

BESTPRAC WG1/WG2/WG3 Meeting

Report

September 22-23, 2016

Mykolas Romeris University, Lithuania

The sixth meeting of the three working groups of COST Targeted Network TN 1302 (BESTPRAC) was held on September 22-23, 2016 in Vilnius, Lithuania.

The main objective of BESTPRAC is to establish a network for the administrative, finance and legal services in universities, research organizations and related entities supporting researchers involved in the lifecycle of European funded projects in order to exchange experiences and share and develop best practices, encourage knowledge sharing, knowledge transfer and increased efficiency.

The target group BESTPRAC is aiming at is the staff in universities and research institutions carrying out administrative tasks in support of European projects during the post-award phase, often with low salaries, without any possibility to travel and to network and share experiences about carrying out administrative tasks in European research projects. The target group does not include researchers, European project officers focussed on the pre-award phase of the project lifecycle, managers/directors, people with PhDs.

The call for participation in the joint meeting was overwhelming. In total, 126 applications were received. Finally, 92 research administrators from 31 countries attended the meeting. Among the participants 46 % came from so-called inclusiveness countries, 26 % were MC members, 60 % Working Group members, and 58 % so-called Early Stage Administrators. It shall also be mentioned that 79 % of the participants were female and 74 % already participated in previous BESTPRAC activities.

Following the success of the previous Working Group Meetings, again a joint interactive discussion of all three working groups as well as the meetings of the three individual working groups were scheduled. The theme of the joint interactive discussion was "Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of Model Grant Agreement / Consortium Agreement". In addition, WG2 presented their BESTPRAC Financial Guideline and WG3 their „Alone at the grant office" Survival Kits.

The respective documents can be downloaded at <http://www.bestprac.eu/events/workshop-vilnius-september-2016/>

Summary of WG1-meeting

WG1 has addressed the following topics at the BESTPRAC meeting in Vilnius:

- Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of the Model Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement (Interactive Session with WG2 and WG3)
- Reporting in Horizon 2020
- Research Support Staff (RSS) framework
- Recycling strategies for rejected proposals
- Topics for next WG1 meeting

Below, highlights are presented for each topic.

Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of the Model Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement

A total of 20 administrative, financial and legal questions on the Model Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement were collected prior to the meeting. In Vilnius, mixed groups of WG1, 2 and 3 attendants discussed these questions, and each group was asked to formulate an answer to two questions. All answers were presented during a plenary discussion, and have now been translated in a BESTPRAC FAQ document that will be made available on the BESTPRAC website.

Reporting in Horizon 2020

Report by Juan Abolafia (Fundacio Clinic per a la Recerca Biomedica, ESP), Ellen Schenk (Erasmus MC, NLD) and Despoina Xenikaki (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK)

During this session, experiences with reporting in Horizon 2020 were shared by **Eveliina Klemola** (Aalto University, FIN), **Veronika Csapo** (Central European University, HUN), **Véronique Victor** (Ghent University, BEL), **Eva Kremshuber** (University of Applied Sciences Upper Austria, AUT) and **Stijn Delauré** (KU Leuven, BEL). Presentations are available on the BESTPRAC website. In summary, it was reported that the Participant Portal is a great facilitator for the management of a project, but users also experience lots of bugs. All attendants were asked to send any bugs to Jan Andersen, and he will forward these to Peter Haertwich at the European Commission who is responsible for the participant portal. The reporting of personnel costs have changed considerably compared to FP7, and institutes are struggling with the selection of the most appropriate methodology. Another challenge is the reporting of internal invoices. Furthermore, experiences with a 2nd level audit in FP7 were presented.

After the presentations, the following 12 questions on reporting in Horizon 2020 collected before the meeting were discussed:

Administrative issues

1. Are there any experiences with technical or other problems when uploading deliverables? Are you aware of consequences for delayed deliverables?

- No experiences with technical or other problems when uploading deliverables have been reported. There are requests for open access but there is no deadline for this.
- Deliverables must be uploaded in the system according to what is written in the Grant Agreement. Deliverables might include ethics requirements.

2. In this project a meeting with the project officer took place which seems to have been focused on the scientific aspects (it is hard to get information from the coordinator). Do people have experience with these kind of meetings?

- This question came from an administrative colleague who has experienced difficulty finding out information when the coordinator met with the project manager and project officer. The coordinator was reluctant to share any information.
- In Horizon 2020, all information should be available through the participant portal.
- Different experiences have been reported with project officers who want to be contacted through the portal and others who want to be reached by email only.

Personnel

3. I am confused with reporting parental leave. The ERC is fine with it (as far as I have understood it) but I am not sure whether this means the project will therefore be extended or not (in Norway the maternity leave can be for 10 to 12 months). I know for ITNs, the project duration cannot be extended, so how to report this?

- In Marie Curie fellowships it is easy to report the parental leave. The project is suspended and extended according to the dates entered in the portal.
- In an ITN, parental leave is not covered and the spare money of the parental leave covered by the government is given back to the EC in case the expected contract duration goes beyond the end date of the project.
- ERC allows a project extension for a maximum of 1 year.
- This could also be discussed with colleagues from WG2.

4. In case of an audit, how to show in an ITN that the PhD student worked 100% on the project (without timesheet)?

Timesheets should be completed when someone works for a project. If one works 100%, timesheets are not needed but a declaration needs to be signed to confirm his/her involvement in the project.

5. If in the proposal phase we suggested 4 particular persons to be involved, and during the course of the project implementation we have to employ several more on the project (sharing the total person months

allocated with the 4 persons already mentioned and not spending additional person months than envisaged) – how do we report on that? And how do we justify it?

In Horizon 2020, only the person months are included in the proposal, not the number of people. The allocation of person months per person is not included in a proposal. But for an audit it is necessary to justify and document the people involved. Paper or electronic timesheets is a good way to record who works on a project.

6. How did you deal with personnel changes, who did you inform? People who were named in the DOW were later not involved anymore, but others.

In Horizon 2020, only the person months are included in the proposal, not the people. If the list of names is required, the coordinator could prepare a list with the people working on the project, which could be sent to the project officer.

7. There are several possible ways to calculate the amount of money to be reported given in the MGA (even more in the new version published in July) – namely how to calculate the hourly rate and the productive hours. None of these methods matches the real personnel costs in our book keeping – some methods give a higher and some a lower sum, and this also depends on the individual case. Do other universities face the same problem? How have you chosen the method to use? How do you deal with the uncertainty of how much funding you will receive for personnel costs?

