

Ref.: CERIM – Internal meeting at the Innovation Conference in Salzburg
Minutes

Date: October 23' 2009

Time: 9.00 to 12 a.m.

Attachments: Presentation internal meeting
Presentation on administrative issues

Participants

N°.	Partner	Name
PP2	Valdeal	Klara Stumpf
PP2	Valdeal	Peter Csikos
PP3	SAS	Ivan Chodak
PP3	SAS	Sylvester Salis
PP4	Chemnitz	Peter Häfner
PP5	ITG Salzburg	Thomas Reisinger
PP5	ITG Salzburg	Oliver Wagner
PP6	Forum Gryf	Zofia Gliszczynska
PP7	IRI	Manca Poglajen
PP7	IRI	Slavko Dolinsek
PP8	inno	Nils Gabrielsson
PP8	inno	Kailey Peng
PP9	Zilina	Michal Janovcik
PP9	Zilina	Marian Majchrak

Agenda

WP n°	Topic
WP1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflection and review of the conference and workshop 2. Review of P1 and P2 Actions and Outputs focusing on compliance with the project plan and needs for corrective action 3. Financial reporting – open issues and lessons learned so far 4. Next steps – actions and meetings 5. Next study trip and reflections on the UK study trip 6. SC-meeting – if needed 7. Management and Coordination

1 Reflection and review of the conference and workshop

The meeting started with a review of and discussion about the seminar and workshop of the previous day. Oliver Wagner of ITG expressed his satisfaction with both seminar and workshop and thanked the project partners for their contributions. He highlighted in particular the following:

- a) That the service sector is of such importance to Salzburg that specific policy measures must be launched (or existing ones adapted) in order to optimise growth conditions for new, knowledge based companies. Therefore, the workshop was of great value as it resulted in a number of ideas for which policy measures that would provide added value in the regional support portfolio.
- b) The key challenge, in the perspective of ITG, is to motivate clients to demand innovative services. Many sectors still do not realise the potential that lies in the application of innovative services for their own business.

As the seminar and workshop focused on good practice approaches to service-related tech transfer and on raising new ideas for broadening of the policy measure portfolio, a key issue was the communication of outputs towards policy makers. This was secured through the ITG, which is both an innovation policy developing actor as well as an implementing agency, i.e. it runs certain types of policy measures on behalf of the Land Salzburg.

Also during the review, it was further stated that although there are many commonalities and shared challenges between the project partners regarding tech transfer there are also important differences. One such difference can be related to the motivation of researchers to engage in tech transfer activities. This motivation seems to differ significantly between old and new member states.

2 Review of P1 and P2 Actions and Outputs focussing on compliance with the project plan and needs for corrective action

The partners jointly reviewed the activities carried out in period 1 & 2 focussing on compliance with the project plan and needs for corrective action. It was concluded that with only a few exceptions all foreseen activities are concluded as according to the project plan.

In particular this goes for WP3, which was concluded with the policy seminar and workshop the previous days. Also, the first study trip (to the UK) was carried out in accordance with the plan. Two learning workshops have been organised, the first in Bratislava during the launch conference and the second in UK within the frame of the study trip. Furthermore, the self-assessment tool has been developed, tested and made available on the project home page. The tool has on-line functionalities as well as material for internal partner workshops.

The self-assessment exercises of the individual project partners have not yet been completed but this is foreseen for period 3. The activities “Information events targeting researchers” and “Bilateral discussions with researchers” have commenced but will continue with intensified efforts in period 3. A more detailed view of the status of the individual Actions/outputs are provided in the table below and in the attached presentation.

