



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

**WP1 Project Management**

**Task 1.4**  
Meetings

**Deliverable 1.7**  
Steering Committee Meeting

**Task leader**  
EIBIR/EMBL

**August 2013**

## Euro-Biolmaging 7<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting

### MINUTES

### Euro-Biolmaging 7<sup>th</sup> Steering Committee Meeting

**Date:** Thursday, July 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 10.00-16.00

**Venue:** Sheraton Hotel, Frankfurt Airport Terminal 1, Room 1022-1023

#### **AGENDA**

10:00	Welcome
10:15	<b>Report on 1st Open Call for Nodes:</b> Scientific Coordinators
11:15	<b>Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Report on Community Specific Working Groups (Chairs of BIWG, MIWG)</li> <li>- Presentation of consensus version of Governance Structure (Silke Schumacher)</li> <li>- Voting on consensus Governance Structure (to be suggested to IWG) (SC)</li> </ul>
12:45	<b>Report on Intergovernmental Working Group:</b> Scientific Coordinators
13:15	Lunch
14:00	<b>Hub and Node Activities-</b> Presentation and Discussion
15:00	<b>Euro-Biolmaging Interim Governance after Preparatory Phase</b>
15:30	<b>Conclusion and next steps</b>

#### **List of Participants**

<b>Organisation</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>First Name</b>	<b>Details</b>
ABO	Eriksson	John	
CEA	Lethimonnier	Franck	
CNR	Alberto	Luini	
CNRS	Choquet	Daniel	
CRG	Sharpe	James	
DFG	Renner	Christian	
EIBIR	Hierath	Monika	
EIBIR	Speck	Oliver	
EIBIR	Zolda	Pamela	
EMBL	Ellenberg	Jan	
EMBL	Keppler	Antje	
EMBL	Schumacher	Silke	
EMC	Spek	Wouter	
EORTC	Lejeune	Stephane	
FMI	Gasser	Susan	Represented by Patrick Schwarb
Helmholtz	Thies	Annika	
IMG	Hozak	Pavel	
Imperial	French	Paul	
INRIA	Kervrann	Charles	
INSERM	Lehericy	Stephane	
Nencki	Bernas	Tytus	Represented by Marcin Szumowski

NWO	Martens	Frans	
OVGU	Speck	Oliver	
UNITO	Aime	Silvio	
UNIVDUN	Swedlow	Jason	
UU	Langström	Bengt	
Weizmann	Geiger	Benjamin	
WWU	Jacobs	Andreas	Represented by Yannic Waerzeggers
EMC	Niessen	Wiro	
LMU	Nikolaou	Konstantin	Represented by Thomas Hendel

Not participating:

AIAQS	Almazan Saez	Cari	No reply
BBSRC	Collis	Amanda	No reply
AUH	Frokiaer	Jorgen	excused
EMBL	Pepperkok	Rainer	Proxy: Antje Keppler
EMBL	Schultz	Carsten	Proxy: Silke Schumacher
ETHZ	Szekely	Gabor	excused
FCRB	Donoso	Luis	Proxy: Stephane Lejeune
Fraunhofer	Hahn	Horst	Proxy: Oliver Speck
EPFL	Unser	Michael	No reply
UHEI	Gretz	Norbert	excused
UKLFR	Hennig	Jürgen	excused
UMCU	Klumperman	Judith	excused
UPF	Frangi	Alejandro	No reply
MPG	Musacchio	Andrea	No reply
ZonMw	Beem	Edvard	excused
MPG	Baines	Ivan	Proxy: Jan Ellenberg

All presentation slides are attached.

### **1. Welcome and Introduction of Oliver Speck as new Scientific Coordinator for Medical Imaging**

Agenda was approved unanimously by the SC.

### **2. Report on 1st Open Call for Nodes (slides 3-15)**

Jan Ellenberg presented the procedure, the composition and procedures of the Independent Evaluation Board-IEB(non-European senior scientists from USA, Australia, Asia) and the general results of the 1<sup>st</sup> Open Call for Euro-Biolmaging Nodes Expressions of Interest (Eols). All documents relevant for the 1<sup>st</sup> Open Call are accessible at the project website. Euro-Biolmaging received 71 Eols from 19 different countries supported by more than 2200 user letters of intent with outlined research projects. For the final evaluation the IEB assigned the Eols into five categories (see slide 12). 25 out of 71 Eol were deemed highly recommended to become Euro-Biolmaging Nodes.

