

Challenges in Implementing FP7 Projects in the Public Institutions

Viorel VULTURESCU¹,
Nicoleta DUMITRACHE²,
Daniela VASILE³
Constanța-Nicoleta BODEA⁴

ABSTRACT

National Authority for Scientific Research (ANCS) and Executive Unit for Higher Education, Research and Development and Innovation Funding (UEFISCDI) participate to several projects funded under the Framework Programmes, since 1998. The staff from each the two organisations participating in projects are merely the same, typically from “international cooperation” departments. In each of the two organisations, dedicated teams were set and a distinct specialization emerged. In this respect, dedicated procedures and good practices in project management were developed. Even the Framework Programs had different structures and the focused was different (e.g. knowledge creation, EU problem solving, scientific support for policies and programs, etc.), the funding instruments (projects) were not radically different from a Framework Program to another, so the staff could gain experience in managing this type of projects. Experience and expertise gained during this long period of time led to definition of a general framework within the two institutions and setting up of a general guideline for participation to this type of projects. The main dimensions of this framework are: project team organization, project management process, managing results and risk, organisational framework, good practices, factors which ensure success in project implementation.

The paper presents a specific framework for FP 7 project implementation and how this framework is applied by both organisations, a set of rules and procedures that should be followed by any organisation, in particular governmental ones, participating in FP 7 projects and a set of good practices developed by ANCS and UEFISCDI.

KEYWORDS: projects, scientific research, project management, 7th Framework programme, European Union.

JEL CLASSIFICATION: H00, H79, O22.

¹ National Authority for Scientific Research, Romania, Ph. Student at “Lucian Blaga” University, Sibiu, Romania, E-mail: viorel.vulturescu@ancs.ro

² The Executive Unit for Funding Higher Education, Research & Development and Innovation, Romania, Ph. Student at “Lucian Blaga” University, Sibiu, Romania, E-mail: nicoleta.dumitrache@uefiscdi.ro

³ National Authority for Scientific Research, Romania, E-mail: daniela.vasile@ancs.ro

⁴ The Bucharest University of Economic Studies, E-mail: bodea@ase.ro

INTRODUCTION

Project management involves planning, organizing, and managing resources to achieve a specific project's goals and objectives. The management of projects requires distinct technical skills and the adoption of separate management techniques. Staff from the National Authority for Scientific Research (ANCS) and Executive Unit for Higher Education, Research and Development and Innovation Funding (UEFISCDI) participates to several projects funded under the Framework Programmes, since 1998. In each of the two organisations, dedicated teams were set and a distinct specialization emerged. In this respect, dedicated procedures and good practices in project management were developed. Even the Framework Programs had different structures and the focused was different (e.g. knowledge creation, EU problem solving, scientific support for policies and programs, etc.), the funding instruments (projects) were not radically different from a Framework Program to another, so the staff could gain experience in managing this type of projects. Experience and expertise gained during this long period of time led to definition of a general framework within the two institutions and setting up of a general guideline for participation to this type of projects. The paper presents a framework-model which should support Romanian public organisation in the area of project management and implementation of collaborative R&D projects. It also focuses on aspects of project management that are specific to collaborative R&D projects.

1. CHALLENGES IN MANAGING FP7 PROJECTS

The way in which collaborative R&D projects are managed is fundamental to their success. Such projects are characterized by having geographically dispersed participants, multiple consortium partners, and diverse teams. The research project management is full of uncertainty and complexity. Research has elements of creativity and innovation and accurate prediction of the research outcome is therefore very difficult. It is the project manager responsibility to manage both the complexities stemming from the culture(s) of researchers/research work and the uncertainties associated with generating research results (Bodea & Dascalu, 2009). Researchers acting safe are more likely to produce conservative and expected results. In order to obtain innovative results, the researchers usually adopt a risk-taking behaviour, increasing the probability of failure. It is an apparent conflict between the need for predictability of project output, "on time" and "on budget" and the unpredictability of research outcome and new research opportunities arising in the course of the project. Usually, the quality of output may improve if deviations from plan are allowed.

Collaborative R&D projects therefore involve numerous challenges, due to their complexity and the heterogeneity of the people involved. Barnes et al (2006) categorize success factors for collaborative research into the following two groups:

- *Universal success factors*, including mutual trust, commitment, good personal relationships, continuity, flexibility, and leadership;
- *Project management related success factors*, including items such as clearly defined objectives, clearly defined responsibilities, a mutually agreed project plan, realistic aims, adequate resources, defined project milestones, a simple collaborative agreement, regular progress monitoring, effective communication etc.

