



Brussels, 19 December 2005
F3/EM D(2005) 658114

Minutes of information meeting

Prop. Acronym: EGEE-II Negotiating POs: Kyriakos Baxevanidis

Enric Mitjana

Prop. Number: 031688 Other POs present: Maria Ramalho(part.)

Meeting date: 19.12.2005 (10:15 - 16:30)

Proposal co-ordinator name: Bob Jones

Organisation: CERN

Deadline for conclusion of negotiation: 20.03.2006

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Carried out?</u> |
|---|----------------------------|
| Reminder of negotiation deadline | Done |
| Confirm delegation empowered to negotiate | Done |

Introductions and general aspects:

KB and EM (negotiating POs) introduced themselves. For the matters concerning the negotiation of this proposal, KB and EM will be the contact points on the Commission side.

The members of the consortium attending the meeting can be found attached at the end of these minutes.

There were no objections on the composition of the EC negotiating team from the side of the consortium.

The coordinator confirmed that the attendants were empowered to negotiate on behalf of the consortium.

The meeting participants checked that the information required to start negotiations was available at both sides:

- Following the approval of the implementation plan for the FP6-2005-Infrastructures-7 call by the RI programme committee on 16.12.05 the formal letter of invitation to negotiations will soon be sent to the consortium. For this reason, this first meeting is formally declared as “information meeting”.

- The ESR had been sent to the project on 06.12.2005. Links to documents containing background information useful for the negotiation phase had been sent to the project on 12.12.05.

- The project had provided a first version of the Annex I and Word format CPFs ahead of the meeting. A paper responding to the ESR recommendations was made available as well.

The main objective of this informal meeting was to agree the basis of a complete and final Annex I and to clarify as many legal and financial aspects as possible.

Technical issues:

Modifications of the initial proposal according to the ESR recommendations

- Potential impact: “The proposal addresses the issue of long term sustainability although the description of the proposed European Grid Organisation is somewhat tenuous”.

- 1.- The consortium reported on the discussions of the EGO concept that have taken place since the time of the proposal writing. These will further be elaborated in a workshop organised at CERN in January 2006. Based on the outcome, the sustainability plans and specific steps should be further elaborated and detailed.

- 2.- The idea of progressively moving additional functionalities to the ROCs for them to become major actors in the set up of national grid initiatives was welcome. A deliverable that documents the status of this progress and identifies open issues would be of interest.

- 3.- It was commented that DNA5.3 on M22 may be too late if significant actions result from this analysis that need to be implemented in order to ensure sustainability after the project’s end.

- Mobilisation of resources: “The overall financial plan is well presented, although the requested funding for several of the activities appears excessive, such as NA2, NA3, NA4, JRA1, and SA1. This should be clarified during negotiation.”

4.- The EC services are considering a budget cut (in the order of €2.5Mio) to implement this point of the ESR. If additional tasks can be agreed upon during negotiations this amount could be at least partially reconsidered. Slides providing justification for the requested funding of these activities were presented. Furthermore, additional work was proposed as well. This was perceived as a step in the right direction but still limited in scope and detail.

- Overall remarks: “The participation of partners from third countries (Korea, Taiwan, Serbia and Montenegro, Russia, and United States) adds value but the large amount of funding requested for Russian partners should be justified.”

5.- Well substantiated arguments on the requested financing for the Russian partners were presented. Their important contribution in EGEE and the good progress towards the creation of a NGI were acknowledged as it was the expected prominent role in fusion in EGEE-II. The EC considers the proposed cut of 70K€ to the Russian partners is sufficient.

- Overall remarks: “There may be some overlap with the work proposed in OMII-Europe, especially in the areas of Quality Assurance and Middleware Re-engineering. This should be addressed through close cooperation between the two projects, leading to tangible and measurable results.”

6.- It was stated that CERN is planning to join OMII-Europe. The approach to involve EGEE-II, ETICS and OMII-Europe to define QA processes needs further detail. Plans on how to identify any possible duplication of work in middleware re-engineering were not specified.

