



CESSDA PPP Management Board Meeting

Venue	UK Research Office, Brussels
Date	28 and 29 October 2009
Present	K Schürer (UKDA-KS); Bjorn Henrichsen (NSD-BH); Hans Rattinger (GESIS-HR); Hans Jørgen Marker (SND-HJM); Sami Borg (FSD-SB); Roxanne Silberman (RQ -RS); Adrian Dusa (RODA-AD); Laurent Sesink (DANS-LS); Peter Farago (FORS-PF); Chryssa Kappi (EKKE-CK); Janez Stebe (ADP-JS); Steen Ousager (SND-SO); Jindra Krejci (SDA-JK); Zoltan Fabian (TARKI-ZF); Karl Mueller (WISDOM-KM); Luis Antonio Castrillo Aguilera (CIS-LA); James McBride (ISSDA - JMB); Annika Thies (EC – AT); Deb Mitchell (ASSDA – DM); Franz Barjak (University of Applied Sciences Northwestern Switzerland - FB); Algis Krupavicius (LiDA, AK); Margarida Freire (BELSPO - MF); Maria Theofilatou (EC – MT); Hilary Beedham (UKDA – HB)
Apologies	Herve Pero (EC – HP); Aziz Naji (BELSPO - AN); Sonia Stefanizzi (ADPSS-SS)
Minutes	Beck Pitt (UKDA)

		ACTION
	Following a brief introduction, KS stressed the importance of reaching clear recommendations on the following, by the close of the meeting: (1) operational model; (2) speed of the ERIC's development; (3) funding model.	
1	<p><u>Project Manager's Report (HB)</u></p> <p>HB reported that the PPP's practical work was complete. Finances are healthy with some under spend due to UKDA staff changes. WP1 and WP3 continue to be active and WP12 is near completion: GESIS have finished required work; decisions on Portal enhancements are pending (re: DDI and Persistent Identifiers). It was noted that the work carried out for the WP9 tender went beyond remit and suggested an improved architecture for CESSDA.</p> <p>HB noted that a new version of the extension papers had been sent out. The status of some organisations had been queried: HB to follow up today with relevant organisations.</p> <p>MT confirmed that the extension's approval was purely an administrative matter.</p>	HB

	<p>HB proposed that WPL reports be submitted prior to the year end, in order to assist with the Final Report - Agreed.</p> <p>Following a query from RS, it was agreed that, subject to budget, a meeting for WPLs to present their findings to the Management Board in late February/March 2010 should be organised.</p>	<p>HB ✓</p> <p>HB/BP ✓</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><u>Strategic Plan (KS)</u></p> <p>With reference to the implementation plan, KS stressed that agreement on the content of <i>Key Strategic Drivers for the cessda-ERIC: 2010-2015</i> was vital. It was noted that the WP3 team had provided input into the circulated draft.</p> <p>DM queried the financial implications of Part 2 on extension of the ERIC. KS noted that Associate membership currently allows any country to join the ERIC although EC countries will retain majority voting rights. Financial implications will be discussed at ERIC board level. Suggestions include half price fees for Associate members. KS personal view is that Associate membership should be on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>It was agreed that founding the ERIC securely in Europe should be an initial priority with extension of the ERIC in years 3-5.</p> <p>It was agreed to move Part 6 to the beginning of the document and to include a mission/vision statement.</p> <p>AK further suggested 1.2 (external promotion) should be moved to the end of the document and that 1.1 (Governance and Finance) should become two separate issues. Both suggestions were agreed.</p> <p>It was noted that the Strategic Plan is generic enough to encompass multiple membership possibilities and that ultimately the ERIC decides modifications to the document.</p> <p>It was agreed to include reference to cross-fertilisation with other disciplines in 2.2 (e.g. DARIAH, ESFRI Roadmap, Cross Co-operational Workprogramme for 2011) and use the inclusive phrase “diversity of quality data” in 6.2 and 4.1 (was it agreed to mention as an operational goal also?)</p> <p>HR suggested the use of the term “cultural heritage” to capture past and present types of data.</p> <p>A revised version of the Strategic Drivers document will be circulated following submission of new FP7 application.</p>	<p>KS</p>
<p>3</p>	<p><u>Organisational Models (KS):</u></p>	