EU project, named "Together Anywhere, Together Anytime", recently examined the challenges and best practice involved with collaborative R&D projects (TA2 Consortium,

2010), describing the principal challenges in terms of “People”, “Processes” and “Results”. As they pointed out, many issues facing the successful implementation of projects include aspects that apply to two or more of these categories. The principal challenges associated specifically with collaborative R&D projects are presented below.

Challenges associated with *people* are the following:

- *Building a project team*; The process of building a project begins before its start, at the proposal stage when forming the consortium. The project management challenge is to create a “harmonious, high-performing team”, which is more difficult than in company-internal projects, where the heterogeneity and geographical dispersion is much lower. At ANCS and UEFISCDI this challenge was (and still is) as both organisations have a hierarchical structure (pyramid), there are stable departments and, very often, commands received from the project manager / team leader are competing (and interfering) with commands received from the higher hierarchy of that staff member. Under these circumstances, human resources management policy within public organisations has to be very flexible. Typically, an internal note (decision, order, or similar) approved by the head of institution is needed. The aim of such a document is twofold: to certify that a particular person is part of the project team and to acknowledge the authority of project manager / coordinator. Furthermore it could – optionally – be specified the number of hours / day (or month or week) to be spent for project activities. This number of “man-hours” should be also reflected also in their timesheets.

- *Effective project communication*; The quality of project communications is related to the effectiveness of the team. The project management challenge is to establish and encourage effective communication at all levels. This will also help to enable defined tasks and project goals to be achieved with the most efficient investment of resources and with the minimum confusion or duplication of effort. As the team is diverse, one of the challenges in sustaining effective communication is to build understanding and trust. This “communication” should not limit only to meetings, phone calls and e-mails but also to person-to-person communication. Typically, within public institutions like ANCS and UEFISCDI this type of communication is effective, more effective than the formal ways. A possible explanation this effectiveness relates to cultural background.

- *Managing diversity in project*; Collaborative projects involve people of different cultural and professional backgrounds, which can lead to tensions. When managed well, this diversity can be strength. However, the challenge is to work through each problem sensitively, and to be aware that tensions may occur at different points in the project.

- *Managing projects without executive power*; The coordinator and the project manager of a collaborative R&D project are different from a project leader in a company-internal project, in that they do not have direct managerial control over the project personnel. There is no formal authority over consortium partners and their employees. The limited authority is based only on the commitments made in the Collaboration Agreement. In the event that a team member is underperforming, the project management is unable take direct measures. Likewise, if a partner organization decides that other activities should take precedence over the project, the project management is in a weak position. This relatively low level of power increases the challenge for the project management in a collaborative project to keep everyone motivated to perform their work by ensuring good team dynamics and by applying excellent communicational and motivational skills.

Challenges associated with **processes** are:

- *Collaborative decision making*; Decision-making in a collaborative project is challenging, as partners might have individual agendas. Furthermore, there is relatively high requirement for unanimous decisions, particularly with crucial decisions such as exploitation of project results and the definition of fair terms of usage of Intellectual Property.

- *Keeping the Project on Track*; Keeping the project on track means controlling and steering the project towards its goals as well as ensuring that the objectives and associated tasks are adapted, if necessary, as the project progresses. This includes controlling resources in a way that the expected results can be achieved within the deadlines. This is a standard project management task but is particularly challenging in collaborative projects.

- *Managing Resources*; The three main resources to be managed in the project are human resources, financial resources, and time resources. The challenge is continually measure where the project is in terms of resources consumed and how this compares with the plan. The project management needs to be able to identify significant deviations and initiate appropriate corrective actions. In public institutions like ANCS and UEFISCDI the financial management must fit the financial discipline from budgetary institution. Furthermore, financial project management (multiannual) should match the institutional financial management of public Romanian institutions. It is well known that the financial management in public organisations based on annual budgets. Several times the two systems (multiannual and annual) are antagonists which causes many difficulties.

- *Managing change*; Many collaborative projects run for several years and a lot of change can, and usually will, happen in this time. For example, new technological developments can change the context for the project's goals, threatening to make some of them obsolete, changes can occur in partner organisations, which may decrease their involvement in the project. The better that the project manages change, the less disruption and negative impact will occur. The challenge is that in order to manage change effectively, both preparedness and flexibility are required.

