

**Participants:** Dettenhofer, Rubeš, Reinöhl, Sapíková, Koča, Vrba, Oschkinat, Náhlík

**External participants:**

**Meeting type:** Management mtg

**Necessary documents:**

PPT presentation (Dettenhofer), Spending excel sheet (Pokorná)

**Meeting agenda:**

No	Text	Action Item	Date
1	<p><b>Introductory word by Markus Dettenhofer</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Agenda</li> </ul>		
2	<p><b>Financial status</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Comparing MR 9 and 10 - differences in spending. Conclusion- we continue to be severely under spending. The MR 10 is the mid-way point in the project and we have spent 36% on the Investment side and 24% on the Non-Investment side. To get more control of this, the OU partners have agreed to put a together a quarterly report on real spending at the GL and core facility level. This will be shared with all of the OU directors and individual spending will be sent to the GLs and Core heads each quarter.</li> <li>▶ Partners are saving because of future spending, now financed from different grants or projects.</li> <li>▶ This situation demands that we have a full plan of spending for the CEITEC project to the end of 2015. We do not want to have to return the money.</li> <li>▶ Change request maybe delayed because of MEYS situation</li> <li>▶ BUT is preparing detailed analysis of spending till the end of the project (due 30.10.13.)</li> <li>▶ All units: whole plan of spending (on quarter base) till the end of the project</li> <li>▶ MD should receive email from all managers with the actual expenses and will not be distributed further, except that each GL and Core Facility Head will see their respective spending.</li> </ul>	04.10.2013.	30.10.2013
3	<p><b>Monitoring indicators</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Volume of funds for R&amp;D from international sources are OK</li> <li>▶ Volume of contract research – quite low percentage</li> <li>▶ Number of PhD graduates – plan should be fulfilled</li> <li>▶ BUT will make an analysis and by the end of the year will know if they can fulfill their indicators</li> <li>▶ Applied research results – also weakness</li> </ul>		
4	<p><b>Principles of Funding Research Groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Should be a similar set of principles across CEITEC</li> <li>▶ Start-up package should have some level of uniformity and reflect the grading from the ISAB</li> <li>▶ The funding will be based on GL unit, and not on the research program coordinator</li> <li>▶ BUT suggested that it should be based on 3 years average, MU noted that the period could even be longer (5 years)"</li> <li>▶ Everybody agreed with the principles of having sustained GL packages over multiple years</li> </ul>		

5

- ▶ We need definition of who is GL (HO to form a committee)

#### Events

- ▶ Communication strategies – no partner attended the CMS meeting (open house) on 02.10.13. It is a disappointment since this was agreed by all of the partners and they were repeatedly informed
- ▶ Flow of communication between groups (Management group x Working groups x Group leaders) is not good – set up new format of communication?
- ▶ BUT - will outline their strategy of communication together with E. Pudova (CMS)
- ▶ New VaVpl call – reminder of deadline (extended until 9/10 midnight)
- ▶

**Homework** (email) - What is a research center of excellence?

#### Next meeting

- ▶ 16th October
- ▶ MPT meeting with partners – first Tue of every months, 9 – 10:30

**Recorded by: L. Moskalenková**  
**Next meeting: 16.10. 2013, 8:30am**