<p>KS introduced <i>Planning the cessa-ERIC</i>, noting that it focused on options for reaching a “steady state” in terms of the ERIC’s size and speed of construction. It was noted that the Vienna MB had concluded that a “clusters of expertise” approach is preferable.</p> <p>KS confirmed that the ERIC will not replace any national organisation functions and that it will pay for organisations to carry out any services required (e.g. UKDA/Shibboleth, development of DDI4, etc.)</p> <p>It was agreed that KS would make details on the Management function more explicit in the discussions on legal and access issues.</p> <p>It was agreed that the location of functions and their integration, alongside an indication of the budget required to run the ERIC, was of central importance.</p> <p><i>Coffee Break</i></p> <p>KS noted that two countries had offered to host the new ERIC but that, contrary to the preferred distributed model, it appeared from their proposal that the location of the ERIC’s functions will be determined by representatives of those countries that will be funding the organisation. German and Norwegian representatives were asked for their comments.</p> <p>(AT joined the meeting)</p> <p>BH reported that a meeting was held on 14 October 2009 in Frankfurt (see <i>Brief Report</i>) between Norway and Germany to discuss “hosting” the cessa-ERIC</p> <p>HR noted that Germany’s involvement was more “pedestrian” but that Germany had proposed the meeting in October. HR reported that he had been active in securing the full/partial host offer through liaising with German funding body representatives following his appointment to GESIS on 1 October 2008. He noted that following the June 2009 ESFRI meeting, both the composition of the October meeting and its date were changed at short notice. HR acknowledged that the <i>Brief Report</i> was too cursory and that more details were needed. Similarly the expected timeframe and the division of labour needed to be clarified.</p> <p>BH confirmed that both Germany and Norway had agreed on a sum of money which would make the ERIC possible (1.3-1.4 million euros total). He also emphasised that the <i>Brief Report</i> had been written directly following the meeting itself so that clarity was ensured but that a 2-page summary of the meeting was pending. All activities have a 5 year period and he asked the MB whether they accept/reject the offer.</p> <p>KS noted that Funding bodies would focus on financial matters when examining the terms of the proposed ERIC. He stressed the necessity of CESSDA members keeping their Ministries up-to-date and informed on</p>	<p>KS</p>
---	------------------

the background to, and detail of, the proposed plans.

KS asked how the functions will operate, given that 75% of monies will come from Norway and Germany? HJM noted that alternative solutions should also be discussed. KS noted that the outcome of the Frankfurt meetings had changed the emphasis of potential funding models.

RS expressed surprise and concern that the MB had not been notified about the Frankfurt meeting and that documents had been circulated very late.

PF noted that although FORS had no hosting aspirations, in what context could they, and other smaller organisations, contribute to the development of the ERIC? If certain countries dominate and make the rules they would effectively be joining a ready-made organisation.

HR noted that the Frankfurt meeting did not discuss where the functions would be hosted and that CESSDA as a whole would have to be involved substantially in setting up the ERIC. BH responded to RS by noting that the Funders decide the detail of the ERIC and that the proposed Germany/Norway agreement was not about taking control of CESSDA. KS responded by asking BH and HR what conditions the agreement was based on as these had not been made explicit. Explicit replies were not provided.

Questions were then asked about how this will work in practice, given the recommendation that the location of the management function should meet criteria set by the PPP.

CK noted that a middle way was possible via CESSDA members keeping their national funding bodies fully briefed to ensure that their recommendations are considered.

It was confirmed that both Norway and Germany's money was "new" and is not being substituted from other activity.

KS returned to the question of alternatives to the proposal and the six scenarios outlined in the documentation. He reminded the meeting that the October 2008 MB had taken a very different approach to the ERIC with competency, rather than money, being the decisive factor. He asked whether CESSDA would be able to discuss this with Norwegian and German funders. The question was not clearly resolved.

PF remarked that the question of competency was void as the competent organisations were: UKDA, GESIS and NSD. KS disagreed – it is anticipated that in 4-5 years time membership will be ca. 30 organisations. If this is the case, he suggested that it would be strategically important that any management "hub" should not be based in one of the "big three" as it must develop an identity of its own and be clearly seen to be independent.