*Q: How was the number of users calculated and how many users can be expected on an annual basis?*

The 2202 user Lols represent at least 50% of the expected number of users interested to use the Euro-Biolmaging facilities during the first two years if all Nodes were constructed. The projected number of users per year would be around 750-1000.

*Q: What did the IEB generally state about Euro-Biolmaging?*

The IEB was very positive and indicated that a similar exercise would be of interest for the US imaging community. The IEB recommended that: mature imaging facilities shall mentor/partner up with new facilities, especially in new Member States, so that they can build up excellence in a short time period. The IEB recognizes the challenge of building a European infrastructure.

Access model:

Therefore Euro-Biolmaging shall have one access point for the user at the European level, not a second administrative layer for the user on the national network level.

Cost models presented in Eols:

Some facilities had very optimistic (low) cost estimates for the operational costs. Others were too ambitious (high costs). Due to the diverse funding landscape in different countries it was difficult for the IEB to review the cost plans. Therefore the IEB focused mainly on the scientific evaluation. The funding models differ in different countries but it might be possible to compile an overview from the Eols.

Overall, the evaluation process was a very positively received process and strongly supported by the IEB. IEB members had striking detailed knowledge of all Eols and they were impressed by the quality of the users research projects (Lols). Many IEB members offered to support Euro-Biolmaging again in the future e.g. as members of the Scientific Advisory Board, should the Euro-Biolmaging member states request that. They indicated some small improvements that could be made to the structure of the applications and on the administrative performance of the procedure that will be considered during the next call.

Further details are available in the evaluation report of the IEB and the Node Lols that will be made available once all applicants agreed to forward this information.

### **3. Euro-Biolmaging Governance Structure**

*Report on Community Specific Working Groups (Chairs of BIWG, MIWG)*

John Eriksson reported on the BIWG meeting in Freinsheim (see slide 18). The BIWG discussed the governance structure, Hub and Node activities, Hub structure, first discussion on costs, funding structure and concept "fund the user". In addition, the group discussed future visions for Euro-Biolmaging such as translational research, bridging biological and medical imaging, and innovative imaging technologies. After a thorough discussion, the BIWG adopted the compromise governance structure (as circulated to the SC prior to the meeting). The BIWG is now asking for information on the funding plan and the hub model.

Oliver Speck reported on the MIWG activities (see slide 19). He outlined again, what the tasks of the community-specific working groups are, for which topics they were mandated. He described the thorough MIWG consultation process of the Open Call Part B preparations as well as the meetings and conference calls that led to the preparation of a new governance structure, which formed the basis for the MIWG/BIWG consensus governance structure. This model was unanimously supported by the MIWG.

*Presentation of consensus version of Governance Structure (Silke Schumacher) (slides 20-30)*

Silke Schumacher presented the new MIWG/BIWG compromise governance structure, pointing out the differences to the previous draft version (Jan 2013). For details on the governance structure, please refer to the document sent on June 10<sup>th</sup> to the SC as well as to slides 22-30. Silke Schumacher continues to outline in detail the function of all bodies as requested by the Steering Committee.

In the following short discussion a few points were clarified:

Christian Renner asked if Nodes have to be located in Euro-Biolmaging Member countries. Jan Ellenberg replied that Nodes can only be established in member countries. The Hub-and-Node structure will only work, if all countries hosting Nodes are also members of Euro-Biolmaging.

Furthermore, Christian Renner asked who can become member of the newly created international organization. Jan Ellenberg replied that as stipulated by e.g. the ERIC model, countries and international organizations will be able to become member of Euro-Biolmaging.

*Q: How will industry communication with the future Euro-Biolmaging executive management and Board be guaranteed?*

One possibility is to include a position, which coordinates the industry board and is incorporated in the executive management of Euro-Biolmaging hub. Industry is considering funding such a position. Antje Keppler added that the Euro-Biolmaging Industry Board (EBIB) recently has conducted a survey about the form of their future engagement in Euro-Biolmaging. The majority of the EBIB supports funding a liaison person as part of the staff of the future Euro-Biolmaging Hub.

*Q: How will the communication between the advisory committees and the board be maintained?*

Regular information flow from the advisory committees to the Board will go via the Executive Director. If the board requires specific advice from one of the committees they can invite a representative from this committee. The Executive Director will have the obligation to ask the advice of the panel of nodes committee before the board meetings on matters pertaining to node operation.