Regarding this question there was no particular feedback. It is a decision each institution has to make by selecting one of the 3 methods provided by the Model Grant Agreement.

Other financial issues

8. The 'Form C' does not longer exist in its previous form, correct?

Yes, that is correct.

9. Are there any tips on how to deal (report, explain, justify) with shifts of resources:

a) **Between work packages**

b) **Temporal shifts (more work in the beginning and less later (as planned) or vice versa**

Any kind of shift shall be discussed with the Project Officer in advance. A justification is required.

10. Use of resources: in the system there is only a very basic report of the use of resources. We had to send very detailed information to the coordinator however. Does anybody know whether the coordinator has to report in more detail?

Sometimes the coordinators ask for more information than is required. The partners should be prepared to share the information about their institution and who works on the project. But they can also say no to the request from the coordinator.

11. Is adjustment still possible for previous periods or not?

Yes, this is still possible.

12. Is there any feedback on the use of art 11 'use of in kind contribution provided by third parties against payment' that was not initially planned in the DOA. It is stated that an amendment is not necessary provided a justification in the activity report is given (the project officer agreed on this but it would be interesting to have a feedback of reporting if there is any).

This is possible but there is always the risk that the costs are not accepted. Therefore, it is advisable to contact the project officer upfront.

These Q&A's will be made available as a separate document on the BESTPRAC website.

Research Support Staff (RSS) framework

These two sessions chaired by **Nik Claesen** (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium) continued with the activities started at the previous WG1 meetings in order to define a structured framework for the following WG1 RSS types:

- Type 1: Research Administrator (a person at the administration providing minimal support and checks, guarding the organisational processes and facilitating the signature process, involved in many projects)
- Type 2: European Liaison Officer / EU Research Manager (a person with expert knowledge of EU funding providing advice and support to researchers in a multitude of ways, involved in many projects)
- Type 3: Project Manager / Project Developer (a person dedicated to a limited number of projects helping the researchers in preparing and managing the project on a day to day basis, involved in 1-4 projects)

As a next step in the further development of the RSS framework towards an annotated, quality-controlled and standard tool that links to best practices, qualifications and competences, and to WG2 and WG3, the following Work Packages (WPs) were defined to deal with specific parts of the framework:

WP	Title	Chairs
1	Integrating the work of the other work packages and providing a report which outlines the framework	Nik Claesen Ellen Schenk
2	Linking the content of BESTPRAC to the framework	Eveliina Klemola Anja Mertinkat
3	Linking skills, competences and qualifications to the framework	Jan Andersen Mary Caspillo-Brewer
4	Quality assurance and annotation	Nik Claesen Elina Humala
5	Integration and communication	Rebekka Steinmann

At the meeting, the individual WPs (WP2-5) discussed on specific tasks and deliverables. The work within the WPs will continue in the period towards the next BESTPRAC meeting in spring 2017.

Recycling strategies for rejected proposals

Report by Andri Charalambous (Cyprus Institute of Neurology & Genetics, CYP), Véronique Victor (Ghent University, BEL), and Nathalie Queffelec (Université de Bretagne Occidentale, FRA)

During this session, strategies how to proceed with good proposals that unfortunately were not funded were presented.

Claudia Oliveira (University of Lisbon, POR) presented how her office analyses the ESRs to assess why projects fail, focusing on the 3 evaluation criteria (excellence, impact and implementation) and 2 dimensions (relevance to the call & appropriateness).

Common problems: Hard to read

Unclear

Complex language

Insufficient detail

Lack of coherence

Lack of reality and lack of realistic analysis and clear dissemination plan

Excellence:

Unclear objectives

Unclear state of the art

Lack of innovative aspects

Implementation: Appropriate work plans

It is important to be aware of how a proposal is evaluated, namely in 3 phases: individual evaluation report, consensus report, ESR.

Evaluation Summary Report (ESR):

- It is very important to read the ESR. It usually gives you all that you need to understand what the problem was with the proposal. Read carefully the evaluator's comments. Usually there are hints on what has failed the report.
- What does the ESR tell us: it is often very general. It can deceive the researcher. You have to read between the lines, what the evaluator is trying to say.
- You can have a redress procedure, only in special cases

Tips:

- Please the eye of the evaluator
- Have it proof-read and the logic to impact checked– ask for help!
- Ask to see successful applications/ Look at other successful projects
- Read carefully weaknesses and strengths because maybe a strength could turn to be a weakness.

Q&A:

- Resubmission has been successful for an ERC proposal.
- Recommendation/comment of Jan Andersen: his office collects all ESRs to get a picture of what evaluators are looking for. When you work with the ESR for researchers who are trying to resubmit, don't only look at the weaknesses, also look at the strengths!
- In order to understand the mind of the evaluators, it is a good exercise to make your own list of strengths and weaknesses and compare this with the ESR.
- Comment Eva Kremshuber: evaluators are instructed to use general sentences. ESRs might become less useful.

Elina Humala (University of Jyvaskyla, FIN) reported on recycling of bottom-up applications such as for ERC and MSCA (ITN and IF):

- Many successful cases (especially ERC).
- ERC applicants have received funding after resubmission from three different types of sources: ERC, Academy of Finland or from Finnish foundations.
- You have to adapt according to comments/adapt to template of financer

Projects in top-down instruments are difficult to recycle:

- No matching topics
- Check other financing channels, but they have also limitations.
- Might be necessary to collect many from many sources, instead of 1 project at 1 financer

Approach:

- Motivate the researcher
- Go through the ESR, discuss and analyse
- For top-down calls – many funding applications for 1 proposal
- Sometimes, a potential new H2020 topic: is this the right consortium, do you really match the new topic?
- Might be necessary to apply for many sources
- Analysis of what funding could be available for the proposal (funding mapping) and with what conditions.

Q&A:

- Do not try to recycle a research proposal into a COST application. COST is for networking on existing research.
- Funding mapping to create a conglomerate of linked projects (e.g. ERC, ITN and RIA) is a good strategy.
- Lot of researchers work with third countries such as USA, Australia, Japan and it is very difficult to involve them.

