### **Build on Best Practice** *Video Workshop*

**Best Practices and Potential Risks** from an ESS Partner's perspective

#### **Daniel Csanády**

Wigner Research Centre of Physics

27.08.2020, Remote



### brightness<sup>2</sup> Background

- The **BrightnESS-2 East IK Hub is Hungary** where the funding agency is the **National Office for Research, Development and Innovation** ("NORDI") of the Hungarian Government.
- The NORDI authorized 3 Hungarian research institutes to conduct In-Kind Agreements with ESS ERIC:
  - the Institute for Nuclear Research ("ATOMKI"),
  - the Centre for Energy Research ("CER"), and
  - the Wigner Research Centre for Physics ("WIGNER").
- All these institutes are **not-for-profit public law organisations** and are operating in the same legal and economic environment as a result of belonging to the **Lóránd Eötvös Research Network of Hungary**.



# Best Practices already in place on which to build further developments (B-1/B-2)

- The Hungarian ESS Board ("HUB") has been established by NORDI and involving representatives of ATOMKI, CER, WIGNER and NORDI to allocate state funding and approve in-kind contributions ("IKC"). HUB held meetings approx. quarterly since 25<sup>th</sup> February 2015.
- On 12<sup>th</sup> December 2015 a **Memorandum of Understanding for Funding Inkind Contributions** ("Financial MoU") was signed between NORDI and ESS ERIC which aimed to clarify financial matters and to avoid possible risks of transnational finance.
- According to this Financial MoU, Hungary is transferring all of its funding to ESS ERIC in cash on an annual basis and ESS ERIC transfers the Hungarian inkind commitment to its authorized Hungarian in-kind Partner according to agreed Technical Annexes ("TA") of the relevant In-Kind Agreement ("IKA").



#### Best Practices already in place on which to build brightness<sup>2</sup> further developments (B-1/B-2) – IKC protocols and networking activities in Hungary

- Hungarian ESS Board composed by IK partners and the financing agency of Hungary was established by the National Office for Research, Development and Innovation (NORDI) to regulate and supervise Hungarian IK projects
- A Memorandum of Understanding for Funding In-kind Contributions was reached between ESS ERIC and NRDIO
- An Ex Ante Statement on VAT Status of In-kind Contributions was obtained for Wigner RCP from the Hungarian Tax and Customs Administration
- An Authorised Legal Opinion on Public Procurement of Innovation was received to interpret properly the Hungarian Public Procurement Act of 2011
- Activities of Hungarian delegates in various ESS bodies and advisory committees were coordinated
- Direct communication with ESS units and ESS IK partners was maintained to report and reflect on key issues
- Technical assistance and best practices were provided to Hungarian partners during preparation of IK Technical Annexes
- Administrative support was provided to the Hungarian ESS Board to assess progress of Hungarian IK projects
- Coordination with *Hungarian ILO representative* was ensured.



# Best Practice #1 – Cross-Hub Communication 1. – on Value Added Tax

- Consultations with North-West Hub (contacts: Justin Greenhalgh and Philippa Kingston), Nordic-Baltic Hub (contact: Miloš Davidović) and Central Hub (contact: Artur Glavic and Tania Claudio Weber)
- participation and Hungarian presentation at BrightnESS-1 "Value Added Tax Workshop" of 2016 in Malmö
- *information sharing* re. *VAT Opinion of the Swedish Tax Agency* on IK Contributions
- joint participation at BrightnESS-1 In-kind Best Practice Workshop "VAT exposure related to ESS Installations in Sweden" of 2018 in Lund
- information exchange re. access to and usage of XRM+ Data System



# Best Practice #2 – Cross-Hub Communication 2. – on Warranty & Liability

- 2. Consultations with North-West Hub (contacts: Justin Greenhalgh and Philippa Kingston), Central Hub (contact: Tania Claudio Weber), Iberia Hub (contacts: Fiamma Garcia-Toriello and Estefania Abad Garcia) and South Hub (contacts: Paolo Mereu)
- risk analysis re. Warranty clauses of different IK Technical Annexes
- common interpretation of *IK Agreement Template* Section 7.2
- joint participation at BrightnESS-1 WP2 General Meetings at ESS Bilbao in Basque Country
- information sharing re. Warranty clauses of Technical Annexes of Wigner, STFC, FZ Jülich, ESS Bilbao, INFN



# Best Practice #2 – Cross-Hub Communication 3. – on Swedish Labour Law

- 3. Consultations within South Hub (contacts: Paolo Mereu ) and Central Hub (contact: Tania Claudio Weber)
- joint participation at BrightnESS-1 3rd Best Practice Workshop "Detailing the European Spallation Source In-Kind Installations: Organization, Plans and Support" in Lund
- *information sharing* re. registration to *Swedish Work Environment* Authority.
- information exchange re. BrightnESS-2 1st Technical Report



### brightness<sup>2</sup> Main risks identified in IK Management

ID	Event	Cause	Impact	Cost Schedule	Prob. 1-5	Mitigation Measures
1	Narrow area of coordination between ESS IKRC and IK Group	No coordination mechanism exists regarding IKRC ToR 2.7 & 2.9 review actions	No conflict resolution mechanism is at work between ESS and Partners	N/A – structural isuue	Already in place	Conflict resolution mechanism between ESS and Partners could be established
2	Reorganisation of ESS IK Management in 2019	No working conflict resolution mechanism is at work between ESS and Partners	Reduced role of the IK Group and creation of the IK Project Office	N/A – structural isuue	Already in place	Coordination roles of the IK Group could be strengthened
3	Overlapping responsibilities of the IK Group and the IK Project Office	Reduced role of the IK Group and creation of the IK Project Office	Structural tension cannot be ruled out within ESS IK Management while Partners has no mechanism to voice their interests	N/A – structural isuue	3	Share of responsibilities between the IK Group and the IK Project Office could be regulated
4	No channel for ESS Partners to be involved into ESS IK Management	Structural tension cannot be ruled out within ESS while Partners has no mechanism to voice their interests	Conflict resolution mechanism has still no place in the organisational structure of ESS	N/A – structural isuue	4	Conflict resolution role of ESS IKRC could be strengthened since Partners need a mechanism to be heard

Probability: 5 = most severe; Cost: Estimated potential cost in M€ if not mitigated; Schedule: Estimated delay of activity in months if not mitigated

Comments: We suppose that ESS Council is not the right place to deal with project level technical and management conflicts.

### brightness<sup>2</sup> Achievements & Lessons Learnt

- **Good working relationship** with ESS IK Management were dully established in Hungary which is one of the greatest achievement of ESS Partners of the country.
- However, ESS IK Group and IK Project Office are representing ESS by definition, so they
  are not always able to take into account those interests of their Partners which are
  conflicting with ESS interests.
- BrightnESS-2 IK Field Coordinators have only informal roles, hence the FC Network is able to forecast conflicts but it is **unable to mediate or resolve them**.
- Conflict resolution mechanism between ESS and its Partners could be an opportunity for IK managers of all sides to resolve conflicts at their early stages and to prevent unnecessary delays.
- Certainly, conflict resolution should be an exceptional tool which does not interfere
  with day-to-day operation and decision-making of ESS IK Management because it starts
  to work only in exceptional cases.
- As a basic rule, good and effective conflict management is impartial and thus it does not reduce but increases trust among cooperating partners.



## Thank you!

Daniel CSANÁDY, Wigner RCP csanady.daniel@wigner.hu