- Overall remarks: “In the context of the proposed European Grid Organisation, it is important that the project contributes substantially to the building up of national grid organisations throughout Europe.”

7.- This has been addressed under the ESR point on Potential impact.

Discussion on the work plan:

8.- For the project as a whole and especially for each activity, metrics for the objectives should be defined that are concrete and measurable.

9.- The targets for the different activities need to be realistic but not over-conservative. It was suggested to define scenarios (e.g. for the expected new applications and user communities) and specify any risks in the section foreseen to this end in the DoW.

10.- The importance of effective interworking between the grid and the underlying networks is paramount for the provision of production quality services. Efforts on how to improve it need to be detailed. Examples of areas with potential are: formalised exchange

of status information; harmonisation of trouble tickets; extensions of the ENOC coordination with the GEANT emergency response team; generalisation (and standardisation) of EGEE-GEANT interfaces.

11.- The attention to industry in the project needs to be increased. The proposed plans via CERN openlab, the consortium industrial partners, linking with BEINGRID and NESSI need to be refined. Involving industrial partners in evaluating and assessing the project is seen as a way of getting feedback and gaining trust from them.

12.- The proposal of identifying a single point of entry for new applications was welcome. The production of a “EGEE-II user guide” that details the different stages in the process of becoming a user of the grid infrastructure would be beneficial. It should not fall short in realistically presenting the effort and contributions that new user communities will have to deliver.

Reporting periods:

A scheme of two reporting periods (12+12) is envisaged. Beyond the reviews at the end of the reporting periods, targeted intermediate reviews will be performed as well.

Start of the project:

In order to avoid a gap between EGEE and EGEE-II the consortium would like to start in April 2006. This will require that the negotiations advance swift and in any case will most probably lead to the fact that the contract is not signed before the start of the project.

Consortium technical capability. (Recommendations for changes in consortium?)

The consortium has the required skills to achieve the project goals and those of individual partners complement each other well.

The consortium stated that there may still be some changes in the consortium constitution. These should be communicated to the EC services as soon as possible.

List of other relevant projects/proposals involving consortium members

EGEE, ICEAGE, DEISA, EUMEDGRID, EUChinaGRID, BELIEF, SEE-GRID, DILIGENT, BalticGrid, EELA, ETICS, ISSeG, eIRGSP, BELIEF, BIOINFOGRID, BELIEF

| <u>Item</u> | <u>Carried out?</u> |
|--|---|
| Contract type and funding basis discussed | Done |
| Cost Reporting Models discussed and agreed for each contractor | Will be finalised when the pre-filled CPFs are returned |

Participants' cost reporting model

It was recalled that there has to be consistency in the cost reporting model used by a contractor across the whole FP6. The consortium was requested to explicitly notify the EC services of any known modifications of the cost models with respect to EGEE.

The cost reporting model of the participants will be assessed in detail by the EC once the CPFs and possibly supporting additional information are available. General information on cost reporting models can be found at http://europa.eu.int/comm/research/fp6/working-groups/model-contract/pdf/cost_model_en.pdf.

Legal and financial aspects

Christophe Kowalski - CK joined for the financial and legal discussions.

It is the project obligation to be aware of all the legal and financial aspects implied by the contract signature. Just a few can be explicitly addressed during the negotiation process and thus it is the consortium's responsibility to check the details of the contract. The Model Contract and the Financial Guidelines can be found at ftp://ftp.cordis.lu/pub/documents_r5/natdir0000035/s_2034005_20050316_104305_2034en.pdf.

Before signing the contract the Commission will perform a legal and financial verification of the contractors. In principle, no legal documents are needed for contractors or JRUs validated already in EGEE. For the other, copies of legal documents should be sent to the EC.

The consortium was asked to check the pre-filled CPFs and indicate any modifications made on them. No signed CPFs are needed at this stage. Signed CPFs will be required after the closure of the negotiations once a final version of the CPFs has been agreed upon. The CPF forms copied into the DoW have to be of the final CPFs.

