TEMPLATE FOR THE PEER REVIEW REPORT

The template hereafter provides the structure for the peer review report that needs to be prepared by the peer reviewers.

The report is submitted to the SERSCIDA Project Coordinator at the email lsk@hrc.unsa.ba or for attachments larger than 2MB at serscida@gmail.com.

If the peer review expert feels that he/she does not have the competence or the information to answer a question, he/she must declare it in the corresponding sections.

PEER REVIEW REPORT

Grant Agreement number:	288985
Project Acronym:	SERSCIDA
Project title:	Support for Establishment of National/Regional Social Science Data Archives
Funding Scheme:	FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2011-1
Project starting date:	01 Jan 2012
Project duration:	30 Jun 2014
Name of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator and organisation:	University of Sarajevo, Human Rights Centre
Project web site:	www.serscida.eu
Work package reviewed:	WP2
Date and place of review meeting (if applicable):	
Name(s) of peer reviewer(s):	Adrian Dusa - - -
Name of the Project Coordinator:	Lejla Somun-Krupalija

1. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

a. Executive summary

Comments, in particular highlighting the scientific/technical achievements of the Work package, and its impact:

The SERSCIDA project aims to extend a previously FP6 funded project called CESSDA-PPP, of which one of the working packages related to extending the netword of the European social data archives.
The objectives of the WP2 refer to mapping the existing potentials in a number of previously unchartered countries from the former Republic of Yugoslavia, where a lot of social science activity exists but very few are scientifically documented and preserved for secondary analysis.
All the country reports analysed present a clear scientific study of the social science community in these countries, by means of a survey which reached a large number of academics by means of a rich interviewing methods: face to face, online, telephone etc.
The results were then mapped to the current legal system that frames the research activity, and identifies the different possibilities to establish a standard data archiving activity under various societal conditions.
In my assessment, the objectives of the work package are therefore fully achieved, with very good prospects for the next related activities.

☒ Excellent progress (the project has fully achieved its objectives and technical goals for the work package or has even exceeded expectations).

☐ Good progress (the project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the work package with relatively minor deviations).

☐ Acceptable progress (the project has achieved some of its objectives for the work package; however, corrective action will be required)

☐ Unsatisfactory progress (the project has failed to achieve critical objectives for the work package and/or is not at all on schedule).

b. Overall recommendations (e.g. on overall modifications, corrective actions at WP level, or for other reasons, like re-focusing…).

It is a very good result to map the existing potential and reveal the current practices in the academic community. The only recommentation is to complement that with an intensive communication activity within the community, given that an overall success of this project is dependent on the degree of acceptance by the researchers and data producers.
While admitting that archiving the data is beneficial for scientific research, the study shows that most of the data producers are still reluctant to deposit their data to a public archive, even within tight access conditions.
Potentially, the PR activity whould be accompanied by a series of training sessions for data producers with respect to data management and data documentation.

2. WORK PACKAGE OBJECTIVES and WORKPLAN

a. Progress towards WP project objectives: Have the objectives for the work package been achieved?

x		
Yes	Partially	No

Comments

The reports presented reveal an important potential of the academic community to develop a systematic and standardized data archiving activity. There is a lot of expertise from various scientific fields relevant to this project, from social science departments to computer centers which can provide the relevant hardware infrastructure.

B. Milestones and deliverables: Have planned milestones and deliverables been achieved for the work package?

x		
Yes	Partially	No

Comments

From the description of work in the WP2, the deliverable are due to be submitted in month 10, which also corresponds to the second milestone in the SERSCIDA project.
All the reports were sent in a timely fashion, and they are relevant to the objectives of the WP2.

3. USE AND DISSEMINATION

a. Impact: Is there evidence that the objectives of the work packages has/will produce significant scientific, technical, commercial, social, or environmental impacts (where applicable)?

x			
Yes	Partially	No	Not applicable

Comments

Definitely, this kind of activity has a lot pf potential for a scientific and social impact.
A positive proof to this assessment if a similar activity of a similar activity which took place in neighboring countries like Romania and Hungaria (as part of the former EDAN network), which to the present day are fully integrated in the CESSDA network and actively contributing to the developement of both standards and data archiving tools and procedures.
As a direct result of that activity, the RODA - Romanian Social Data Archive has been granted a project worth 500,000 euro to upgrade its infrastructure to international standards.

b. Dissemination: Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results and information adequately (publications, conferences…)?

☐	☒	☐
Yes	Partially	No

Comments

There is little evidence from the country reports that preliminary results have been disseminated in the academic community and relevant stakeholders. However, this activity was not part of the WP2 objectives and I asume this is an activity which will be covered by some other work package.
In addition, a proper dissemination activity should include not only this initial survey of the community, but also the resultsand the conclusion of the project as a whole. However, this first survey and contact with the community can also partly be considered dissemination, as many researchers are now aware of the future possibilities of this project.

c. Please identify potential information that should be disseminated to:

- Policy makers

Governmental agencies, local authorities, various Ministries and decision makers dealing with public policies.

- The scientific community

Researchers from all scientific domains, as the next framework program Horizon2020 intends to involve scientists from many scientific areas in common, interdisciplinary activities that are targeted to solving real life problems that involve human populations.
In addition, data producers, either as individual researchers or research institutes and University departments dealing with producing social science data.

- The general public

The general population might be interested in the results of this project, given that proper (non-scientific) dissemination tools are provided.
NGOs and other public associations are particularly subject of a targeted public.

- A specific group of end users

The decision makers which deal with the national roadmap of research infrastructure, as the data archives resulted from this project have a very good potential of being integrated in the European network of data archives, which is now a pan-European priority in the landscape of large scale research infrastructures present in the ESFRI roadmap.

d. Involvement of potential users and stakeholders: Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved (if applicable)?

x			
Yes	Partially	No	Not applicable

Comments

The target public that was surveyed as part of the activity in this WP overlap in a very large proportion the potential usrs and major stakeholders.
Researchers can be both data producers, when they design their own research frameworks, and data users, when they re-use other colleagues' data in a process of secondary analysis.
With a subsequent activity of PR and a series of training sessions, these key stakeholders have the largest potential for making a big impact as a result of the SERSCIDA project.

4. OTHER ISSUES

If applicable comment on whether other relevant issues (e.g ethical, policy-related/regulatory, safety and gender issues) have been handled appropriately.

x		
Yes	Partially	No

Comments

The activity resulted from this WP obeys the usual scientific standards for social science research.

Name (s) of the expert(s):	Adrian Dusa
Date:	17.10.2013
Signature(s):	