

**EMPIR Contracts - Reporting Guidelines**  
**Part 6a – Preparing for Mid-Term Reviews**

Document: P-CON-GUI-111  
Approved: Programme Manager

Version: 1.0  
2022-01-26

---



**EMPIR Reporting Guidelines**  
**Part 6a – Preparing for Mid-Term Reviews - JNPs**

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>The self-assessment</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introduction	4
2.2	Strengths and weaknesses	4
2.3	Opportunities and threats	7
2.4	Summary	7
<b>3</b>	<b>The presentation</b>	<b>7</b>

---

If you require further help or guidance after reading this document, please contact the helpline

Email: [EMPIR.msu@euramet.org](mailto:EMPIR.msu@euramet.org)

Telephone: +44 20 8943 6666

## 1 Background

All JNPs are subject to a mid-term review process, where they will be reviewed at a high level by a group of external experts who will be selected by the TP Guardian and by members of the EMPIR Committee. As all JNPs will be reviewed at the same time, the review may be near the start, or the end, of some projects rather than at their mid-term.

The reviewers will evaluate the potential outcomes of the projects and their uptake by key stakeholders (in most cases the European Metrology Networks – EMNs) by addressing the following questions:

- Have the key EMN's needs changed since the PNTs were submitted, and if so, how?
- Is the project going to meet the needs of the key EMN?
- Is the project supporting the EMN in developing the best strategy to present their available services to end users?
- Should changes be made to the project to ensure impact is maximised?

The reviews can then be aggregated at TP level to make a judgement on how well the portfolio of projects will meet the intentions in the scope for the call. The mid-term TP reviews will not be about individual project progress against the plan as this is already assessed by the EURAMET MSU during the reporting process.

To facilitate the mid-term TP review process, the consortia shall deliver the documents detailed below:

- Publishable Summary
- [Reporting Template 05a - JNP Self-Assessment for the Mid-Term Review](#)
- PowerPoint presentation in a PDF file
- One of the following:
  - a) Strategic research agenda (SRA) - for JNPs which planned to develop one in their Annex 1, or
  - b) Plan for the establishment of a key EMN – for JNPs which did not plan to develop an SRA in their Annex 1.

These documents will be requested by the EURAMET MSU and will then be provided to the reviewers. **Note that it is particularly important that, when existent, the JNP website is updated prior to the mid-term review as the reviewers will use this as evidence of dissemination activities and impact.**

A mid-term review meeting will be held to supplement the mid-term review documents. It is expected that the meeting will take place face-to-face, but this will depend on the progress of the Covid-19 pandemic. There are therefore three possible scenarios:

**Scenario A** – The meetings are held face-to-face. In this scenario, all attendees will be asked to travel to the host organisations.

**Scenario B** – The meetings are held in hybrid mode. In this scenario, the EURAMET MSU and reviewers meet face-to-face, while JNP representatives and EURAMET EMPIR representatives join the meetings remotely.

**Scenario C** – The meetings are held remotely. In this scenario there is no travel involved and all attendees will join remotely.

The EURAMET MSU will inform the reviewers, JNP representatives and EURAMET EMPIR representatives of the date, format and location of the meeting, which is planned to take place in early summer 2022.

Whatever the format, attendees will include the external experts (~5), the JNP representatives (one per project), the EURAMET MSU and may include the TP Guardian and / or EMPIR Chair or EMPIR Deputy Chair. The mid-term review meeting will include a Q&A session which should be attended by one representative of the consortium. In addition, the consortium is required to prepare a PowerPoint presentation in a PDF file, which will be provided to the reviewers in advance of the meeting. A structure for the presentation is given in Section 3. JNP representatives should prepare slides following this structure as closely as possible.

The reviewers will express their opinion about the achievements of each project and will make recommendations in their final written report on the improvements that should be made by the project.

Following on from the outcomes of the mid-term review, the EMPIR Committee will decide whether the recommendations that the consortia need to implement should be followed-up by the EURAMET MSU through the normal reporting process or whether an improvement plan needs to be prepared by a consortium in cooperation with the national EMPIR Committee member / TP Guardian. When a suitable solution is agreed (e.g. discontinuation of a task, redefinition or refocusing of activities / deliverables, removal / addition of a partner), the JNP coordinator may need to liaise with the EURAMET MSU to implement an amendment of the project's EMPIR Grant Agreement. The EMPIR Committee may also raise other general issues about the TP to be addressed by the TP Guardian (who is detailed in the table below).

