

Geosci. Commun. Discuss., referee comment RC2
<https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-29-RC2>, 2021
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

Comment on gc-2021-29

Alexey Pavlov (Referee)

Referee comment on "How to get your message across: designing an impactful knowledge transfer plan in a European project" by Sara Pasqualetto et al., Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2021-29-RC2>, 2021

Review

General comments

Authors share their experience with knowledge transfer, dissemination and communication activities conducted during the EU-funded project APPLICATE.

After reflecting on the read MS, I got reaffirmed that evaluating the impact of a project is not easy, particularly given the ambiguity of the definition of impact and the time needed to make the impact (often, beyond the project timeline).

This work will be useful for planning and implementation of knowledge transfer activities in future EU projects, and hopefully, provide valuable insights for the EU commission and other funding agencies. I recommend accepting the MS after minor revisions have been made.

Specific comments and Technical corrections

I encourage authors to re-read the MS and consider shortening / streamlining.

Title: The title specifically mentions EU projects. Is there anything that can be done to make the findings relevant for non-Eu funded projects?

Abstract: If space allows, considering adding 1-2 sentences at the end of the abstract text summarizing key messages and findings to make the abstract more focused and useful.

Line 44 – Remove double parenthesis

Line 48 – Should it be "Indicators" rather than "Indications"?

Line 49 – "Roadmap" instead of "Road map"?

Line 57 - As a person not familiar with the project structure, I feel like it's time to introduce the structure of the project at this stage, incl. a figure/graphic summarizing linkages between different WPs, User Group, and teams (KT, Communication, User Engagement, Education, Clustering, etc.)

Line 63 – Stakeholders and users are mentioned in this paragraph, but the definition and clarification comes much later (Lines 144-145). Consider defining both already here.

Line 104 – out of curiosity, was there a coordination between different WPs when it comes to dissemination of results and engagement with community?

Line 108 – could please provide several examples of "targeted activities"?

Line 108 – Is the word "team" missing after the word "... dissemination"?

Line 135 – how were policy briefs communicated?

Line 146 – how do you define "pro-active"?

Line 160 – NGOs and public sector are not mentioned among UG members. Was it the case? If so, was it intentional? I am just curious here.

Line 161 – word "external" is used twice

Line 165 – please give 1-2 examples here?

Line 167 – either "data" or "Information"?

Line 196 – even though readers can check Schneider & Fugmann (2020), I encourage authors to add 1-2 sentences key outcomes of the survey.

Line 214 – consider adding 1-2 examples of clustering activities here or earlier in this section.

Lines 217-220 – this part highlights the challenge of impact tracking during the timeline of the project. The definition of impact in this work (and project) is different compared to the one mentioned in Lines 22-23. With the definition of impact by the EU commissions, I wonder, if the impact can be fully assessed during the project timeline. Can authors think of a recommendation for the funding agencies here?

Lines 223-319 – the sub-sections are defined based on the type of activity. I wonder whether authors considered arranging this part of the MS based on the target audience?

Lines 231-232 – how does one monitor and evaluate meetings and workshops?

Line 234 – events and initiatives

Line 236 – what are the criteria required by the European commission?

Line 245 – Items #5 is not reflected in the Figure 1. Is it on purpose?

Line 283 – How short?

Lines 312-313 – Again, authors highlight the challenge of timeline. Do you have any

recommendations or solutions to solve the issue?

Line 315 – it would be interesting to see a breakdown of UG members per sector.

Line 332 – byproducts?

Line 340 – consider adding 2-3 sentences summarizing takeaway messages from Schneider & Fugmann (2020)

Lines 341-357 – I wonder what was the main driving force of clustering activities? Was it more of top-down approach or rather bottom-up, with cases when researchers in different EU (and non-EU projects) found ways for synergies and cooperation irrespective of planned clustering activities? Could you please comment on that?

Line 350 – a space missing before (Notz et al ...)

Line 358 – suggest introducing KT abbreviation here or earlier in text and use it throughout the MS

Line 361 – is "APPLICATE's users and stakeholders contacts" the same as the UG?

Lines 375-380 – I must admit that I am surprised that 55% of respondents had not heard of any dissemination material produced by the project! Are there any lessons one can learn from that? Any recommendations can be given?

Figure 3 – please add Y axis on graph 2

Figure 4 – the figure takes a lot of space. Consider removing it and rather mentioning 4-5 key words

Lines 420-423 - I agree that absolute numbers are not always useful. Other indicators, like engagement rate or other similar values divided by the number of followers are more representative.

Line 434 – Evaluations of

Lines 458-476 – Consider splitting this part into two (or several), for examples recommendations for funding agencies and recommendations for project managers.