*Q: Can/will Euro-Biolmaging provide guidelines for the appointment of national coordinators and the organization of national imaging communities?* National communities will likely organize themselves even more formally in the future. To support these processes, this can develop into a task of the Euro-Biolmaging Executive Management. It remains however a national decision how the respective community is structured.

In most of the existing 22 national imaging initiatives, one or two national coordinating persons have been elected by the national imaging communities. The formation of a national coordinator committee might trigger a constant discussion and might result in valuable further structuring of the imaging community.

*Q: Can a national coordinating person become a member of the Euro-Biolmaging Board?*

Yes, but only if the national coordinating person is not a Head of Node as well.

A Head of Node cannot become member of the Euro-Biolmaging Board due to a conflict of interest. Other ESFRI projects setting up an ERIC have proposed this inclusion of Head of Nodes in the Board but the EC has refused due to conflict of interests (e.g. evaluation of Node performance by the Euro-Biolmaging Board).

***Voting on consensus Governance Structure (to be recommended to IWG)***

Approval of consensus governance structure (including proxies): 35

Non-approval: 0

Abstention: 2

The consensus governance structure will be presented to the IWG during the next meeting on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013 as recommendation from the Euro-Biolmaging Steering Committee.

**4. Report on Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG) (slides 32-40)**

Oliver Speck presented the status of the IWG, its composition, the report on the first meeting (January 21, 2013) and conference call (May 24, 2013). He presented the initial comments from the IWG on the consensus governance structure (slide 40). In general the IWG advised to simplify the governance structure.

*Q: Will there be an open call for hosting the Euro-Biolmaging Hub?*

All European countries are invited to make proposals to host the Euro-Biolmaging Hub. This will be done in an open and transparent manner. It will be possible that different sites contribute to the Hub, i.e. the directors office as well as the community specific sections.

*The SC was asked for feedback or discussion items:*

Frans Martens stated that as IWG member, he welcomes the governance structure recommendation. However the hub structure and the funding plan will be determined the by tasks that will be performed at the central hub It will be important to carefully develop a financial plan.

Oliver Speck replied that the Hub will scale with its tasks and the number of Nodes, which it will support as well as with the number of users, who will access the Nodes. The model is scalable and adapted to the actual workload. There is a minimum package of Hub tasks required for a functional Euro-Biolmaging infrastructure, and it would be possible that the Hub is requested to take on board additional tasks.

Jan Ellenberg added that the consortium has a good information basis to get an idea of the scale of Euro-Biolmaging based on the Expressions of Interest in the 1<sup>st</sup> Open Call.

Frans Martens asked which of the proposed 2202 user projects in the 1<sup>st</sup> Open Call could be carried out if Euro-Biolmaging would not come into being. He also indicated that in WP4 different funding bodies have stressed that it should be avoided that they pay twice for the same project. He agreed that the consortium has a good case with the concrete user numbers and could extract the number of new research proposals from the user proposals.

Oliver Speck stated that the request to provide concrete projects descriptions in the user letters of intent was a high hurdle to take. As this was very successful it shows that many European researchers realize the benefits Euro-Biolmaging will bring.

The IWG will be asked on advice on which information shall be extracted from the user project proposals (Letters of Intent).

Christian Renner asked for the finance plan, as this is the missing piece of information. Jan Ellenberg pointed out that this will be done shortly and after all relevant information from the EoIs has been collected. This information will allow for the respective analysis and for scaling of the Hub.

It will be important for WP4 and the Project Management Team to prepare a financial plan based on the hub-and-node model, the governance structure, Node numbers and foreseen annual Euro-

Biolmaging user numbers. Finance plans for different scenarios (scales of the Hub) will be prepared for presentation at the upcoming IWG meeting. It will be important to move forward as fast as possible with the business plan.

### **5. Hub and Node Activities – Presentation and Discussion (slides 41-45)**

Jan Ellenberg presented the Euro-Biolmaging model regarding the user access model, the Hub-&-Node model and the services which the Nodes and the Hub will offer.

In the following discussion a number of points were raised:

*Q: How will appropriate Node(s) be identified for user access?*

In this regard Euro-Biolmaging can rely on the PCS exercise: all imaging technologies offered by the different Nodes will be transparently displayed on the Euro-Biolmaging web-access portal. It will be up to the user to indicate the requested technology and any preference of suitable Node. The Hub will perform a consultation process to see if the user selected the most appropriate technology and the Node will decide if it is technically feasible to run a given user project.

