

# COST OFFICE Open Call

[Go Back to my Proposal](#)

## EEP CONSENSUS RESULTS FOR

Proposal reference **oc-2008-2-2873**

Title: Challenges in Fully-Adaptive Spoken Dialogue Systems

| EEP       | A1 | A2 | B1 | B2 | B3 | C1 | C1-A | C1-B | C1-C | C2 | C3 | D1 | D2 | D3 | E1 | E2 | E3 | Totals    |
|-----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|------|------|------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------|
| Consensus | 2  | 3  | 3  | 2  | 3  | B  |      | 2    |      | 2  | 2  | 3  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 2  | 3  | <b>33</b> |

### Comments

**Author**

**Comment**

Consensus  
13 Feb, 2009 12:03 pm

**A. CRITICAL CRITERIA**  
This proposal doesn't really look like a COST Action proposal but more like a very ambitious research project addressing all possible problems related to adaptive spoken dialogue systems, ranging from feature extraction, speech recognition, dialogue systems, and even emotion. Also, the consortium is mainly (only) composed of academic partners spanning a very large set of expertises. However, as a COST proposal, this is really below standard and the motivations for such a specific action is not clearly given.

**B. SCIENCE**  
Even as a very large research project, the stated goals of the proposal are far too ambitious and are definitely not achievable, especially in the context of a COST Action. In addition, evaluation of progress is also very poorly defined (evaluation of what, at what level, etc?). Databases are mentioned several times, but it is not clear what will actually be collected.

**C. IMPACT**  
The impact was believed to be very questionable since it is difficult to believe that such a large and diverse team of partners has the potential to exploit reasonable synergies around such a generic proposal. In spite of all the claims, the actual objectives of the proposal and evaluation measures are not clearly spelled out (size of data, why is it necessary to collect more data, what and how evaluation will take place, and at what level). Since links with existing (EU) projects are not discussed in a convincing way (besides a mere list of "related" project), it is really not clear what the impact of the proposed Action could be.

**D. STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION**  
Not clear and definitely too fragmented for such an Action. Workplan, milestones, and deliverables are only very roughly addressed, providing no clear guidance or progress monitoring for the project.

**E. CONTRIBUTION TO WIDER COST GOALS**  
Such large and multi-disciplinary group action had the potential to reach wider goals, given the importance of the problem and the fact that the targeted technologies are definitely lagging behind. Unfortunately, in the way it is currently formulated, it was not believed that any of those goals could be reached in the context of the present proposal.

**F. OVERALL RECOMMENDATION**  
F.1 Strength of the proposal:  
This proposal contains a lot of knowledge and a great number of experts, and many of them collaborated before. It could thus have been interesting to bring such a large group of experts together, basically overarching the whole field of adaptive spoken dialog system.

F.2 Weaknesses of the proposal:  
Goals are not clear at all, and are far too ambitious with no clear common objective(s) and evaluation criteria. Purely academic research without clear strategy on how to transfer the results into practical use. The Economic Dimension is missing.

### Rated Questions

**A - CRITICAL CRITERIA**

- A1 IS THIS RIGHT FOR COST? Is COST the right funding mechanism for achieving the proposal's objectives?**
4. Proposal is very suitable for networking of European national research teams.
  3. Proposal is quite suitable for networking of European national research teams; any defects can be easily remedied (specify in Comments).
  2. Proposal is unsuitable for networking of European national research teams; includes ineligible or inappropriate aspects (specify in Comments);
  1. Proposal is completely unsuitable for networking of European national research teams.
- A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 MEANS REJECTION
- A2 DOES THE PRESENTATION MEET THE STANDARD OF A COST MoU? Is the proposal presented in a clear, convincing, and appropriate way?**
4. Very clearly written with compelling argument; fully appropriate format.
  3. Well written; argument is easy to follow; appropriate format but may need minor changes for MoU (specify in Comments);
  2. Poorly written, but argument can be followed with effort; and/or defective format.
  1. Poorly written; argument is unclear; and/or inappropriate format.
- A SCORE OF 2 OR 1 MEANS REJECTION
- 