Antun Plenkovic (Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, CRO) showed that his institute conducts each year 20-30 research projects. There is national funding available for good but unsuccessful ERC proposals. His office likes to focus on young researchers who speak English, but it does not reject/refuse other researchers. There is no official strategy for rejected proposals, but activities are:

- Offer a crying shoulder → encouragement to reapply! Are there new possibilities to rewrite the 'bad' proposal?
- Analyse the ESR
- What now/where now? Apply in same call next year (e.g. ERC) or find new calls (other funding agencies) and try to adapt
- Rewriting
- Applying
- A project is not only the idea. It is also the strategy, the budget. So it must be well prepared in advance.

Q&A:

- People take rejection personally, but often do not take into account sufficient time for writing a proposal and getting support.
- Nik Claesen states that comforting researchers is really a job for administrators. We should not underestimate the effects of rejection. People need motivation and energy. In this respect, we are acting a bit as a psychologist. We can help researchers in different ways, e.g. by explaining the rules and regulations, but a project is more than just a researcher (budget, communication, impact, etc.). This is often underestimated. You have to 'push' a researcher sometimes. There can be potential, but they need to be motivated.
- Comforting and motivating skills should be added to the list of tasks in the RSS framework, and training will be considered.

Mary Caspillo-Brewer (University College London, UK) is involved in a highly interdisciplinary and collaborative research setting. Main funders are EU (EuropeAid), Wellcome Trust, UK Research Councils and Gates Foundation. The funding environment is very competitive with more applications and less money. Key issues are impact & public engagement. UCL has quite good success rates, but it is decreasing. The trend now is 28% success rate, with an EU success rate of 14% (20% in FP7). Mary refers to a Portuguese article showing that "**when grant managers provide specialised input, approval rates rise.**" **The office of Mary has the following strategy to improve grant success rates:**

- Grant Application Peer Review (set up by new head of department): formal review process by a scientific review committee. The committee (3 seniors who are evaluators, 3 early-careers, 1 admin) meets monthly and provides constructive guidance in relation to the requirements of the funder. Researchers were not enthusiastic at the start ('you don't have a say'). The committee can e.g. advise to postpone to next year (e.g. for IF), but never will refuse an application.
- Monthly departmental seminars organised by researchers planning to apply and looking for input from colleagues. This also offers a platform to identify collaboration opportunities.

Q&A:

- All proposals have to go through the Scientific Review Committee, even in stage 1. It is a lot of work, but it is empowering. Mainly general feedback is given. Proposals can either be as a coordinator or as a partner.
- Ellen Schenk states that in the H2020 GSC1 success rates are often < 10% and even around 2%. A recent application got a score of 15/15, but was put on reserve list. Eventually, the Commission funded the application. With those low success rates, how do you keep the motivation? At the end of the day: there will be another scheme, you can rewrite, you can look at the proposal again. You have to be positive for the researchers. Nik Claesen adds that an SSH project also had a score of 15/15 in SSH and is still on the reserve list.
- Jan Andersen comments that the EC may be asked to make a bigger distinction between funded and non-funded projects. Ellen adds that just the scores without an explanation what distincts one 15/15 project from the other 15/15 project makes the evaluation process less transparent.

Delphine Nicolas (University of Oslo, NOR) reports that the Norwegian government wants more applications and is really pushing for this. Her office does not really have a recycling strategy, but does the following:

- Resubmission within same funding instrument.
- Within same funding agency: from MSCA IF to ERC StG, or from GSC call to another.
- Different funding agency: success rate is pretty good for national and regional funding. Difficult to motivate them for EU funding.
- Classic resubmission. From one societal challenge call to another.
- Concept from researcher → applied for center of excellence and they got it → applied for a research project and they got it → applied for ETN and they got it → other partners applied with project ideas from the ETN for national funding.

Q&A:

- Ellen Schenk comments that Norwegian researchers are lucky that national funding is not that competitive. In the Netherlands, funding rate for LSH research are dropping to the level of H2020. In Norway, it is the government that is pushing (they want to get out more of EU funding).

Rebekka Steinmann (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, GER) addresses the audience with a speech why she does not feel comfortable with the use of the term 'recycling'. She would like to transform this into engage, strategize and succeed. One should consider that a proposal is generated in the complex environment of research that is changing continuously.

Topics for next WG1 meeting (March 2016, Lisbon, Portugal)

The following topics were identified for the next WG1 meeting(s):

1. Continuation of Research Support Staff framework (activities at the level of the 5 WPs), including a plenary session to engage WG2 and WG3
2. Administrative issues in Marie Curie Skłodowska Action proposals and projects

3. Strategies on how to promote the collaboration with the private sector and NGOs in collaborative projects
 4. Training on psychology skills: how to comfort and motivate researchers
- The final agenda for the next meeting will be set by the WG1 leader together with the BESTPRAC core group.

Summary of WG2-meeting

During the BESTPRAC Meeting in Vilnius, WG2 members (30 attendants from 20 COST Countries) analysed and discussed following topics:

- Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of MGA and CA
- Managing VII FP and H2020 Projects Guide to Best Practice – Financial Issues based on BESTPRAC members’ experience
- Synergies between H2020 and European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) 2014-2020
- Subgroups discussions on best practices in financial management of MSCA
- ERC Portability and Host Institution experience in managing ERC Grants
- How to avoid financial errors in managing H2020 projects

Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of MGA and CA

WG2 members, together with WG1 and WG3, discussed, divided in 10 subgroups, 20 questions selected and shared before the meeting. Each group presenter discussed two questions with answer during a plenary discussion and decided to send it to Ellen Schenck for the preparation of a Q&A document.

Managing VII FP and H2020 Projects Guide to Best Practice – Financial Issues based on BESTPRAC members’ experience

Following the plenary discussion with the other WGs members, WG2 decided :

- to share the guide for the last check on minor mistakes
- to better specify the reference to the version of the AMGA
- to publish /disseminate it after the 15th of October 2016

Synergies between H2020 and European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIF) 2014-2020

During the WG session, WG2 participants analysed how the EC recommendation regarding “enabling synergies between European Structural and Investment Funds and Horizon 2020” as described in the document published on http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/synergy/synergies_en.pdf, can be implemented.

