



**Euro-Biolmaging**  
European Research Infrastructure for Imaging Technologies in Biological  
and Biomedical Sciences

**WP1 Project Management**

**Task 1.4**  
Meetings

**Deliverable 1.6**  
Steering Committee Meeting

**Task leader**  
EIBIR/EMBL

**February 2013**

## Euro-Biolmaging 6<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, January 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2013, 11.00-16.00; NH-Hotel, Vienna Airport, Room Europa1

### Minutes

### **Agenda**

11:00	Welcome
11:15	Summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Meeting;</li> <li>- 1<sup>st</sup> Intergovernmental Working Group;</li> <li>- Industry Board Meeting</li> </ul> <i>(Jan Ellenberg and Stefan Schönberg)</i>
11:30	Timeline - Euro-Biolmaging in 2013 <i>(Jan Ellenberg and Stefan Schönberg)</i>
11:45	Presentation Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure by WP2 <i>(Vera Herkommer)</i>
12:15	Discussion and Approval of Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure <i>(Silke Schumacher)</i>
12:45	<i>Lunch</i>
13:30	Euro-Biolmaging interactions in the BMS group: EATRIS, ECRIN, ELIXIR, and INSTRUCT <i>(Jan Ellenberg and Stefan Schönberg)</i>
14:15	The path to complete the Preparatory Phase: One or two tracks? <i>(Ivan Baines)</i>
15:15	Publication of 1st and future calls for Euro-Biolmaging Nodes <i>(Antje Keppler and Pamela Zolda)</i>
15:40	WP11 – Status of the integrated Euro-Biolmaging data infrastructure model
16:00	Conclusions and next steps <i>(Jan Ellenberg and Stefan Schönberg)</i>

**Attendees**

Organisation	Last Name	First Name	
ABO	Eriksson	John	
CNR	Alberto	Luini	
CNRS	Choquet	Daniel	
DFG	Renner	Christian	
EIBIR	Hierath	Monika	
EIBIR	Schönberg	Stefan	
EIBIR	Zolda	Pamela	
EMBL	Ellenberg	Jan	
EMBL	Keppler	Antje	
EMBL	Pepperkok	Rainer	
EMBL	Schumacher	Silke	
EMC	Niessen	Wiro	
EMC	Spek	Wouter	
EORTC	Lejeune	Stephane	
ETHZ	Szekely	Gabor	
FMI	Gasser	Susan	
Fraunhofer	Hahn	Horst	
Helmholtz	Thies	Annika	
IMG	Morska	Marketa	Representing Pavel Hozak
Imperial	French	Paul	
INRIA	Charles	Kervrann	
INSERM	Lehericy	Stephane	
LMU	Nikolaou	Konstantin	
MPG	Baines	Ivan	
Nencki	Bernas	Tytus	
NWO	Martens	Frans	
OVGU	Speck	Oliver	
UHEI	Gretz	Norbert	
UKLFR	Hennig	Jürgen	
UNITO	Aime	Silvio	
UNIVDUN	Swedlow	Jason	
UU	Langström	Bengt	
WWU	Waerzeggers	Yannic	Representing Andreas Jacobs

**Absentees**

AIAQS	Almazan Saez	Cari	
AUH	Frokiaer	Jorgen	Proxy: Gabor Szekely
BBSRC	Collis	Amanda	
CEA	Lethimonnier	Franck	Proxy: Stephane Lehericy
CRG	Sharpe	James	
EMBL	Schultz	Carsten	Proxy: Rainer Pepperkok
EPFL	Unser	Michael	Proxy: Jason Swedlow
FCRB	Donoso	Luis	Proxy: Stephane Lejeune
MPG	Musacchio	Andrea	Proxy: Jason Swedlow
UMCU	Klumperman	Judith	Proxy: Rainer Pepperkok
UPF	Frangi	Alejandro	Proxy: Wiro Niessen
Weizmann	Geiger	Benjamin	Proxy: Rainer Pepperkok
ZonMw	Beem	Edvard	Proxy: Frans Martens

On the request of the Coordinator the Steering Committee Meeting was also attended by Vera Herkommer (EMBL) and Tanja Ninkovic (EMBL) as nonvoting attendees.