**B - SCIENCE**

- B1 Does the proposed Action address real current problems/scientific issues?**
- 4: Highly exciting and interesting proposal on a very important and/or timely topic.
  3. Interesting proposal on an important topic.
  2. Some interesting aspects, but not clearly an important or timely topic.
  1. Serious lack of substance and/or relevance.
- B2 Does the proposed Action show awareness of the state-of-the-art of the relevant scientific/ technical fields?**
- 4: Excellent and up to date awareness of relevant scientific/technical fields
  3. Good awareness of relevant fields.
  2. Defective awareness of relevant fields.
  1. Serious lack of awareness of relevant fields.
- B3 Is the proposed Action innovative?**
4. Highly innovative: identifies a significant new problem and/or a significant new approach.
  3. Innovative in some notable aspects.
  2. Not very innovative: the topic is already well-studied and/or the proposal largely follows a well-trodden approach.
  1. Not at all innovative.
- 

**C - IMPACT**

- C1 A COST Action may make impacts in various valuable directions. This Action mainly aims at impacts in :**
- (1) meeting European economic or societal needs [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1A
  - (2) developing the scientific or technological field [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1B
  - (3) both (1) and (2) [YES] [NO] If YES go to C.1C
- NOTE: Score only ONE of the three alternatives
- C1-A If the proposed Action aims primarily to meet European economic or societal needs, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
  3. Some notable impacts likely.
  2. May be some minor impacts.
  1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.
- C1-B If the proposed Action aims primarily to contribute to the development of the scientific or technological field, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
  3. Some notable impacts likely.
  2. May be some minor impacts.
  1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.
- C1-C If the proposed Action aims BOTH to meet European economic or societal needs, AND to contribute to the development of the scientific or technological field, how likely is it to achieve useful impacts?**
4. Important impacts very likely in several respects.
  3. Some notable impacts likely.
  2. May make some minor impacts.
  1. Unlikely to make useful impacts.
- C2 Are there clear plans for stimulating the production of high quality outputs?**
4. Plans for outputs are clear, wide-ranging and ambitious.
  3. Plans for outputs are reasonable.
  2. Plans for outputs are unambitious or defective.
  1. Plans for outputs are minimal or absent.
- C3 Is attention given to the potential application of results (including, where appropriate, fostering their commercial exploitation)?**
4. Plans for application of results are clear, wide-ranging and ambitious.
  3. Plans for application of results are reasonable.
  2. Plans for application of results are unambitious or defective.
  1. Plans for application of results are minimal or absent.
- 

**D - STRUCTURE AND ORGANISATION**

- D1 **Are the workplan and organisation appropriate?**
4. Workplan and organisation make full, productive and cost-effective use of COST opportunities.
  3. Workplan and organisation are reasonable.
  2. Workplan and/or organisation show some defects.
  1. Workplan and/or organisation are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
- D2 **Are the time schedule and the setting of milestones appropriate?**
4. Schedule and milestones are well-defined and practical.
  3. Schedule and milestones are reasonable.
  2. Schedule and/or milestones show some defects.
  1. Schedule and/or milestones are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
- D3 **Are appropriate plans made for monitoring and evaluating the achievement of objectives?**
4. Monitoring and evaluation plans are well-defined and practical.
  3. Monitoring and evaluation plans are reasonable.
  2. Monitoring and evaluation plans show some defects.
  1. Monitoring and evaluation plans are lacking or inappropriate or unclear.
- 

## **E - CONTRIBUTION TO WIDER COST GOALS**

- E1 **How well does the proposed Action aim to involve early stage researchers?**
4. Extensive and substantive plans for involving early stage researchers including the organisation of Training Schools.
  3. Reasonable and substantive plans for involving early stage researchers.
  2. Promises to involve early stage researchers, but no substantive plans.
  1. No attention given to early stage researchers.
- E2 **How well does the proposed Action aim at gender balance?**
4. Extensive and substantive plans for gender balance.
  3. Reasonable and substantive plans for gender balance.
  2. Promises to achieve gender balance, but no substantive plans.
  1. No attention given to gender balance.
- E3 **Will the proposed Action attract interest from a wide range of European countries?**
4. Proposers reflect a wide range of countries, and the topic is likely to attract very wide interest.
  3. Proposers reflect a reasonable range of countries, and the topic will attract wide interest.
  2. Proposers reflect a quite narrow range of countries, and/or the topic is of quite limited interest.
  1. Proposers are from a narrow range of countries, and/or the topic is of only narrow interest.
-