

# Skiis 4 eos

- Skills for the European
- Open Science
- Commons

## Consortium Agreement

Fulvio Galeazzi (GARR)

[fulvio.galeazzi@garr.it](mailto:fulvio.galeazzi@garr.it)

Supporting

eosc



Funded by  
the European Union



# The process

- The CA is based on the latest version of the DESCAs model
  - Few additions (Associated Partner) and adaptations (mostly from our past experience as Coordinators)
- Initial version circulated among Consortium partners
- Comments were collected
- Final version including modifications derived by comments circulated
- We expect this version to be signed by **30-09-2022**
  - Consistent with CA Art.7.2.2, no fund transfer without signature

# Comments on comments

- Tried to accomodate feedback we received, but...
  - ...even “cosmetics” may be risky in the legal world...
- When in doubt, we prefer to stick with DESCA
  - If you need further info, please just ask! ([coordinator@skills4eosc.eu](mailto:coordinator@skills4eosc.eu))
- CA needs to be kept simple and “minimal”
  - Anything in it, is binding: we can always do more/better
- Balance procedures/mechanisms with project DoA

We assume good will, openness and collaboration at any level

# What's in it for me?



# Governance structure

- A lot is already (signed and) agreed in DoA.
- During the lifetime of the project:
- admin/financial/strategic matters: directly involve all beneficiaries (General Assembly)
- Technical matters: primarily dealt with at WP level, with coordination level among WPs (Technical Board)
- We want to be as lean and effective as possible (and open, too!)

# Project Manager, Technical Manager, Coordinator Office

- Project Manager (Emma), appointed by Coordinator
  - responsible for the execution of the workplan
  - leads the successful implementation of the project
- Technical Manager (Sara), appointed by Coordinator
  - chairs the Technical Board
  - responsible for overall technical management and execution of the project
- Coordinator Office, appointed by Coordinator:
  - this is the “project secretariat”, its role is to
  - assist the Coordinator and the General Assembly



# General Assembly

- GA is the decision-making body of the Consortium
  - One representative per Party (plus one deputy), plus PM and TM
  - Chaired by PM
  - Project Office assists GA and attends its meetings
  - normally meets at least twice per year
- GA decisions:
  - Content, finances, intellectual property rights
  - Changes to workplan (amendments), Consortium structure,... and much more
  - All decisions are binding for all Parties (6.2)
- Main operating procedures are (a bit formal and) detailed in CA:
  - GA Members should participate and cooperate, possibly appointing delegate (6.3.1)
  - Members may be assisted by “externals”: procedure described in 6.2
  - Voting: 1 vote per Party (PM and TM: no voting rights), decisions require large quorum, veto rights can be exercised (6.3.5)

# Technical Board

- The body taking day-to-day technical decisions, for the execution of activities described in GA - Annex 1
  - Composed by WP leaders (including ELSI Meta-WP)
  - Chaired by Technical Manager
- Ensures smooth overall progress and synchronization
  - Expected to meet “rather often”
  - Coordinate WPs (e.g., towards Milestones and Deliverables)
- Lean and effective structure
  - Any act of the TB is public (e.g., minute meetings)



# Other relevant stuff in the CA (1/2)

- Associated Partner
  - Inserted in CA, so as to avoid additional document
  - Specific provisions are included for AP (obligations, responsibilities) to make it in line with other members (bound by signature of GA)
  - GA is an attachment to CA, so that AP can be made aware of provisions therein

# Other relevant stuff in the CA (2/2)

- Payments:
  - Constraints:
    - Coordinator is obliged by GA to “monitor” project execution
      - Technical (dealt within TB) and financial dimensions
    - Excess payment: if no refund within 30 days, Partner is in “substantial breach” of CA
    - Admin processes can be lengthy
    - Procedures should not affect spending capacity
      - At any given time each Partner should have enough money in the pocket (*but... Partners need to be aware they won't ever receive > ~85% budget during project lifetime*)
  - How we tackle: try and avoid occurrence of over-payments via non-automatic payments and internal monitoring
    - Pre-financing distributed in full, according to project initial budget
    - Other payments distributed as soon as internal reporting shows Partner used >75% of what already received so far

# Thanks for your attention!

## Questions?