During her presentation, **Valeria di Caro** (Politecnico di Torino), presented the conditions and typologies of synergies. She presented following cases:

- Simultaneous/cumulative use of funds (*combining ESIF and H2020 funds in the same project*)
- Parallel use of funds in separate projects (*ESIF and Horizon 2020 funding run in parallel and are mutually supportive*)

- Upstream sequential combination of funds (*ESIF investment potentially enables H2020 successful proposal submissions*)
- Downstream sequential combination (*H2020 or FP project results are used or further developed through subsequent ESIF investments*)
- Alternative funding through ESIF (*H2020 projects that have been positively evaluated reoriented towards ESIF*)

Because of the lackness of official monitoring/report on ESIF/H2020 synergies, Valeria Di Caro discussed with the WG2 members conditions enabling synergies such as *Inclusion of synergies in the elaboration of smart specialisation and ESIF strategies; Design of operative measures to enable synergies; Awareness raising and involvement of national and regional implementing bodies, stakeholders and potential beneficiaries*

Jaco De Graaf (Leids Universitair Medisch Centrum), **Dace Kärkle** (Latvian Institute of Organic Synthesis) and **Ewelina Wronka** (University of Lodz) continued the analyses of "ESIF-H2020 Synergy" presenting best practices related to 'enabling synergies with other financing programmes' and discussed with other WG2 members concluding remarks on risks and challenges associated with synergies, such as

- Synchronization of timing of H2020 and ESIF calls
- Lack of harmonization of cost models and reporting requirements of H2020 and ESIF
- Interpretations on definition of «cost item»
- Fear of controlling authorities of «double financing»
- Differences in counting for state aid
- Differences in composition of partnerships

Subgroups discussions on best practices in financial management of MSCA

During the meeting in Sofia, WG2 decided to discuss in 4 different subgroups common issues related to the financial management of MSCA. Each subgroup, focussed on a single MSCA (IF, ETN, ITN, Rise) analysed main characteristics of the actions, differences in comparison with FP7 . Participants actively contributed to the discussion, and, due to the interest in this topic, decided to continue in exchanging information and suggestions during the next meeting in Lisbon . Subgroups leaders (**ITN, Ulfar Gislason** (University of Iceland), **ETN, Cristina Velasco** and **Chelo Morán** (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid); **IF, Per Inge Andresen** (Norwegian University of Science and Technology), **RISE, Stephanie Rossard**, (Université de Technologie de Compiègne)) confirmed their commitment in coordinating the discussion, sharing the documentation per e-mail for the preparation of the next meeting in Lisbon.

ERC Portability and Host Institution experience in managing ERC Grants

The presentations of **Dirk De Craemer** (Ghent University) **Renè Maasen Van den Brink** (VUmc Amsterdam) and **Marta Bravo Nájera** (Universidad de Murcia) gave to participants the opportunity to better understand policies of the HIs to increase the numbers of ERC Grants , how do they deal with the "ERC portability", how His are organizing for a sound financial management of the grants.

How to avoid financial errors in managing H2020 projects

Staska Mrak Jamnik (University of Ljubljana), **Eva Vas** (Central European University), **Meltem İsanlar** (KOC University) and **Alexandra Attard** (University of Malta) discussed with the participants internal institutional regulation for additional remuneration for personnel.

Wolfram Rieneck, (Medical University Innsbruck) presented the major changes of Version 2.1. of AMGA. The first version of this important document was issued on, December 11th, 2013 (Initial version V. 1.0), and then followed 4 versions:

- October 1st, 2014: Version 2.0
- October 1st, 2015: Version 2.1
- July 1st, 2016: Version 2.11 (aMGA) – minor changes concerning country-specific issues for France and Slovenia and time recording
- July 20th, 2016: Version 3.0 (MGA) – major changes

Meike Dlaboha (Weihenstephan-Triesdorf) presented interesting tools and effective communication strategies in order to ensure successful implementation of EU projects

Primoz Petek (Slovenian Forestry Institute) discussed the “Exclusion of VAT in H2020” and **Madalena Martins** (Universidade Nova de Lisboa) presented “The Experience of the Science Funding office at a Portuguese Research”.

Topics and Volunteers for the next WG2 meeting

In order to facilitate the preparation for the next WG2 meeting (March 2017, Lisbon), WG2 participants decided following major themes and volunteers proposals:

1. ESIF European Structural and Investment Funds

- Policy recommendations: draft document to be discussed and approved during the WG meeting, **Valeria di Caro** (Politecnico di Torino)
- First level audit experience

Jaco De Graaf (Leids Universitair Medisch Centrum), **Dace Kärkle** (Latvian Institute of Organic Synthesis), **Ewelina Wronka** (University of Lodz), **Dorianne Attard Mamo** (University of Malta)

2. H2020 Management

- Personnel costs- UNIT COSTS- **Renè Maasen Van den Brink** (VUmc Amsterdam)
- PRACTICAL EXERCISE on personnel costs calculation: **Eva Vas** (Central European University)
- Major changes of new Version of AMGA (December 2016): **Volunteer needed**

3. MSCA: WG2 subgroup discussions on best practices in financial management of MSCA (with discussion on H2020 audit checks)

- **Stephanie Rossard**, (Université de Technologie de Compiègne)
- **Ulfar Gislason**, (University of Iceland)
- **Chelo Morán, Cristina Velasco**, (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid)
- **Per Inge Andresen** (Norwegian University of Science and Technology)

4. Audit in FPVII vs Audit in H2020 (analysis based on FRAMEWORK CONTRACT FOR SERVICES- DG Research and Innovation , Directorate J Common Support Centre , Unit J.2 Common Audit Service

- **DIRECT PERSONNEL COSTS : personnel costs (no MSCA): Meike Dlaboha** (Weihestephan-Triesdorf), **Raquel Vargas** (Universidad Complutense de Madrid)
- **Travel costs and related subsistence allowances : Staska Mrak Jamnik**, (University of Ljubljana)
- **Subcontract: Dirk de Craemer**, (Ghent University)
- **Unit costs in clinical trials: Wolfram Rieneck**, (Medical University Innsbruck)
- **Other Costs: Primoz Petek** (Slovenian Forestry Institute)

Summary of WG3-meeting

The BESTPRAC WG3 meeting in Vilnius, like all the previous WG3 meetings, started with an informal preparatory meeting of the WG3 Leader and the Task Co-Leaders (Niina Mikkonen, Miriam Ryan, and Elger Vercayie) which took place at the Amberton Hotel in Vilnius on Wednesday, September 21st at 6:30 pm. As usually the Group Leader gave a general overview of the WG3 programme followed by some practical aspects of presenting for the WG. The main focus of the specific tasks and presentations, their content, ways of presentation and encouragement of discussion within the WG and the subgroups were discussed.

