During a full-day meeting, the 3DSSC consortium presented their work done within the consortium, as well as demonstrated a TRL4 prototype. From the consortium the following people were present:

- Erik de Schutter and Philippe Delforge, representing FRS
- , representing KU Leuven.

The role of each partner is clear after the review meeting, and the collaboration—even when some people at FRS are also affiliated with KU Leuven—is clear and fruitful.

The project focuses on automatic "shaving" of factory-produced cheeses, so that the shaved cheese can be further processed (e.g., to produce slices, or whatever). The project is clearly focused of reducing production costs at large cheese production facilities in Europe, while at the same time reducing dependency on seasonal workers. The two most important factors of the system are (*) dependability and (*) cost-effectiveness.

The current solution to "cheese-shaving" is by manual shaving with a planer. Measured quantities are time as well as the amount of material lost. In the latter, the goal of the manufacturer is not to create healthy produce, but rather to remove as little as possible of the cheese while removing all plastic coating. This quality measure is obtained by visual inspection plus weight of removed cq. remaining material.

Taking the above restrictions into account, the 3DSSC consortium explained their algorithmic choices. For a non-applied approach and fascinating demo, force or impedance control would be the preferred approach. In this case, the time constraints—the system should not be more than XX% slower than the human to be commercially viable—prohibit the use of a feedback system, and the group decided for a different approach. In this approach, a high-precision scan is evaluated and used to generate a trajectory in Cartesian space. This trajectory is then followed by the robot, while shaving the cheese.

One can be critical about the consortium not following the initial proposal and plan. There are two answers to this. First, the consortium has a strong drive to place their development on the market, and the customer interest to underline it. Second, this decision, as well as the others that deviate from the plan (or do not), are always supported by a strong grasp of the underlying control theory, and in each and every case such decisions are well-founded and can, at the review meeting, be satisfactorily explained.

All in all, the technical presentations clearly showed the solid (albeit sometimes uninspiring) R&D behind the project, and the excellent reasoning behind the setup of the system. The demo then clearly certifies the soundness of the approach. The system is at best at TRL 4, while technical improvements still need to be made. Furthermore, the deployment until TRL 9 will be cost-, time- and work-intensive. But then, FRS is negotiating contracts with two large European producers, with NDAs already in place. It is highly credible that this development will survive the end of Echord funding.

In the situations where the consortium decided not to follow the proposal their choices were well-founded and saved time or money. The low TRL is somewhat disappointing, but not worrisome because of existing customer contact. A good or excellent project, in which Echord did a good thing in funding it—how else would this scientifically boring work be done?