<p>RS argued for a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) similar to that prepared by the ESS PPP. KS agreed and offered to arrange for a draft. Equally BH said he would provide a copy of the ESS MoU.</p> <p>SO noted that Denmark can make an offer but would not be able to fund the hub. He noted that much more detailed information would be needed, in particular he would need a document describing the mission and vision for the new organisation. KS pointed out that Executive committee colleagues had been asked to prepare such a document but it was, as yet, not available.</p> <p>Discussion turned to how the Norwegian and German money would affect individual membership fees and a suggestion was made that fees could be based on GDP. HR pointed out that even if an alternative such as GDP pro rata payment was implemented, this would not resolve the hosting issue. Furthermore CESSDA would be ineffectual if functions are spread too widely throughout its membership. He noted that the plan was to set up mechanisms within the ERIC which would decide on where functions would be based.</p> <p>Following a brief summary of the discussion by KS, MT reminded everyone that a MoU was a normal outcome of PPPs. She did note, however, that the EC had anticipated more meetings between Funders and CESSDA as part of the PPP. KS responded by noting that a Funders' meeting was scheduled for January 2010, and that the nature of CESSDA's structure may have contributed to this perception (e.g. ESS and SHARE each has an existing, pre-PPP governance structure which includes an established Funders Forum, unlike CESSDA which has previously functioned on the basis of bilateral national funding arrangements).</p> <p>SB observed that had Norway and Germany not made an offer, CESSDA would be placed in difficult situation. He noted that the UK, as one of the largest member organisations, had not put forward an offer. KS confirmed this and stated that the UK would not be putting forward a disproportional offer of funding.</p> <p>BH stated that the MoU would be based on discussions with CESSDA.</p> <p>(MF joins the meeting)</p> <p>Lunch</p>	
<p>Following a recap on the morning session, KS suggested that if the Frankfurt agreement was a given, the priority was to decide what CESSDA wants when negotiating with Funders.</p> <p>HJM suggested one condition: voting in the administrative organisation</p>	

should be by member, not by size, and should be unconnected to funding arrangements. HB suggested an assurance that the Statutes would remain unchanged during the first wave of membership.

Following queries regarding the MoU, BH confirmed that the initial signatories will be the Funders – discussion with CESSDA will then follow. Concerns were raised by KS in relation to the transparency of this process, given the organisation and composition of the Frankfurt meeting. AT reinforced this point, highlighting the need for transparency and the maintenance of dialogue between the members of the ERIC, Funding bodies and CESSDA. It was confirmed by KS that this will be central aim of January’s Funders Meeting and that although, as KM noted, consensus from CESSDA on the documentation for the meeting was necessary, this would be difficult if the MoU stated that the ERIC’s functions should be based in those countries putting money forward.

KS stressed that it was crucial for Germany and Norway to be open about what conditions they were placing on their offer, and for CESSDA to be clear about what it will/won’t accept with regard to the proposed ERIC.

BH noted that the Funders make the final decision regarding the ERIC construction and confirmed that Norway will be the legal entity and Germany a prominent node.

Following an observation from RS regarding the accessibility of national datasets, KS confirmed that the ERIC is unconnected to this arrangement as separate agreements are already in place.

FB queried whether any other offers had been received and whether CESSDA was in a position to reject the offer under discussion. KS confirmed that there were no further realistic offers expected/on the table and that CESSDA itself was now only able to influence funders, not veto their decisions.

Following a query from DM, BH confirmed that the Norwegian offer was contingent on where the nodes would be based.

BH noted that this process, which is now political, is in line with ESFRI’s recommendations on siting, although KS argued that ESFRI was not a decision making body and that CESSDA should follow a model that best suited CESSDA and this was something that ESFRI was unable to express a view on. The subsequent discussion raised a number of concerns: lack of CESSDA’s control over process; how essential it is for CESSDA members to be influencing and informing their Funders etc; potential conflict of interest and appropriateness of the hosting country, esp. as funders will be unaware of many issues and perhaps lack sufficient background on current organisational arrangements.