- *Envisaging and dealing with risks*; The challenge is to deal with risks without allowing them put the project off track, by having an "early-warning system" that identifies risks as early as possible and contingency plans in place for major risks in order to respond swiftly and effectively, if they occur.

Challenges associated with the **results** are the following:

- *Achieving high quality results*; Good people and good processes are essential for achieving high-quality results. However, there remains the need to instil a commitment to excellence in the consortium in order to achieve high-quality results. It is challenging to set up effective project-internal quality management procedures and to ensure that these processes are continuously and strictly applied.

- *Disseminating the results*; Dissemination of information about project results to the right audiences is an important goal of EU collaborative projects and can be a first step towards successful exploitation of the results. The challenge for project management is to achieve the most effective dissemination, within the resources available. Most participants in a project are interested in their specific research discipline and are motivated to perform dissemination around their research expertise. A challenge for the project management is to harness and finesse the dissemination so that lower level goals can be associated with the large scale goals of the project and to ensure that the goals and successes of the project are made known to as influential an audience as possible.

- *Exploiting the results*; Exploitation of project results should be the ultimate goal of every project. However, doing it can be quite challenging. Real exploitation means, in most cases, bringing the results to the market. The challenge is to get IP issues that could block the road towards successful commercial exploitation out of the way. Conflicts could emerge particularly between academic and industrial exploitation. For an academic researcher the exploitation goal might be to present project results as a paper at a workshop or conference. Industrial researchers might object to this as they might feel too confidential results are being disclosed. Solving these potential conflicts in exploitation approaches could become a major project management challenge.

2. BEST PRACTICES IN MANAGING FP7 PROJECTS

Keraminiyage et al. (2009) identified key success factors for collaborative research, starting with the following focus elements: *trust, the commitment ability and leadership, the transparency and clarity and communication and monitoring*, as they were defined in (Davenport et al., 1998), (Mora-Valentin et al., 2004), (Barnes et al., 2006) and (Mann, 2006). The key success factors related to the mutual respect and trust among partners are: good personal relationships, simple collaborative agreement and a clear and honest understanding of each other's abilities. The key success factors related to the top managerial commitment from all parties are: active participation on project team by all the parties, adequate resources, specialist and complementary knowledge and expertise of partners and one agreed project leader with required authorities. The key success factors related to the transparency and clarity are: common goals with no hidden agendas, clear understanding of each partner's responsibilities and tasks, clearly defined objectives, clearly defined responsibilities, mutually agreed project plan, realistic aims, defined project milestones and focused project scope. And, finally, the success factors related to the effective communication and regular contacts with partners are: regular progress monitoring, and ensuring collaborators deliver and monitoring project's progress against agreed milestones.

Starting with these key success factors, the approach defined in the TA2 EU Project was *adapted* by the ANCS and UEFISCDI, in order to fit the national legislation, *adopted* by means of procedures for managing organizations and projects, and *consolidated* by regular monitoring and adaptation to legal and financial aspects. Responding to the key challenges summarized in the previous paragraph, a set of best practice for collaborative R&D project management was identified. The table 1 presents these best practices.

Table 1. FP7 project management best practices

Area	Best practices
<p>Team Building Because of the diversity and geographical distance of the consortium partners, team building is central for a successful project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have a well-prepared and organised kick-off meeting during the first two project weeks in a proper meeting environment and spend enough time of the meeting to allow the team getting to know each other and building <i>mutual trust</i>. ▪ Organise face-to-face <i>project management meetings</i> at least once every three to four months so people can build up their relationships and resolve any issues in personally. ▪ Encourage technical teams to set up and run technical workshops to achieve results that cannot be done with teams working remotely. ▪ Regular audio conferences are necessary to <i>monitor and encourage progress</i>.