Activities M1 - M12	When	Resp.	Status
Partnership agreement	End of Nov.	LP	Done
6-monthly progress reports		LP + PPs	On-going
6-monthly financial reports		LP + PPs	On-going
Updated web-site	Each quarter	All PPs	On-going
Communication plan	End of Nov.	LP + PPs	Done
Launch conference	Mid Nov.	PP3	Done

Activities M1 - M12	When	Resp.	Status
Project web-site and knowledge management directory	End of Nov.	LP	On-going
Documentation/description of relevant policies, policy documents and RTT strategies	Cont. until M9	All	Done
Documentation/description of existing policy instruments supporting RTT	Cont. until M9	All	Done
Documentation/description of relevant RTT-models / networks / structures including their achievements	Cont. until M10	All	Done
Policy Seminar	M13	PP5	Done
Good practice cases of Central Europe models for RTT	M12	PP8	Done
Profiles of organisations active in technology transfer	M12	LP	Done

Activities M1 - M12	When	Resp.	Status
Learning workshop 1	Mid Dec.	PP8	Done (at launch conference)
Learning workshop 2	M8	PP2	Done (UK study trip)
Visits to successful regional tech transfer models	M7	PP2	Done
A jointly developed Self Assessment Tool available and functioning on web site	M10	PP8	Done
1st self assessment exercise + 1st peer review + 1st SA-report	M10-M12	All	On-going? Lagging?
Information events targeting researchers	M1 - M20	All	On-going? Lagging?
Bilateral discussions with researchers	M1 - M20	All	On-going? Lagging?

3 Financial reporting – open issues and lessons learned so far

WP n°	Topic
WP1	<p>Admin Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting issues • Follow-up 1st Progress Report • Current reporting status • Next reporting deadlines • Lessons learned • Underspending

- **Reporting issues/ Follow-up 1st Progress Report**

The partners were reminded about the JTS requests for clarifications on the 1st Progress Report and the Preparation of the 2nd Progress Report.

As for the JTS requests for clarification, the partners were informed about the main points of concern including:

- Insufficient FLC Control Checklists
- Inconsistency between activities and financial parts of the Progress Report

PP8 provided the partners with guidance on how to prevent these points of concern in the future.

- **Current reporting status**

PP8 provided the partners with an overview of the current reporting status:

Partners	Feedback on Financials PP	Annexes				2. Progress Report excel file filled in
		Confirmation of Control incl. breakdown of validated expenditure	Internal Control Report	Control Checklist	Need for modification?	
LP PVA-MV AG	work in progress					
PP2 ValDeal Innovation	yes	no	no	no	n/a	no
PP3 Slovak Academy of Sciences	yes	no	no	no	yes (for 1st RP)	no
PP4 Chemnitz University of Technology	yes	no	no	no	n/a	yes
PP5 ITG Salzburg	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no
PP6 GRYF	no	no	no	no	n/a	no
PP7 IRI UL	yes	no	no	no	n/a	yes
PP8 inno AG	work in progress					
PP9 University of Zilina	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no
PP10 Eurogroup Consulting	no *	no	no	no	n/a	no

* The costs of the Italian partners are not included in the 2nd Progress Report due to the ongoing establishment of the Italian FLC system. This is in accordance with the JTC comment from 23 June 2009.

- Next reporting deadlines**

Also the next reporting deadlines were presented to plan in advance:

Reporting Period		Submission date to JTS	Latest extension date <i>min. 1 week prior to submission according to §9.4 of Partnership Agreement</i>	Submission of PP input to LP <i>1 month before the deadline according to §9.3 of Partnership Agreement</i>
0	Preparation Costs	01/05/2009		01/08/2009
1	09/08 - 02/09	01/05/2009		01/08/2009
2	03/09 - 08/09	01/11/2009	23/10/2009	01/10/2009
3	09/09 - 02/10	01/05/2010	23/04/2010	01/04/2010
4	03/10 - 08/10	01/11/2010	22/10/2010	01/10/2010
5	09/10 - 02/11	01/05/2011	22/04/2010	01/04/2011
6	03/11 - 08/11	01/12/2011	22/11/2010	01/10/2011

PP5 (Thomas Reisinger) remarked that the next study trip to the United States –planned for end March 2010 – might be an hampering factor in the preparation of the 3rd Progress Report.