It was quite challenging to cover all the programme topics by only five volunteers due to the lack of experienced WG3 members able to join the Vilnius meeting for specific personal reasons or due to the previous professional commitments. Since sharing knowledge, experience and exchange of best practices are the cornerstones of the TN BESTPRAC it is vital that there the number of participants in each WG representing ESAs and the experienced ones are in balance. Otherwise there is a lot of responsibility and effort on the shoulders of just few volunteers with sufficient expertise in particular topic to be able to prepare and present for the whole WG encouraging discussion at the same time.

DAY 1 - September 22nd

The WG3 members actively participated in the plenary (joint) **Interactive Sessions** of WG1/WG2/WG3 including the presentation of the **WG3 "Alone at the grant office" – Survival Kits – Parts 1-3** prepared for project officers without legal background providing support (single-handedly) to the researchers with regard to preparing H2020 applications and/or managing the H2020 grants: 1) "Checklist and Tips for Non-Disclosure Agreements for Horizon 2020 Actions" – Survival Kit – PART 1, **Niina Mikkonen, Aalto University, FI**, 2) "Legal issues in the proposals for Horizon 2020 Actions" - Survival Kit – PART 2, **Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL substituting the author - Carmen Gasco, Universidad Politecnica de Madrid, ES**; 3) "Practical Comments for DESCA Model Consortium Agreement for HORIZON 2020 Research and Innovation Actions" - Survival Kit –

PART 3 Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL on behalf of the co-author Sarah Dello, Ghent University, BE.

The Vilnius WG3 sessions were devoted **for the first time** exclusively to the legal issues beyond Horizon 2020 programme.

Thematic block 1: On Day 1 the WG3 Task Co-Leaders' presentations focused on the **analysis of selected legal issues in other than H2020 EU research programmes run by different Directorates General of the European Commission with particular attention to grants with participation of beneficiaries from third countries, followed by a case study.**

During the first part of this session the WG3 members analysed the similarities and differences between the selected legal provisions in the standard model Grant Agreements for implementation of research projects awarded under specific calls published by different DGs of the European Commission and the H2020 model GA for RIA, in particular with regard to the general rules of participation, rights and obligations of the parties as well as the liability provisions and Intellectual Property Rights.

Presentation(s) were given by the WG3.1 Task Co-Leaders - **Miriam Ryan (Maynooth University, IE), Elger Vercayie (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, BE)** followed by a 30 minutes discussion in the group.

During the second part of this session the WG3 a case study was presented. It concerned the Grant Agreement for implementation of the research project under the Justice Programme run by the DG Migration and Home Affairs. Firstly the general overview of the Justice Programme was made (Regulation establishing the Justice Programme – objectives, types of actions, rules of participations, complementarities to other EU Programmes including H2020 and protection of the financial interests of the Union). Secondly the main objectives of the project focusing on preventing and combating crime were discussed; And finally the selected legal issues & implementation challenges were analysed and presented in particular those concerning ethics and data protection, IPR - ownership of results/use of results (e.g. licence for the EC for free use of the project results, the beneficiaries must ensure they have all rights to use the pre-existing IPR and disclose a list of such IPR to the EC before the project start date); subcontracts with third parties (e.g., the sole liability of the beneficiaries toward third parties including for damage of any kind sustained by them while carrying out the action); Liability (EC and beneficiaries).

The presentation in question was given by the WG3 Leader - **Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL**, followed by a 30 minutes discussion in the group.



Day 1 concluded with the continuation of the WG3 **“raising awareness mission”** concerning the principles of the European Charter & Code and the promotion of the HR Excellence in Research Logo the

WG3 undertaken and in particular with regard to their significance for participation in H2020 and other EU programmes. To this end another on-line survey was run before the Vilnius meeting within the framework of regular updates and the outcomes were elaborated and shared by **Tihana Damić (Croatian Veterinary Institute, HR).**

The survey was developed taking into consideration the status of the institutions either: Being granted the HR Excellence in Research logo, institutions without the

logo and institutions in the process of obtaining the logo. The survey was distributed among the Budapest, Sofia and Vilnius TN BESTPRAC meeting participants in September 2015, and March and September 2016. In total 62 project managers participated, each representing one institution. For detailed outcomes of the survey please see the attachment "Logo survey updated 2016".

Follow-up: The survey will be sent out to all the BESTPRAC WG members again before the Lisbon meeting in order to update of the results and to make them as accurate and representative as possible by collecting responses for more participants.

DAY 2 – September 23rd

Thematic block 2: Analysis of the EC procurement-based research/innovation contracts + case study.

Since many research institutions look for EU research funds beyond H2020 they apply for them under public tenders for research and innovation. Since the legal framework for procurement in relation to research and/or innovation differs from the one under Horizon 2020 or other EU programmes including those run by different DGs of the European Commission, the services contracts and the (framework) agreements were analysed and discussed among the WG3 members with particular attention to confidentiality, management of intellectual property rights, and liability provisions.

The presentation was given by the WG3.3 Task Co-Leader - **Miriam Ryan (Maynooth University, IE)**.

After the presentation WG3 **worked in five smaller groups** at first analyzing and comparing the selected legal issues like liability (including the joint and several liability), contracting authorities, beneficiaries/contractors, third parties, liquidated damages, IPR (ownership and exploitation rights) included in the EC procurement-based contract for services vs. those in the GA for H2020 (RIA). The small groups were asked to **find similarities and differences, identify risky clauses and finally report to the whole WG3 on the outcomes and conclusions**. Working in the small groups task was prepared and run by the by the WG3 Leader - **Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL**.

WG3.3 BESTPRAC, WG3 Meeting, 21-22.09.2016, Vilnius

Work in the small groups (4 persons)

Please:

- 1) Analyse and discuss the selected legal issues in the EC procurement-based contract for services and in the grant agreement for H2020 projects (R&I Actions);
- 2) Compare them,
- 3) Find similarities and differences,
- 4) Identify risky clauses;
- 5) Report to the whole WG3 on your findings and conclusions.

