



ARIMNet2

Work Package 3_ D3.2

Reports on the funded research projects mid-term reviews

ARIMNet2 Dissemination Level

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the seven Framework Programme		
<i>Dissemination Level</i>		
PU	Public	
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	X

Forecast Delivery date: M7

Actual Delivery date: M9 (September 9, 2014)



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
APMeD	Pierre-Eric Lauri	Apple and Peach in Mediterranean orchards- Integrating tree water status and irrigation management for coping with water scarcity and aphid control

Summary

The work plan of the project has been performed satisfactorily and the milestones have been achieved. There are no problems of the coordination and collaboration between the partners, while the financial report responds to the work done by each partner. The results of the WP1 are very interesting but as it was appeared discordance between greenhouse and field experiments for ranking of genotypes this should be further analyzed and may require further experimentation. The results of WP2, WP3 and WP4 are generally clear and can create innovation.

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?	+			The work done so far meets the targets of the project. The milestones have been achieved. However it could be useful to clarify and document better why the research team will not carry out experiments in 2014 concerning the WP1. The other deviations from the proposed work plan have been fully explained. The mid-term report is carefully written and clear. The data collection for D1.1, D1.2, D2.1, have already been completed!
Are the remaining objectives achievable?	+			No problems for implementation of the objectives are expected.

Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties

The goals of the WPs are characterized as original. The results so far indicate that new knowledge and innovation may be produced especially in the WP4.

Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	+			
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	+			
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	+			
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?	+			
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?		+		A six months delay in the implementation of the project may be necessary.
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	+			The number of publications and the Master reports is impressive for this period of work (only 18 months research work).
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	+			
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?			+	
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?	+			The results will develop new knowledge and innovation in the relationships between water regime, aphids attack and nutrition of the trees. The parameterization of the existing models for Apple and Peach with the use of realistic field data and the development of new simplified models consist the innovation potential of this project.
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?	+			The results in the WP1 are very interesting. Their practical impact should be analyzed more. It should be examined any further experimentation.
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment

Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?		+		The work in Morocco officially started one year later. It seems that this did not have any negative impact on the whole work. The coordinator should denote if the Morocco partner will implement its work plan.
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?	+			

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The quantity and quality of the achieved results. - The excellent coordination and collaboration of the research teams.
Weaknesses	The work undertaken by the Morocco side may be not fulfilled.
Recommendations	<p>The coordinator and the research teams should decide if some of the field experiments related to WP1 and WP3 should be repeated. This may require further experimentation and extra time for completion of the project.</p> <p>The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the APMed project.</p>

Date: 24/6/2014

Expert name: Dr. S. Vizantinopoulos

Email: sp.vizant@nagref.gr



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
ARIDWASTE	Dr. V. Kavvadias	DEVELOPMENT OF SPECIFIC AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES WITH THE USE OF RECYCLED WASTES SUITABLE FOR INTENSIVELY CULTIVATED MEDITERRANEAN AREAS UNDER DEGRADATION RISK

D

Summary

The work plan has been implemented so far well and the milestones have been achieved. There are no problems of coordination while the collaboration between the partners is satisfactory. The obtained results may create innovation concerning the safe usage of AWs in different crops with the addition or not of zeolite.

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?	+			The work in the project is proceeding according to the initial schedule. The milestones have been fulfilled. The implementation of the field experiments just after the first response experiments was a good idea. The greenhouses experiments showed in some cases no consistent results and this finding should be checked better under more realistic cases e.g. field experiments. The mid-term report is well documented and analytical.
Are the remaining objectives achievable?	+			The implemented work so far is good enough concerning the quality and the quantity of the results. This supports the view that the rest of the objectives will be achieved.

Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties

The obtained so far results are in most of the cases original and all the encountered difficulties have been outreached.

Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	+			No problems of coordination according to the report and during the coordinator's presentation have been recorded.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	+			It has been clarified in the conducted experiments the responsibility of each partner concerning the targets of the project
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	+			
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?	+			
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?		+		It should be required extra time about five months for completion of the results.
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	+			There are some publications in some conferences. However emphasis should be given to inform the competent personnel of the Ministries of Agriculture and Regional services, cooperatives, groups of farmers and industry about the goals of the project and the achieved results so far.
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	+			
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?			+	So far no unexpected impacts have been emerged
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?	+			The final results may be innovative in the sense that a number of AWs can be used safely under the Mediterranean conditions in a number of crops increasing the quality of the products and decreasing the cost of production. The application of AWs in the crops offers sustainability in the agricultural production. The role of natural zeolite-clinoptilolite and its influence on the production of the crops under field conditions may be clarified and mixtures of zeolite plus different AWs for practical reasons can be formed.
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?	+			The application of zeolite under field conditions will be verified and validated.
Budget				

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?	+			No, this fact was solved during the experimentation period.
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?		+		According to the financial report two of the partners, CERSAA & MIGAL spend more than the 86% of the total budget so far. This was explained by the coordinator during his presentation and made the appropriate corrections.