- Lessons learned**

PP8 provided the partners with instructions on how to make the Preparation of FLC documents more efficient and on how to process the Progress Report. The partners were reminded of Partnership Agreement §9.3, according to which “each PP commits itself to deliver the necessary documentation to the LP 1 month before the deadline net in the subsidy contract”.

- Underspending**

Moreover the partners were reminded of performing their activities in line with the pre-allocated budget and be aware of the underspending threshold of 15%.

The issue of underspending was discussed with the partners. Peter Häfner (PP4) suggested a budget shift. Also, partners raised the idea of extending the project duration. The partners held the view that the

being below budget is also related to the delayed project start as well as other factors such as the ongoing establishment of the Italian FLC body.

It was agreed to work on a solution concerning the underspending in early 2010.

To Dos		
What?	Who (lead)?	Deadline?
Reporting		
Send ppt on administrative issues to partners	inno	ASAP
Send reporting documents to PP8	All partners	ASAP
Drafting a proposal for a budget shift	inno	Early 2010

4 Next steps – actions and meetings

The planned Actions and Outputs of P3-P4 were presented and discussed. In general, efforts will be intensified around contacts with researchers and the extraction of high potential commercialisation cases. Also, two learning workshops are planned, one within the frame of the US study trip and one in M24.

A key output will be the commitment of researchers/research organisations to the project. It was discussed what form this commitment may take and it was concluded that each PP must consider what the best way will be of reaching a formal “agreement” with the researchers.

A further important output are the policy recommendations/communication to be designed and disseminated in P4. Further outputs of the coming periods and their deadlines are provided in the tables below.

On-going activities and activities starting M12 - M24			
	Availability	Resp.	To Dos
1st self assessment exercise + 1st peer review + 1st SA-report	M10-M12	All	On-going? Lagging?
Communication activities	Continuous	all	Press, TV, etc as according to individual communication plan
Learning workshop 3	During US study trip (M19)	PP2	Preparations
Learning workshop 4	M24	PP8	Preparations
US study trip	M19	PP2	Preparations
Reporting RP3	March 2010	all	
Study visit reports	M20	PP2	Write and publish reports

On-going activities and activities starting M12 - M24			
	Availability	Resp.	To Dos
Information events targeting researchers	M1 - M20	All	2 events per partner
Bilateral discussions with researchers	M1 - M20	All	10-20 meetings per partner
Policy guidelines	M20	PP8	Communication material available in each partner region
Researchers provide MoE or similar to the project partners.	M20	all	The partners identifies a group of researchers (approx.100) per region constituting the core target group of coming activities. Approx. 1,000 researchers are connected to the project
Meetings and interviews with researchers	M22	all	At least 500 meetings/contacts. At least 100 meetings by joint teams.
Filtered ideas and feed back	M29	all	Ca. 100 ideas left after first filter. Involved researchers given feedback.
Structuring of teams and meetings	M30	all	1 team of 3-5 persons/idea. 1 general meeting including case team meetings.

5 Next study trip and reflections on the UK study trip

A thorough discussion was held around the issue of the next study trip. This is planned to take place end March 2010. Target locations are Boston, Detroit and Cleveland.

It was emphasised that this study trip should have a more focussed and operative character compared to the UK-visit. Foreseen focus areas are material sciences and medical technologies. This will, however, be refined during the coming months. To make the visit more operative the project partners shall prepare cases (research results with commercial potential) well in advance of the study trip. VALDEAL will provide a template and instructions for this. The cases will then be presented to and discussed with experts during a workshop of the study trip.

PP2 is responsible for arranging the study tip and for related technical issues. PP2 will distribute suggested visit schemes and meeting plan within the coming weeks. PPs shall develop and suggest cases well in time before the trip.

6 SC-meeting

It was concluded that there were no pending or imminent issues for the SC to consider. The next SC-meeting will be held during the study trip to the US: