ***European Commission***
> DG INFSO
> Unit F3
> BU25 04/81
> B-1049 Brussels/Belgium
> +32 2 296 63 89
> _patricia.heindryckx@ec.europa.eu_ <mailto:patricia.heindryckx@ec.europa.eu>