	TP Guardian	TP Facilitator
18NET	Hans Arne Frøystein (JV)	Tanasko Tasic (EURAMET)
19NET	Hans Arne Frøystein (JV)	Tanasko Tasic (EURAMET)
20NET	Hans Arne Frøystein (JV)	Tanasko Tasic (EURAMET)

## 2 The self-assessment

The EURAMET MSU provides a template – [Reporting Template 05a - JNP Self-Assessment for the Mid-Term Review](#), which shall be completed according to your consortium's assessment of the project and sent to the EURAMET MSU to be provided to the external experts before the review meeting.

Please note that the reviewers do not have the Annex 1 of your project, so the self-assessment should be a standalone document.

### 2.1 Introduction

This section should be summarised in 0.5 – 1 page, depending on the size of the consortium. In doing so, please address the following points:

- What are the key existing capabilities and knowledge of your consortium?
- How will these key existing capabilities and knowledge be enhanced by this project?
- How is your project supporting the sustainability of the key EMN?
- What will the enhancements resulting from the project enable the key EMN (or other key stakeholder) to do in the future in terms of new products or services to their customers?
- What will your project's tangible contribution be to the work of standardisation committees?

### 2.2 Strengths and weaknesses

#### 2.2.1 Objective indicators

The objective indicators should already be detailed in your publishable summary or output and impact report, and in your project's Annex 1. Please insert the numbers in the table of indicators.

Indicator		Total to date	Target <sup>1</sup>
Engagement outside the metrology community	Number of unfunded partners		
	Number of collaborators <sup>2</sup>		
Presentations & other dissemination	Conference presentations / posters		
	Other dissemination activities		
Open access peer-reviewed publications <sup>3</sup> and datasets	Open access peer-reviewed publications		
	Co-authored open access peer-reviewed publications <sup>4</sup> (of the above)		
	Open access datasets linked to publications		
Standards	Inputs to standardisation committees <sup>5</sup>		
	No. of unique standardisation committees engaged with (of the above)		
Training	Training activities (internal)		
	Training activities (external)		
Uptake	Uptake / use of project outputs by the end-users		

<sup>1</sup>-Target number of specific indicators for the lifetime of the project e.g. open access peer-reviewed papers or conference presentations etc, as described in your Annex 1.

<sup>2</sup> - Collaborators are those organisations that have signed a Letter of Agreement with the consortium. Do not include stakeholders i.e. organisations which have not signed a Letter of Agreement.

<sup>3</sup> - Only published open access peer-reviewed publications with a suitable persistent identifier should be listed i.e. papers in preparation or submitted should not be included in the table, but can be mentioned as a footnote below the table.

<sup>4</sup> - More than 1 partner from organisations in different countries.

<sup>5</sup> - Committees whose main task is to draft documentary standards (not metrology committees).

## 2.2.2 Main outcomes of the JNP so far

Objective indicators, as listed in the table above, may not reflect all that your project has achieved thus far. With this in mind, please explain how your project has helped the EMN in identifying their key stakeholders and how you have supported the EMN in developing a strategy for communicating with their key stakeholders. Additionally, you may want to explain how you have helped the EMN drafting messages to their key stakeholders and identifying potential collaboration possibilities, as well as identifying what type of support actions are needed to get those collaborations up and running. Explain if you helped drafting the SRA for the EMN and how you are supporting the EMN in developing the best strategy to present their available services to end users. If your JNP was funded before an EMN was established, you may want to clarify how you supported the potential EMN in putting together the scope, proposal and background information for the EMN to submit to GA.

### 2.2.3 Excellence

With a view towards the end of your project, what do you consider are the strengths and weaknesses regarding the excellence of your project's work?

Focus on 3 strengths and 2 weaknesses and compare your consortium's contribution with that from other regions (SIM, APMP, etc.).

Please rate your project using the following scale and explain your self-assessment.

- (9) Dominant: The consortium is recognised internationally - setting the pace and direction of metrology in this area worldwide.
- (8) Strong/dominant
- (7) Strong: The consortium is recognised internationally - not the leading entity, but able to set new directions on its own.
- (6) Favourable/strong
- (5) Favourable: The consortium operates mostly as its individual national identities - leading at national level and able to sustain technological competitiveness.
- (4) Tenable/favourable
- (3) Tenable: The consortium operates only as its individual national identities - not leading and unable to set an independent course.
- (2) Weak/tenable
- (1) Weak: The consortium is unknown beyond Europe and its scientific contributions lag behind other regions.