	<p>In response to a query from LS regarding what information he could use to inform his funding body, BH advised that if agreement on the Statutes could be reached these should be used.</p> <p>HJM reported that Sweden is almost ready to commit monies for the first wave of the ERIC.</p> <p>Break</p> <p>AK reported on Lithuanian impressions of the ERIC. He noted that a clear vision of added value for membership/value for money was needed alongside stable and fixed fees. A country's GDP was not sufficient criteria – membership should be related to one's standing in the Social Science community. He suggested grouping countries into different fee camps. KS noted that multipliers don't make sense within this context (example: ESF)</p>	
4	<p><u>Support for the cessda-ERIC (All)</u></p> <p>Greece: New government in place. As EKKKE have a new funder they have to start from scratch with regard to the passing on of information.</p> <p>Hungary: National Roadmap will be finalised by the end of the year. The office is aware of TARKI involvement in PPP and ZF hopes CESSDA will be on Roadmap. Issues regarding TARKI running costs need to be addressed.</p> <p>Netherlands: Informal commitment to annual funding for 5 year period. DISC on national Roadmap but no funding. Further discussion needed.</p> <p>Romania: On Roadmap and ESFRI support. However situation uncertain due to there being no government in place at present!</p> <p>Czech Republic: On ESFRI/Ministry of Education list. Roadmap in progress and project under discussion – outcome will be known by end of year. JK stressed the importance of receiving information soon.</p> <p>Ireland: Post-Vienna MB Education Authority issued no response to contact made by JMB. Major cuts pending and JMB thought ERIC involvement in future unlikely.</p> <p>Sweden: HJM noted that although there were numerous bodies involved in funding decisions, the final decision lay with DISC. HJM reported that on Monday it was agreed that Sweden could put forward 60K€ plus for membership of ERIC. KFI should OK this next week.</p> <p>Slovenia: JS reported that new Ministry representative had yet to give firm commitment but had been positive to date.</p>	

	<p>Lithuania: AK reported that commitment to the ERIC had already been issued. It was noted that BH is on the Lithuanian Roadmap committee. Functions are being moved to AK's research centre but as yet without sustained funding commitment.</p> <p>UK: KS reported that it is not certain if the UK would join the ERIC during its 1st phase but that Associate membership was a possibility.</p> <p>Denmark: SO reported that no firm commitment had been made.</p> <p>France: RS noted that ERIC membership was contingent on the Memorandum of Understanding being approved by the legal team, and the ERIC's inclusion in the Ministry's National Strategy.</p> <p>Finland: The Ministry of Education has agreed to raise the membership amount to 70K€ to cover the membership fee and that University negotiations were required to move forward.</p> <p>Austria: KM noted that WISDOM is a small archive with not enough current funding for data. However, Ministerial agreement for 3-year 15-100K€ funding has been approved.</p> <p>Norway: As noted above.</p> <p>Switzerland: PF reported that ERIC regulations have now been confirmed as OK. CESSDA is on Swiss Roadmap but funding discussion is pending and invite for Funders' meeting in January urgently needed.</p> <p>Germany: As noted above.</p> <p>Spain: LC reported that a meeting with the Ministry of Science was pending w/b 2 November 2009.</p> <p>Belgium: Internal negotiations are ongoing but there are strong indications that CESSDA will be included in funding priorities.</p> <p>Italy: KS is currently in negotiation with the Italian Research Ministry. Meeting in December to reformulate current organisational structures. Possibility of membership in a few years.</p> <p>Portugal: KS reported liaison with Funders. Support there but need to submit funding application for national provision. Associate membership from year 4-5?</p>	
5	<p><u>Statutes (KS)</u></p> <p>KS introduced the Statutes, noting that there was no difference in content than that previously circulated. HB remarked that the VAT clause and a conflict resolution procedure (suggested by a member of</p>	

	<p>the Scientific Advisory Board are pending. Statutes will be re-circulated following these additions.</p> <p>AT noted that VAT issues affect the host organisation but that a declaration can be made by a non-member host which states that VAT will not affect them, but that it applies to other countries. It was noted that Article 8 states that the postal address and the ERIC's seat should not be in separate locations (e.g. a Mailbox address)</p> <p>PF noted two further inconsistencies in the Statues. It was agreed that 10.1.2 should read that the Board, and not the Funders, will appoint the ERIC's Director. The Statutes definitions also need to be revisited.</p> <p>It was noted that a country's service provision was determined by the funding body.</p>	<p>HB ✓</p> <p>HB/KS ✓</p>
--	--	--

Thursday 29 October 2009: Day Two

	<p>KS opened the meeting by recapping on the previous day's discussion and noting that amendments to the Statutes, as noted by PF, will be done and sent to the Funders prior to the Funders meeting in January.</p>	
<p>6</p>	<p><u>Contracts and Licenses (HB)</u></p> <p>HB stressed that agreement to the following documents' content is <i>in principle</i> only and that documents will need subsequent agreement from the relevant country and ERIC's legal team.</p> <p><i>Computer Program document:</i> Agreed.</p> <p><i>Thesaurus document:</i> Based on WP4 recommendations. Intellectual Property (IP) rights with regard to Thesaurus translation is a matter for individual organisations to manage under their own legal system. Agreed.</p> <p>SB to pass HB comments from Taina re: technical issues.</p> <p><i>Non-Commercial User Licence:</i> Output from WP4. Non-CESSDA organisations may use the ELSST Thesaurus for non-commercial use (e.g. Eurostat).</p> <p><i>Commercial User Licence:</i> HB noted that the ERIC will need to make a decision on whether to use this type of Licence: a potential source of income.</p> <p><i>Licence for CESSDA depositor:</i> Output from WP10 and to be used in conjunction with the <i>User Licence</i>.</p> <p>A discussion on the length and implementation of the agreement was</p>	