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)

Strengths	The level of the coordination is good The quality of the work satisfactory The cooperation among the partners is flexible
Weaknesses	The variability of the factors under field conditions may lead to inconsistent results
Recommendations	The work should be continued according to the schedule and the fixed milestones. An extension period for completion of the project may be necessary. The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the ARIDWASTE project.

Date: 24/6/2014

Expert name: Dr. S. Vizantinopoulos

Email: sp.vizant@nagref.gr



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
CLIMED	V. ALARY	The future of Mediterranean Livestock Farming Systems: opportunity and efficiency of crops-livestock integration

Summary

The project aims to characterize contrasted and common challenges in regards to efficiency and sustainability of crop & livestock systems in Egypt, France and Morocco: (1) Contrast among the 3 Mediterranean countries from historical and geographical point of view, mainly between the recent reclaimed lands in the Egyptian site compared to the two other research sites in France and Morocco. In the last two research sites, the zones cover contrasted topographic zones from mountain to coastal zones although in Egypt the gradient is linked to agrarian development (from 1954-2007); (2) Researchers in the France site have cumulated research studies on agrarian changes and data on farms over the last decade; at contrary, there is an important work of collecting primary data in the research sites of Egypt and Morocco; and (3) The challenge of biomass management in the efficiency of the integrated crop-livestock systems with the important development of cash crops on coastal zones due to the high demand from urban zones, in competition with ranges and forage crops.

The project includes 3 French organizations (Cirad, IRD and Montpellier Supagro), IAV in Morocco and APRI/ARC in Egypt.

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		The planned objectives have been reached for mid-term, but the start has been delayed for more than a year in Morocco, because the funds were available only in December 2013.
Are the remaining objectives achievable?	X			Anyway strong results are presented for most of the WPs and the calendar will be respected from now.

Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties

The project submitted was quite original and promising, but it is very difficult to give an opinion from the submitted mid-term report, which presents only factual results and very few things about the content, i.e. the intellectual challenges of the project. One member of the review panel had the opportunity to meet the Egyptian team last March and to visit the new-reclaimed land case study: it was very interesting and he saw very original situations of crop-livestock relationships, never met elsewhere. The situation of a new PhD student from Lebanon should be clarified: does it mean that a fourth case study has been added or will she work on the actual situations? It is not clear from the report.

Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	X			
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	X			Considering the reports at our disposal, it seems that the partners are all involved as expected. Moreover universities in Morocco and Egypt are more committed than originally and it open new perspectives for Master and PhD students contributing to the project.
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	X			
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?		X		The kick off meeting has been held in Cairo in April 2013 and the next project meeting is planned in December 2015 in Morocco, which could be considered as quite late, but we understand that most of the participants have taken advantage of the Resilience Conference in Montpellier in May 2014 to meet formally or at least to exchange.
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?				To be decided later

Publications / Patents / Outputs

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?		X		Very few publications are presented and only about the Moroccan case study ... which means probably coming from works carried on before the project start, which has especially been delayed in Morocco. None other publication is quoted even the report said that many participants to CLIMED attended the 2014 Resilience Conference in Montpellier ... No other significant output at this stage.
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?				
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?				

Innovation Potential

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
--	-----	--------	----	---------

Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?				
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?				Not yet
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?			X	
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?	X			

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)	
Strengths	This project is working quite well
Weaknesses	Delay in Morocco and other difficulties as in many multinational research project relying on separate donors (as a fund contraction in Egypt)
Recommendations	<p>Despite of the delay in Morocco and other difficulties as in many multinational research projects relying on separate donors (as a fund contraction in Egypt), this project is working quite well. Maybe the partners should pay a bit more attention to the integration of the different results and focus on the links between the different tasks. The project must go further than only a description of different situations, it must demonstrate something more. It should point the three situations in a dynamic view. But globally, the review panel has no specific recommendation to make from the M18 report which is not too much developed, e.g. the "results" for each WP are only factual and don't give any information about the content (see above).</p> <p>The review panel recommends the project to be carried on. May be could it could be useful to meet the teams at one of their next common meeting, or even before (for eg. planned meeting in Dec. 2014).</p>

Date: 8 June 2014

Expert name: Bernard Hubert
Email: hubert@avignon.inra.fr



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
DOMESTIC	C. LIGDA	Mediterranean biodiversity as a tool for the sustainable development of the small ruminant sector: from traditional knowledge to innovation

Summary

The project associates 4 partners: Veterinary Research Institute on Thessaloniki (Greece), Inra, Corte (France), ARI, Nicosia (Cyprus) and IAV, Rabat (Morocco). The project website www.arim-domestic.net, includes the information and news on the project, which is continuously updated with the dissemination material.

