



**EUROPEAN VIRTUAL INSTITUTE
for
INTEGRATED RISK MANAGEMENT - EU-VRI**

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Meeting:	Kick-off meeting of iNTeg-Risk project	Date:	Dec. 2, 2008	Dec. 3, 2008		
		Start:	09:00	09:00		
		End:	18:00	15:30		
Venue:	CEN Premises, 36 rue de Stassart, Meeting room "Erasmus" B - 1050 Brussels					
Meeting Objective(s):	Clarification, structuring and discussion of the expectations of different stakeholders (EU, industry and others) from the project, financial and administrative details, plan of the work to be done.					
Project:	iNTeg-Risk - Early Recognition, Monitoring and Integrated Management of Emerging, New Technology Related Risks	EU-Proj. No.	CP-IP 213345-2			
		EU-VRI Proj. No.	12005			
Participants / Distribution:	Participants:	Distribution:				
	See Annex 1 – List of participants	➤ Authors ➤ Main beneficiaries ➤ Article 10 partners ➤ International Advisory Board				
Document data:	Author(s):	O. Salvi, A. Jovanovic, M. Löscher, G. Xenikakis				
	Approved by:	Main beneficiaries, Article 10 partners, IAB				
	Pages:	19	Version:	0.8	Date:	Dec. 22, 2008
	Doc. Nr.:					
	Annexes:	➤ Annex 1 – List of participants ➤ Annex 2 – Agenda of the meeting ➤ Transparencies of the presentations, audio recordings and minutes are available for registered project participants on the project web site (UID and password required). (http://integrisk.eu-vri.eu)	Status:	Final		

Agenda items as discussed (short form, extended version in Annex 1):

1. Welcome
2. Introduction of participants
3. Overall expectations and its obligations towards the community from iTeg-Risk as an EU "flagship projects": Beyond the project responsibility
4. iTeg-Risk project and related expectations of the main stakeholders
5. Presentation of the technical contents, including discussions
6. Project management
7. Budget Review
8. Planning of the work in year 1
9. Final discussion

1. Welcome

Summary: The project coordinators and the meeting host welcomed the kick-off meeting participants and present the key factors for the success of iNTeg-Risk.

- A. *Jovanovic* welcomed the participants and introduced A. Pirlet (CEN).
- A. *Pirlet* presented CEN organization and activities (see www.cen.eu/cenorm). CEN will support the standardization activities in this project.
- O. *Renn (President of EU-VRI)* expressed his satisfaction to start the project after a long negotiation phase. Three criteria should be used for evaluating the deliverables of this “challenging project”:
- integration: partners have to work together and integrate the main elements, technologies and stakeholders of emerging risk management
 - efficiency: we need a risk management regime that is effective to protect people and the environment, while promoting innovation (cf. financial crisis showed the inadequacy of the existing systems)
 - fairness: risk management is always a way to manage public concerns, which have to be taken into account fairly.

The project is a great opportunity for integration but it involves also challenges:

- Better way to model and deal with uncertainty in the data and results of the assessment of emerging risks, and characterize the uncertainty.
- Promote innovation without compromising safety. We do not need less technology, less innovation, but on the contrary demonstrate that safety is on-board.
- The Project is a show case to bridge the gap between theory and industrial needs in practical applications.
- Bridge the gap between public concerns and the “official” results of risk assessors. People behave according to perception, not according to the facts. We need two way communication and learning on both sides.

O.R. closed his speech by saying that with this consortium, “yes, we can do it”.

- A. *Jovanovic* introduced the coordinator, EU-VRI, and presented the grouping. He explained that most of the partners have joined EU-VRI exactly because they have understood the need for integration.
- iNTeg-Risk is a unique opportunity and both EU-VRI and the consortium must demonstrate the ability to perform such a large project with many difficult challenges.
- P. F. *Hansen*: suggested including “transparency” as criterion.
- O. *Renn* agreed and said that transparency and openness are key factors to build trust with the public. He said that this concept was implied by “fairness” in his speech. He explained that different values among the stakeholders can compromise the perception and safety.
- A. *Jovanovic* emphasized that the project must yield results which will last after the project, through EU-VRI and the commitment of its members.

2. Introduction of participants

Summary: Each project main beneficiary briefly introduces his company/institution and explains his/her main tasks in the project.

The meeting material (presentations and audio recordings) is also available through the iNTeg-Risk web tool (<http://integrisk.eu-vri.eu>) at the members area and under the tab “Meetings”.

The following partners expressed their apologies for not being able to attend the meeting:

- EKON (partner #59)

The following partners did not give any notice for not attending the meeting:

- COWI (partner #16)
- NIS (partner #21)
- Regione Lombardia (partner #51)
- ARPC (partner #53)
- FTN (partner #58)

Decision 1: Partners COWI, NIS, Regione Lombardia, ARPC and FTN have breached their contractual obligations. The coordinator will follow the procedure of non-performance and warn them to take corrective measures within one (1) month. However, they are going to receive the pre-financing.

Action 1: The coordinator will warn the partners according to Decision 1 that they have breached their contractual obligations through an official letter with one month notice.

3. Overall expectations and its obligations towards the community from iNTeg-Risk as an EU “flagship projects”: Beyond the project responsibility

Summary: The project officer described the administrative and financial obligations. He pointed out the importance of the timesheets which need to be filled in by each partner. The proposed project technical assistant (PTA) was announced. Confidentiality issues have been discussed. Financial details have been arranged.