	<p>held. The importance of Section 11's disclaimer was noted; how to encompass each country's idiosyncrasies in a single User Agreement; method by which Users will agree to conditions etc.</p> <p>It was agreed that adoption of the documents would not take place until decisions are made on the ERIC so documents will now remain as is, in draft form.</p>	
7	<p><u>Arrangements for Funders' Meeting (KS)</u></p> <p>KS stressed that the Funders need to be informed about the Frankfurt meeting and that indicative membership fees for each country should be available at the meeting.</p> <p>It was noted that although representation at the funders meeting can be 'devolved' WP3 had agreed that invitees need to be "right" representative for each country to ensure these representatives are properly briefed in order to make signatory commitment to the proposed ERIC.</p> <p>BP to email MB asking for 1-2 representatives per country next week. BP to also ask for confirmation of ESFRI name and original letter signature so that these persons can be cc'd into letter.</p> <p>The agenda for the meeting will include German and Norwegian presentations on the vision and consequences for/of the new ERIC.</p> <p>In the context of its importance to the Scientific Community, and as a possible agenda item, DM raised the issue of conflict of interest in relation to the PPP's commitment to Open Source and NSD's ownership of NESSTAR.</p> <p>A brief discussion regarding potential issues arising from the close proximity of NSD and NESSTAR offices to the proposed cessda-ERIC hub took place. It was of particular concern that NSD's technical solutions could potentially be driven by a NESSTAR agenda, rather than the agreed commitment to Open Source. HJM noted that this was essentially an issue of trust that needed to be examined by the ERIC itself, subject to their agreement to continue a commitment to the development and use of Open Source software.</p> <p>HR emphasised that another meeting between Germany and Norway needed to take place before January 2010 to discuss the relationship between the ERIC and its functions. KS stressed that absolute clarity on conditional arrangements and total transparency was necessary.</p> <p>RS stressed that documentation for discussion with Funding bodies was crucial to this process. BH noted that a MoU was being produced and that he and HR were in the process of liaising with other countries that could join in the first wave (e.g. Finland and Sweden,).</p>	BP ✓

	<p>It was stressed that liaison should be wider, including all countries regardless of whether they were able to become full members in the first wave. It was agreed that further documentation from Norway and Germany, along with the Statutes should also be circulated prior to the meeting.</p> <p>KS noted that unlike other ERICs, membership of the cessda-ERIC was not just based on financial provision but also service provision criteria. With this in mind, who judges whether criteria can be met?</p> <p><i>Coffee break</i></p> <p>Following discussion, it was suggested that, following a Quality Assurance Survey, an independent review committee with a variety of competencies, should assess whether an organisation meets the service provision criteria. It was noted that these criteria are listed on p22 of the Statutes.</p>	<p>BH/KS/ HR</p> <p>KS</p>
<p>8</p>	<p><u>Recent EC call (MT/KS)</u></p> <p>MT stressed the close proximity of the call's deadline: 3 December 2009 (up to €4 million for up to 4 years) and emphasised that it is NOT a Construction phase call but for existing Research Infrastructures. The EC is able to fund approx. 20 out of 35 topics in the call. MT stressed the networking and co-operative aspects of the relevant topic, and noted that any submission was expected to include collaboration with Eurostat and other SSH infrastructures.</p> <p>RS reported that three PPP meetings had taken place to discuss and facilitate integration and networking activities with NSIs and included the Paris and Copenhagen meetings. The need for consistency when continuing to develop the relationship between the CESSDA-PPP and Eurostat was stressed.</p> <p>RS noted four areas: 1) Info for researchers/services etc; 2) Work on agreement and standards, European accreditation, Pilot for remote access; 3) An agreement on proposed Metadata standards; 4) Devising technical solutions for Remote Access. Networking activities and transnational access (and associated researcher training on use of national datasets) should also be included. With regard to Networking and Service activities, KS noted that the proposed project partners should be inclusive and drawn from the widest possible pool of organisations.</p> <p>Person months can be claimed for Joint Research Activities – this work should ideally be restricted to some NSIs and CESSDA organisations, with consultation broadening to a larger stratum of organisations.</p>	