<p>Communication Management Effective communication is the basis of success for any project.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish clear and simple rules for communication within the project - communicate openly and keep everybody who needs to have specific information in the loop, and make use of the phone and face-to-face meetings as often as possible. ▪ Use appropriate <i>tools for communication</i> – e.g. regular audio-conferences within the most senior decision-making units of the overall project
<p>Project Structure It is important to have a clear project structure with clearly defined work packages and tasks, and with clear relationships</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ On the day-to-day project management separation between <i>technical</i> and <i>administrative</i> coordination is recommended. ▪ Separate the role of <i>Project Coordinator</i> and <i>Project Manager</i> in large projects. The Project Coordinator should ensure proper reporting, control resources and budgets, handle payments to partners, control milestones and deliverable schedules. The Project Manager has mainly to coordinate technical work, ensure technical results, handle technical problems, and maintain the quality of technical results. One of the potential dangers of splitting these roles is that there is a team of roughly hierarchically similar persons, whose responsibilities could overlap. It is crucial that these persons have a very good personal relationship.
<p>Resource Management In the large complex projects, keeping the overview on resources is challenging.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Employ <i>easy-to-use reporting</i> to facilitate the <i>controlling and managing of resources</i>. ▪ Resources to be managed are person days, financial funds, and the available time to spend both of them.
<p>Risk Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Undertake comprehensive risk assessment and define a risk management plan. ▪ Prepare for typical risks by drafting a <i>contingency plan</i> and make sure that the project management knows of concrete risks as soon as possible. ▪ As a project coordinator or team coordinator in a public institution, be sure that the higher hierarchy (including project funding organisation) are aware about those risks. In the specific case of ANCS and UEFISCDI it is needed indeed an explanatory note where all those issues are explicitly presented. Directors, directors general and the president of ANCS have to give their visas and approve the explanatory note.
<p>Quality Management</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project needs to take quality assurance measures to guarantee a high quality of the results. Those quality assurance measures are on the project and deliverable level, and on the working level. On the project and deliverable level, this could encompass internal and external reviews of results and case-by-case self-assessments. On the working level, quality assurance could include control of changes made to hardware, software, documentation, tests, and test documentation. ▪ Measures to make partners perform better are to enforce <i>good reporting</i>, in particular of work done and problems, and to <i>monitor</i> whether it is done correctly. If project participants are underperforming, Coordinator, Project Manager and/or Work package Leaders have to start remedial actions to bring performance to a satisfactory level. ▪ Establish an <i>Advisory Board</i> with external experts and stakeholders. The Advisory Board advises the project on its scientific direction and on business opportunities. It reviews on a regular, i.e. yearly, basis the progress made and gives advice on the scientific and business aspects. This advice could, for instance, include new academic or technological achievements the project should consider, new important trends, new societal developments the project should take into account, concrete proposals on how new business may be generated and how exploitation should be organised.
<p>Dissemination of the results</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use a wide variety of <i>dissemination means</i> in order to continuously get your message across to your target audiences and the broad public – e.g. presentations, newsletter, web-site, targeted media and publicity activities, concept demonstrators.

Source: authors

4. THE PROPOSED PROJECT MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

Based on the best practices a project management framework is defined and recommended for the implementation of the collaborative R&D projects.

The *main dimensions* of this framework are the following:

- Clearly defined project scope, aims, objectives, work packages, tasks, milestones, deliverables, timescales, roles and responsibilities, and resource allocation.
- Project governance. It is very important to assure that other department from your organization are fully supporting you for project activities implementation particularly the financial department, public purchase department and human resources department. Without an effective governance structure, most projects will struggle to progress to a successful outcome. The governance structure is used to resolve issues that arise and consider recommendations on project deliverables. Often substantial consultation occurs at the beginning of a project, but the governance structures need to remain active throughout the project's life. Any changes to a project's scope, timelines or budget need to be presented to all elements of the governance structure and the changes documented and agreed.
 - Building team cooperation and trust.
 - Effective project communications.
 - Project quality management.
 - Project risk management (Identification of risks mitigating actions, contingency planning), It is very important for the Romanian governmental (public) organisations, where the head is politically appointed and has a limited (in time) mandate, the political risk to be taken into consideration.
 - Project monitoring and reporting.

A typical *collaborative project organization structure* involves a number of key bodies and roles as follows:

- *Steering Group*. This is the most senior management group in the consortium and has overall responsibility for the project. The steering group will consist of the project coordinator (the chair), project manager and senior representatives of each partner organisation. The steering group will ensure the scientific and technical quality and coherence of the project. Regular updates on the development of the project will be prepared for and emailed to the members of this group, who will otherwise have frequent email communication through a dedicated emailing list and regular telephone conversations. The steering group should meet typically every 3 months. The tasks assigned to the steering group will include: □supervising the coordination and management of the project; ensuring the ongoing quality and successful completion of the project; ensuring the strategic vision of the project and proposing technical roadmaps for the project; overseeing issues relating to technology, security and relationships with key stakeholders; ensuring the project keeps to its original objectives and relevance; ensuring implementation of the guidelines established within the consortium agreement; ensuring that ethical issues are properly handled; supervising implementation strategies for dissemination and exploitation of project results.
- *Technical Specification Board (TSB)*. This would consist of chief scientists and heads of research groups included in the research and development work packages. The TSB would report to the steering group and will be responsible for defining the technical requirement in line with scientific and quality guidelines of the appropriate regulatory and accreditation authorities. The TSB should ensure the scientific and technical quality and coherence of the project.

