

**Ref.:** CERIM – Preparatory management and coordination meeting in Vienna

**Minutes**

**Date:** February 11' 2010

**Time:** 10.00 a.m. to 16.30 p.m.

**Attachments:** Agenda (Power-Point)  
Presentation on US study trip  
Presentation on administrative issues  
CERIM\_Table\_100\_ideas  
Case report-template  
CERIM List of Participants

**Participants**

N°.	Partner	Name
PP2	Valdeal	Klara Stumpf (KS)
PP2	Valdeal	Peter Csikos (PC)
PP2	Valdeal	Eva Magyar (EM)
PP3	SAS	Ivan Chodak (IC)
PP3	SAS	Sylvester Salis (SyS)
PP3	SAS	Marian Janek (MJ)
PP4	Chemnitz	Peter Häfner (PH)
PP5	ITG Salzburg	Thomas Reisinger (TR)
PP6	Forum Gryf	Hubert Pachciarek (HP)
PP8	inno	Nils Gabrielsson (NG)
PP8	inno	Robin Grankvist (RG)
PP8	inno	Kirsten Petersen (KP)
PP8	inno	Kailey Peng (KAP)
PP9	Zilina	Michal Janovcik (MiJ)
PP10	Eurogroup	Alessio Scopa (AS)

PP7 was excused due to unforeseen weather conditions.

## 0 Agenda

WP n°	Topic
WP4	1. US study tour information
WP5	2. Case selection and next steps
WP1	3. Admin Issues

### 1 US study tour information

PC and KS presented the upcoming US study tour. The partners shall book flights to Detroit so that they arrive on Sunday the 7<sup>th</sup> of March and fly home from Boston on Friday evening the 12<sup>th</sup> of March. The domestic transportation and hotel reservation will be arranged by PP3.

PC and KS emphasized the importance to provide them (ASAP) with descriptions of innovation-cases (1-2 pages) to be presented at workshops in the US.

A template for describing the cases is to be distributed by KS.

### 2 Case selection and next steps

Each partner presented their identified and initially filtered innovation-cases (ideas). These ideas have been identified by the project partners individually and in combined teams through meetings and discussions with researchers. Due to the amount (100 ideas on a project level), each idea was only very briefly presented regarding its technical area, development stage, possible commercial application and suitability in further CERIM activities.

NG proceeded with presenting the next steps in WP5, presented below;

- **Brief information about each partners' 10 ideas shall be sent to RG by 28th of February 2010.** An excel sheet (CERIM\_Table\_100\_ideas) for this is attached.
- For the 10 ideas per partner, 10 innovation reports shall be developed by August 2010. A template (Case report-template) for these reports is attached.
- **On 25-26<sup>th</sup> of August a meeting will be held in Bratislava or Vienna** where the project partners will be divided into teams and further analyse the selected 100 ideas (10 per partner). During this meeting, 10-20 of the project's 100 ideas will be selected for further commercialisation work and strategies for this will be discussed.
- For the selected 10-20 cases, in-depth commercialisation strategies will be developed.

NG proceeded by reminding the partners to arrange information events for their researchers and to make sure that when they meet with a researcher and discuss technology transfer with them, they should **write down the date of the meeting, participating persons and which subjects were discussed**. An excel sheet (CERIM List of participants) where this information should be documented, is attached.

Finally NG presented the activity “Policy guidelines”. This output will be a booklet comprising 10 chapters dealing with different policy-related technology transfer issues (or equivalent) written by each project partner. Each partner shall write their chapter by August 2010. More information about this will be sent out during the coming weeks.

### 3 Administrative issues

After a short presentation by PP8 on the agenda of administrative issues ...

WP n°	Topic
WP1	<p><b>Admin Issues</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current reporting status &amp; next steps</li> <li>• Status on payment</li> <li>• Underspending</li> <li>• Budget shift</li> <li>• Change in partnership</li> <li>• Questions &amp; Answers</li> </ul>

... KP handed over to AS (PP10) to inform the Partners about the *change in partnership* - the Lead Partner has been informed about this change on 03.02.2010.

#### Explanation by PP10 on a *change in partnership*

PP10 – AS – informed the Partners about the recent change regarding the Partner Eurogroup: AS, formerly an employee of Eurogroup Srl, explained that within a spin-out of Eurogroup a whole business unit – dealing with projects in the public sector – left Eurogroup and established a new company CRS Srl on February 4, 2010. In particular, AS assured – with a whole business unit turned into a separate organisation - the continuity of all activities in the CERIM-project, as all project responsibility, legal rights and liabilities of Eurogroup concerning the project CERIM have been entirely transferred to CRS. Therefore, no change in the team involved in CERIM will take place.

PP8 has already informed PP10 about the formal implications of a change in partnership and informed the Partners on the procedure of partnerships according to the CENTRAL EUROPE Implementation Manual. PP8 and PP10 will take the next steps on Monday of formally announcing the change in partnership and start the formal procedure with the JTS.

#### Current reporting status & next steps

KP gave the Partners the current reporting status along with an overview of the past reports and contractual processes since the beginning of the project. The Partners have been made aware of the next coming reporting deadline on **May 1, 2010** for the 3rd PR. Also, KP reminded the Partners of the obligation to turn partner inputs – as agreed in the PA - for the PR until the 01.04.2010. The Partners shall hand in their input 10 days to two weeks before the deadline for the consolidated report at the latest.

