

Annual Meeting 2015

Meeting of Steering Committee Friday, 13 February, 13:40h in Berlin

DISCHARGE Coordinator: Marc Dewey (MD)

DISCHARGE Steering Committee: Dr. Jacob Geleijns, Dr. Christine Kubiak (CK), Dr. Iñaki Gutiérrez-Ibarluzea (GI), Prof. Vladimir Rogalewicz (VR), Prof. Jacqueline Müller-Nordhorn (JMN), Prof. Peter Schlattmann (PS), Prof. Klaus Kofoed (KK), Dr. Christian Delles (CD), Prof. Teodora Benedek (TB), Prof. Marco Francone (MF), Dr. Ligita Zvaigzne (LZ), Prof. Matthias Gutberlet (MG) (not present, represented by MD)

Affiliated: Adriane Napp (AN)

Nr.	Issues	Outcomes	ID
1	Welcome		MD
2	Round of Introduction		all
3	Inclusion new Partners		AN
	a) Overview	AN informed the SC about the four new partners already included by the SC: Turku PET Centre at the Turku University Hospital (TURKU) in Finland; Clinical Hospital Center Zemun (CHCZ) in Serbia; OSI Bilbao-Basurto-Organización Sanitaria Integrada Bilbao-Basurto (OSAKIDETZA) in Bilbao, and the University of Medicine and Pharmacy in Targu-Mures (UMF) in Romania. After that, she introduced the two additional partners which need approval from the SC. AN also reminded the SC member that everyone can make proposals for new partners.	AN
	b) The Institute of Cardiology in Warsaw (IKARD)	All attending SC members agreed on including this site as a new partner.	
	c) University Hospital Centre Zagreb, Croatia (KBC)	All attending SC members agreed on putting this partner on hold. This is needed, due to the now reached amount of partners and the missing FP7 registration of the hospital.	

4	Consortium Agreement		AN
	a) Overview	AN informed the SC members about the importance of the mandatory Consortium Agreement version 2 (Cav2). AN explained that the majority of the Cav2 is set up with standard formulations. The relevant parts which have been individualized for DISCHARGE were presented during the SC meeting and are attached.	AN
	b) Decision	All attending SC members agreed on the Cav2. The Cav2 will be finalised soon and all partners will sign it as the replacement for the existing version 1.	
5	Others		
	a) WP9 Discussion	a) Overview: VR requests more financial resources. AN states that this is not possible due to the payment system in FP7 projects.	AN + VR
		b) VRs argumentation: VR states that he delivered all his tasks and received insufficient feedback. The whole project is delayed and he could not do any review on any data. He requests that payments from Charite that were disconnected without any notice in the end of October 2014 be restored.	VR
		c) ANs argumentation: AN said that she paid VR the money in advance for the first two years of the study. The money should have been enough until the exploratory analysis. The task had an estimated amount of person months that can be paid in money. This money is only for the time spent on the tasks. She agrees that she had been wanting to transfer a further payment in November 2014 to VR, which was meant for the future exploratory analysis. She stated that all WP leaders who sent the deliverables in the expected quality have received prepayments to have money on their accounts. AN kept asking VR for the deliverable CEA Plan. Since VR did not submit an acceptable deliverable, she had to freeze the payment to comply with the European Commission funding rules and handed the issue to the Coordinator and the Steering Committee. She states again, that for the ongoing tasks, VR has already received the entire respective budget (CEA plan and micro-costing analysis).	AN

	b) WP9 Discussion without AN and VR	<p>CD wants the discussion separated: On one hand the financial problem and on the other hand the scientific problem. All members agreed on this idea. MD described the scientific situation in detail. KK commented that he could not fully understand the WP9 CEA analysis plan which is a bad sign for the scientific level.</p> <p>MD proposed to the SC that a new WP leader is needed. CD mentioned the importance of VRs remaining in the project due to his already done work and his expertise in his field.</p> <p>Three possible new WP leaders were discussed.</p>	
	c) Decision about VRs position in WP9 Cost Effectiveness Analysis	The attending SC members decided unanimously to replace VR as the leader of WP9 CEA. The SC mentioned the importance of VRs experience remaining in the WP9. A new WP leader was not defined but MD will search for one.	
	d) Communication of results to VR and AN	The SC will communicate the decision about the discussion to VR and AN after the end of the SC meeting. SC Members attending will be KK and MD. MD is asked by SC to search for a new WP leader with the help of PS, JMN, GI and KK	
6	Closing and Good by		