G. Katalagarianakis (*Project Officer*) explained the details of the validation procedure of the partners and the delays which it has caused.

He explained the term “Flagship” and the importance of iNTeg-Risk, as a project that opens new ground and described the project impact and insists on the project organisation and progress control.

G.K. stressed that technology is changing along with society. He said that the consortium must develop methods and tools which will be needed and used in 2016.

G.K. mentioned that the complexity of the system has to be understood by the project consortium. For this and other reasons he claimed that integration is the keyword in the project. He further explained the various aspects of integration. In the field of technology integration he explained that we want a new “lead market” towards accident-free production.

Describing the project organization and reporting, he mentioned that the coordinator is the bank of the project.

G. Katalagarianakis announced that the proposed Project Technical Advisor (PTA) is Dr. Michalis Loupis.

The project critical success factors are:

- Clear project plan with partner roles well defined
- Progress follow-up and adaption of work planning
- Partners’ commitment to objectives and in-line with business strategies
- Effective technical and financial management and understanding between partners
- Total quality management
- Sound exploitation plans and continuous follow-up of exploitation and dissemination

G.K. further described the reporting procedure that is needed for the project.

He explained that a periodic activity report is required once a year and claimed that the guideline already exists. He continued by saying that the report content has an impact on the payment of the grant. The task leaders are asked to accept the work and enable payment.

The periodic management report should be prepared for each partner and will consist of 8 to 10 pages.

Finally, G.K. said that a plan for using and disseminating knowledge will be needed and explained that a draft can be prepared in about 2 years.

The annual review will be done by the Project Technical Assistant (PTA) and other reviewers.

G.K. claimed that the consortium should take care of the needs from the partners, concerning visits and meetings. Describing the criteria of the project he said that every partner should produce the results as described in the tasks and deliverables of the DoW.

G.K. stressed out the project procedures and mentioned that "Agreements make good friends". For this reason he claimed that the Consortium Agreement is created and signed in order to define the use of the results. Additionally he said that the decision making procedures have to be defined upfront.

G. Katalagarianakis explained on the involvement of the sub-contractors in the project. He asked from the beneficiaries to keep the procedure simple and clear and showed a good example of housekeeping.

He further described the problems that may occur in the consortium and informed about the solutions that can be applied. In case on inactivity of a partner, he said that the Executive Board should send a warning letter and provide one (1) month notice to rectify. If the inactivity continues the partner can be informed that he is no longer participating in the project. In this case the Executive Board has to define a solution for the remaining tasks and deliverables. Additionally, the prepayment for this partner has to be reimbursed with a penalty, which will be decided by the board.

G.K. then presented the payment modalities and pointed out that the coordinator has to define the distribution of the pre-payment according to the project needs. He further described the reimbursement of eligible costs.

G. Katalagarianakis insisted that if there is a disagreement, experts will be nominated to assess the work. Concerning this matter he said that reasonableness is given as a criterion to the evaluators.

Then he explained that every receipt has to be declared and archived for a period of 5 years after the end of the project. He underlined that a partner cannot make extra profit from the project, because the partner receives a grant and all of the costs have to be accordingly proved.

G.K. continued by describing the timesheets method. Each partner does not have to send the timesheets directly to the European Commission, but should keep it available for potential checks. At the end of the year every partner should send the declaration or financial statement, which will be used for the cost claiming. He stressed out that the submission of the financial statement should not be delayed and that a partner can rectify from one year to the other. Finally, he mentioned that overheads have to be calculated per capita.

He underlined that confidentiality is important for the project and the application of the results on industrial sectors. Information with confidentiality should be specially treated under certain procedures. G.K. stressed out that it is important to correctly acknowledge the commission in case of publication of the results, by e.g. printing the seal of the European Union on official documents.

Finally he mentioned that access rights shall be made in writing according to Art. II.31 and that useful documents regarding the procedures of FP7 can be found by following the link http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/find-doc_en.html

Decision 2: Timesheets are going to be applied for the project work and cost controlling purposes.

Decision 3: Based on the statements of the project officer the non-performing procedure is defined. The procedure includes the following main steps:

- a) The non-performing or inactive partner receives a warning letter with one month notice to rectify.
- b) In case of no reaction to this decision, a second letter will be sent.
- c) The partner will no longer participate to the consortium and consequently to the project, if the partner will not react to this within 1 month. The exclusion can be finished unilaterally.

Decision 4: In order to comply with the EU requirement the coordinator is obliged to keep the receipts related to cost reporting for a period of 5 years after the end of the project.

4. iNTeg-Risk project and related expectations of the main stakeholders

Summary: The results of the project must be useful for industry. The outcome of this project is of high importance for several scientific committees of the European Commission and for other governmental organizations in member states.

4.1. Expectations of industry - P. Morilhat

P. Morilhat insisted that the change in technologies coincides with the change of people who have different background. In this context he underlined the necessity of knowledge management. Additionally, he expressed his conviction that the pressure of the environment has also increased.

Concluding, he marked out the importance of developing a common culture under this methodology and this common framework.

4.2. iNTeg-Risk and SCENIHR (European Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks) – K. Bromen, EU-Sanco, Belgium

K. Bromen presented all bodies where risk assessment is addressed. She insisted on the three Scientific Committees managed by Directorate General Sanco.

