**Proofs of Concept**

**Executive report for Roadmap consideration**

**Scenario x.y**

**<<Tool name & version>>**

**Revision: [draft, 1, 2, ...]**

**Authors:**

**Name (Organisation)**

**……**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project co-funded by the European Commission within the ICT Policy Support Programme** | | |
| **Dissemination Level** | | |
| **P** | **Public** |  |
| **C** | **Confidential, only for members of the consortium and the Commission Services** |  |

**Revision History**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rev.** | **Date** | **Author** | **Organisation** | **Description** |
| 3 | 9 Aug 2013 | M. Drescher | EGI.eu | Used DCH-RP deliverable template, adopted section structure from RA reports |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table of Contents

1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

1.1 Grading 3

1.2 Recommendations 3

2 TITLE 1 4

2.1 TITLE 2 4

2.1.1 Title 3 4

3 Conclusion 5

ANNEx 1 6

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

<<Provide a summary of the document content. Should be no more than one page excluding grading and recommendations>>

## Grading

<<Provide an overview of the tool/service grading. Each grading mentioned here must be discussed in the document’s main body, and the graded aspect must be defined in Annex 1.>>

For an explanation and the definitions of the various aspects see Annex 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Aspect** | **Score** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Recommendations

<<This section should provide specific recommendations to the Roadmapping committee in WP3, if any.>>

# Scenario overview

<<A brief summary of the scenario. The scenario is expected to be described in detail elsewhere and be linked here.>>

## document structure

<<A brief run-down of the document and the section goals for the reader’s orientation>>

## Scenario / Tool testing environment

<<Describe here the environment and condition under which the tests were executed. Strike a balance between brevity and accuracy as required.>>

# <<Tool 1>>

<<As many sections as tools may be added here, perhaps with a similar or identical structure.>>

<<This takes the description of the tool.>>

## Data sets

<<A description of and reference to the data set that is used for this report.>>

## Test description

<<A brief summary of the test execution and what it tries to solve. Detailed test descriptions are expected to be documented elsewhere and referenced here.>>

## Results

<<A discussion of the findings etc.>>

# Conclusion

<<Looking at all results of all tools in a bigger picture, describe any conclusions consequences that should be drawn out of this activity>>

# ANNEx 1

This annex provides an extensive list of aspects that were assessed during the Proof of Concept reported in this document. For each discussed aspect a definition and the respective grading scale is provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **<<Aspect name>>** | |
| <<Aspect definition>> | |
| Grade | Description |
| n/a | <<Description of the grading>> |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **<<Aspect name>>** | |
| <<Aspect definition>> | |
| Grade | Description |
| 1 | <<Description of the grading>> |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **<<Aspect name>>** | |
| <<Aspect definition>> | |
| Grade | Description |
| 1 | <<Description of the grading>> |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **<<Aspect name>>** | |
| <<Aspect definition>> | |
| Grade | Description |
| 1 | <<Description of the grading>> |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |