



MINUTE OF MEETING

Technical Management Committee extend with the Project Assembly (all partners)

Prot.:
Ver. final
Date: 08/FEB/2011, 11:00-12:00
Location: Phone Conference
Prepared by: P.Osocha

Internal people:	Silvia Mier (AS); As'ad Salkham (CS); Marcin Karpinski (MK, CS); Mohammad Mushfiqur Rahman Chowdhury (MMRC, CWIN); Fabrizio Maria de Seta (FdS, ED); Andrea Morgagni (ED); Renato Baldelli (ED); Josef Noll (JN, MAS); Ezio Rossi (SESM); Przemyslaw Osocha (POs, SESM); Gordana Mijic (GM, THYIA); Spase Drakul (SD, THYIA); Andrea Fiaschetti (AF, UNIROMA1); Inaki Eguia (IE, ESI);
External people:	
Subject:	<u>pSHIELD project - Phone Conference</u>
References:	

Description	Decisions and Actions
<p>Minutes of Meeting</p> <p>Information about Mid-Term Review preparation status</p> <p>SD informed that Mid-term Review will be delayed, due to difficulties that Project Officer encountered looking for experts. The announcement of the new date will allow to have at least three weeks for planning. The information on Mid-term Review date should be available any moment, but the Mid-term Review can be scheduled after 28 of February 2011.</p> <p>SD also said, that Officer informed him, that all partners representatives are invited to the Mid-term Review to provide support during review presentations.</p> <p>SD confirmed, according to Action 1 from 20.01.11 PhC, that D1.1.3, D2.2.1 and D2.3.1 don't need to be presented in a separate dedicated presentation for that at the Mid-Term Review Meeting, since it will be included in the WP leaders presentations. But anyway the statuses of works in all respective tasks and all WPs should be presented during Mid-term Review.</p> <p>JN pointed that despite additional time we have, we should try to prepare those deliverables as soon as possible.</p> <p>POs asked that in case of extensive Mid-term Review delay, there is possibility that discussed deliverables will meet their postponed deadline and will have to be delivered during Mid-term Review.</p> <p>SD explained that he sent a brief report on the action items from the previous PhC in which all deliverables that enter in Mid-term Review are specified.</p> <p>SD informed also that there is option to extend period of project delay based on the assessment during the Mid-term Review that may be requested by the reviewers and the PO (Mr. Vecchio).</p> <p>POs suggested to make physical meeting in Rome before Mid-term Review to prepare for review. POs proposed even to make single internal and mid-term meeting in Rome. It is possible due delayed and still uncertain date of Mid-term Review.</p> <p>SD answered that it is impossible to make Mid-term Review in Rome because of Officer and JU reviewers limited availability, so it has to be done in Brussels. But SD proposed to make WP leaders meeting in Rome before mid-term review, and also to meet in Brussels one day</p>	<p>Action 1 SD will inform partners about new Mid-term Review date after Officer will inform him.</p> <p>Action 2 MAS will generate one page D1.1.1, D7.1.1, THYIA will suggest the form for these summaries.</p>