4.3. EU project and the SME-relevant opportunities for innovation – U. Haug, Steinbeis Foundation, Stuttgart

U. Haug presented the organization of the Steinbeis network. He shared the Steinbeis point of view that EU-VRI is an international platform to launch projects and he expressed his agreement to the fact that iNTeg-Risk is a flagship project.

4.4. Place of the issue of Emerging risks in EU policies (SCENHIR) – A. Boenke, EU DG ENTER, Belgium

A. Boenke explained the concerns of the European Union about nanotechnology and analyses the benefits and risks.

(See http://ec.europa.eu/nanotechnology/index_en.html)

He stressed out the fact that for the implementation of the law, tools are needed. The European Commission carefully looks at the tools that will be developed to help for the implementation of the law related to emerging risks.

A.B. said that best practices will be spread out in this project and the exchange of information will boost the implementation.

He presented the Scientific Committee on Occupational Exposure Limits (SCOEL) and explained the main targets and tasks.

(See http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/health_safety/scoel_en.htm)

A.B. insisted on the fact that the work done has to be published in scientific peer reviewed journals.

He presented the Advisory Committee on Safety and Health at Work (ACSH) and the Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC)

(See http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/health_safety/acsh_en.htm and http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/health_safety/slic_en.htm)

Closing his speech, he asked for paying attention to the applicability of the results and he focused on the potential nano-material risks. He also pointed out that the OECD working groups are of high importance.

Finally, A.B. announced a new lead market initiative of Directorate General Enterprise on protective clothing.

A. Jovanovic remarked that iNTeg-Risk is a challenging project with research in many scientific sectors.

4.5. Gain from the integrated EU projects for the government organizations in the Member States – M. Hailwood, LUBW, Germany

M. Hailwood introduced himself explaining that his main role within the State Institute for the Environment is to advise and train public authorities, including inspectors, in the application of the Seveso II Directive and the prevention of major accidents. Also he is the current chair of the OECD Working Group on Chemical Accidents and has been involved in a number UNEP projects in the field of prevention of major accidents.

He emphasized that the communication of the project should be carried out carefully, remembering to include authorities at the local level, who may be involved in licensing or enforcement at a later date.

M.H. expressed his belief that several stakeholders will benefit from the project. If the regulators are involved at an early stage of an integrated program then the benefits are of a greater chance of acceptance and use of the results when the project is completed.

4.6. Emerging risks and insurance industry – R. Schneider, Swiss Re, Switzerland

R. Schneider introduced the function of re-insurance companies and he further explained that they are interested in avoiding cases such as asbestos, where it was known that this product can cause harms, but the actual knowledge was lost. He summed up by telling that re-insurance companies want to know and reduce the uncertainties.

He presented several examples of emerging risks such as the climate change, nano-particles, RFID and others. He pointed out that not only minor applications of technology have to be assessed but every technological aspect. Integrated risk management is the best response to the emerging new technology related risks.

R.S. concluded by saying that Swiss Re can contribute to the horizontal integration of knowledge in order to solve the emerging risks challenges.

4.7. Emerging risks and HSE – L. Cusco, HSL, UK

L. Cusco presented the view of the regulator and describes the procedure for risk assessment focused on new emerging risks.

Closing he said that BATNEEC is the cheapest available technology not entailing excessive costs.

5. Presentation of the technical contents, including discussions

Summary: Basic facts and keywords for iNTeg-Risk project were presented. The subproject leaders analyzed the competencies, the objectives and execution details of every subproject. The kick off meetings for the subprojects were announced for Jan. 29-30, 2009 (Joint SP1, SP2) and project month 23 or 24 (SP3).

5.1. Overall project structure – O. Salvi, EU-VRI

O. Salvi presented the inspiring initiatives and the basic facts about iNTeg-Risk. He spoke about the problem of emerging risks and the way the project can manage them.

Closing his speech, he presented the outline, methodology, expected results and the team of the project.

5.2. Subproject 1: Representative industrial applications involving emerging risks related to New Technologies – M. Zarea, Gaz de France SUEZ, France / B. Debray, INERIS, France

B. Debray presented the position of subproject 1 in iNTeg-Risk and explained the objectives, main figures and details of execution. He underlined the importance of defining the set of assumptions used to implement the models, and the limitations of the models. He stressed out that this fact is also important for regulators.

M. Zarea announced the kick-off meeting of the sub-project and asked from the participants to take immediate action about their tasks.

5.3. Subproject 2: Developing the overall framework for dealing with emerging risks related to New Technologies – V. Cozzani, Univ. of Bologna, Italy / C. Duval, EDF, France

C. Duval and *V. Cozzani* presented the overview, aims and strategy of subproject 2. They explained the key deliverables and internal interdependencies of tasks and work-packages.

Concluding they presented the work planning and monitoring.

5.4. Subproject 3: Deploying and verifying the iNTeg-Risk Framework in industry – G. Lenkey, BZF, Hungary / F. Bagnoli, D'Appolonia, Italy

F. Bagnoli explained the ENISFER and ERRRA acronyms and presented the work description in subproject 3. He announced the kick-off meeting in month 23 or 24 and pointed out that economic aspects have to be included, because cost-effectiveness is the main decision criteria.

