

BESTPRAC Joint Meeting of WG1/WG2/WG3 Preliminary Programme

September 16-17, 2014 | Hotel Lindner, Bratislava, Slovakia

Tuesday, September 16, 2014

- 09:00 Welcome address to all participants & brief introduction of BESTPRAC
(Jan Andersen, Chair)
Introduction to WG1 / WG2 / WG3 (Ellen Schenk, WG1-Leader /
Vanessa Ravagni, WG2-Leader / Diana Pustula, WG3-Leader)
(room Antwerpen)
- 09:45 Coffee break
- 10:00 Parallel WG1/WG2/WG3-meetings
(WG1: room Antwerpen; WG2: room Wien, WG3: room Praha)
- 12:30 Lunch
- 14:00 Parallel WG1/WG2/WG3-meetings
(WG1: room Antwerpen; WG2: room Wien, WG3: room Praha)
- 15:30 Coffee break
- 16:00 Parallel WG1/WG2/WG3-meetings
(WG1: room Antwerpen; WG2: room Wien, WG3: room Praha)
- 19:30 Dinner at Hotel Lindner

Wednesday, September 17, 2014

- 09:00 Presentation & discussion on “The Matrix: core messages, target groups, and communication means” (Fred Balvert, Head of Communications Erasmus MC) (*room Antwerpen*)
- Communication matrix: how does communication work and which tools can you use?
 - Group exercise: design of outreach project in small groups using virtual project
 - Plenary presentation/discussion of proposed designs
- 11:00 Coffee break
- 11:30 Parallel WG1/WG2/WG3-meetings
(*WG1: room Antwerpen; WG2: room Wien, WG3: room Praha*)
- 13:00 Lunch
- 14:30 Summing-up session of all working groups
(*room Antwerpen*)
- 15:00 End of meeting

Programme of WG1

Tuesday, September 16, 2014 (room Antwerpen)

Definition of “administration of EU projects”

The discussions will start from the outcome of the previous WG1 meeting with the ultimate goal to reach a consensus on this theme. The outcome is to be included in a WG1 output document.

- 10:00 **Outcome online WG1 survey**
Tjaša Nabergoj, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- 10:20 **Explanation on how to reach consensus on the definition of administration of EU projects**
Kaisa Männikkö, Tampere University of Technology, Finland
- 10:25 **Discussion in subgroups**
- 11:10 **Plenary consensus on definition “administration of EU projects”**
Kaisa Männikkö, Tampere University of Technology, Finland
- 11:40 **Short break**

Skills and competences for an EU research administrator

The discussions will start from the outcome of the previous WG1 meeting with the ultimate goal to reach a consensus on this theme. The outcome is to be included in a WG1 output document.

- 11:45 **Explanation on how to reach consensus on skills and competences for an EU research administrator**
Kaisa Männikkö, Tampere University of Technology, Finland
- 11:50 **Discussion in subgroups**
- 12:30 Lunch**
- 14:00 **Plenary consensus on skills and competences for an EU research administrator**
Kaisa Männikkö, Tampere University of Technology, Finland

Market place for administrative tools

There is a clear need for sharing tools helpful in administering an EU project (e.g tool for sharing of documents, planning of meetings, calculations, timesheets). During the market place session, WG1 members will present useful tools. The presented tools will be listed on the BESTPRAC website and will be included in a WG1 output document.

- 14:30 **Dropbox**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands
- 14:35 **Survey monkey**
Tjaša Nabergoj, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
- 14:45 **Impact tool**
Elina Humala, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
- 15:00 **pFACT, HEIs & fec: not so secret diary of a university research administrator**
Mary Caspillo-Brewer, University College London, UK
- 15:15 **EMDESK project management tool**
Anja Mertinkat / Kristin Smeral, WIFO, Austria
- 15:30 Coffee Break**
- 16:00 **Project spreadsheets**
Jan Andersen, University of Copenhagen, Denmark
- 16:10 **Symbaloo**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands
- 16:15 **Doodle**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands
- 16:20 **Hyperion website**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands
- 16:25 **Additional input from the WG1 group**
- 16:40 **Short break**

Open discussion on next steps for WG1

- 16:45 Topics for next WG1 meetings
- Format of WG1 meetings
 - Topics for training school
 - Output from WG1

Wednesday 17 September 2014 (room Antwerpen)

How to deal with lack of knowledge on funding rules by administrators and lack of respect and commitment by researchers

The goal of this discussion arising from the previous WG1 meeting is to define best practices, tips and tricks, templates, possibilities for training etc. for this topic. The outcome is to be included in a WG1 output document.

- 11:30 **Introduction**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands
- 11:35 **Quality procedures for the follow-up of European projects**
Nathalie Queffelec, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, France
- 11:50 **Training of administrators**
Nathalie Queffelec, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, France
- 12:05 **Good practices in the administration of large EU projects:
WWWforEurope**
Anja Mertinkat / Kristin Smeral, WIFO, Austria
- 12:20 **Best practice to inform administrators and researchers on
funding rules**
Eveliina Klemola, Aalto University, Finland
- 12:30 **Promoting good practice for best practice of projects
administration and participation**
Rita Vaicekauskaite, Klaipeda University, Lithuania
- 12:40 **Good Practice Guide for Lead Partners**
Mary Caspillo-Brewer, University College London, UK
- 12:50 **Conclusions and wrap up**
Ellen Schenk, Erasmus MC, The Netherlands

Programme of WG2

Tuesday, September 16, 2014 (room Wien)

- 10:00 **Outcome WG2 questionnaire on the "Task Matrix"**
Vanessa Ravagni, University of Trento
- The outcome of the questionnaire sent after the Zagreb Meeting will be used as a basis for the Bratislava discussions on the definition of administration of EU projects as well as on skills and competences for an EU research administrator.
- 10:10 **Administration of EU projects: tasks performed and skills and competences needed, Case discussion: Norwegian University of Science and Technology**
Per Inge Andresen, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
- 10:20 **Definition of administration of EU projects: tasks performed and skills and competences needed**
Discussion in subgroups
- 11:30 **Plenary consensus on definition "administration of EU projects"**
The chairs of the subgroups will present the outcome of the subgroup discussions. The WG 2 then needs to reach consensus on the definition (task performed and skills required). This will be included in the BESTPRAC deliverables report.
- 12:30 Lunch**
- 14:00 **Difficulties to be addressed by research administrators:**
During the last WG2 meeting, participants analysed a list of difficulties that administrators are confronted with in dealing with European project and decided to better understand some of the difficulties through questionnaire prepared, delivered and analysed by WG 2 members. At the end of each presentation WG 2 participants will reach a consensus on the results to be included in the BESTPRAC deliverables report.
- Difficulties to be addressed by research administrators:
Use of Overheads in different institutions**
Cristina Velasco, University of Madrid Carlos III

- 14:50 **Difficulties to be addressed by research administrators:
One size fits all: same rules and system schemes for all
European Programmes: harmonization need**
Per Inge Andresen, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
- 15:30 **Coffee Break**
- 16:00 **Difficulties to be addressed by research administrators:
Allocation Direct vs Indirect Cost**
Dirk De Craemer, Ghent University, Belgium

Wednesday 17 September 2014 (room Wien)

Difficulties to be addressed by research administrators:

WG 2 will discuss and share best practices for the “top issues” selected after the last meeting

- 11:30 **Budgeting in H2020 – Difficulties, tools and best practices**
Per Inge Andresen, Norwegian University of Science and Technology
- 11:55 **Personnel Costs – Difficulties, tools and best practices**
Géraldine Leonard, Université d'Orléans
- 12:20 **Third Parties – Difficulties, tools and best practices**
- 12:45 **Consensus and open points**
Vanessa Ravagni, University of Trento

Programme of WG3

Tuesday, September 16, 2014 (room Praha)

Based on the outcomes of the WG3 meeting in Zagreb development of tools for EU research programmes' legal support services will be started.

