

Project Administration Committee

21st September 2011, Face to Face meeting at EGI Technical Forum.

Present:

Claire Devereux	STFC (UK-IE-NL)
Denise Small	STFC (UK-IE-NL)
Anders Waananen	UCPH
Geraldine Fettahi	CNRS
Andres Aeschlimann	DACH
Anna Loukaku	GRNET
Antun Balaz	IPB
Boro Jakimovski	UKIM
Csaba Hajdn	KFKI
Jana Hrdlickova	CESNET
Miroslav Dobrucky	IISAS
Celine Bitoune	EGI.eu
Catherine Gater	EGI.eu
Sjomaa Specht	EGI.eu
Rob van der Meer	EGI.eu

Apologies: David O'Callaghan TCD (UK-IE-NL)

Chair: Claire Devereux, minutes: Claire Devereux

Agenda

1. Proposed changes to the project following first year review recommendations
2. Timelines for next payment

Claire introduced the agenda and thanked people for attending another PAC so soon after the last teleconference. There are important changes being considered at the PMB and Collaboration Boards for which a decision is being sought this week. Today is an opportunity to get a further understanding of these changes and how they affect us at an administrative and financial level so that NGIs can make informed decisions to vote on these changes at Collaboration Board.

Proposed changes to the project following first year review recommendations

Catherine gave a short presentation around the four main proposed themes.

Q: how can change 4 happen (SA1.7 taking over the responsibility for reporting NA3.3 tasks) without more money or effort? How can it be reported?

A: It's a change in the responsibility of WPs in reporting

Q: Some NGIs were not sure they could consolidate effort as staff were already in post and effort was distributed between institutions within the NGIs

A; The change is requested in part to reduce the administration overhead. NGIs are free to redistribute effort and funding as they wish. We appreciate that not everyone will be able to fully complete this task but we'd like all to try in the spirit of the reviewers and report fewer staff in PPT.

Q: International tasks are 67% funded via national sources (i.e. majority) so they should have the biggest say in effort reprioritisation

A: yes but we need to be seen to be acting on the reviewers recommendations too

Q: these recommendations from the reviewers, are they specific to EGI InSPIRE or more general across FP7 projects

A: Catherine believes the recommendations may be more general, but in particular to EGI they are trying the help us move to more sustainable platform

Q: What is the timeline?

A: EGI is looking for decision very soon and a move towards implementation, but don't have to have everything in place before the next review. We do have to have the procedures ready though. Hoping to implement at start of 3rd year.

A: Catherine reported that many deliverables around outreach had already been submitted. EC said they will not be accepted unless they reflect suggestions from reviewers. SO having to bring forward 3rd yr deliverables now.

Timelines for next payment

Celine finally presented two options for the next payment depending on the speed that the EC validates the first year reporting. If any NGI has a cash flow issue that cannot wait until mid-December please let Celine know and a stand-alone transfer of PQ5 may be possible sooner.

Additional notes from Claire Devereux following the Collaboration Board meeting on 22nd September 2011.

For further clarification below are my personal notes taken from questions I and others raised in the Collaboration Board.

1. Effort and budget within an NGI remains the same.
2. Consolidation of effort in NA2 and NA3. This applies to international effort only. Global task allocations remain the same in NA2 and NA3. SA and JRA tasks are not being requested to consolidate effort in international or global tasks.
3. NA3.4 global tasks. There are three tools funded under this task. The question is are these tools aimed at getting new user communities on board – if so they should remain in NA2/3. If not, if they primarily serve the existing user community, then we need to decide where they fit, perhaps better in SA1. It is likely that AppDB and Training Marketplace are orientated around getting new users on board so will be incorporated into the new NA2. VO services may fit better in SA1.
4. User Support: will we be required to report further effort to be able to draw down the funds after merging 3.3 and 1.7? In other words if a partner has 3 PM in NA3.3 and 6 PM in SA1.7, when NA3.3 is merged into SA1.7 will the partner be required to report 9 PM to draw down 6 PM effort? No, the “effort” remains in NA2/3 for the new NGI co-ordinator role. The Partner will be required to report existing effort levels in SA1.7, 6 PM in this example, but must reprioritize NGI tasks to include new user communities if no extra (free) effort available in NGI. If this leads to SA1.7 original task suffering then we must report this to the EC.
5. Financial Reporting of EGI Global tasks. All tasks (NA, SA, JRA) will require an institutional breakdown of all costs incurred in running the global tasks – full details, inc overheads etc.

NA3 & NA2 merger

A new NA2 work package with the following structure is being proposed

- Central team

NA2.1 Management

NA2.2 Strategy policy and planning support teams

NA2.3 Marketing team

NA2.4 Community Outreach

NA2.5 Technical Outreach and Engagement (in SA3 and old NA3.4 task coordination)

- NGI's

NGI Co-ordinator role, responsible for getting non-operational stuff done within the NGI (assigning to the most appropriate person, managing its delivery if they themselves are not the person to do the task)