▪ *Project Coordinator.* The project coordinator will be in regular contact with the project manager and a nominated contact person for each partner. The initial actions of the project coordinator would be to: establish the reporting structure and systems, set up financial recording and reporting systems; confirm and make plans for systems to produce project reports in a timely and comprehensive manner; liaise with the work package leaders. Throughout the project, the project coordinator, supported by the project manager, should: maintain and manage the financial accounting records and reporting mechanisms, balancing spend to budget estimates; undertake constant monitoring and communication to ensure that any necessary changes to the project plan are managed correctly; liaise with work package leaders and act as a first instance in the resolution of conflicts, should they arise. It is very important for the governmental (public) organisations, like ANCS and UEFISCDI that the financial operations to be performed exclusively at the financial (accounting) department. The project coordinator or the implementation team has no access to accounting or any other financial issue. Therefore, the cooperation with financial / accounting department is of crucial importance. Still, any resource, available in the project has to be used exclusively under the approval of project manager or project coordinator.

▪ *Project Manager.* The project manager would be in charge of the day to day issues relating to the running of the project. In particular they should monitor the timely production of deliverables and the financial budget. The prime roles of the project manager would be to: generate project risk assessment procedures and continually assess and mitigate any potential or identified risks to the project; establish and monitor the overall project plan based on the work package plans produced by each of the work package leaders; provide and monitor task and activity lists, deliverables and milestones for all work package leaders to ensure the project is delivered as planned; put in place issue reporting structures and implement change control processes and configuration management; ensure regular project reporting; undertake the day to day management of the scientific and technology activities of the project consortium, having responsibility for any ongoing operational issues and the implementation of any decisions of the steering group.

▪ Each work package would have a *work package leader* appointed who will have the knowledge and expertise within the precise activities to enable the achievement of objectives set. In addition to managing the work within their own work packages, the leaders will report to the project manager and take part in coordination activities of efforts across the entire project. Decision making on a daily basis will be undertaken by the work package leaders. Should decisions be required in relation to the fundamental areas of research, risk management issues, implementation of contingency plans or budgetary issues, they will be referred initially to the project manager. Should the decisions fall outside the project manager's authority, the decision will be passed to the steering group.

▪ *Advisory Board.* This would consist of leading experts, invited on the basis of their extensive knowledge of the systems and processes which will be impacted upon by the outcomes of the project. They will be drawn from disciplines that cover all of the strategic guidance requirements of the project. They should not bear an executive responsibility but will be in regular contact with the steering group and TSB, and will meet with them annually. Members of the advisory board should receive briefings on the progress of the project and will make recommendations.

The general principle of the procedure for resolution of conflicts is that if conflicts arise, there is an attempt for them to be resolved at the lowest level. If a conflict relates to a specific work package and cannot be resolved by the participating organizations of this specific work package, then the conflict is referred to the project manager in the first

instance. Any unresolved disputes are referred to the steering group. In the event that an acceptable solution cannot be reached, external independent arbitrators will be appointed to resolve the outstanding dispute. As previously mentioned in governmental (public) institutions, the head is politically appointed and its mandate is no longer than 4 years. Once a new head is appointed the project manager has to present the project, the team, status of implementation, expected outputs and deliverables and its impact. A *Consortium Agreement* should be produced and agreed upon prior to the start of the project. This agreement will provide formal guidelines as to how reports, payments, management etc. are organised and how important issues such as the intellectual property rights and resolution of disputes are dealt with.

The *effective project risk management* is an integral part of project management processes and contributes to a smooth and successful project development and implementation. Project risks are usually identified and analysed by involving a wide cross-section of project stakeholders and are best done at a single session led by a skilled facilitator. For a small project, however, it may be sufficient for the risk identification and analysis to be performed jointly by the Project Coordinator and Project Manager. The analysis process involves discussion and agreement on the potential risks to the project. All risks should be scored in terms of impact and likelihood. The scores are multiplied together to produce the overall assessment.