G. Lenkey presented the Bay Zoltan Foundation and its role in the project

F. Bagnoli presented D'Appolonia and its role in the project

5.5. Subproject 4: Making the iNTeg-Risk solution available to all – A. Jovanovic, EU-VRI

A. Jovanovic presented the target of subproject 4 and underlined the fact that it will be the most exposed subproject to criticisms by users.

M. Hailwood pointed out the problem of the language for the dissemination, when claiming availability to all, and recommended that a strategy be developed with different layers of communication.

A. Jovanovic indicated that the coordinator expects from partners to work as wikipedia, based on the motivation of the users and other project beneficiaries. Additional to that he announced that some parts of the results will be translated in several languages according to the needs.

Dec. 3, 2008

6. Project management

6.1. Introducing of the management requirements – F. Biagioni, EU

Summary: The Grant Agreement will be signed before the end of the year. Therefore it is needed that every beneficiary signs the A-form. Every change in the contact details or the legal status should be communicated to the EC by the partners LEAR.

F. Biagioni insisted to read the guidelines for the management of projects, in particular the guideline for financial issues and intellectual property.

He informed the meeting participants that the Grant Agreement will be signed before the end of the year.

F.B. said that the pre-financing should be made within 45 days. Before receiving the pre-financing, the beneficiaries have to sign the Form A (accession to the contract). At least 3 beneficiaries have to send the Form A to the coordinator in order that the commission can proceed with the money transfer to the coordinator. He further explained that the coordinator will transfer then the money only to the partners who have signed the Form A.

Regarding the cooperation with third parties from third Countries, he said that if there is such a need for cooperating with a third country not associated to FP7, then it is necessary to inform the coordinator and consequently the IPR has to be examined carefully. The demand will be examined by the Executive Board.

He described the procedure for changing the legal entity form of a company. He pointed out that changes of legal address, legal name, etc. do not have impact on the budget

and are not considered major. This has to be done by the LEAR of the partner's organization, who will inform the validation unit of the EC and the coordinator. In case of a change in legal status, he explained that a partner has to inform the EC which will examine the situation. The coordinator has to be informed as well to examine the impact on the budget. He further explains that the initial company has to withdraw its participation and the new legal entity has to apply to join the project.

- A. *Jovanovic* proposed a common way of dealing with these changes through a procedure agreed in advance. Changes have to be submitted to the meeting of the Executive Board and the General Assembly.
- M. *Zarea* asks if the "electronic signature" is accepted by the EU or special directives have to be taken in account.
- F. *Biagioni* responded that regarding the commission the original signature is needed. However, he explained that for the internal project management other practical rules can be applied.

Discussion: All stakeholders interacting with the consortium could be identified by the Executive Board and given account to the website. The partners involved in the project also comment on payment modalities.

- F. *Biagioni* further explained the slides presented during G. Katalagarianakis' speech which deal with payment and says that pre-financing is 160% of the average EU-funding period...

He went further by giving an example described in the Financial Guideline (see page 21 of the Financial Guideline) and answering to questions.

- P. *Bos* said that they have four Art.10 partners and asked if these partners can have the full payment at the end of year 2, when their work stops.

Decision 5: Decisions of the Discussion

Decision 6: Third parties participating through Art. 10 are paid through the main beneficiaries. In these cases the coordinator can decide to keep them until the end of the project for the entire payment.

Decision 7: Then there will be a request to the commission by email in order to discuss with the financial/legal officers and clarify the practicalities of this issue.

Decision 8: Every change in the contact details or the legal status should be submitted to the Executive Board.

(Decisions 5 and 6 do not apply to non performing partners.)

- A.-M. *Heikillä* asked how are the costs related to the meetings, like for example the kick-off meeting.

- F. *Biagioni* answered that the participation in the kick-off meeting should be considered as RTD work during the reporting period and said that project management costs are related only to financial / administrative costs. He further explained that the 10% and 5% reserves are kept until the end of the project. He stressed out the fact that payment will be made only for the work done.

He also described that each partner is free to organise the work within his budget without changing the type of activity. He stressed out that for any modification the information has to follow the project hierarchy: task leader, WP leader, SP leader and Coordinator.

- G. *Lenkey* pointed out that modifications should have a 2 step procedure:

- 1) the task leader should confirm that it will not change the workplan
- 2) then the coordinator can validate that there is not impact on the budget

- F. *Biagioni* recommended that every beneficiary reads the guide for amendments. He also made clear that calculations are based on money and not man-months. He said that it is complicated to change the cost calculation method during the project. Normally, it is not possible to change the method during a project execution period, unless it is recognized that there was an error. In case of change the same procedure through the LEAR applies. He pointed out that the partners have to keep all the justifications of the money spent up to 5 years after the end of the project, for potential auditing purposes.

F.B. concluded by saying that the explanations given were the standard terms and conditions to perform the project smoothly and added that everybody has to know and apply the rules.

Action 2: In order to receive the pre-financing, the beneficiaries have to sign the A-Form and return it to the coordinator as soon as possible

6.2. Subproject 5: Meeting the challenges of managing large projects – D. Balos, EU-VRI

Summary: Introduction of the main functions of the iNTeg-Risk web tool.