The status of the 2nd PR already submitted was communicated, indicating that the PR was still awaiting JTS approval and may still face a clarification process before the approval and the issuance of the pre-filled 3rd PR excel form. In view of the upcoming preparation of the 3rd PR, the partners were reminded on the new reporting guidelines as of 15.12.2009 from the JTS and the obligatory use of new FLC documents.

## **Status on payment**

Following the Partners' request, KP provided the partners with an expected date of first payments communicated by the JTS - spring 2010 - as well as the general procedure (as laid down in the Implementation Manual) concerning the requests for payments.

## **Underspending**

As for the topic of underspending, KP concentrated on the following points:

- Rules – implementation manual
- Figures – RP 1&2, RP 3 planned
- Communication with JTS
- Preparation explanatory statement

KP continued with the outlook that an underspending beyond 15% of the project budget of the RPs 1 to 3 might take place. The Partners were reminded on the respective passages in the Implementation Manual on the meaning of underspending and its implications for the project budget in the RP 1 to 3, namely a reduction of ERDF for the percentage exceeding the allowed underspending of 15%. The Partners were also made aware of the exceptions where decommitment of funds shall not apply. KP presented a prognosis based on estimates of the Partners on the expected level of underspending after the 3<sup>rd</sup> reporting period, amounting to a consumption rate of approximately 69% which is below the allowed rate of 85%.

Then the Partners were informed that according to the JTS, the Managing Committee will decide after the monitoring of the 3<sup>rd</sup> PR on decommitment of otherwise taking into account all the reasons for the underspending. Therefore, KP asked the partners for their cooperation in preparing an explanatory statement regarding the individual underspending and illustrate their individual situation that has led to the underspending. The Partners were requested to report on their external and / or internal problems that had an impact on project implementation such as e.g. the delay of signing the subsidy contract. KP asked the Partners to provide the requested explanation for the 3<sup>rd</sup> PR. In addition, the Partners agreed on contacting their respective NCP point on the question of whether the underspending rule will strictly enforced in this particular case or if – taking into account the experience of other 1<sup>st</sup> round CENTRAL EUROPE projects – an exemption can be expected. In addition, KP will contact the regional Ministry in Baden-Württemberg.

## **Budget shift**

KaP reminded the Partners on the budget flexibility rules as stated in the Implementation Manual. While the "10% budget shifting rule" can be applied on project level without prior notification to the Managing Authority, the Partners have been made aware that a major budget shift will be necessary that requires detailed planning and the notification of the MA. KaP also informed the partners on the formal procedure of applying for a major budget shift as indicated in the Implementation Manual.

With regards to the budget shifting plans the partners are asked on keeping a good overview on their expenses. The partners are requested not to exceed the amount originally planned for WP1 which represents approximately 12% of the total budget. Based on experience in the management of other EU projects, KP

expressed the concern that overbooking WP1 might lead to a budget cut. Also the Partners were asked to keep in mind that any plans of shifting so far unused budget from the budget line “administration costs” to “staff costs” might be expected to be problematic. KP announced to contact the JTS in this question but is in doubt whether the administration costs can be reduced or shifted beyond the 10% budget flexibility rule.

On the following steps towards the budget shift KP explained the following:

- **Finalisation of RP3 and decision on underspending** – First of all, the basis for a budget shift will be determined by the question whether the underspending rule will be enforced.
- **Review budget shifting plans + explanations** – Then, the partners can be informed on submitting their budget shifting plans and explanations for the change as formally demanded by the JTS.
- **Negotiation with the JTS etc.**

KP suggested to start with the budget shift in summer, assumed that an answer on the underspending question will be given by then, and to gather for a meeting before the summer holiday season. A possible date will be mid June and could also be organised as a steering committee meeting for taking formal decisions.

- **Next steps**

To Dos		
What?	Who (lead)?	Deadline?
Call NCPs concerning underspending and inform LP / PP8	All partners	ASAP
Send explanations for underspending to PP8	All partners with underspending	26.02.2010
Continuous monitoring of the budget regarding the budget shift	All partners	Continuous
Preparing the formal procedure of a partner change	PP10 and PP8	ASAP

#### 4 Next steps – actions and meetings

- Send descriptions of innovation-cases (1-2 pages) to be presented at workshops in the US, to Peter Csikos and Klara Stumpf as soon as possible and book your flights to the US.
- Brief information about each partners’ 10 ideas shall be sent to Robin Grankvist by 28<sup>th</sup> of February 2010.
- For the 10 ideas per partner, 10 innovation reports shall be developed by August 2010.
- On 25-26<sup>th</sup> of August a meeting will be held in Bratislava or Vienna where the project partners will be divided into teams, further analyse the selected 100 ideas (10 per partner) and pick 10-20 of the most interesting.

- Policy guidelines, where each partner writes one chapter about a certain area, shall be finalised by August 2010.

## **5 SC-meeting**

A Steering Committee meeting is foreseen in order to agree on and to conclude the budget shifts. The preliminary date is set to June 9 in Vienna.