No.	EC procurement-based contract for services	Grant agreement for H2020 projects (R&I Actions)	Findings, comments, conclusions
1.	Art. II.6. LIABILITY including joint and several liability (joint tenders) – Art. 2.6.5, II.23.4	ARTICLE 46 – LIABILITY FOR DAMAGES including joint and several liability - Art. 41.1	

This thematic bloc was concluded with a presentation of one case study (WG3.4) pointing out **contractual challenges and difficulties related to EC procurement-based research/innovation contracts** – in particular **liability of the parties and ownership of results** – the main differences between procurement contracts and the GA under H2020 being a comprehensive summary of the main legal issues to be considered before bidding for the contract supporting the conclusions resulting from the previous presentations given during Day 2.

The presentation was given by the WG3.4 Task Leader - **Niina Mikkonen (Aalto University, FI)**.

During the BESTPRAC Vilnius meeting the WG3 members used again the unique opportunity to study and discuss legal aspects of participation in other than H2020 programmes including the procurement-based contracts for services, work in the small groups and share their professional experience and best practices with their peers from different European countries and institutions providing legal support to the researchers in their institutions.

The list of potential topics for the next WG3 meeting in Lisbon has been prepared based on the suggestions collected during the Vilnius meeting supplemented by the new ones collected by e-mail after the meeting.

From the collected ones in the on-line survey were included those of them which have not been covered at the previous WG3 Bestprac meetings and eliminated those which refer only to the specific procedures and not to the legal matters concerning proposed topics. The list of the pre-selected topics WG3 members have been choosing from:

1. Commercialization of research results - legal aspects,
2. Successful negotiations (strategies) in R&I,
3. Legal aspects of joining a new international programme - Check list,
4. Best practice to risk management (legal/financial/administrative aspects – as an idea for an Interactive Session for WG1/WG2/WG3) or as Risk Management of legal issues in contracts for WG3 only including, e.g.: JTI /

IMI projects: room for negotiation? 'Risks' of participating for academic partners: strong pressure of the industrial partners to retain all IP (often royalty-free),

5. Legal arguments under H2020 and procurement contracts (dispute resolutions),
6. Belgium law - which laws and regulations shall we be aware of,
7. Interreg Programme (rules and principles of participation),
8. Guarantee Fund H2020 (what it covers, how it operates).

In order to prioritize among the pre-selected topics on-line survey was prepared and distributed on 11 October 2016 by the WG3 Leader in order to find out which topics are the most interesting/the most important for the Group and consequently which of them are going to become part of the WG3 agenda of the next meeting in the first place.



39 responses in total were collected by the WG3 Leader who prepared a summary of the survey results to be shared with all the WG3 members by e-mail in order to inspire and encourage them to take the lead of the winning topics at the next meeting in Lisbon.

The winning topics (with the highest number of replies marked as no 1 priority (very interesting)) are:

1. Legal arguments under H2020 and procurement contracts (dispute resolutions) – 9,
2. Commercialization of research results - legal aspects – 8,
3. Legal aspects of joining a new international programme - Check list – 7,
4. Belgium law - which laws and regulations shall we be aware of – 7,
5. Best practice to risk management (legal/financial/administrative aspects – as an idea for an Interactive Session) – 6 (very interesting) and 10 (interesting).

HOWEVER: The final topics priority list will depend on the availability of volunteers with sufficient expertise in the selected subjects.

The last update made is based on the WG3 survey run on regular basis aiming to identify the **professional profiles of the new WG3 members** (educational

background, professional experience, position in the organization, scope of support provided to the researchers participating in the EU research programmes).

The results based on the answers given by nine WG3 Vilnius meeting participants are as follows:

1. Educational background: legal - 3, other – 6;
2. Professional experience: legal support - 1, research administration - 7, other – 1;
3. Position in the organization: legal office – 0, research supporting office – 9, other – 0;
4. Do you advise on legal issues concerning European research programmes on a daily basis: Yes - 6, No – 3;
5. Position of the legal support services in the organization: central administration – 6, faculty administration – 3, other - 0;
6. Scope of professional legal support services in the organization concerning European research projects: complex – 5, selected, specific legal issues only – 3, none – 1.

Most of the new WG3 members has no legal background, work in the central administration, at the research support offices), advise on legal issues on a daily basis and have access to the complex legal services at their institutions.

BESTPRAC WG1/WG2/WG3 Meeting

Final Programme

September 22-23, 2016

University of Vilnius, Lithuania

Wednesday, September 21, 2016

18:00-19:15 **Pre-Registration** (Hotel Amberton, L. Stuokos-Guceviciaus str. 1)

Thursday, September 22, 2016

08:00 **Departure of bus to meeting venue at University of Vilnius** (outside of city).

Pick-Up point: central building of Vilnius University, Universiteto str. 3.

In case you miss the bus, trolleybus No 2 goes from the city centre to the venue. Bus stop in the city centre is "Vinco Kudirkos aikštė", the venue "Vilniaus universitetas" and vice-versa. Timetable: <http://stops.lt/vilnius/#trol/2/b-a/0210/en>

08:30 **Registration**

09:00 **Welcome address & brief introduction of BESTPRAC** (Jan Andersen, Chair)

Welcome address (Its dr. Aistė Vilkanauskytė, Head of the International Programmes Unit - COST, H2020, Marie Skłodowska programmes)

Introduction to WG1 / WG2 / WG3

(Ellen Schenk, WG1-Leader / Vanessa Ravagni, WG2-Leader / Diana Pustula, WG3-Leader)

Report on Training School “How to manage key financial tasks for FP7 and H2020 European research and innovation projects: Finance for Beginners” (Vanessa Ravagni, Local Organizer & Trainer)

09:20 **Administrative, financial and legal issues resulting from the provisions of Model Grant Agreement / Consortium Agreement**

The joint interactive session is meant to be a joint presentation and discussion session for all WG1/WG2/WG3 participants.

Instructions have been sent to you by Martina Pöll on 23 August 2016. Please check these carefully in order to prepare for this session.

A total of 20 questions from the attendants have been collected. During the session, the questions will be discussed for 45 min in 10 mixed groups of WG1, WG2, and WG3 members. This is followed by a 45 min plenary discussion on the questions, during which every group will present its answers to 2 specific questions. After the meeting, all answers will be combined into a Q&A document.