D. Balos introduced the main functions and roles of the iNTeg-Risk web tool. He insisted on saying that simple communication rules should be respected, in order to ease the load of the support team. As an example he asked that the tag "iNTeg-Risk" should be included in the subject of every relevant e-mail.

He continued by saying that the web tool for the preparation is known by all partners. This tool will be improved for the management of the project and constantly adapted to the actual needs of the consortium.

D.B. further explained important functions of the tool, e.g. the task descriptions, project calendar, e-mail tool, participants list and others. He stressed out that the option "project partners" leads to the list of all organizations involved in the project. As a remarked, he mentioned that the role of URL-IQS has to be clarified and describes that this modification will be addressed with an amendment in January 2009.

Concluding he asked every partner to identify every person working on the project to a specific task. He repeated that this is a very important procedure which has to be completed as soon as possible. The responsible person of each task leading / work-package leading partner will be considered as task leader / work-package leader, respectively. If no objection is raised by informing the coordinator, it will be considered that this allocation is accepted.

Decision 9: The responsible person of each task leading / work-package leading partner will be considered as task leader / work-package leader, respectively. If no objection is raised by informing the coordinator, it will be considered that this allocation is accepted.

Action 3: All partners should assign persons to tasks in which their companies are involved by informing the task leader at the latest by January 15, 2009.

Action 4: All partners should get familiar to the iNTeg-Risk web tool and participate to the instructional open forums (teleconferences) which will be soon announced.

Action 5: The responsible persons of each partner should provide any objection to their engagement as task/work-package leaders. In case of no action, it will be considered that they agree to this allocation.

6.3. Management and organization - Coordinator, Project Officer

Summary: Discussion of important administrative issues and actions to be taken in the next months, such as electronic voting and assignment of participants to tasks.

A. Jovanovic said that the "electronic signature" was not accepted by only 4 out of 65 partners. He requested that every partner should sign the approval sheet of the amendment and accept the electronic procedure for the ease of the project load. He proposed to have the electronic voting and then to have the validation of important issues with formal signatures once a year.

A.J. stressed out that the electronic voting (and not "electronic signature") can be accepted by all partners, if the right to vote is given to an authorized person in the company, like a LEAR. He announced that the current responsible persons from every partner will be considered as the authorized person to participate into the electronic voting on behalf of his/her company.

- M. Zarea expressed his concern that only paper signatures are valid in front of the court. He proposed to provide an explanation of the amendment every 6 months and a check after 12 months.

Anyway the problems if the partners do not want to complete the time sheet, the burden of evidence will be transferred to the partners to demonstrate the good planning and progress in the project.

7. Budget Review

Summary: Discussion of budget allocation, time tables and travel costs.

- A. Jovanovic described the procedure for allocating effort outside a time period, e.g. participation in the kick-off meeting. He said that it is possible and that the management team will inform how to proceed.
- D. Balos described the allocation of resources. He explained that simple units for the project are tasks and persons. Concluding he asked from the partners to assign the company's participating persons to each task. He further explained that the allocation can be done by task leaders and administrators of the system, so the valid procedure is:
- click on "company profile" at the left pane of the web tool
 - click on "my tasks" to identify the tasks that you lead and the tasks where you are involved in
 - send by email the persons from your company involved in the task and the time allocated to the task leader

- A. Jovanovic announced that there will be training courses via "open users' forums" which will be scheduled to provide assistance with the use of the web tool.

He also announced that the deadline for entering the previously mentioned data in the system is the **15th of January 2009**.

A.J. presented the CV of the new person nominated by the EC as the new Project Technical Assistant (PTA) of the project. The new PTA is Dr. Michalis Loupis as announced by the EC. He said that the CV seems very ICT oriented and that the management team will check the openness to the broad issue of the project and his level of understanding. He asked from every partner to communicate any concern about the nomination of Dr. Michalis LOUPIS as PTA, until December 15, 2008. Opinions and concerns will be collected through voting tools.

Regarding dissemination activities he said that they have to be coordinated. He further explained that demands should be addressed to integrisk@eu-vri.eu

8. Planning of the work in year 1

Summary: Discussion and Presentations of the overall project work in year 1, especially of Subproject 1 and 2.

- B. Debray presented the expectations for the planning of the first months of sub-project 1. Finally, he asked for the e-mail address to which all inquiries regarding the project should be addressed.

- A. Jovanovic replied that the e-mail address for sending any request is integrisk@eu-vri.eu

A.J. summed up and announced following important meetings:

- SPs meetings 29-30 January 2009 in Paris
- iNTeg-Risk conference 2-3 June 2009 in Stuttgart

and asked from every partner to participate.

Decision 10: The partners agree to the following advance notification for meetings:

- 1 month for tasks
- 2 month for WPs
- 3 months for SP
- 6 months for project coordinating including open conferences issues

Decision 11: The current responsible persons from every partner will be considered as the authorized person to participate into the electronic voting on behalf of his/her company.

Action 6: The main beneficiaries should provide agreement for the new PTA of iNTeg-Risk through electronic voting by December 15, 2008.

Action 7: All partners should update the project calendar and upload useful documents at the web tool

Action 8: The coordinator should prepare an official letter in order to analyze the electronic voting procedure addressed to the following partners: GDF SUEZ, ATOS Origin, COWI and BT.

Action 9: All partners should attend the iNTeg-Risk conference on June 2-3, 2008 and the respective kick-off meetings of the subprojects in which they are involved.