**Executive Summary**

- The commitment of both communities to work together shall be continued and the message towards the outside (Euro-Biolmaging stakeholders) shall be harmonised.
- A temporary working committee named “Task Force” shall be established to define common and community-specific topics of the biological and medical imaging communities in Euro-Biolmaging.
- If a topic is regarded to need a community-specific approach, the respective model(s) will be developed in the Community Specific Working Groups and then submitted to the Steering Committee for approval.

**1.) Extraordinary Agenda Item: Withdrawal of Prof. Stefan Schönberg from his position as Euro-Biolmaging Scientific Coordinator (Medical Imaging)**

Stefan Schönberg announces that he will not continue as Scientific Coordinator for Medical Imaging after March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013 and indicates the following reason:

- The scientific objectives of the Euro-Biolmaging Preparatory Phase have successfully been concluded (European-wide Survey, PCS, establishment of national imaging initiatives).
- The upcoming months of Euro-Biolmaging primarily require fundamental expertise in legal/financial matters as well as a position with nearly full-time availability. As a position funded only by in kind contributions, these increasingly time-demanding tasks cannot be aligned with his other professional responsibilities as chairman and director of a large clinical academic department.

Stefan Schönberg particularly thanks Pamela Zolda, Jan Ellenberg, Antje Keppler and the entire EIBIR team for the fruitful collaboration, stimulating scientific exchange and support and announces that EIBIR will take care that the transition will be smooth and not in any way hinder the further progress of the project. He also states that for clinical science disciplines in the field of imaging, such as e.g. radiology, the close collaboration with the biological community has been very inspiring and will in his opinion have a catalytic effect on closing the gap between imaging on a cellular level and applications in vivo. He envisions for the future that a new class of scientists could arise from this interdisciplinary collaboration.

**2.) Approval of Agenda /Proposal to change the agenda**

The Scientific Coordinators propose to restructure the agenda due to the discussions of the 4<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Meeting and the outcome of the Strategy Meeting of WP1-WP4 (topics: governance structure, hub responsibilities, inclusion of technologies in open call) held prior to the SC meeting and to start with the agenda item *The path to complete the Preparatory Phase: One or two tracks?*

Jürgen Hennig suggests adding the following agenda item: *Approval of minutes of the 5<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Minutes* (addressed in these minutes in section: “SC Discussion”)

No objections were made to these proposals.

**3) The path to complete the Preparatory Phase: One or two tracks? (Moderator: Ivan Baines)**

Ivan Baines introduces the subject and indicates that the present Euro-Biolmaging concept already contains a lot of substance. The SC however failed to build consensus on a single infrastructure model. It will now be important to identify, where the synergies of models coming from medical and biological imaging are and where separations are necessary. There are issues in eligibility criteria, proof of feasibility, and inclusion of technologies for open calls, the governance structure and the nature of the hub.

## **SC Discussion**

John Eriksson indicates that national authorities have already been approached and he expresses his concern about the current way of communication and disappointment about the 4<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Meeting. For the future he wishes for unemotional, pragmatic meetings to move ahead with concrete decisions and to move ahead on a unified track.

Rainer Pepperkok: some parts of the medical community are fundamentally different from the biological community needs, which led to a certain blockage. He recommends to resolve the blockage in the SC and to discuss how to accommodate the 2 different ways and to move in 2 ways.

Jason Swedlow raises his concern that the unclear status of Euro-BioImaging is critical with regard to the perception of Euro-BioImaging by funders' representatives and reports on the status of UK funders: the BBSRC would be willing to invest into Euro-BioImaging (basic science) and also MRC needs to be informed about the current status of Euro-BioImaging. The current deadlock might confuse the funders and give the impression that the two years of work were a substantial failure. He urges to change this and to continue the work on Euro-BioImaging.

John Eriksson adds that bringing back home a vague message about Euro-BioImaging would reflect negatively on the BioImaging Finland.

Alberto Luini confirms this for Italy, which would fund Euro-BioImaging, if the message was clear.

Daniel Choquet introduces that France has a working model and that it should be moved forward in a pragmatic manner, which will be best for the users. He adds that a common voice is required for Euro-BioImaging and that two ways of operation are possible. France is in favor of supporting any kind of thing that really works – that accounts the needs of the two communities.

Silvio Aime: the path shall be continued; it is a strongly innovative way to create science, which is important for Europe. It is important to see the developments at the national level. The discussion held in the 5<sup>th</sup> SC Meeting was good, and it was learned that multi-sited nodes are needed. Politicians don't want to hear that researchers can't perform research, because they don't have access to sites. We have to strongly pursue unification of 2 communities to push science forward. Difficulties are natural; we have to come out with clear decisions to trust each other to ensure transparency and to reinforce participation of both communities. But we have to realize that from the national roadmap it is a practical way to build synergies: Single governmental board, single advisory board, but having two hubs that will deal with the needs of the two communities.