Legal aspects specifically mentioned:

- The deadline for the completion of negotiations is 20.03.2006. This implies that final versions of all documents to be submitted by the consortium in the negotiation phase need to be received by the EC services well in advance of the above deadline.
- The consortium was informed that the partners acknowledge they have concluded a Consortium Agreement when signing the contract.

- The consortium will include the following footnote in DoW: “Training and education are meant as actions for the dissemination of knowledge”.
- Special clause 2.A on international organisations will be included in the contract as CERN will be a contractor.
- Special clause 3bis on concertation will be included in the contract.
- Special clause 14 on contractors not receiving funding will be included in the contract.
- Special clause 23 concerning the JRUs will be included in the contract.
- Special clause 38 exempting public bodies from the financial collective responsibility will be included in the contract. It was clarified that in EGEE-II only public bodies from member states will be exempt from financial collective responsibility.
- Special clause 39 on the possibility not to submit audit certificates at the end of the first reporting period for contractors claiming less than 150K€ of EU contribution for that period will be included in the contract.
- The consortium was made aware that one clause of the contract specifies that the pre-financing at any stage of the project has to be less than 80% of the project’s total grant. Furthermore, if less than 70% of the pre-financing is spent in the first reporting period there will be no renewal of the pre-financing for the second reporting period.

Financial aspects specifically mentioned:

- The “Framework for negotiations” that will soon be sent to the coordinator will contain the ceiling for the EC contribution (i.e. maximal EC contribution).
- Pre-financing: up to 85% of the first reporting period plus 6 months. It was agreed that the release of the pre-financing would be triggered by the reception of the accession forms of the minimum number of contractors according to the rules of participation.
- The different contract accession time options 30/45/60 days were discussed. Due to the likely scenario of the contract being signed once the project has already started, the EC does not favour the 60 days option. This point is to be followed up in the next meeting.
- Audit certificates are mandatory for all contractors (and eligible as management cost). Particularities on the submission of audit certificates, especially the implications of Clause 39 were discussed. In any case, audit certificates have to be provided by all partners at the end of the project. Working notes on audit certificates can be found in ftp://ftp.cordis.lu/pub/documents_r5/natdir0000001/s_6918005_20050727_150035_2521en.pdf.
- Tasks for 3rd parties that will contribute and claim costs have to be clearly identified in the Annex I.
- Tasks for subcontractors have to be clearly identified in the Annex I. The consortium has to be in a position to justify that the best value for money option was taken when selecting subcontractors.

Sources of matching funds (if not 100% Commission funded)

The consortium reassured that as in EGEE the EC funding effort is matched by at least an equal unfunded contribution from the side of the consortium.

Russian partners (associated in the RDIG federation) will receive funding from an INTAS project. This contribution will not be considered as a receipt (in the sense of FP6) for them as long as the covered tasks are not part of the EGEE activities but complementary to them.

Concluding remarks

A functional mailbox address for backing up all correspondence with the EC is being set up and will soon be operational (INFSO-RI-031688@cec.eu.int). All E-Mails should be addressed to KB (kyriakos.baxevanidis@cec.eu.int) and EM (enric.mitjana@cec.eu.int) with CC to the functional mailbox.

The consortium will provide the CPFs (with indications on any modifications with respect to the pre-filled version sent to CERN on 19.12.05 just after the meeting) and an update of the DoW (including a front page reflecting any changes allowing version tracking) before 11.01.06.

Date and time of next meeting: 16.01.06 at 10:00 (Note: 01.02.06 has been tentatively reserved for the meeting after that one).

Attached: List & co-ordinates of proposers attending

Enric Mitjana
Scientific Officer

List & co-ordinates of proposers attending

| Name | Organisation |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Bob Jones | CERN |
| Frederic Hemmer | CERN |
| Cal Loomis | CNRS |
| David Ferguson | NeSC |
| Hannelore Hammerle | CERN |
| Slave Ilyin | SINP MSU |
| Ian Bird | CERN |
| Fotis Karayannis | GRNET |
| Claudio Grandi | INFN |