One of the first actions of the project was the formalization of the questionnaire (translated into the national languages of the partners) to be used in the personal interviews with the farmers in the targeted regions, which includes: general data on the farm and the farmer, details on the livestock composition, feeding system, labour, breeding and reproduction aspects, health management, performance, products and marketing information. Furthermore, specific templates that were used to describe the breed management, the history and priorities of conservation schemes and products valorization processes where exist and the different aspects of the supply chain were developed. The above information is required as the basis for the investigation of the different components of the production systems, the role of local authorities and the organization at territorial level, the distribution of the products through the supply chain, the trends in the market and the role of the different stakeholders.

Personal interviews were organized in specific geographic regions, the information collected was entered in an xls file, and a first descriptive analysis of the data has been completed. Besides the field research, secondary data were collected, from national and local administrative organizations, technical and research institutions and other key actors.

The information collected is presented in the case studies report. A report on values and challenges of all case studies has been also produced in this step. The reports on breed management, and supply chain are completed. In this step the main stakeholders involved in the breed management at different levels and in adding value processes to the products were identified and characterized. The deliverables are included in Annex I.

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		The planned objectives have been delayed due to funding issues (in France and Morocco) as well as to the fact that the time to produce the common questionnaire and to implement it by farmers in the four countries was longer than expected. Thus at the last meeting in Corte (June 2013) the teams have reorganized the WP Planning in a quite satisfying way.
Are the remaining objectives achievable?	X			Nevertheless these changes do not disturb the general framework of the project.
Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties				
<p>the project is original and very interesting considering the Mediterranean situation for small ruminants. The website is well done, informative and gives some interesting points to consider, particularly several dissemination material. The teams seem to have overcome the difficulties linked to funding delays for some of them by a convincing reorganization of the WPs work plan.</p>				
Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	X			The report shows a quite coordinated organization between the partners.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	X			The partners seem to be correctly involved
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	X			They have three face to face meetings (the kick off in Greece in July 2012, a second in Corsica in June 2013 and a third in Cyprus in April 2014) + four Skype meetings.
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?				
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?				
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?				
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	X			The dissemination material posted on the website gives a good idea of what has been done in that perspective. il is quite interesting and of good quality.
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?				
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment

Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?				
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?				
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?		X		At the beginning, they met problem with Moroccan funds and they had to mobilize other resources.
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?				

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)	
Strengths	The project, as far as we can assess it from the transmitted documents, confirms it is promising and very relevant for the small ruminant sector in the Mediterranean, which is one of the main targets of the ARIMNet program. The project management seems to be satisfying and has shown that it has allowed reframing the work plan taking into account the difficulties the teams have to meet with.
Weaknesses	
Recommendations	The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the DOMESTIC project.

Date: 8 June 2014

Expert name: Bernard Hubert
Email: hubert@avignon.inra.fr



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
MEDILEG	Diego RUBIALES	Breeding, agronomic and biotechnological approaches for reintegration and revalorization of legumes in Mediterranean agriculture

Summary				
<p>The goal of the project is to promote grain legume cultivation in Mediterranean countries. To achieve this, we should be able to stabilize the yield and production of major food legume cultivars adapted to different pedoclimatic conditions encountered in the Mediterranean region. For this purpose, we will use a multidisciplinary, integrated and participatory research including biotechnology, plant breeding, plant physiology, organic chemistry and crop protection in order to identify the best food legume genotypes that can resist disease infection and tolerate drought and salinity and to propose appropriate agronomic practices that may help different grain legumes crops to resist better to this limiting factors.</p> <p>Project activities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) Evaluation of current and historic chickpea, common bean, faba bean, lentil and pea germplasm for characteristics of importance to sustainable agriculture in order to define the desired phenotypes suitable for each Mediterranean area (ii) Development of new and reliable screening methods for the most relevant biotic and abiotic stresses in order to identify new sources of resistance and characterize the resistance mechanisms. The resulting germplasm will be of great interest in future breeding programmers (iii) Identification of new QTLs for yield and resistance/tolerance to stresses in pea. Studies on field stability of QTLs across diverse locations and genetic backgrounds will allow the development of specific markers for pyramiding and rapid screening. (iv) Identification of primary inoculum sources explaining the recurrence of the disease and evaluation of new combinations of control methods (architectural features, cultural practices, resistance, etc) for the management of the major legume diseases. (v) Development of integrated management of the fungal diseases and broomrapes using fungal and plant metabolites. 				
Achievement of planned objectives / calendar				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment

Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6/8 deliverables (before 18 months) have been done. Most of tasks are in progress, except the tasks: T2.4, T5.4, T5.5, T6.2 et T6.3 which have not been undertaken yet, although they should be in progress. In the report and the oral presentation there are lacks of information about the major results and the remaining activities of the most tasks, which make the evaluation not so easy. Therefore, some changes were made by the participants in some tasks to overcome certain constraints.
Are the remaining objectives achievable?		X		Some of the objectives can't be achieved because the time required was underestimated.

Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties

A collection of performance genotypes was identified (chickpea, pea, lentil, bean and faba bean). Methods for selecting resistances to stress (biotic and abiotic) have been established for certain species of legumes. Confirmation of a QTL for resistance to anthracnose and the corresponding candidate genes are underway. SNP and SSR molecular markers are identified for genotyping populations RIL's and for the characterization of diversity (plants and fungal). Two phytotoxins (fusaric acids) were isolated and tested on pea (leaves). New phytotoxic activities are determined (*Inula viscosa*) and tested.

Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?		X		Both meetings (kick-off and mid-term) took place as planned, consortium agreement signed, and the M6 and M18 reports made. However, some deliverables were not finalized in time.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?		X		For some WP the partners are not clearly identified according to the activities
Is the collaboration between partners effective?		X		It is difficult to response to this question when the information about the contribution of partner per task and activities are not available. Nevertheless, in WP3 and WP4 the collaboration seems efficient between CSIC, INRAA Dijon and ITQB.
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?	X			For one member of the review panel the schedule established is consistent but not enough realistic. The time required for some tasks are underestimated. In some tasks the number of species, pathogens, abiotic stress, trials, accessions or RILs ... could be reduced in order to respect the timetables.
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?				Yes, minimum 6 months. Due the drought, one trial should be repeated, therefore they need additional 6 months

Publications / Patents / Outputs

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	X			Publications : Yes
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	X			Website, Workshop,
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?		X		To help breeders on molecular selection

Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?		X		-Tools : New molecular markers (pea), Genetic composite maps, failed selection protocols to select genotypes, -Genetic materials : Elite genotypes, QTLs, candidate gene (Ascochyta), bioactive plant and fungi metabolites
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?		X		-QTLs and / or candidate gene for resistance to certain diseases can be introduced into the legumes breeding programs. -Interesting-forward to implement biological control against broomrape and anthracnose
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?	X		X	Delay on financing. In Egypt it is still not solved. No comment have been done about impact effect about the delaying of budget in the report but during the meeting, it appears that, even if the partners are "under control" now, the management of the project and the coordinator task were much more difficult than in other type of projects. In this type of project, it is less easy than in EU projects where the coordinator administrate all the funds.
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?			X	The coordinator did not establish the financial report due to the delay of receiving budget, so it is not easy to response to this question. Probably, the partners were forced to spend on other financial resources (projects,..) to accomplish their tasks on time.

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)	
Strengths	Multidisciplinary approaches Use modern and classical tools Scale of partners very high and their fields corresponding to the aims of project There a connection between this project and other consortium project that address the same theme
Weaknesses	Work on 5 legume cultures, 5 pathogens and 2 abiotic stresses it is so hard work to must accomplished in 3 years. No clear connection between most of the WP, especially concerning genetic material. It seems like each WP is more and less independent. The additional value of Medileg in the huge consortium network is not clearly explained. Lack information about results.

	The putative users are not involved in the project: tools, QTLs, genes, inoculums...
Recommendations	<p>While respecting the main objectives of the project, the expert encourages reducing the number of stresses and/or species in some WP if necessary.</p> <p>-One member of the review panel enhances clarifying the results which come from the effort MEDILEG and the results which are the results of the others project and consortium. That would help the follow up of the Medileg activities. Because some confusion could be induct to estimate some innovations not really belong to the project MEDILEG.</p> <p>Diego Rubiales explained during the meeting that he will detail in the publications and final report the % of each project.</p> <p>- Integrate potential users in the project.</p> <p>The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the Medileg project.</p>

Date: 30 June 2014

Expert name: Meriem LAOUAR

Email:Laouar_m@yahoo.fr ; m.laouar@ensa.dz



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
PESTOLIVE	MATEILLE Thierry (IRD)	Contribution of olive history for the management of soil-borne parasites in the Mediterranean basin

Summary

PESTOLIVE aims at producing knowledge and tools for a new and efficient management of plant-parasitic nematodes (PPN) and plant-pathogenic fungi (PPF) in olive cropping systems

1. olive domestication and breeding : phylogeography and population genetics
2. response of soil-borne organisms to domestication and breeding
3. response of soil-borne organisms to plant-resistance
4. response of soil-borne organisms to cropping systems

Twelve partners from seven countries are involved in this project, it demonstrate the common and high importance of this sector at the Mediterranean level. Instead of September 2012, the project started on April 3013 (8 months of delay).

The first year of PESTOLIVE was especially devoted to :

- surveys in the countries involved in the project and database constitution on
 - Olive phenotyping and genotyping
 - Diversity of soil-borne parasites
 - Plant-parasite interactions

Concrete achievement is fully satisfactory In terms of (i) networking and management and (ii) scientific results (Phylogeography and genetic structure of the olive tree on the whole Mediterranean basin, biodiversity of soil-borne communities and relation between soil-borne parasites and olive tree)

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		PESTOLIVE did not begin on September 2012 because most of the partners did not receive their funding. So, the kick-off meeting was held in April 2013.