Christian Renner adds that the vision shouldn't be lost; if there is confusion it gives impression of immaturity.

Gabor Szekely: the main issue is the hub structure; the solution of a lean hub with minimal tasks, delegating power to the nodes is preferred by the medical imaging community, but has never been discussed.

Stephane Lehericy confirms this conception for France.

**Ivan Baines summarizes that the commitment of both communities to work together should be continued at scientific level and that the current problem is that the message towards the outside is confused. We have to accept that operationally the models might need to be different (1 or 2 hubs, 1 or 2 executive offices). How can each community arrive at respective models? This needs to be defined as soon as possible.**

Jan Ellenberg states that nobody doubts scientific need for collaboration and that we arrived at a difficult moment, where decision-making structures have started to inhibit the progress. We have started a destructive mode rather than allowing each community to build on what is important. This needs to be stopped. Many things have to be achieved in the remaining months of the preparatory phase. There are simply fundamentally different needs of the communities. An infrastructure model was developed over the past months opening up access to imaging technologies; we understand that there are other technologies that might not work for one community. We have to preserve a common umbrella, but create a solution where both communities find their needs addressed. It is a success of the preparatory phase that those differences become clear. We do realize that needs are not the same and alternatives are needed in certain areas. In the long run, we need to empower that medicine and biology move together in Europe. In the long run we need to bring biology and medicine closer together and this is a goal for a generation, not for 10 months. If we continue like we do now it is a strategic risk to the project and we risk losing support of the countries and communities we represent, thus we need to find a way to change.

Stefan Schönberg adds, that it has to be differentiated, which common terms are given by ESFRI and which aspects leave room for different elaboration within each of the both communities. Medical imaging for example sees population based imaging as a valid technology. The medical community should be allowed to put the data infrastructure and population based imaging into the first call – by fully adhering to the overarching criteria of feasibility etc.

Having the terms defined for each community, minutes and the approval of the minutes can be much faster. Stefan Schönberg doesn't see a structural segregation, the calls etc. need to be fully aligned and we need to speak with a common ESFRI voice together. Furthermore he questions, why a data infrastructure, if it is fulfilling generic terms of physical access, hardware, open access, feasibility cannot be on the first call, if the MI community says this is our specific elaboration of the ESFRI terms. There must be an overarching structure otherwise we lose the unique Euro-Biolmaging selling point (from single cell to population comprehensively addressing the grand challenges, e.g. such as Alzheimer's disease) and strength in the ESFRI process.

Oliver Speck highlights the fruitful discussion during the 4<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Meeting and that the Euro-Biolmaging combination makes a difference in the ERA. He states, that the discussion on strategic aspects should have started much earlier and that several SC members have asked many times for it, but that discussions were postponed. We now have to move forward and need to discuss what is common and central and which aspects should be divided – at the same time keeping things we separated interoperable.

Jürgen Hennig confirms that we should go ahead together and the differences and commonalities need to be figured out. One issue was that the decision on inclusion of technologies in the 1st call has not been left to each community. We should get guidance in proper form, but there were very little fixed points, that were decided by the SC. We have to change things and get votes on a clear wording and statements. The PMT should distribute minutes in the format of the exact wording and not as narratives and action items.

Jan Ellenberg: After an SC meeting, minutes are distributed to all participants for their feedback. All feedback is considered by the PMT and included, if correct. If it is not included, the PMT comments on this and provides the comment to all SC members. Minutes are approved by the SC if no (further) objections are expressed by SC participants.

Wiro Niessen supports what has been said. We should go on with one voice and decide how to divide certain items.

Stefan Schönberg encourages the Steering Committee to allow for an individual scaling of the hubs within each community

Horst Hahn: agrees to most, what has been said and adds that it is up to the SC to take ultimate decisions. We need to have a clear, transparent structure to come to a decision. This has not been done. If we have an honest and unbiased PMT, it will always get support.

Jan Ellenberg (speaks on behalf of PMT). The letter sent to the PMT by EIBIR is unacceptable. The PMT as executive body represents the communities 50/50 and acts in the best interest of the Consortium. If the medical imaging community is unhappy their model shall be defined and those items that are different shall be executed.