Action 10: The management team will provide information about the procedure of allocating effort outside a time period, e.g. in meetings.

Action 11: The coordinator will provide all the partners with the list of responsible persons authorized for electronic voting.

9. Final discussion

Due to the lack of time this agenda item did not take place.

Summary of Decisions

- Decision 1:** Partners COWI, NIS, Regione Lombardia, ARPC and FTN have breached their contractual obligations. The coordinator will follow the procedure of non-performance and warn them to take corrective measures within one (1) month. However, they are going to receive the pre-financing.
- Decision 2:** Timesheets are going to be applied for the project work and cost controlling purposes.
- Decision 3:** Based on the statements of the project officer the non-performing procedure is defined. The procedure includes the following main steps:
- a) The non-performing or inactive partner receives a warning letter with one month notice to rectify.
 - b) In case of no reaction to this decision, a second letter will be sent.
 - c) The partner will no longer participate to the consortium and consequently to the project, if the partner will not react to this within 1 month. The exclusion can be finished unilaterally.
- Decision 4:** In order to comply with the EU requirement the coordinator is obliged to keep the receipts related to cost reporting for a period of 5 years after the end of the project.
- Decision 6:** Third parties participating through Art. 10 are paid through the main beneficiaries. In these cases the coordinator can decide to keep them until the end of the project for the entire payment.
- Decision 7:** Then there will be a request to the commission by email in order to discuss with the financial/legal officers and clarify the practicalities of this issue.
- Decision 8:** Every change in the contact details or the legal status should be submitted to the Executive Board.
- Decision 9:** The responsible person of each task leading / work-package leading partner will be considered as task leader / work-package leader, respectively. If no objection is raised by informing the coordinator, it will be considered that this allocation is accepted.
- Decision 10:** The partners agree to the following advance notification for meetings:
- 1 month for tasks
 - 2 month for WPs
 - 3 months for SP
 - 6 months for project coordinating including open conferences issues

Summary of Actions

- Action 1:** The coordinator will warn the partners according to Decision 1 that they have breached their contractual obligations through an official letter with one month notice.
- Action 2:** In order to receive the pre-financing, the beneficiaries have to sign the A-Form and return it to the coordinator as soon as possible
- Action 3:** All partners should assign persons to tasks in which their companies are involved by informing the task leader at the latest by January 15, 2009.
- Action 4:** All partners should get familiar to the iNTeg-Risk web tool and participate to the instructional open forums (teleconferences) which will be soon announced.
- Action 5:** The responsible persons of each partner should provide any objection to their engagement as task/work-package leaders. In case of no action, it will be considered that they agree to this allocation.
- Action 6:** The main beneficiaries should provide agreement for the new PTA of iNTeg-Risk through electronic voting by December 15, 2008.
- Action 7:** All partners should update the project calendar and upload useful documents at the web tool
- Action 8:** The coordinator should prepare an official letter in order to analyze the electronic voting procedure addressed to the following partners: GDF SUEZ, ATOS Origin, COWI and BT.

- Action 9:** All partners should attend the iNTeg-Risk conference on June 2-3, 2008 and the respective kick-off meetings of the subprojects in which they are involved.
- Action 10:** The management team will provide information about the procedure of allocating effort outside a time period, e.g. in meetings.
- Action 11:** The coordinator will provide all the partners with the list of responsible persons authorized for electronic voting.

Annex 1 – List of participants

		Last Name	First Name	Company	Country
1.	Mr.	Andersen	Henning Boje	Danish Technical University, Dept. of Management Engineering	Denmark
2.	Mr.	Andersson	Dag	SWEREA IVF AB	Sweden
3.	Ms.	Aneziris	Olga	National Center for Scientific Research "DEMOKRITOS"	Greece
4.	Mr.	Bagnoli	Fabio	D'Appolonia S.p.A.	Italy
5.	Mr.	Baloš	Daniel	Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies GmbH	Germany
6.	Mr.	Bernatik	Ales	VSB - Technical University of Ostrava	Czech Republic
7.	Mr.	Biagioni	Fabio	European Commission - Directorate-General Research - Directorate G - Unit 5	Belgium
8.	Mr.	Biermann	Tobias	European Commission DG Environment	Belgium
9.	Mr.	Boccaccini	Aldo	Imperial College London, Department of Materials	U.K.
10.	Mr.	Boenke	Achim	European Commission DG Enterprise and Industry	Belgium
11.	Mr.	Böhm	Christoph	H.G. Geodata Solutions GmbH (GDS)	Germany
12.	Mr.	Bos	Peter	RIVM - National Institute for Public Health and the Environment	Netherlands
13.	Ms.	Bromen	Katja	European Commission, Health & Consumer Protection DG, Directorate C: Risk Assessment	Belgium
14.	Mr.	Bubbico	Roberto	Dipartimento di Ingegneria Chimica, Materiali e Ambiente - DICMA	Italy
15.	Mr.	Buschmann	Marco	Mavionics GmbH	Germany
16.	Mr.	Costescu	Mihai	INCDPM "Alexandru Darabont", National Research and Development Institute on Occupational Safety	Romania
17.	Mr.	Cozzani	Valerio	CONPRICI - University of Bologna	Italy
18.	Mr.	Cusco	Laurence	Health and Safety Laboratory	U.K.
19.	Mr.	Debray	Bruno	INERIS - Institut National de l'Environnement Industriel et des Risques	France
20.	Mr.	Dolinski	Krzysztof	Institute of Fundamental Technological Research, Polish Academy of Science	Poland
21.	Ms.	Duval	Carole	EDF - Electricité de France	France
22.	Mr.	Garcia-Martin	Jesus	Iberdrola S.A.	Spain
23.	Mr.	Gerbec	Marko	Josef Stefan Institute	Slovenia
24.	Ms.	Giorgini	Chiara	Saipem Energy International SpA	Italy
25.	Ms.	Golanski	Luana	CEA- Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique / LITEN / L2T	France
26.	Mr.	Hailwood	Mark	Landesanstalt für Umwelt, Messungen und Naturschutz Baden-Württemberg, Section Environmental Technology	Germany
27.	Mr.	Hansen	Peter Friis	DNV - Det Norske Veritas AS	Norway
28.	Mr.	Harris	John	MERL Ltd	U.K.

