

Agenda

EURO-CARES Kick-off meeting

Natural History Museum, South Kensington London. U.K.

27th January 2015

1. 10:00. Welcome and Introductions (SR)
2. 10:30 Summary of the project (CS/SR)
3. 11:00 Administrative issues and management (OB/AFRS)
4. 11:30 WP1: *Knowledge Capture* status and plans (CS)

12:30-13:30 Lunch

5. 13:30 WP7: *Maximising Impact* status and plans (MG)
6. 14:30 Other work packages (All)
7. 16:00 Recruitment (LF/JBru)
8. 16:30 Team communication and future meetings (OB/CS)
9. 17:00 Any Other Business

Delegates

Sara Russell (SR) – NHM	Yves Marrocchi (YM) – CNRS
Caroline Smith (CS) – NHM	Allan Bennett (AB) – PHE
Oliver Bacon (OB) – NHM	Tom Pottage (TP) – PHE
Antonio Fernandez-Ranada-Shaw (AFRS) – REA	John Bridges (JBri) – Leic
John Brucato (JBru) – INAF	Petra Rettberg (PR) – DLR
Ludovic Ferriere (LF) – Vienna	Jutta Zipfel (JZ) – Senck
Emmanuel Jaquet (EJ) – MNHN	John Vrubleviskis (JV) – TAS
Francois Robert (FR) – MNHN	Lidia Pittarello (LP) - ULB
Monica Grady (MG) – OU	Frances Westall (FW) – CNRS (via video link)
Ian Franchi (IF) – OU	Ernesto Palombo (EP) – INAF (via video link)
Frederic Foucher (FF) – CNRS	Luigi Folco (LF) – Pisa (via video link)

Apologies: Matthieu Gounelle (MNHN), Vincianne Debaille (ULB)

1. Welcome and introductions (SR)

Nb. Frances Westall, Ernesto Palombo and Luigi Folco attempted to join the meeting via video link, only Frances was successful.

Welcomed to the meeting by SR, all attendees gave a brief introduction to themselves and their role in the project.

2. Summary of the project (CS/SR)

SR outlined the project structure and Work Packages and spoke about NHM's role as coordinator.

CS spoke about the possible issues with public fear and the consortium's role in allaying those fears.

CS presented a number of possible logos that had been designed for the project. These will be uploaded to the project dropbox so that partners can comment on their preference.

ACTION: Partners to feedback to CS over logo preference (deadline: 15th February 2015)

FR raised the fact that there is a huge amount of existing information relating to the background for the project. CS stated that this is the purpose of WP1 which is a 'knowledge-gathering' exercise on which to form the basis of the project and the following work packages.

CS mentioned that since the proposal was submitted there is Planetary Protection Standard being developed, this is an example of the constantly evolving landscape on which the project is based and highlights the importance of the scheduled workshops and project meetings so that further external developments can be discussed.

3. Administration Issues and Management (AFRS and OB)

AFSR gave a presentation on the Administrative issues from the perspective of the European Commission (EC) and the Research Executive Agency (REA). The presentation covered the role of REA, background to the COMPET8-2014 call and guidelines for project reporting. AFSR stressed the importance for all institutions to keep time sheet records for staff working on the project.

ACTION: All partners to initiate and regularly maintain timesheet records for all staff working on the project. These records should be used as the basis for the Form C claims for the Periodic Reports.

OB gave a presentation on the Administration and Management of the project from the perspective of the Coordinator. The presentation provided an update on the status of the Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement which have now been signed by all partners.

ACTION: OB to distribute version of Consortium Agreement signed by all Beneficiaries as a scanned copy by 31 March 2015.

OB the presented the breakdown of the project budget and spoke about the different types of cost category. It was explained that each partners' budget is split into Direct Personnel Costs, Other Direct Costs and Indirect Costs.