Are the remaining objectives achievable?	X			In spite of the delay, many good results are obtained
Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties				
<p>The first year of PESTOLIVE was especially devoted to surveys in the countries involved in the project; all results are relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - selection of sampling areas according to the typology of olive tree (wild, feral, cultivated) and to its cultivation (traditional, high density, irrigated or not, etc.); - characterization of the olive trees and of the associated soil-borne organisms (using different accurate tools like morphobiometrics, biochemical and molecular markers) - A new list of PPN and PPF is in progress and reveals a very high richness of soil-borne parasites under olive. - Distribution maps will be developed in order to analyze spatial disseminations and/or isolation of the parasites, eventually to link distribution to olive domestication. - All the information recovered (species diversity, diversity within species, population levels, etc.) is now analyzed in order to link diversity with olive typology and to hierarchize the most informative environmental variables which are able to control the soil-borne diversity. <p>A first database of chDNA polymorphism and 10 nuclear microsatellites on 860 accessions including oleasters and cultivars. A first study of the genetic structure on the whole Mediterranean basin (860 accessions of oleasters and cultivars representative of the different Mediterranean gene pools) based on 10 nuclear microsatellite loci (SSR) and plastid markers. No major difficulties are encountered, it seems that the whole network is functioning in several thematic sub-networks and each sub-network is contributing by some results obtained apart from the present project. This situation can't be considered as a weakness since the objective of ARIMNet process is networking, sharing data an experiences and create synergetic research in the Mediterranean basin.</p>				
Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	X			Considering the large number of partners (12), the coordination and organization are rather good. At the beginning, the expert committee expected some management difficulties; it seems not to be the case? All the teams were already working together in small groups. Pestolive is a big group built with other groups. ARIMNet was the opportunity to gather all these partners.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	X			- Indeed, the results within WPs testify of the contribution of the different partners
Is the collaboration between partners effective?		X		- It's a bit early to measure the effectiveness of the collaboration between all the partners; nevertheless, the results obtained are an indicator of interconnected subgroups of partners
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?		X		- Yes, in case of recuperation of the delay
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?		X		- Six months
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	X			- Scientific papers (15) - Conferences (11)

Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Workshop - Research school and training
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?				
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's too early to expect some innovations, but we have already some in plant protection strategy
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The genetic structure of the olive tree on the whole Mediterranean basin in which we observe three main groups (Estern, Central and western group). The review panel members would becurious to know <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the situation of pathogens is similar and • about their relation with the type and the quality of the product?
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?	X			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The allocation of funds by some partners is the origin of the observed delay; once the budget is allocated, its management depends on national laws and rules of each country
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In some cases, the allocated budget is lower than the one initially planned; it is evident for Tunisia, for example, because many items are in progress according to the National research program; ARIMNet Budget is mainly dedicated to networking, sharing experiences and scientific results, technology transfer and mobility.

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although it was not expected, the high number of partners appeared as a strength; indeed because of the economic importance of olive sector in Mediterranean basin
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the project, one member of the review panel remarks that there is not any distinction between the two types of productions systems (oil and “table olives”) : once we go further in the chain the expert expects some differences between them?
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Even if there is no big problems to manage a so big number of partners, we recommend for the future, if possible, the constitution of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • two subgroups according to the olive production type or • three subgroups according to the tree genetic groups identified in the preliminary results <p>The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the PESTOLIVE project.</p>

Date: July 11th 2014

Expert name: Mohamed BEN HAMOUDA

Email: m.b.hammouda@iresa.agrinet.tn



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
PoH-MED	Didier Andrivon	Potato Health – Managed for Efficacy and Durability

Summary

PoH-MED (Potato Health – Managed for Efficacy and Durability) aims at delivering new solutions for the sustainable development of potato production around the Mediterranean Basin, in a context characterized by a wide variability of pedo-climatic conditions, market expectations, and pathogen profiles. It federates 11 partners from four countries (Algeria, Egypt, France and Morocco) around three workpackages, dedicated respectively to:

- 1) the genetic and phenotypic characteristics of major pathogens of the crop, both airborne (*Phytophthora infestans*, the cause of late blight) and soil and seed borne (*Rhizoctonia solani*, causing black scurf; *Ralstonia solanacearum*, the quarantine bacterium causing ring rot; and the *Pectobacterium/Dickeya* complex causing blackleg and tuber soft rot), to understand their movements across regions and their adaptive potential;
- 2) the performance of control means, including host resistance, resistance induction by natural molecules and irrigation management, and their integration into innovative cropping systems;
- 3) training and dissemination activities.

The first results obtained show that pathogen populations (especially those of *P. infestans*) share some characteristics, but also maintain some idiosyncrasies and specific adaptive patterns (including the ability to break the complex late blight resistance of cv Sarpo Mira by some Algerian isolates). They also show specific species distributions in pathogenic complexes of the soft-rot bacteria between France and Morocco. Further investigations are underway to analyse the extent of phenotypic variability for temperature response patterns, and of genetic and phenotypic polymorphisms in pathogens other than *P. infestans*.

