

CONSENSUS EVALUATION REPORT

GENERAL OVERVIEW

Open Call Collection	OC-2019-1
Proposal Reference	OC-2019-1-23955
Proposal Title	Network on Privacy-Aware Audio- and Video-Based Applications for Active and Assisted Living
Proposal Acronym	GoodBrother
Review Panel	RP 2 - Information and Communications Technologies related sciences and applications, targeting to advance and empower the society of tomorrow
Evaluation Status	Final

EVALUATION

SUMMARY TABLE

S&T EXCELLENCE			NETWORKING EXCELLENCE			IMPACT			IMPLEMENTATION	Marks
Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9	Q10	Total
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	50

COMMENTS

S&T EXCELLENCE

Soundness of the Challenge

Q1 - Does the proposal demonstrate a comprehensive command of the state of the art in the field and present a relevant and timely challenge?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: Privacy preserving technology is a relevant factor in audio-video based monitoring AAL systems. The proposal, well motivates and timely also considers ethical and legal aspects and has a clear vision of the problem: the dilemma faced by older adults - the need to keep monitoring of their health and well being and the need to keep their independence and privacy, when in a situation of frailty, while also addressing multiparty privacy and re-identification issues are included. From the state of the art it can be seen, that users are often unable to understand potential or concrete individual risks, potential (also later in time) negative consequences and its privacy implications of sharing data/resources. The proposal should consider this as a challenge in an adequate manner. Yet, we need to express some concern when the authors write "(...) the aim of the GoodBrother Action is to design privacy-aware solutions to support (...)". The aim of a COST Action is never to design or to build but to develop a network of researchers and practitioners and users around a common problem to allow them to create synergies on the solutions for that problem.</p>	5

Progress beyond the state-of-the-art

Q2 - Does the proposal describe an innovative approach to the challenge that advances the state of the art in the field?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The problem is real and the way to move forward is correctly envisioned, namely regarding the cooperation in an environment that is dynamic, transdisciplinary, stimulating, and respectful of sound ethical practices. The challenges are well identified and in line with state of the art, the needs of users and end-users, aiming for a better integration between technical and non-technical actors. The work of the Action should look to contemplate on one basic truth, and this is that there are many shapes and forms and flavours of frailty and ageing and independence needs, and therefore, the clearly stated assumption that "one solution will fit all" is very limitative. There are expressions on this section that mark this, namely the first paragraph, where it is more or less stated that "all persons" "frail seniors" "human's technology acceptance" and so on. A clear engagement of different "users" associations, and the use of participatory design could have been highlighted.</p>	5

Q3 - Are the objectives presented relevant to the challenge, clear and ambitious?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: Complete, clear and focused objectives, directly related to problem being addressed, while still being ambitious. Large spectrum of objectives from theoretical all the way to strategies for market-related activities.</p>	5

NETWORKING EXCELLENCE

Added value of networking in S&T Excellence

Q4 - Does networking bring added value in tackling the challenge in relation to existing efforts at the European and/or international level?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The networking is done in an excellent manner and it is expected to bring added value in accordance to the challenges. The inclusion of countries outside the list of COST Countries at start is very positive. Although there is a good knowledge of many activities relevant to the proposal in Europe, an effort could be made to complement the state of the art with relevant knowledge from other parts of the world.</p>	5

Added value of networking in Impact

Q5 - Does the proposed network contain, or present a credible plan for securing, the critical mass and expertise for achieving the objectives and thus addressing the challenge?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The overall plan for securing the critical mass and expertise is done in an excellent manner for achieving the objectives and thus addressing the challenges, allowing the assumption that the COST Action will have significant impact. The involvement of a large number of industrial partners active in the topic of the Action is a strong advantage and their participation in the Action activities should be fostered.</p>	5

Q6 - Does the proposal identify the most relevant stakeholders and present a clear plan to involve them as Action's participants?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The proposal identifies a correct mix of relevant stakeholders with clear roles from different disciplines and their involvement is presented in an excellent manner. Also, the proposal plans to involve also independent researchers from science perspective to discuss the approaches and enhance the view in early, new research directions, possibly by creating open calls for participation or by invitation to the planned workshops, etc.</p>	5

IMPACT

Impact to science, society and competitiveness, and potential for innovation/break-throughs

Q7 - Does the proposal clearly identify relevant and realistic impacts for science, society and/or competitiveness (including potential innovations and/or breakthroughs)?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The proposal topic is of high relevance and interest. The realistic impact to science, society and competitiveness can be ranked with excellent, describing both realistic and convincing identification of relevant impacts in scientific and societal domains.</p>	5

Measures to maximise impact

Q8 - Does the proposed networking clearly contribute to knowledge creation, transfer of knowledge and career development?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The proposal clearly contributes to knowledge creation, transfer of knowledge and career development, as it proposes excellent measures to create a cohesive multidisciplinary consortium. With some detail, the use of Training Schools in parallel with MC meetings is a good proposal (despite its different durations). The use of Industry Days is a good proposal. The goals for STSMs seem too shy, and the MC should be encouraged to further extend it. Caution and wisdom should be applied at all times, in particular in the area of favouring a particular gender for grantees. Ideally, efforts could be made to create gender balance and not gender bias.</p>	5

Q9 - Is the plan for dissemination and/or exploitation of results clear and attainable and does it contribute to the dialogue between science and the general public or policy?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The proposed dissemination committee and the actions planned are an excellent strategy for maximize the impact. The proposal presents a very complete and comprehensive dissemination plan in various levels and targeted events and activities tailored to different stakeholders. In detail, the use of Social Media and the metrics for success have been correctly defined. The use of Open Access publication of research and Data are adequate and address a real problem in today's research scenario. The metrics for the number of published papers and books seem shy and should be re-evaluated while the Action is running. Also, the promotion of Open Content, Open Data, Open Access publications and Open source is well done. Nevertheless, for the planned outcome of the work plan priority should also be given to Open Content, Open Data, Open Source and Open Access.</p>	5

IMPLEMENTATION

Coherence and effectiveness of the work plan

Q10 - Is the work plan (WGs, tasks, activities, timeframe, deliverables and risk analysis) appropriate to ensure the achievement of the objectives?	Mark
<p>The proposal addresses this question in an excellent manner.</p> <p>Main strengths: The work plan is well done considering all challenges and derived objectives. The outcomes and milestones are appropriate, with sufficient details in order to assess the implementation aspects, in line with the challenges and objectives of the project. With detail, the definition of Working Groups seems adequate and done in a transversal manner. The composition of the Steering Committee seems adequate although the existence of an ECI representative could have been done in a more efficient manner, for example requiring that either the Coordinator or Deputy-Coordinator of each WG would be an ECI.</p>	5

SELECTION

COMMENT OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To comply with the COST Excellence and Inclusiveness Policy, in the implementation of the Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the level of involvement of Inclusiveness Target Countries (ITCs) should be maintained and the plans described in the proposal for ensuring ITC involvement should be implemented; - the level of involvement of Early Career Investigators (ECIs) should be increased and a plan should be developed and implemented to ensure the full involvement of ECIs in all aspects of the Action's implementation (including in Action leadership positions); - the gender balance should be maintained and the plans described in the proposal for ensuring gender balance should be implemented.
----	--