During the meeting, please proceed as follows in the discussion group:

- The group decides on two group note takers and a group presenter
- The group discusses all 20 questions
- The group formulates an answer to the two specific questions assigned to the group
- The group note takers write the two answers down as detailed as possible
- The group presenter presents the two answers during the plenary discussion
- The group note takers adapt the two answers if needed based on plenary feedback

10:50 Coffee break

11:10 **Managing FP7 and H2020 Projects Guide to Best Practice – Financial Issues based on BESTPRAC members’ experience**

Presentation & discussion of the BESTPRAC Financial Guideline prepared by WG2 members in previous meeting (Vanessa Ravagni)

12:00 **WG3 “Alone at the grant office” – Survival Kits – Parts 1-3**

Presentation & discussion on the BESTPRAC WG3 “mini-guides” for project officers without legal background providing support (single-handedly) to the researchers with regard to preparing H2020 applications and/or managing the H2020 grants:

- 1) “Checklist and Recommendations for Non-Disclosure Agreements for Horizon 2020 Actions” – Survival Kit – PART 1
Niina Mikkonen, Aalto University, FI
- 2) “Legal issues in the proposals for Horizon 2020 Actions” - Survival Kit – PART 2
Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL substituting the author -
Carmen Gasco, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ES
- 3) “Practical Comments for DESCA Model Consortium Agreement for HORIZON 2020 Research and Innovation Actions” - Survival Kit – PART 3
Diana Pustuła, University of Warsaw, PL on behalf of the co-author
Sarah Dello, Ghent University, BE

12:30 Lunch Break

14:00 **WG1/WG2/WG3-meeting** (*in parallel*)

WG1.1: Reporting in Horizon 2020

WG1 members, especially those working in the post-award phase of projects, are often involved in both the reporting of the scientific progress as well as of the finances of projects. Experiences in technical and financial reporting in Horizon 2020 are now developing. In this session, volunteers will share their Horizon 2020 reporting experiences, specifically focussing on the do’s and don’ts and on their reporting questions. These questions will be addressed by the audience during the session. If financial or legal questions cannot be answered by the WG1 attendants, these will be forwarded to WG2 and WG3, respectively, after the meeting. For all other questions, other sources of information will be consulted after the meeting. The questions and answers will be summarised in a WG1 Horizon 2020 Reporting Q&A document.

14.00 – 15.00 h Presentations on reporting do’s & don’ts

1. Eveliina Klemola (Aalto University, FIN)
2. Veronika Csapo (Central European University, HUN)
3. Véronique Victor (Ghent University, BEL)
4. Eva Kremshuber (University of Applied Sciences Upper Austria, AUT)

5. Stijn Delauré (KU Leuven, BEL)

14.50-15.00 h Discussion on Horizon 2020 reporting questions

Writers of WG1 Horizon 2020 Reporting Q&A document

- Despoina Xenikaki (London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, UK)
- Agnieszka Wojciechowska De Cokere (Warsaw University of Life Sciences, POL)
- Juan Abolafia (Fundacio Clinic per a la Recerca Biomédica, SPA)

WG2.1: European Structural and Investment Funds in 2014-2020: guidance on using and managing

European Structural and Investment Funds are the main financial instrument for the implementation of the EU's cohesion policy and play an important role in promoting projects and initiatives that support job creation. In September 2015 at the meeting in Budapest, WG2 members shared the opportunity to better understand the complex web of responsibilities and programmes that influence the content and management of calls for project proposals co-financed by the Funds. (up to 20 minutes presentation)

- General Framework Valeria Di Caro (Politecnico di Torino)
- Best practices related to the "enabling synergies with other financing programmes" Jaco De Graaf (Leids Universitair Medisch Centrum), Dace Kärkle (Latvian Institute of Organic Synthesis), Ewelina Wronka (University of Lodz)
- ESF – European Structural Fund and problems with Contracting Authorities, Mihaela Lesičak (Institute for Social Research in Zagreb) , and Mirela Crljen (Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar)
- ESIF: The Experience of the Science Funding office at a Portuguese Research, Madalena Martins (Universidade Nova de Lisboa)

WG3.1: Analysis of selected legal issues in other than H2020 EU research programmes run by different Directorates General (e.g. DG Justice, DG Culture etc.) of the European Commission with particular attention to grants with participation of beneficiaries from third countries – Part 1

The WG3 members will analyse some selected legal issues of the model Grant Agreements for research grants awarded under specific calls published by different DGs of the European Commission. The similarities and differences of the legal provisions between those standard model GAs and the H2020 model GA for RIA, in particular with regard to the general rules of participation in the project; liability provisions and Intellectual Property Rights will also be studied and the results shared. Presentation(s) given by the Task Co-Leaders will be followed by a 30 minutes discussion in the group.

WG3.1. Task Co-leaders: Miriam Ryan (Maynooth University, IE), Elger Vercayie (Vrije Universiteit Brussel, BE)

15:30 Coffee break

16:00 **WG1/WG2/WG3-meeting** (in parallel)

WG1.2: Defining Research Support Staff framework

As a next step in the further development of the RSS framework towards an annotated, quality-controlled and standard tool that links to best practices, qualifications and competences, and to WG2 and WG3, Work Packages (WPs) have now been defined to deal with specific parts of the framework:

WP	Title	Chairs
1	Integrating the work of the other work packages and providing a report which outlines the framework	Nik Claesen Ellen Schenk
2	Linking the content of BESTPRAC to the framework	Eveliina Klemola Anja Mertinkat
3	Linking skills, competences and qualifications to the framework	Jan Andersen Mary Caspillo-Brewer
4	Quality assurance and annotation	Nik Claesen Elina Humala
5	Integration and communication	Rebekka Steinmann Ellen Schenk

In Vilnius, sessions WG1.2 and WG1.3 will have discussions by the individual WPs (WP2-5) on specific themes determined by the WP leaders listed above.

WG2.2: MSCA: WG2 subgroup discussions on best practices in financial management of MSCA

practices in financial management of MSCA

Conclusions of each subgroup (IF, ITN, Rise) will be presented by the subgroup chairs in a WG2 plenary session.