		Last Name	First Name	Company	Country
29.	Mr.	Haug	Uwe	Steinbeis Foundation, Steinbeis GmbH & Co für Technologietransfer	Germany
30.	Mr.	Haugen	Gregar	Eni Norge AS	Norway
31.	Ms.	Heikkila	Anna-Mari	VTT Technical Research Centre of Finland	Finland
32.	Mr.	Heikura	Pekka	Pöyry Forest Industry Oy	Finland
33.	Mr.	Ingason	Haukur	SP Technical Research Institute of Sweden (SP Sveriges Tekniska Forskningsinstitut)	Sweden
34.	Mr.	Jovanovic	Aleksandar	European Virtual Institute for Integrated Risk Management	Germany
35.	Mr.	Katalagari nakis	Georgios	European Commission DG RTD G2	Belgium
36.	Ms.	Kokejl	Roswitha	Universität Stuttgart (Zirn)	Germany
37.	Mr.	Kontiĉ	Davor	Jozef Stefan Institute	Slovenia
38.	Mr.	Kovacs	Stefan	INCDPM "Alexandru Darabont", National Research and Development Institute on Occupational Safety	Romania
39.	Mr.	Krause	Ulrich	BAM Bundesanstalt für Materialforschung und -prüfung	Germany
40.	Mr.	Kühnen	Andreas	Definiens AG	Germany
41.	Mr.	Lana	Jose Alfredo	Enagas, S.A.	Spain
42.	Mr.	Landucci	Gabriele	CONPRICI - Pisa University Research Unit	Italy
43.	Mr.	Lee	Lyndon	British Telecommunications plc	U.K.
44.	Ms.	Lenart	Eva Maria	ELITE Foundation	Germany
45.	Ms.	Lenkey	Gyöngyvér B.	Bay Zoltan Foundation for Applied Research, Institute for Logistics and Production Systems	Hungary
46.	Mr.	Lerena	Pablo	Swiss Institute for the Promotion of Safety and Security	Switzerland
47.	Mr.	Leucker	Roland	Studiengesellschaft für unterirdische Verkehrsanlagen e. V.	Germany
48.	Mr.	López de Ipiña	Jesús M	Fundación LEIA - CDT	Spain
49.	Mr.	Lorenzo	Jose	Atos Origin sociedad anonima espanola	Spain
50.	Mr.	Löscher	Michael	Steinbeis Advanced Risk-Technologies GmbH	Germany
51.	Ms.	Lu	Jie	University of Technology, Sydney	Australia
52.	Mr.	Morilhat	Patrick	EDF Electricite de France	France
53.	Ms.	Nagyova	Anna	Technical University of Kosice	Slovakia
54.	Mr.	Oberhagem ann	Dirk	German Fire Protection Association (vfdb)	Germany
55.	Mr.	Øien	Knut	SINTEF, Technology and Society	Norway
56.	Ms.	Pacaiova	Hana	Technical University of Kosice	Slovakia
57.	Mr.	Papadakis	Georgios Art.	Technical University of Crete	Greece
58.	Mr.	Pinchbeck	Dave	GERG - The European Gas Research Group	Belgium

		Last Name	First Name	Company	Country
59.	Mr.	Pirlet	André	European committee for standardization	Belgium
60.	Mr.	Renn	Ortwin	Universität Stuttgart (Zirn)	Germany
61.	Mr.	Rieber	Fabian	Novineon GmbH	Germany
62.	Mr.	Rigaud	Eric	Ecole des Mines de Paris	France
63.	Mr.	Rota	Renato	Politecnico di Milano	Italy
64.	Mr.	Rózsahegyi	Péter	Bay Zoltan Foundation for Applied Research, Institute for Logistics and Production Systems	Hungary
65.	Mr.	Saetren	Thomas Grieg	DNV - Det Norske Veritas AS	Norway
66.	Mr.	Salvi	Olivier	European Virtual Institute for Integrated Risk Management	Germany
67.	Mr.	Salzano	Ernesto	CNR-IRC - Istituto di Ricerche Sulla Combustione	Italy
68.	Ms.	Schmidt	Christina	Definiens AG	Germany
69.	Mr.	Schneider	Reto	Swiss Reinsurance Company	Switzerland
70.	Mr.	Schurr	Marc	Novineon GmbH	Germany
71.	Mr.	Sempere	Julià	Institut Químic de Sarrià - Universitat Ramon Llull	Italy
72.	Mr.	Ström	Mikael	Swerea IVF AB	Sweden
73.	Mr.	Van Wijk	Lorenzo	European Commission JRC Ispra	Belgium
74.	Mr.	Voirin	Marc	EDF - Electricité de France	France
75.	Mr.	Wardman	Mike	Health and Safety Laboratory	U.K.
76.	Mr.	Wietek	Maximilian	VSH Hagerbach Test Gallery Ltd	Switzerland
77.	Mr.	Xenikakis	Grigorios	Steinbeis Advanced Risk Technologies	Germany
78.	Mr.	Zarea	Mures	GDF SUEZ Research & Innovation Division	France
79.	Mr.	Zheng	Jian Hua	Technologica Group - European Technical Joint Venture C. V.	Belgium
80.	Mr.	Zöllner	Rolf	TÜV-SÜD Industrie Service GmbH	Germany