Rules for calculation of Actual Personnel Costs were outlined and details of the new rules under Horizon 2020 were explained by OB. Actual Personnel costs are calculated by taking the number of hours worked and multiplying by the hourly rate. The hourly rate is to be calculated per financial year and must be based on the last closed financial year. The hourly rate is calculated by dividing the

Total Annual Personnel Costs by the Total Annual Productive Hours. Under Horizon 2020 each institution has 3 options for the calculation of the Annual Productive Hours, either 1720 Hours, an Individuals' Annual Productive Hours or Standard Annual Productive Hours for the whole institution.

ACTION: OB to add guidelines to EURO-CARES dropbox and/or website

4. WP1: Knowledge Capture status and plans (CS)

CS presented an overview of Work Package 1: Knowledge Capture. She stated that the first set of Deliverables (D1.1 – D1.6) should be completed by the end of Month 4 (April 2015) and that shortly after in Month 5 the first review meeting should be held.

Task 2 in WP1 is to arrange the International Conference and Workshop, it was suggested by CS that the format for this should comprise of 2 days of open invitation conference sessions followed by 2 days of invitation only expert meetings.

It was stated that the first major decision to be made is on the dates for the International Conference and Workshop. In the proposal it was written that this would take place in Month 9 (September 2015).

Question was asked over dates of other conferences around that time. It was said that the European Planetary Science Congress (EPSC) is taking place at the beginning of September so it would have to be mid-late September to avoid clashing.

Action: All partners to check availability in September 2015 and report to OB by 13th April 2015?

CS stated that this Conference will take place in London and outlined a number of options. It was said that the Conference should take place away from the Natural History Museum, venues suggested were the University of Greenwich, the Royal Astronomical Society and the Institute of Physics.

Question was asked regarding the number of attendees for the Conference and the Expert Workshop, CS stated between 50-100 for the Conference and 30-40 for the Expert Workshop.

Action: SR to decide on location for International Conference and Workshop by 30 April 2015 and communicate to partners.

Following the Conference there should be another web conference between all partners in order to prepare the Consolidated Requirements Document (Deliverable 1.9). As some institutions do not allow Skype to be used there is the requirement to find another platform in order to successfully hold the web meetings. Comments on issues with the video link for this meeting.

Action: NHM to investigate a stable web-based meeting platform or to decide whether to use conference calls instead (deadline: September meeting)

CS and SR gave an overview of the current sample return missions that are planned and should be taken into consideration with regards to the project.

Question from JBru – should the partners consider possible future missions that have yet to be agreed, for example Comet return missions? CS answered that while this wasn't addressed in the call or the proposal it would be prudent to consider this during the project. AFRS commented that from the EC's perspective it is fine to adapt the Work Plans if required due to changing priorities for external organisations like ESA and NASA.

Question was asked over the volume of samples that would likely be returned? SR answered that the OSIRIS REX mission is planning to return approximately 60 grams of samples while there are plans to return 500 grams from Mars, both relatively small sample sizes.

Question from JV – Should a project glossary document be created? CS stated that it should.

Action: CS to create project glossary document which will be available to all partners through the project drop-box and/or project website.

5. WP7: Maximising Impact status and plans (MG)

MG gave a presentation outlining the plans for Work Package 7 – Maximising Impact.

The OU plan to recruit a Website Manager/Outreach Coordinator who will work for 3 years across a number of projects including Euro-Cares. The job specification for this post has already been created and they hope to recruit in the next two months.

The website is likely to be hosted externally rather than at the OU or NHM.

A Massive Open Online Course (MOOC) will be developed. Question was asked if this would be too time-consuming however MG stated that it would not due to OU's experience and existing frameworks.

It would be desirable to tie in the work of the project with any European exhibitions that may be taking place. It was said that MNHN Paris is due to have a meteorite exhibition in 2017 and possibly NHM in 2018. MG also stated that we should look to regional museums as well if we can tie in with their schedules.

The OU will develop formal education packages for different levels of education.

Project outreach will be via the website and social media including Facebook and Twitter. Communication should be aimed at the a wide range of audiences - the General Public, the Scientific community, Government and Policy makers.