	<p>KS also noted that correspondence from INED had been received following an EC recommendation that they be part of a combined bid</p>	
<p>9</p>	<p><u>Matrix/Grid Comments (KS):</u></p> <p>The most recent version of the work grid was not tabled but some questions were asked about it. It was first noted that it was not a final document and that it had been drafted to bring together the interests expressed by NSI's and those expressed by CESSDA members following the meetings at Point 8. KS also noted that 7a is for Researcher training only. Preference for a larger training budget has been expressed by Christof Wolf and is supported by KS. It was agreed to emphasise the collaborative aspects of the proposal, emphasising the links with NSI's and access to official data and to remove reference to the ERIC's construction.</p> <p>KS opened a discussion on the co-ordination of the application. He asked the meeting to consider whether it would be appropriate for Essex to undertake this role when UK is unlikely to be an early member of the ERIC and questioned whether the role should be moved to either the proposed host or to Germany.</p> <p>It was agreed that UKDA is still the most experienced organisation to make the call application. HJM further noted that the UK's position re: ERIC membership may be beneficial as UKDA will be able to concentrate on leading the project, rather than being focused on the construction of the ERIC.</p> <p>The need for synergy between the ERIC's management and technical teams and the WPs proposed for the new call was noted.</p> <p>Following further remarks it was agreed that UKDA will prepare and lead the application.</p> <p><i>Lunch</i></p> <p>(MT, CK, HR, KM departed)</p> <p>Discussion of the content of the application continued.</p> <p>It was suggested that something similar to the UK Survey Link Scheme where young researchers spend a short period at a survey organisation, and that short courses on the prolonging of data's life cycle, could be included in the application.</p> <p>Discussion focused on agreeing the lead and relevant organisational competency for each proposed WP, along with a clear commitment to produce the material requested within the next three weeks.</p> <p>GESIS expressed an interest in working with Eurostat. Provisional</p>	

	<p>allocation based on list as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UKDA; 2. UKDA with FSD; 3a. UKDA; 3b. NSD with contributions from everyone re: Joint Research Networking; 5. NSD/GESIS; 6a. GESIS with SND but also networking activity and contribution from ADP; 6b. The inclusion of this WP was debated. It was agreed this is an ERIC activity and should therefore not be part of bid application; 7a. UKDA/GESIS lead with FORS contributing. Eurolab and Luxembourg involvement also; 7b. DANS; 8a & 8b. RQ to reformulate, GESIS/FORS/NSD interest; 9. Agreed to remove as per reason for proposed WP6b; 10a. Query whether an ERIC task. NSD/UKDA DG Research interest, meetings need to move forward, a self-archiving repository could be made available across CESSDA; 10b. GESIS with Eurostat involvement. RS noted, and it was agreed, that content should not remain concentrated in one WP; 11. Agreed that further work on networking section and identification of cross-fertilisation with other organisations necessary; 12a. NSIs strong in this area, GESIS/DANS/UKDA on Secure Data Service involvement, WP9 model of specialist researcher liaison useful; 12b. GESIS and NSIs; 12c. EKKE to instigate, CIS/DANS interest; 13. Agreed to remove as per reason for proposed WP6b. <p>AD will confirm RODA involvement in next few days. KS confirmed that until WP leaders have provided an indication of the extent of the proposed work budgets, in particular for networking activities, cannot be estimated. It was agreed that WP4 would benefit from an extension of networking activities.</p> <p>KS advised that if, in three weeks time, a WP is seen to be floundering it will be removed from the application so as not to jeopardise the application.</p> <p>HB to arrange networking, list and template functions.</p>	
10	<p><u>General Assembly/Management Board 2010 (KS) and Closure of CESSDA (KS)</u></p> <p>It was suggested that the GA and final MB be a combined event in Spring 2010. It was noted that, if applicable, these meetings could be held in conjunction with the ERIC launch.</p>	

	<p>BH to propose a date following liaison with HR.</p> <p>It was agreed that the current CESSDA organisation should remain until 2011, and that a MoU will be a prerequisite to its dissolution.</p> <p><i>Meeting Closed</i></p>	<p>BH/HR</p>
--	---	---------------------