10:00 **WP3 welcome address and a brief summary of the outcomes of the WG3 meeting in Zagreb for the new members of the Group**

Diana Pustula, WG3 Leader

Expected outcome: All WG3 members present at the Bratislava meeting start their work enjoying the same scope of information allowing them equal involvement in the WG3 activities;

10:10 **Task 1**

Chelo Morán, Carlos III University of Madrid (UC3M), Spain

Presenting profile(s) of the legal support officers concerning educational background and professional experience, position in the organisation (central legal office, central research support office, school/departmental level, separate service/ part of a complex research support services provided by the institution) – report on the outcome of the quick written survey among WG3 members;

[Survey was prepared and sent out by the WG3 Leader in June 2014; Feedback was collected and summarized by the task 1 Leader]

Expected outcome to be presented by the task 1 Leader: Written description of the profile(s) of the research projects' legal support officers and their location in the organization structure;

Feedback on the task 1 outcomes from the WP3 participants followed by discussion and drafting conclusions to be presented at the plenary meeting

10:40 **Task 2a**

Niina Mikkonen, Aalto University, Finland

Involvement of legal support services as a part of the complex research project administration process and procedures involved - detailed analysis on legal issues at each stage of the project life-cycle identified during the WG3 meeting in Zagreb:

a. PRE-PROPOSAL STAGE

Analysis of examples of basic model NDAs used by the institutions taking into consideration different national legal frameworks and the rules of participation in the EU research programmes followed by discussion

[WG3 Members were asked to send samples of the model NDAs used in their institutions to the WG3 leader by the end of June which were collected and analyzed by task 2a Leader]

Expected outcomes to be presented by the task 2a Leader:

- *Exchange of best practices in respect of the model NDAs used by different institutions,*
- *Identification of the most important/tricky NDA's clauses,*
- *Drafting a check list for NDA (short list of "must check" clauses that cannot be omitted while negotiating NDAs by research institutions),*
- *Selection of a model NDA adjustable to the specific needs (institution/project/partners (academic and non-academic) in the easiest way.*

Feedback on the task 2a outcomes from the WP3 participants followed by discussion and drafting conclusions to be presented at the plenary meeting

12:30

Lunch

14:00

Task 2b (Part 1)

Carmen Gascó Fortea, Technical University of Madrid (UPM), Spain;
Diana Pustula, University of Warsaw, Poland

b. APPLICATION STAGE

Shifted focus from non-existing in H2020 negotiation stage requires from the legal support services to advise the researches on specific issues in advance in order to avoid problems at the implementation stage.

Therefore, the following issues based on examples (archive proposals) will be analysed and discussed in detail in the group:

- IPR issues in the context of the consortium partner profiles (non-profit/ commercial partners),
- potential TT issues,
- subcontracting and public procurement,
- ethic issues,
- consortium governance structure and business plan,
- open access,
- financial consequences

15:30

Coffee Break

16:00

Task 2b (Part 2)

Carmen Gascó Fortea, Technical University of Madrid (UPM), Spain;
Diana Pustula, University of Warsaw, Poland

Analysis of the above listed issues based on archive project proposals will be continued followed by discussion, sharing experience and best practices

Expected outcomes to be presented by the task 2b Leader:

- *Exchange of best practices – sharing experience on how to read the project proposals in order to identify “tricky” clauses and avoid potential problems related to them; Joint recommendations;*

[WG3 members are asked to bring selected passages from the proposals concerning above mentioned issues – as examples subject to the group analysis],

- *Drafting a check list for an application (short list of “must check” clauses that cannot be omitted while analyzing the research proposals).*

Wednesday, September 17, 2014 (room Praha)

11:30

Task 3

Chelo Morán, Carlos III University of Madrid (UC3M), Spain & Sarah Dello, University of Gent, Belgium

Presentation of the internal institutional guidelines on DESCAs model CA used by the post award research support officers (especially non-lawyers) as a daily work supporting tool based on the example provided by one of the WP3 members participating in FP7.

Joint analysis of the document followed by the collection of feedback from the WP3 participants will be sought on the adjustments needed to comply with the H2020 rules based on the experience in participation in the FP7 and the changes made to the new DESCAs model CA for H2020.

Expected outcomes:

Collecting suggestions from the WP3 group concerning modification of the internal institutional guidelines on the DESCAs model CA used under FP7 to be compliant with the H2020 rules in order to be able to prepare an updated daily tool for the H2020 project legal supporting services.

12:45

Summing-up

Diana Pustula, WG3 Leader