Comment by AFRS that the EC will likely flag the project as 'Media friendly' and details of the outreach and communications will be distributed by the EC.

Question by LF – What details of the project are we allowed to tell journalists? CS stated that as the project is EC funded details of the award value and call can be divulged. It was stated in the proposal that there would be no confidential information generated by the project.

Action: SR to discuss options for inclusions with Temporary Exhibitions Programme Manager at NHM and MG to follow suit at MNHN.

6. Other work packages (All)

Work Package 2

JBru gave a presentation on Work Package 2 which covered the outline for the WP2 work plan. The plans for the recruitment were discussed and it was said that while the PDRA's will be recruited by INAF and Vienna it is important that they work on all aspects of the project and that they receive training from all of the partners, as appropriate.

AB commented that care should be careful when choosing candidates as they should have experience across the different scientific disciplines. He also stated that PHE could offer training courses to the PDRAs.

JBru stated he has a possible candidate in mind.

It was suggested that it could be beneficial for PDRAs to undertake the ESA Planetary Protection course.

Action: Partners to volunteer training courses for the PDRAs to JBru by 1 May 2015. SR to follow up on the accessibility of the the ESA Planetary Protection course & check affordability against the EURO- CARES budget.

Work Package 3

LF presented the outline for Work Package 3. He expressed his concerns that the PDRA positions will only be for 24 months. CS stated that when the budgets were being put together it was not possible to cost in two PDRAs for 36 months as we wanted the budget to be no more than €2 million. LF enquired if it may be possible to extend the duration of the PDRA if he worked less person months on the project. OB stated this may be possible but would have to be discussed with CS and SR at a later date.

Action: LF to present to SR a proposition to reduced charged time by directly allocated staff in order to liberate budget for direct costs of PDRA by 30 March 2015. SR to assess and report back to LF on outcome by 30 April 2015.

Work Package 4

MG is the work package leader however he was not present at the meeting. Francois Robert was deputising and gave a background to the work package and some of the methods and analysis planned.

IF commented that we need to decide on the level of background needed for the project. CS restated that we need a glossary to cover all of the techniques as not all partners are familiar with all techniques and how they impact on other areas of work and the project.

CS stated the partners should be mindful of what other options are available outside of Europe when deciding on the plans for the curation facility. It would be useful to obtain details from JAXA regarding their containment facility which could be done through project partners and members of the advisory committee.

Action: SR to follow up and acquired JAXA details and share with partners by 30 April 2015.

Work Package 5 & 6

Work Packages 5 & 6 were briefly discussed, JZ asked if Cometary material should be considered within the analogue samples in Work Package 5, SR answered that it was not stated in the proposal so it should not be considered at the moment however possibly in the future.

JV stated with regards to Work Package 6 the outputs from Work Packages 2 & 3 are needed in order to complete the tasks.

Action: OB to note the dependency on the Risk Register which will be circulated to all partners for comment by 30 May 2015.

7. Recruitment (LF/JBru)

Issues regarding the recruitment had already been discussed when looking at Work Packages 2 & 3.

8. Team communication and future meetings (OB/CS)

CS stated that Work Package Leaders will be responsible for organising meetings for WP participants and that each Work Package should have communications plan in place.

ACTION: Work Pack Leaders to create communications plans and arrange schedule for WP meetings.

Regarding Project meetings, as stated in the proposal, there will be yearly face to face meetings and web or teleconference meetings every 6 months organised by the Coordinator, .

CS also suggested that discussions with ESA should take place as and when appropriate.

ACTION: OB to send out to doodle poll to book the 6 monthly meetings by 1 June 2015.

9. Any Other Business

JBri questioned how best to involve industry in the project? It was suggested that a workshop could be organised to liaise with key industry figures, although this is not in the original work plan therefore there is no budget allocation for such an activity. JV commented that the Robotics and Innovation Facility in Bristol grant time to SMEs and Institutes which could be useful within WP6.