Promising results regarding defense induction and resistance elicitation against soft rot in potato have been obtained with hydroxytyrosol, a molecule present in crude olive extracts. Similar effects have been also observed with infestine, an elicitor naturally produced in culture by *P. infestans*, and with some bacterial lipopolysaccharides. More trials on the perception of these molecules by plant cells are underway, and should help formulate these products for optimal results.

From a management and operational standpoint, and although the project already yielded its first –and promising – results, PoH-MED has been so far hindered by the late, and often very partial, availability of the allocated funds to the African partners. We therefore expect significant difficulties in completing the initial work programme in its entirety during the time frame allocated (1.1. 2013 – 31.12.2015), despite the considerable efforts made by partners to carry out the different trials they had proposed.

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	
				Comment

Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		-On WP1.1 one pathogen from five was delayed due to financial problem -The activities of WP2.1 is postpone to 2015 (financial problem) -WP2.3 not started yet (financial problem) - in WP3, the most important activities have not been done (financial problem)
Are the remaining objectives achievable?		X		The financial problem for the Algerian and Egyptian partner could be affecting the achievement of the remains objectives.
Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties				
Three collections of the most important pathogens are established and characterized. Structuration of some population of <i>P. infestans</i> showed some relationship between Algerian and France collections. Natural olive extracts have shown an induction of plant resistance against certain pathogenic bacteria pectinoletic. The search for the molecule responsible is underway. Other activities as the search for resistant cultivars, irrigation management ... have not been undertaken due to financial problem. The financial problem broke the dynamic of the project. All practical aspects remain unrealized.				
Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?		X		-Coordination, which is only related to research aspects, was disrupted by the financial and administrative problems of Algerian and Egyptian partners. -Despite the financial problems, the coordination has been efficient.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?		X		-
Is the collaboration between partners effective?		X		disrupted by the financial problem
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?		X		If the financial problems will not be solved. Other ways, some activities should be reduced or abandoned.
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?	X			Minimum 12 months
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	X			Two publications (journal and proceeding) and two publications in preparation.
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	X			website disrupted by the financial problem
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?			X	
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment

Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?		X		Natural elicitors secreted by plant olive to induce defense against some pathogens.
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?			X	
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?	X X			-Algerian partner have received just 20% of funding and no possibilities for mobility outside Algeria -Egypt problem : no financing -No progress of : WP2.1, WP2.3 and WP3
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?				The budget was made available at very different stage for the different partners Use of other sources of finance to overcome financial problems. The financial report has not done, so it is difficult to response to this question.

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Potato is a strategic culture in the Mediterranean region. -Multidisciplinary approach. They take into account the system of production included the pivot system -Development institute, research institute and high education structure are involved -There is a transfer of knowledge between the two sides through training students, organization of conferences, demonstration tests... -Some expected results can be transferred directly to users
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Just 4 countries, with 1 only from north side, it is not representative of Mediterranean region. -Financial problem (partners: Algeria and Egypt).
Recommendations	<p>An extension of the duration of the project should be asked in order to compensate the delay of funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - solve urgently the problem of financing of Algerian and Egyptian partners - Additional months to overcome the delay due to financial problem. - Integrate potential users <p>The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the POH-Med project.</p>

Date: 30 June 2014

Expert name: Meriem Laouar

Email : Laouar_m@yahoo.fr ; m.laouar@ensa.dz



FOLLOW UP MEETING PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
REFORMA	Paolo Annicchiarico	Resilient, water- and energy-efficient forage and feed crops for Mediterranean agricultural systems

Summary

REFORMA is dealing with an important and strategic issue, its main objective is to develop resilient, water- and energy-efficient forage and feed legume crops lucerne varieties with greater tolerance to severe drought, salinity, heat and grazing in the Mediterranean region,

It is focusing on:

- 1- pea varieties with greater drought tolerance than the available varieties, targeted to grain and forage production;
- 2- cost-efficient marker-assisted selection procedures for pea lucerne;
- 3- ecological breeding strategies for lucerne and pea;
- 4- optimal lucerne-based and pea-based forage crops in relation to legume plant types, associated grass or cereal species.

Nine (9) research institutions from Italy, France, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and USA are involved in this project

The project observed a substantial delay; nevertheless, the preliminary results tally with the objectives

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		X		- The project suffered from substantial delay (one year) caused by the late availability of funding for some institutions (Algeria).
Are the remaining objectives achievable?		?		- It depends on the Algerian partner; some important activities shall be cut off; so if an unexpected drastic cut of the initially approved budget for the Algerian institutions was confirmed.

Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties

According to the proposal, the preliminary results are relevant and in conformity with assigned objectives

- Lucerne phenotyping for moderate drought stress and forage quality
- Lucerne genotyping for responses to high temperatures, for grazing tolerance and for mixed cropping with grasses.
- Pea genotyping for severe drought stress
- Definition of MAS procedures
- Processing field preliminary experiments of different varieties in most Mediterranean-climate sites

As announced before, the major difficulty encountered was the delay of funding for some partners

Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?		X		- The results obtained, although preliminary because of the delay, testify the good coordination and organization of the project
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	X			- Indeed, the results within WPs testify of the contribution of the different partners
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	X			- According to the delay, It's a bit early to measure the effectiveness of the collaboration between all the partners; nevertheless, the results obtained are an indicator of interconnected subgroups of partners
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?		X		- Yes in case of prolongation?
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?	X			- 8 months, maybe more?

Publications / Patents / Outputs

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?				- Scientific papers (5) - Communications (3)
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?		X		- Work shop
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?			X	

Innovation Potential

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?	X			- New Pea and/or Lucerne varieties tolerant to severe drought, salinity, heat and grazing - QTL or other genetic markers with a high interest according to drought, salinity and heat

Other

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?			X	- It's too early, all results are preliminary
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?		X		- It depends on the laws and rules of each country...
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?				

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)	
Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The enthusiasm of the coordinator - The importance of the issue for the animal feeding in the Mediterranean basin
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The absence of a survey of the present situation and/or a prospective economic study concerning the importance of Lucerne and Pea in animal feeding
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mitigate the weakness - To consider the same research protocols for the cereals considered in association <p>The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the REFORMA project.</p>

Date: July 11th 2014

Expert name: Mohamed BEN HAMOUDA

Email: m.b.hammouda@iresa.agrinet.tn



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
SAFEMED	Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI	Food Safety regulations, market access and international competition

Summary

The SAFEMED Project aims at analyzing the conditions for an international co-regulation of food safety between North and South Mediterranean sides. It consists in analyzing the structure of the competition between supply chains of both sides and examining the possibilities for a coordination of public and private food safety strategies. The Project develops a multi-criteria analysis that makes it possible to conciliate:

1. The imperative of food safety, to assure European consumers' health via the provision of safe imports, and, at the same time, the health of South Mediterranean consumers that have to take advantage of the evolution of good agricultural practices at international level,
2. Producers' market access, given that agrifood exports represent an important factor of South countries' economic development,
3. Safe and fair competition among actors of North and South sides to avoid phenomena of "sanitary dumping" (derived from countries heterogeneity of food safety regulations).

Six partners are involved in this project. It's a cross-cutting strategic project dedicated to some agro food products and can be extended to other economically important products.

During the first year, a large literature review was carried out in the objective to delineate and prepare the ground for both field surveys and theoretical (normative) studies. It concerned different tasks:

- domestic and export supply chain organization
- importers' strategies and typologies of international supply chains
- Consumers' behavior toward food safety and protocol testing.
- public policies for food safety and their effectiveness

A very interesting literature review is carried out who forecast important results very useful for making decisions

Achievement of planned objectives / calendar

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment

Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?	X			
Are the remaining objectives achievable?	X			
Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties				
Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	X			- The number of meeting testify of the coordination and the organization of the project
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	X			- The number and the quality of publication, within the WPs, testify of the contribution of the different partners
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	X			- The number and the quality of publication testify of the effectiveness of collaboration between partners
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?	X			- Yes, according to work achieved, the schedule for completion of the project is fully consistent and realistic.
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?			X	
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	X			- A Book is edited : « <i>Sécurité sanitaire des aliments : régulation, analyses économiques et retours d'expériences</i> » Ed. Hermes-Lavoiser, p 322. - Chapters in books (5) - Scientific papers (10) - Doctoral thesis (8) - Communications (13)

Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - website « ORFIQUAD » financed by AFD and INRA : https://www6.inra.fr December 2013, with dedicated location to SAFEMED project (https://www6.inra.fr/orfiquad/Projets/Projet-SAFEMED) - A dozen “physical” meetings (Paris, Madrid, Rabat, Alicante, Bologna, Algiers, etc.). Several meetings were held by Skype and phone.
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?				
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will allow a good visibility to policy makers to make good decisions
Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?				
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?				As for the foreseen scientific tasks, most of the activities have been maintained even though problems have emerged associated with the drastic reduction in funding and/or the non-availability of funding at the expected time, for some partners. Considering budget and administrative problems, minor and limited adjustments may be done?
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?				