Annex 2 – Meeting Agenda

December 2, 2008

9:00 – 10:00	Registration and getting together – Briefing subgroups (Coffee and refreshments)
10:00 – 10:30	1. Welcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Welcome of the host CEN – A. Pirlet, CEN 1.2 Welcome of the Coordinator – O. Renn, President EU-VRI 1.3 Introduction in the project – A. Jovanovic, EU-VRI
10:30 – 11:30	2. Introduction of participants <p>The partners are requested to duly follow format of introduction the proposed format of presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Name, Company & Function (max. 1-2 sentences) b. Main interests and tasks in the project, expectation from the project/intended exploitation of project results (max. 2-3 sentences per partner and max. 3 Transparencies per partner – transparencies to be set upfront to the coordinators integrisk@eu-vri.eu <p>NOTE: Item (b) applies once, for main partners in the project only.</p>
11:30 – 11:45	Coffee break
11:45 – 12:30	3. Overall expectations and its obligations towards the community from iNTeg-Risk as an EU “flagship projects”: Beyond the project responsibility – G. Katalagarianakis, EU DG RTD, Project Officer
12:30 – 13:00	4. iNTeg-Risk project and related expectations of the main stakeholders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Expectations of industry – P. Morilhat, EDF, France (10 mins) 4.2 iNTeg-Risk and SCENIHR (European Scientific Committee on Emerging and Newly Identified Health Risks) – K. Broman, EU-Sanco, Belgium (10 mins) 4.3 EU project and the SME-relevant opportunities for innovation – U. Haug, Steinbeis Foundation, Stuttgart (10 mins)
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch (buffet)
14:00 – 14:45	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.4 Place of the issue of Emerging risks in EU policies (SCENHIR) – A. Boenke, EU DG ENTER, Belgium (15 mins) 4.5 Gain from the integrated EU projects for the government organizations in the Member States – M. Hailwood, LUBW, Germany (10 mins) 4.6 Emerging risks and insurance industry – R. Schneider, Swiss Re, Switzerland (10 mins) 4.7 Emerging risks and HSE – L. Cusco, HSL, UK (10 mins)

14:45 – 15:45	5. Presentation of the technical contents, including discussions 5.1 Overall project structure – O. Salvi, EU-VRI (15 mins) 5.2 Subproject 1: Representative industrial applications involving emerging risks related to New Technologies – M. Zarea, Gaz de France SUEZ, France / B. Debray, INERIS, France (45 mins) 5.3 Subproject 2: Developing the overall framework for dealing with emerging risks related to New Technologies – V. Cozzani, Univ. of Bologna, Italy / C. Duval, EDF, France (45 mins)
15:45 – 16:00	Coffee break
16:00 – 17:30	5.4 Subproject 3: Deploying and verifying the iNTeg-Risk Framework in industry – G. Lenkey, BZF, Hungary / F. Bagnoli, D'Appolonia, Italy (45 mins) 5.5 Subproject 4: Making the iNTeg-Risk solution available to all – A. Jovanovic, EU-VRI (30 mins)
17:30 – 18:00	Discussion
18:00 – 18:30	Walk to Delegación de la Comunitat Valenciana en Bruselas (Delegation of the Region of Valencia in Brussels) Rue de la Loi 227, 1040 Brussels (see attached map)
18:30 – 20:00	Cocktail Reception Welcome speech of Mr. Juan Manuel Revuelta Pérez , Director General, Delegación de la Comunitat Valenciana en Bruselas

December 3, 2008

9:00 – 9:45	6. Project management 6.1 Introducing of the management requirements - Biagioni, EU
9:45 – 10:30	6.2 Subproject 5: Meeting the challenges of managing large projects – D. Balos, EU-VRI (15 mins)
10:30 – 11:00	Coffee break
11:00 – 12:30	6.3 Management and organization - Co-ordinator, Project Officer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organisation and decision procedures • Communication distribution lists • Appointment of Project Management bodies & responsables • Meeting structure and calendar • Time sheets • Reporting
12:30 – 13:00	7. Budget review - Co-ordinator, Project Officer 7.1 Budget allocation and time table 7.2 Major equipment, consumables, travel 7.3 other issues
13:00 – 14:00	Lunch (buffet)
14:00 – 15:00	8. Planning of the work in year 1
15:00 – 15:30	9. Final discussion
15:30	10. End of the Meeting