As users might decide on a “cost of user access” basis it would be good to strive that comparable services have a comparable price. Jan Ellenberg recommended avoiding internal competition between Nodes, and emphasised that funding for user access is an important discussion with the IWG. At the start of Euro-Biolmaging, the infrastructure will need to accept some internal heterogeneity of user access costs. In general it is recognized that the issue of user funding is a crucial topic to decide on how the infrastructure will work: free access for users? Mixed model of subsidized user access? Start with a limited number of high quality user projects which are commonly funded?

John Eriksson pointed out that quality assurance, management and control in running imaging infrastructure have been good arguments with funding agencies. Therefore, the concept shall be included in the tasks of the Nodes.

Pavel Hozak stated that among the foreseen Hub tasks there is the organization of regular meetings for facility managers (exchange of best practice, “train the trainer”), and the evaluation of training activities at Nodes. The latter can be done in the framework of the Node evaluation by the independent Scientific Advisory Board.

Silvio Aime suggested to bring the user to the best Node. He believes that for serving users requesting access to highly specialized technologies, a larger number of Nodes might be needed. In his view, the best match of Node and user is important, therefore the service package offered by the Nodes should be clear and transparent. If possible unique services should be identified. The Hub will need to work with the Nodes to make clear what is offered and indicate if adjustments are needed.

Daniel Choquet and Jan Ellenberg stated that facility staff training shall be coordinated by the Hub. However, the location of each course will depend on its topic and then be conducted at the most suitable site. Certification of facility staff can be positive as it might promote the career of facility staff. As national systems will need to fund service staff, certification of this staff is likely to give an added value. Many countries do not have such formal training for technical service staff in imaging technologies but are interested in it.

### **6. Euro-Biolmaging Interim Governance after Preparatory Phase (slides 46-48)**

Oliver Speck presented the transition phase of Euro-Biolmaging from preparatory phase into implementation.

In the transition phase, the decision-making body will be the Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG) based on a Memorandum of Understanding signed by the participating countries. The current list of IWG delegates presented in the Annex. It will be important to contact the current delegate if already appointed or the appointing body if no person has been mandated to make sure each country is represented. The IWG has given a direction for the next steps: They indicated that the deliverables on the science and technology RI model are in good shape, and that now a clear governance structure and financial plan need to be worked out. Representatives from the strategic Work Packages (WP2, 3, and 4) as well as from the project management team will take part in the next IWG meeting. They will prepare the meeting and offer their future support for the IWG in their tasks. The IWG minutes will be circulated to the Steering Committee after approval. Regarding the possibility of a cost-neutral extension of the Preparatory Phase, the PMT will contact the Beneficiaries regarding their current status of FP7 budget in Euro-Biolmaging. If budget will be left over it can be considered to ask for a cost-neutral extension with new deliverables as it is expected that all deliverables of the DoW will be achieved until the end of the preparatory phase.

#### **7. Conclusions and next steps (slides 49-51)**

Antje Keppler presented the next steps

The 5th Stakeholder Meeting will take place in Heidelberg 25-26 Nov 2013 and the 8th Steering Committee Meeting in Heidelberg on 26<sup>th</sup> OR 27<sup>th</sup> Nov 2013.

Several members of the Euro-Biolmaging Steering Committee stressed the importance of keeping the momentum. To achieve this it will be important that the countries commit to Euro-Biolmaging.



**Annex*****Intergovernmental Working Group members (status July 2013)*****Country/Name**

AT: Hemma Bauer

CH: Isabella Beretta

FI: Eero Vuorio (mandated)

SE: Örjan Smedby (mandated)

NO: Odd Ivar Eriksen

IE: Sheeona Gorman (mandated)

UK: Rowan McKibbin

DK: Troels Rasmussen

PL: Maria Klimkiewicz

GR: Margy Koffa (mandated)

NL: Frans Martens

BE: Robert Muller

DE: Christian Renner

ES: Rafael de Andres Medina

EMBL: Iain Mattaj

IT: Raffaele Liberali

CZ: Petr Ventluka

PT: Ricardo Migueis

FR: Daniel Boujard

IL: Benny Geiger

BG: Stoyno Stoynov (mandated)