- Subgroup on ITN: The group will discuss the main characteristics of these actions from a financial management viewpoint, Leader Ulfar Gislason (University of Iceland)
- Subgroup of ETN, The group will discuss the of the main differences in the management of H2020 MSCA ETN in comparison with the 7PM ITN management. Leaders Cristina VELASCO and Chelo MORÁN (Universidad Carlos III de Madrid)
- Subgroup on Individual Fellowship (IF), Leader Per Inge Andresen (Norwegian University of Science and Technology)
- Subgroup on RISE, Leaders Geraldine Leonard (Université d'Orléans) and Stephanie Rossard, (Université de Technologie de Compiègne)

17:30 MSCA: WG2 Plenary discussions on best practices in financial management of MSCA

WG3.2: Analysis of selected legal issues in other than H2020 EU research programmes run by different Directorates General (e.g. DG JUST, DG HOME, DG EAC etc.) of the European Commission with particular attention to grants with participation of beneficiaries from third countries – Part 2 – Case studies

An analysis of selected legal issues in the model Grant Agreements for research grants awarded under specific calls published by different DGs of the European Commission as well as the examination of the similarities and differences of the legal provisions between those standard model GAs and the H2020 model GA for RIA, in particular with regard to the general rules of participation in the project and Intellectual Property Rights will be continued.

The results of the model GAs analysis will further be discussed, experience in preparing the

GAs in question will be shared and the best practices on the legal aspects of managing the grants will be exchanged by the WG3 members along with the recommendations/tips for other users outlined, where relevant.

Presentation given by the Task Leader will be followed by a discussion in the group.

WG3.2 Task Leader: Diana Pustuła (University of Warsaw, PL)

WG3 “raising awareness mission” concerning the principles of the European Charter & Code and the promotion of the HR Excellence in Research Logo. Presentation of the updated results of the on-line survey run among the TN Bestprac participants before the Vilnius meeting. The outcomes have been elaborated and will be shared by **Tihana Damić (Croatian Veterinary Institute, HR)**.

17:45 Departure of bus back to city centre

19:00 Dinner (Central building of Vilnius University, Universiteto str. 3.)

Friday, September 23, 2016

08:30 **Departure of bus to meeting venue at University of Vilnius**
(outside of city).
Pick-Up point: central building of Vilnius University, Universiteto str. 3.

09:00 **WG1/WG2/WG3-meeting** (*in parallel*)

WG1.3: Defining Research Support Staff framework - continued

This session will continue the WG1.2 session.

WG2.3: ERC Portability and Host Institution experiences in managing ERC Grants

Contributions to this topic will be provided by (**max 20 min presentation**):

- Dirk De Craemer (Ghent University)
- Renè Maasen Van den Brink (VUmc Amsterdam)
- Jonne Ritari (University of Turku)
- Marta Bravo Nájera (Universidad de Murcia)

WG3.3: Analysis of the EC procurement-based research/innovation contracts – Part 1

Many research institutions look for EU research funds beyond H2020 applying for them under public tenders for research and innovation. The legal framework for procurement in relation to research and/or innovation including confidentiality and (framework) agreements will be studied. In the context of contracting for research and/or innovation in particular intellectual property rights and liability provisions will be analysed and discusses with the WG3 members.

Presentation will be followed by working in five smaller groups analyzing and comparing the selected legal issues included in the EC procurement-based contract for services vs. those in the GA for H2020 (RIA). The small groups will be looking for similarities and differences, trying to identify risky clauses and finally report to the whole WG3 on the outcomes and conclusions.

WG3.3 Task Co-Leaders: Miriam Ryan (Maynooth University, IE) and Diana Pustuła (University of Warsaw, PL),

10:30 Coffee break

11:00 **WG1/WG2/WG3-meeting** (in parallel)

WG1.4: Recycling strategies for rejected proposals

Due to the high level of competition in European funding programmes, excellent research proposals are often not being funded. Best practices how to deal and proceed with such rejected proposals will be presented and discussed.

11.00 - 12.20 h Presentations on experiences in proposal recycling strategies

1. Claudia Oliveira (University of Lisbon, POR)
2. Elina Humala (University of Jyväskylä, FIN)
3. Antun Plenkovic (Institute of Social Sciences Ivo Pilar, CRO)
4. Mary Caspillo-Brewer (University College London, UK)
5. Delphine Nicolas (University of Oslo, NO)
6. Rebekka Steinmann (Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg, GER)

Writers of report WG1 best practices for recycling strategies

- Andri Charalambous (Cyprus Institute of Neurology & Genetics, CYP)
- Véronique Victor (Ghent University, BEL)
- Nathalie Queffelec (Université de Bretagne Occidentale, FRA)

12.20 - 12.30 h Topics for next WG1 meetings

WG2.4: How to avoid financial errors in managing H2020 projects

During the meeting in Budapest members decided to continue the exchange of best practices in managing H2020 projects (for example with the analysis of personnel costs' reporting and third parties involvement). The discussion will take into account the EC running communication campaigns on simplification and reduction of financial errors (up to 20 minutes presentation)

Personnel costs: best practices related to additional remuneration (each 5 minutes), Staska Mrak Jamnik (University of Ljubljana), Eva Vas (Central European University), Meltem İsanlar and Zeynep Neyza Akcabay (KOC University), Alexandra Attard (University of Malta)

Updated version of the Annotated MGA H2020 (max 15 minutes) Wolfram Rieneck, (Medical University Innsbruck)

Ensure successful implementation (max 15 minutes), Meike Dlaboha (Weißenstephan-Triesdorf)

Exclusion of VAT in H2020 (max 15 minutes), Primož Petek (Slovenian Forestry Institute)

12:00: Summing up session, next steps

WG3.4: Analysis of the EC procurement-based research/innovation contracts – Part 2 - Case studies

The legal framework for procurement in relation to research/innovation including confidentiality and (framework) agreements will further be discussed as well as issues concerning Intellectual Property Rights and liability provisions supported by presentation of case studies based on experience of the WG3 members in participation in the public tenders for research/innovation. The aim of this session is to share experience and exchange best practices concerning the legal aspects of preparing the procurement-based agreements/contracts and managing the research/innovation grants. Recommendations/tips for the members of WG3 will be outlined, where relevant. Presentation given by the Task Leader will be followed by a discussion in the group.

WG3.3 Task Leader: Niina Mikkonen, Aalto University, FI

12:30 Break

12:45 **Presentation of outcome on BESTRPAC survey “stress/health/worklife balance of research administrators”** (Jan Andersen, Denmark)

13:15 **Summing-up session of all working groups**

13:30 **Lunch** & end of meeting

14:30 **Departure of bus back to city centre**