Considering a five-point scale, the risk scores can be broken down into the following groups:

- Risks below the threshold, i.e. 10 or below, should be managed and monitored using existing management processes.
- Risks above the threshold, i.e. 12 to 16, should be managed to ensure that the residual risks fall below the threshold where possible.
- Risks significantly above the threshold i.e. 20 and above, should be considered seriously before adoption. Risk management strategies should be put in place to eliminate or reduce the risk within a short timescale. Frequent monitoring would be appropriate to actively manage the risk. The *structure of the project overall plan* is as following (Table 2):

Table 2. The structure of the project overall plan

Project Title	
Project Manager	
Project Partners	
A. PROJECT SCOPE	
A.1. Background	Briefly summaries reasons for establishing the project and how it was initiated, including any relevant background information, such as reference to an approved Project Proposal.
A.3. Purpose	What is the purpose of the project? What is it expected to deliver? This should be a high level description of the objective(s) of the project.

<p>A.4. Objectives(s)</p>	<p>List the target benefits the project aims to achieve, how will these be measured? What are the target dates for achievement?</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="502 235 1133 302"> <thead> <tr> <th>Objective</th> <th>Measurement</th> <th>Completion date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Objective	Measurement	Completion date			
Objective	Measurement	Completion date					
<p>A.5. Project Activities and Milestones</p>	<p>Describe the work breakdown structure for the project:</p> <div data-bbox="502 425 1316 1052"> </div> <p>Define the GANTT chart:</p> <div data-bbox="502 1131 1316 1556"> <p>◆ "milestones" = structure the project and are the important points of the project WP = work package</p> </div>						

	Structure the units of work:			
	✓	Description of task (use the same numbers and titles as in the structures work plan and in the bar graph plan)	Responsible person/team	Completion date
		1. task (= unit of work) 1.1..... 1.1.1..... 1.1.2..... 1.1.3..... 1.2. 1.2.1..... 1.2.2..... 1.3.....		
		2. task (= unit of work) 2.1... 2.1.1... 2.1.2... 2.2.... 2.2.1... 2.2.2... 3. task (= unit of work) 3.1. 3.1.1... 3.2.... 3.2.1....		
	List the milestones for the project:			
	Milestone		Target Date	
	Milestone 1 description		Date for completion of milestone	
A.6. Budget	Summaries the project's budget and expected expenditure.			
A.7. Other Resources	List other resourcing requirements, for example human resources, accommodation, IT equipment, information requirements.			
A.8. Assumptions and Constraints	Identify assumptions made during the planning process along with any constraints. These may include deadlines, financial and budgetary, legislation, resource availability, environmental, technology, security etc.			
B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN				
B.1. Governance	Describe what parties will form the governance structure for the project, their responsibilities and who will be fulfilling each role.			
B.2. Reporting requirements	Describe the reporting frequency, the format and to whom the report goes. Documents would include Project Status Reports and a Project Review and Closure Report.			
B.3. Communication strategy	List the key stakeholders who will have an impact on the project or be impacted by the project and describe how they will be engaged. Provide a summary of the overall key communication and management issues for the project, concentrating on what will contribute to the project's success or where a lack of communication can lead to failure.			
B.4. Related projects	Identify any related projects and what their relationship is. The relationship refers to whether: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the related project is dependent on or interdependent with this project, or - this project is dependent on the other project. The nature of a dependency can include a shared relationship with data, functionality, staff, technology and/or funding.			