Daniel Choquet expresses the need to have procedures defined in a pragmatic approach:

- \* we need a precise listing of where communities disagree – to have a discussion and vote on this
- \* list problems of discontent
- \* Daniel Choquet has no problem with having population based imaging in the first call
- \* hub structure: a very clear point that has not been discussed. In France both communities have the same idea of the hub
- \* the role of nodes in the governance structure needs to be addressed
- \* the PCS model may have different rules for each technology

Alberto Luini: there is a clear need for a transparent decision making procedure. We should emphasize the overlaps of the communities, in structures and models.

Antje Keppler: 4 decisions have been made by the by SC so far (PMT composition; inclusion of technologies in 1<sup>st</sup> Open Call only after PCS or comparable proof of feasibility; 2 times: general eligibility criteria). For all decisions the relevant documents were distributed in advance.

Stefan Schönberg again stresses that terms are generic and that their granularity needs to be decided by the respective community. The feasibility has to be shown but how we do it should be left to the communities.

John Eriksson summarizes the items that need to be addressed and analyzed:

- \* data mining in 1<sup>st</sup> Call
- \* population imaging in 1<sup>st</sup> Call
- \* leaner hub or 2 hubs – discussion of hub structure
- \* handling of agenda and minutes
- \* if there is a divided structure: what is common / what is divided

He adds that the PMT has done a tremendous job and it is understandable that there might be mistakes, but there should be a degree of freedom. However a clearer type of communication is needed.

Gabor Szekely states that the task of the PMT is to execute what the SC decides. It has been decided that feasibility can be proven in different ways. At the 4th Stakeholder Meeting it has been said that proving feasibility in different way was an exception. Who decided this? The PMT did a great job. He states that somebody here is behaving in the strange way, but that in his opinion the PMT is behaving in the strange way. Not even the hardest work empowers anybody to overcome legal and contractual engagements. He requests the PMT to stick to legal and contractual obligations it has.

Jan Ellenberg replies that the fact that we spent the last 9 months with procedural issues is a symptom of dysfunctionality of this body. We need a path to develop individual procedures.

Jason Swedlow proposes that over lunch the PMT prepares a list of items needed to be decided during the next months, listing what would be obviously in common and what could be individual.

Oliver Speck asks to prepare a list of issues/decisions to be made in remaining project months and to set up a working group.

Susan Gasser: A working group (Task Force) not replacing the PMT, but working together with the PMT needs to be established; the group should bring in the details in the discussion with the PMT. A clear wording is needed before any voting. We should also have a list of principles and terms that we all support e.g. feasibility, open access, etc. The SC should have very clear, worked out routines that we come here and vote on. We cannot vote on all the granularity. We are here to guide when things go wrong. There are two decisions to be made: what keeps us together and what will be distributed.

Jan Ellenberg: we do have decision making procedures. But we have fundamental differences. But they have not led us to the decision. He supports the Task Force formation with PMT plus few spokes people for the both communities.

#### **Summary of morning discussion by Ivan Baines**

- **There is a very strong endorsement for the scientific vision of Euro-Biolmaging.**
- **There is a wide support that 2 tracks are required and that we need to identify the tasks to elaborate together and the tasks to do separately**
- **Procedures need to become clearer (e.g. feedback how minutes are written and provided)**
- **Over lunch the PMT will prepare a list of items that might require alternative models**

#### **LUNCH BREAK**

After lunch Ivan Baines handed the chair to Susan Gasser.

*Due to the important discussion on the agenda item The path to complete the Preparatory Phase: One or two tracks?, which took much longer time than originally anticipated, the Steering Committee agreed to skip the following agenda items:*

#### **Cancelled:**

- *Summary: 4<sup>th</sup> Stakeholder Meeting; 1<sup>st</sup> Intergovernmental Working Group (outcome was part of the discussion)*
- *Presentation Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure by WP2 (Vera Herkommer)*
- *Discussion and Approval of Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure (Silke Schumacher)*
- *Euro-Biolmaging interactions in the BMS group: EATRIS, ECRIN, ELIXIR, and INSTRUCT (Jan Ellenberg and Stefan Schönberg)*
- *WP11 – Status of the integrated Euro-Biolmaging data infrastructure model (Wiro Niessen)*

#### **List of common and community specific topics, Task Force, Community Specific Working Groups**

Ivan Baines presents a first draft list of items a) which could be commonly elaborated by the Euro-Biolmaging imaging communities within the existing mechanisms of the Preparatory Phase project (*WPs directly submit their proposals to the Steering Committee for approval*) and b) those items which should be elaborated in Community Specific Working Groups and afterwards be submitted to the Steering Committee for approval.