Note: Do not rate every strength/weakness. Instead, use this scale to rate your project as a whole (i.e. only one single mark should be listed for the scientific or technological excellence of the project).

### 2.2.4 Impact

Elaborate on which, and how, partners and the key EMN will benefit from the project's outputs.

Describe how your project is engaging with stakeholders to promote the sustainability of the key EMN.

Describe how your project is facilitating the transfer of its outputs to the key EMN and other key stakeholders, and how this will maximise the early impact of your project.

Indicate the impacts that you expect to be achieved by the project. Take a perspective of 5 years after the end of the project and focus on a maximum of 5 impacts.

Please rate your project using the following scale and explain your self-assessment.

- (4) High: Evidence for economic and societal impact, showing important influence on economic growth, environmental issues, public health, healthcare, or health policy.
- (3) Substantial: Evidence for economic and societal impact, as a pronounced result of the research.
- (2) Moderate: Evidence for economic and societal impact, but this is not a pronounced result of the research.
- (1) Weak: No or unclear evidence of economic or societal impact.

Note: Do not rate every impact. Instead, use this scale to rate your project as a whole (i.e. only one single mark should be listed for the impact of the project).

Using the standards table from the knowledge transfer task of your Annex 1 as a starting point, describe the progress and the status of your main contribution to the work within standardisation bodies e.g. working draft in preparation, technical recommendation submitted, standard in revision, new guides, new work item accepted. In addition, summarise the work that has been done to promote the uptake of the outputs by these bodies e.g. presentations at committee meetings.

### 2.2.5 Implementation

#### **Strengths and weaknesses**

Outline the strengths and weaknesses of your consortium in implementing the project's tasks and in achieving the envisaged outputs.

Specify strengths or weaknesses of the partners (e.g. in terms of capabilities, motivation and ambition, project management experience, or leveraging the potential impact, etc.).

#### **Issues and deviations**

Summarise (in one or two paragraphs) the deviations from your initial project plan and elaborate on the issues and corrective actions which you consider will be necessary for the remaining project duration. If there is an actual risk of your project not achieving part of its initial objectives, please comment on that.

#### **Cooperation and joint coordination tasks**

Describe whether the cooperation between the partners is effective and up to the standards required for a successful project? Highlight any partners whose contribution is not as required.

Describe whether the joint coordination is leading to results that individual NMIs could not achieve by themselves. Also describe how this is leading to added value for the metrology and wider communities.

## 2.3 Opportunities and threats

Elaborate on the main opportunities and threats you see for the successful exploitation of the project outputs. Indicate how to avoid/limit/minimise the threats and leverage/enhance/maximise the opportunities.

State how your project depends on the actions of the partners and/or external stakeholders, including the key EMN, beyond the contract to achieve the results.

Which decisions need to be taken and by whom to ensure that results are taken up?

## 2.4 Summary

To summarise, please give the headlines of what you want to have achieved at the end of the project and how you expect your partners and the (potential) key EMN to make use of that achievement in the 5 years following the end of the project.

What will make your project a success?

What will remain from your work?

## 3 The presentation slides

For the 2022 midterm reviews consortia will be required to prepare a PowerPoint presentation in a PDF file. The EURAMET MSU provides a structure for the slides that should be followed. The PDF file shall be sent to the EURAMET MSU together with other requested documents by a given deadline. These documents will be provided to the reviewers in advance of the meeting.

If the meeting is held according to scenario A (see section 1), representatives will have the opportunity to update the slides and present those on the day. If the meeting is held according to scenario B or scenario C, representatives will not need to present the slides on the day i.e. the reviewers will review the presentations beforehand and no presentations will be given by the representatives during the midterm review meeting.

The slides are aimed at supporting the claims made in your self-assessment, more specifically the Excellence and Impact scores. It shall include one or two brief overview slides and then briefly focus on the project's objectives. Rather than addressing background or future work, the presentation should primarily **highlight achievements (the main outcomes of the JNP so far) and provide justification for the Excellence and Impact scores.**

The presentation should be an unsecured PDF file of PowerPoint slides (and of a size that can be emailed to the EURAMET MSU) and should follow the suggested outline below:

- Title: 1 slide
- Introduction: 1 or 2 slides
- Objectives: 1 or 2 slides
- Achievements: 2 to 4 slides
- Excellence score: 1 or 2 slides
- Impact score: 1 or 2 slides
- Summary: 1 slide.

To facilitate the review process and to apply/secure a fair approach to each project, the maximum number of slides should not exceed 15.