B.5. Risk Management Plan (see Appendix)	A risk analysis should be undertaken upon commencement of the project and regularly reviewed throughout its life cycle. The results of the initial analysis should be included as an appendix. Include here a summary of the major risks, strategies to minimize or prevent risks, estimated additional costs to deploy the strategies (these should be included in the budget) and an overall assessment as to the level of risk associated with the project. Also discuss how risks will be managed in relation to risk identification, reviews and reporting.
B.6. Quality Management Plan (optional)	The Quality Management Plan details how the quality processes will be implemented. The purpose of quality management in projects is to ensure that the project outputs are delivered fit-for-purpose. If outputs are not fit-for-purpose, there is a likelihood that planned project outcomes will not be realised, or realised to a much lesser extent. Quality Management should contain project specific information describing the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Methodologies and standards, – Monitoring procedures (how to check to see if project is on track), – Change, issue, and problem management (how to notify partners of changes and issues), – Review and acceptance procedures, including details on acceptance and sign off (what processes to ensure that partners give and receive the agreed information), – Documentation and record keeping, – Review processes to be used to capture lessons learnt throughout the project (how to measure if the objectives have been realised and what has been learnt from doing the project).
B.7. Exploitation Plans	Outline exploitation plans as they are understood at the beginning of the project. Outline IP issues, IP ownerships and rights.
B.8. Project review & closure	Who are the outputs going to be handed over to, and how? Describe the revised roles and responsibilities for staff positions, if any are required. What are the training requirements and what on-going arrangements have been made/are required once the project is completed? Will there be any contracts that require on-going management, if so, by whom will they be managed? At what point will the project be closed?
APPENDICES	
	Detailed statement of work with times and responsibilities. Detailed Project Budget Risk Management plan

Source: authors

CONCLUSIONS

Beyond the management techniques and procedures particularly applied to this type of projects, it is important to mention that governmental institutions like ANCS or UEFISCDI can implement or be partner in project within the 7th Framework Program. Both ANCS and UEFISCDI are participating to Framework programs both as partners and coordinators.

Project teams are organised according to principles and frameworks mentioned above which could be compared with those from other similar organisations from EU member states. Project management procedures in place in both institutions are similar with those that are used within partner organisations. Projects such as: Environmental NCP together to improve their competitiveness (www.env-ncp-together.eu) and Black Sea ERA NET (<http://bs-era.net>) are the proof that governmental organisations can coordinate (lead) projects from EU framework Programs. International teams can be coordinated, financial transfer can be made, and there is authority to lead projects in the most important EU program on science and technology.

Regarding project management for project from the Framework Program, we can draw the following conclusions:

- The existing legal framework in place allow any governmental (public) institution to participate / coordinate FP 7 projects;
- Even the project teams are mainly made up from civil servants and cannot be incentivized according to the impact of their work performed in FP 7 projects, addition human resources can be employed and trained, in order to successfully participate;
- Project management plans, risk management frameworks (and plans) and the organizational frameworks are set under the same circumstances as other organisations from formerly EU 15;
- European Commission does not discriminate Romanian institution; their treatment is on the same foot with any other organisation across the EU or abroad.

Nowadays, there are no obstacles (legal, organisational) to implement projects from the 7th Framework program. The status of “participant” (especially “coordinator”) is extremely difficult to be obtained. As the success rate is about 1/10 comparing with the European average of 1/5 participation even more important. It is worth to be emphasised that participation to EU Framework Programs is not as important from financial point of view, getting financial advantages but for a strategic position that is given by this „champion’s league” in research.

REFERENCES

- Barnes, T.A., Pashby, I.R. & Gibbons, A.M. (2006). Managing collaborative R&D projects; development of a practical management tool. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24(5): 395-404.
- Bodea, C. & Dascălu, M. (2009). Modeling Research Project Risks with Fuzzy Maps. *JAQM – Journal of Applied Quantitative Methods*, 4(2), 17-30.
- Davenport, S., Davies, J. & Grimes, C. (1998). Collaborative research programmes: building trust from difference. *Technovation*, 19(1), 31-40.
- Keraminiyage, K., Amaratunga, D. & Haigh, R. (2009). Achieving Success in Collaborative Research: The Role of Virtual Research Environments. *Journal of Information Technology in Construction*, 14, 59-69.
- Mann, L. (2006). Strength and Length of Partnership as Key Factors in Research Collaboration between Universities and Industry”, in: Ville, Simon P (Editor); Boyce, Gordon (Editor); Macintyre, Stuart (Editor). *How Organisations Connect: Investing in Communication*. Carlton, Vic.: Melbourne University Press, 2006, 74-99.
- Mora-Valentin, E.M., Montoro-Sanchez, A. & Guerras-Martin, L.A. (2004). Determining factors in the success of R&D cooperative agreements between firms and research organizations. *Research Policy*, 33(1), 17-40.
- TA2 Consortium, (2010). *TA2 Together Anywhere, Together Anytime*, available at: http://www.ta2-project.eu/deliverables/TA2_D1-3_managing-complex-projects-for-Web.pdf.
- Environmental NCP together to improve their competitiveness*, www.env-ncp-together.eu
- Black Sea ERA NET*, <http://bs-era.net>