First list presented by PMT:

- Governance Model
- Legal Model
- Access Model
- Procedure and implementation for identification of technologies
  - user need
  - development infrastructure model
  - demonstration of feasibility
  - open competitive call and evaluation criteria
- Finance Plan
- Definition of supporting and coordinating hub

Jan Ellenberg clarifies that the Community Specific Working Groups will become involved when the regular mechanisms of Euro-BioImaging do not work. If there are issues with the proposals of the Work Packages i.e. proposals are not approved by the Steering Committee. The Task Force will delegate these topics to the Community Specific Working Groups which will take care of developing the respective community specific model(s).

Susan Gasser asks the SC how community specific solutions will be approved. She suggested that they should be presented to the SC in a digested compact manner and the SC can handle it and vote on it with 2/3 majority. The SC trusts that the Community Specific Working Groups do the work, but still the SC has to approve the suggested models. There was no objection to this statement. The mandate of the Task Force ends, when all items of the Preparatory Phase Project have been agreed by the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee agrees that all members of the Community Specific Working Groups should be members of the Steering Committee. The establishment of the Community Specific Working Groups should be finished in the next 5 days, and 2 Task Force members should send the two lists of the groups' members to the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee can raise objections regarding the composition of the Community Specific Working Groups related to presentation of the communities and expertise required for the upcoming tasks.

**Motion:** A temporary working committee named "Task Force" shall be established to define common and community-specific topics of the biological and medical imaging communities in Euro-BioImaging.

**Result:** SC vote: 26 approvals, 1 abstention

**Motion:** SC Vote on Task Force representatives Biological Imaging: Jason Swedlow and John Eriksson

**Result:** SC approval by unanimous agreement.

**Motion:** SC Vote on Task Force representatives Medical Imaging: Oliver Speck and Silvio Aime

**Result:** SC approval by unanimous agreement.

#### Composition of Task Force:

Silvio Aime

Ivan Baines

John Eriksson

Jan Ellenberg

Antje Keppler

Stefan Schönberg

Oliver Speck

Jason Swedlow

Annika Thies

Pamela Zolda

#### **4) Publication of 1st and future calls for Euro-BioImaging Nodes**

Ivan Baines: there is strong support for including technologies which have not yet been approved by the first round. We will pass this request to the community specific working groups to decide. But there is also recognition that it should be included in the first call. But we also don't want to delay anything. What he proposes is to release the call and one aspect (i.e. imaging modality) will have a later deadline, respective of the delay with opening it. Maybe we can say this part of the call is by this day and the other part by that day.

Jürgen Hennig would like to see Open Call materials/ documents before publication; the SC needs to see, what the potential applicant will see.

Jan Ellenberg: It is now the third time of postponement of the call. We have an accepted version of general criteria. We have a list of technologies that either were validated through PCS or used

alternative procedures discussed by SC. We have all decisions in place to go ahead with the call. To delay any further makes a bad impression in the imaging communities.

Jason Swedlow recommends moving forward with the open call with all biological imaging and medical imaging technologies which have already been agreed upon and community specific modalities will be added later.

Susan Gasser asks why the call text was not shared and how many PMT members have seen it. Two out of the six PMT members have seen the call text.

The urgent need to see the call text before publication is further expressed by Oliver Speck, Wiro Niessen, Frans Martens, Bengt Lansgtröm, Paul French, Stephane Lehericy.

Susan Gasser: There will be an addendum to the call because some technologies are still under discussion. Documents shall be sent to the SC; serious objections have to be addressed to the PMT; an explanation on the evaluation criteria has to be provided.

**Motion:** The following procedure is proposed

- SC will get all call docs with a 1-day feedback period to PMT
- PMT to agree on final version within one week
- If the PMT does not agree, the call will not be published.

Result: SC Vote on the proposed procedure: approval 20; abstain 6; disapprove 1.

#### **4) Summary of Industry Board Meeting (Horst Hahn)**

The meeting of the Euro-BioImaging Industry Board was well attended. Representatives indicated that industry is highly interested to use the innovative technologies provided by Euro-BioImaging.