<p>before mid-term review with all the partners.</p> <p>POs suggested that meeting in Rome should be open to all the partners, not only for WP leaders, because some partners have key competence and should support leaders during deliverables presentations. JN supported opinion that all partners should have opportunity to take part in internal meeting. GM pointed that task leaders are valuable support for WP leaders for review presentations. He also explained that the progress of the work in each WP is organized by the WP leaders and task leaders as well as with participations of other contributors. Regular PhC organized by the WP leader is the right way for progressing in R&D activities. Except for WP2 there is lack of PhC in other WPs. She also mentioned that a physical meeting will not cover this gap and it may required more than one day meetings.</p> <p>SD highlights the importance for heaving TMC meeting with WP leaders and task leaders only to keep the focus on the technical work. He also explained that bscw server is the best image what we are producing, since it is created for exchanging of our contributions and for tracing the progress of the work. He, add the face-to-face meeting in Rome can be done day before in Brussels, and what GM proposes is a good strategy, first to be solved on the individual WP level the progress, and then to identify it is really needed one extra meeting behind this in Brussels. It may happen that not all partners will be there as today and this will damage the expected outcomes. He is strongly supporting the idea of GM first the progress of the work in each WP must be reported by scheduling immediately PhC and then if necessary a physical meeting in Rome.</p> <p>Partners agreed that the internal meeting should be proposed. The meeting should be for WP leaders and open for other partners to make final preparations for Mid-term Review.</p> <p>SD comment on that. He proposed to the TM Fabrizio de Seta to take an action and to find the best way forward.</p> <p>Partners also agreed that all the partners should meet in Brussels one day before Mid-term review meeting.</p> <p>SD provided one feedback from the PO, Mr. Vecchio, which point out that TA must be respected and it is wrong to expect that it is relaxed due to fact that it contains almost the same context as original SHIELD project. The current WP descriptions are contractual obligation.</p> <p>Review of last PhC actions realization status</p> <p>Action 1 – Check if deliverables M6+ may be not presented at the Mid-Term Review Meeting. SD confirmed that. Topic discussed earlier during this PhC.</p> <p>Action 2 – D2.1.1 progress AF confirmed that D2.1.1 is currently under review process.</p> <p>Action 3 – D2.2.1 progress IE informed that in few days deliverable draft will be uploaded to server and involved partners asked for contribution.</p> <p>Action 4 – internal reviews of deliverables Partners discussed status of deliverables for review. D2.1.1 is actually under review.</p> <p>Action 5 – physical meeting in Rome Meeting was widely discussed during initial part of that PhC.</p>	<p>Action 3 ED and SESM will prepare proposal of internal meeting in Rome.</p> <p>Action 4 IE will upload D2.2.1 draft to the server and ask partners for contributions.</p>
--	--

Action 6 - WP leaders proposed regular PhCs
Status of WPs PhCs was presented in WPs statuses part of that PhC.

Action 7 – agenda for technical PhC
Agenda for current PhC was proposed.

Action 8 - Annex VII ASAP signing
SD informed that CWIN signature is missing. MMRC informed that document was sent by mail. MK informed that CS still wait for national agreement.

WPs statuses

Very synthetic statuses of WPs were presented with emphasis on scheduled PhC dates.

WP1 – This will be discussed with PM and TCM to see the progress of the work.

WP2 – WP status was widely presented during last PhC. GM informed that she plans PhC in 2 weeks time.

WP3 – POs informed that known issues with partners moves in WP were solved. Change of WP leader from ETH to SESM was decided by consortium meeting in Oslo. POs informed that ETH confirmed that they uphold the decision. AS decided to stay in T3.3, and since they are T3.3 leader, the issue with lack of T3.3 leader is solved. The PhC will be scheduled in one week time.

GM reminded that all changes of the partner's assignment in tasks should be officially sent to PC.

SD remind that it is scheduled for other PhC discussion on 15 of February.

WP4 – due to absence of leading partners status was not presented.

WP5 – FdS presented status of WP5. He pointed good cooperation with TRS and UNIROMA1. He estimated status of D5.1 to 60% ready. The PhC will be scheduled in 2 weeks time.

WP6 – WP leader excused his absence before PhC. The WP status was presented by FdS.

WP7 – MMRC presented the status of current works in WP7.

Plan of the next conferences

POs pointed that physical meeting was already widely discussed in the beginning of that PhC.

POs said that technical PhCs for the project should be scheduled on regular basis. POs reminded also that there are already proposed "WPall" PhC on 17.02 and 10.03.2011. Due to delay of current PhC, the date 17.02 will be probably skipped, but 10.03 PhC should be hold up.

SD pointed that PhC should be preceded by Doodle poll, because he takes part in many projects and can not assure his availability on particular day in future.

GM asked if planned PhC date will influence physical meeting. POs answered that physical meeting will be planned independently of proposed PhC.

GM suggested that WP leaders should plan WP PhCs on regular basis

Action 5
SESM will propose next technical PhC around 10.03 with prior poll

Action 6
WPs leaders will schedule and inform

and inform about the schedule.
There was no additional topics or questions from partners.

about planned WP PhC.