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)

Strengths	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The project is dealing with an important economic issue “up to date” and provides concrete tools to policy makers- The achievement of a large literature revue is a strong background and an incurrence to the upcoming tasks of the project
Weaknesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The project is not well connected with some other ARIMNet projects dedicated to some strategic products
Recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- More coordination and interactivity with other ARIMNet projects could be enhanced.- Other products with high economic value could be included <p>Nevertheless, the review panel recommends carrying on the support of the SAFEMED project.</p>

Date: July 11th 2014

Expert name: Mohamed Ben HAMOUDA

Email: m.b.hammouda@iresa.agrinet.tn



FOLLOW UP MEETING

PROJECT DETAILS

Acronym	Coordinator	Title
SWIPE	Einat Zchori-Fein	Predicting whitefly population outbreaks in changing environments

Summary

The research work carried out so far responds generally to the scientific goals of the work plan. The obtained results are interesting, very promising and can create innovation. Special care should be given to the fulfilment of the WP2. The coordination of the project is excellent and the collaboration between the partners satisfactory. The mid-term report should be completed with the financial report.

	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project progress according to the original description and milestones?		+		<p>The progress of the project is generally good and the milestones have been fulfilled so far. However the WP2, an important part of the total project, has not practically started yet for objective reasons (withdrawal of the Swiss partner). The solution which is proposed (French student spending two months working with Dr. Aebi) creates questions for the success of this effort. The coordinator should maybe clarify which data of the WP2 should be omitted. The change in the initial plan concerning the WP1 is scientifically correct. One member of the review panel wonders if the number of the selected individuals <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> (480) is enough to determine successfully the goals of the WP1. It is also necessary to be reported the number of the selected individuals per each country. The obtained so far results are interesting especially those of WP4. In the mid-term report there are no financial data related to the implemented activities.</p>

Are the remaining objectives achievable?	+			It should be speeded up the whole work for the completion on time of the goals of the project. The good expertise of the participants in the project in the relative WPs guarantees the achievement of the objectives but more time e.g. at least six months is necessary for the success finish of the project
Relevance and originality of main results /Encountered difficulties				
The prediction of the evolution of the <i>Bemisia tabacci</i> with the application of the appropriate model based on real data produced in the Mediterranean basin gives originality in the project. The encountered difficulties are mainly related with the WP2.				
Involvement of partners /Coordination and Management of the project				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Are the coordination and organization of the project efficient?	+			Although the project consists from thirteen partners from six different countries, it seems that no coordination problems have been reported so far and the organization of the project is good.
Is the contribution of each partner clearly identifiable?	+			It could be useful to clarify if the new partner in the Turkish team (General Directorate of Agricultural Research and Policy and Ankara University) will undertake the same duties and responsibilities related to WP1 of the previous partner (University of Cukurova).
Is the collaboration between partners effective?	+			
Is the schedule for completion of the project consistent /realistic?		+		The duration of the project should be extended by at least six months (completion of WP2)
Should we expect the project to be delayed? How long (in months)?	+			Due to the delay for the materialization of WP2, this will influence the output of WP4. It is expected a delay about six months for finishing the project.
Publications / Patents / Outputs				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Did the project already result in publications, patents or other outputs?	+			It is good, as enough number of publications has been submitted so far. However relative information should also be reported to the public services at Central e.g. Ministry of Agriculture and Regional level and also to the cooperatives and groups of growers.
Did the teams communicated about the project (website, workshop, symposium,...) ?	+			The communication activities implemented so far are satisfactory.
Did the project already had unexpected other impacts?			+	
Innovation Potential				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Do you think that the project results could create innovation? What is the innovation potential of the project?	+			The development of a model predicting the influence of climate change on <i>B. tabaci</i> biotype/population outbreaks is an innovative fact. The achieved results so far can produce innovation in this issue.

Other				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there a significant result that especially got your attention and interest?	+			The obtained indications that the primary symbionts of <i>B. tabaci</i> supplement the insect diet with carotenoids and amino acids are very interesting. Moreover the possible presence of the <i>Bemisia tabaci</i> during the whole year due to climate change consists in useful information for future plant protection programmes and tasks.
Budget				
	Yes	Partly	No	Comment
Is there any difficulty in the funding management of the project? If yes, does it impact the progress of the project?	-	-	-	There are no financial data and any information concerning funding in the mid-term (18 months) report.
Is the state of consumption of the budget allocated coherent with the schedule and state of progress of the project?	-	-	-	See above comment

General advice and Recommendations (prolongation, evolution of activities,...)	
Strengths	The high quality and expertise of the researches participating in the project. The innovative way of tackling the targets. The excellent capacity and expertise of the coordinator
Weaknesses	The big number of the participating partners may influence the level of coordination and cooperation. The possible lack of some data of the WP2 may weaken the significance of the expected results.
Recommendations	The work in all the WPs should be speeded up, especially for the WP2, as many data are expected to be recorded. The insect collections task, if the available time allows doing that, may be continued for increasing the number of individuals and have more information about the genetic variability of the individuals. If at the end of the project some more scientific topics are raised, it should be examined the possible continuation of the project in ARIMNet2, so that the problem of controlling the whitefly in the Mediterranean basin to be solved. The review panel recommends carrying on the support of the SWIPE project.

Date: 24/6/2014

Expert name: Dr. S. Vizantinopoulos
Email: sp.vizant@nagref.gr