



Meeting Minutes

Meeting Subject:	Project Executive Committee (PEC) Meeting		
Work Package	WP6	Task No.	6.2
Date of Meeting:	September 10th, 2018	Time:	14:00-18:00
Minutes Prepared by:	Diana Mesquita and Alexandra Fernandes	Location:	Room Barbosa Romero
1. Attendance at Meeting			
The names, universities and corresponding signatures are in attach.			
2. Purpose of Meeting			
The consortium meeting will serve as a platform for reviewing of the achieved outcomes, discussion of challenges and their solutions. In summary: (1) To update the project status (2) To define strategies			
3. Meeting Agenda			
(1) Presentation of the daily agenda (2) Execution Status Report from WP1 (3) Execution Status Report from WP5 (4) Report from WP4 (5) Clarification of Project Operations Management by PC (6) Reports from PC on financial status (7) Risk Management (8) Approval of next meeting			
4. Meeting Notes, Decisions, Issues			



- (1) Presentation of the daily agenda

Meeting Notes: Dr. Pisut Koomsap started to welcome PEC members and presented the agenda for the afternoon meeting.

- (2) Execution Status Report from WP1

Meeting Notes: Dr. Wichai Chattinnawat informed the members that the document that he was presenting, had been emailed to everyone so they could download it. For WP1, WPL reported the status but it was unclear, so PC suggested to go through WP1 task by task. It was presented the objectives of the WP1 and was defined that this WP must be concluded throughout the entire first year.

In what concerns to the Programme Reviews, the information collected shows that, from 28 Universities selected for this task, 17 Universities were from Thailand and the other 11 represents the European Universities.

The WP1 Plan is divided in two different phases: execution and analyses.

Related to the analyses of the programmes, it was explained that the LO represents the competences of the curriculum. There are the transversal competences and the technical competences. This is an on-going task.

Task 1.1 was still incomplete. It is waiting for the approval from QC.

Regarding to the remaining tasks planned for this WP, there are different periods.

Task Leader reported the status of Task 1.2, but the figure was unclear and need to be finalized. The members talked about working on it during the week but due to technical issue, Task Leader suggested that he would take care of it. We came to agreement that Task Leader should circulate the results among WP1 members by Sep 26 and submit to QC by October 5. Task 1.2 must be completed by the mid of October.

In relation to task 1.3 of the WP1, it was explained that the plan shows 95 companies, however, the study was made based on 55 companies. The majority companies are in Thailand and the main sectors come from automotive, electronics and manufacturing. Two thirds of the 55 companies are classified by the number of the employee.

The PEC discussed at length for Task 1.3. What WPL reported were mainly from Thai industries and only the data. There was no data analysis. CUT, UPB and UMinho were asked to complete their data collection by Sep 26. CUT informed the meeting that his university will start the new semester at the beginning of October. He will be able to obtain student survey by the mid of October. Regarding Industry needs, a member suggested to analyze the top three clusters first. PEC asked WP1 to make a clear execution plan for task 1.2 and 1.3, because it would not be possible to proceed to the remaining tasks unless these two tasks are completed.



It was discussed a better way to immediately understand this issue and the suggestions presented were: an overview based on Thai countries versus EU countries; defining the common requirements of the three major sectors above-mentioned.

Decisions:

Before the end of the first part of the meeting, were made four announcements:

- Reports for task 1.2 should be ended until the first week of October.
- Report of task 1.3 has been provide to all PEC WP1;
- Draft Report of Task 1.4 will be provided by Rui;
- Draft Report of Task 1.5 was provided;
- Draft Report of Task 1.6 must be ended before the ending of the year.

Issues: Described above

(3) Execution Status Report from WP5

Meeting Notes:

For WP5, WPL updated the status of WP5 and reported that no information had been sent to WP5. WP5 planned to launch a flyer by the end of September. The meeting discussed about the form for dissemination. PC asked WP5 leader to collect all dissemination activities and update during the WP5 meeting on the next day. Members also discussed about the evaluation of the project website. Some members have not yet evaluated. Some evaluated that it needs improvement but provide no suggestion. A member asked about publication. PC informed that all partners must contribute publications. The members asked the number that each partners will contribute. PC could not remember the exact number but will inform the members later. PC, at the end, concluded the status of WP5 including the DESP (Task 5.1) had been submitted to QC for approval since the mid of July.

Decisions: None

Issues: None

(4) Report from WP4

Meeting Notes:

For WP4, QCMB chair updated the status of WP4 and asked for criteria for evaluation of WP6. PC informed that the evaluation of WP6 should not be under WP4.

Decisions:



After discussion, the member agreed that PEC should be the one who evaluate the work of WP6. PC asked :

- CUT to come up with criteria for evaluating the deliverable of task 6.1
- TU to come up with criteria for evaluating the deliverable of task 6.2
- PSU to come up with criteria for evaluating the deliverable of task 6.3
- KMUTNB to come up with criteria for evaluating the deliverable of task 6.4.

They should submit the criteria by the end of September.

Issues: None

Since the meeting took much longer than expected, PC asked the permission to skip the planning report from WP2 and WP3 which will be also reported to general assembly.

WP3 leader, however, asked for a few minutes to update about the web-portal for online learning. He informed the meeting that the portal has already been developed, and asked the member to uploaded and try with their courses.

(5) Clarification of Project Operations Management by PC and (6) Reports from PC on financial status

Meeting Notes: Financial Statement feedback and clarification of what need to be done in the financial statements. Explanation on how partners can change resources.

PC reported receiving financial status from all partners, except UPB. He further informed that only the statement from CUT, PSU and AIT were acceptable. He informed the member that they all as the partner leaders must be responsible for time sheets and financial statement. They must check them carefully before submission.

Regarding operation management raised via email by UMinho leader, PC explained why there are many check points in the process.

The project risk management was not discussed during the meeting but PC informed the member that he will communicate with the members via email on this topic.

Decisions: None

Issues: None

(8) Approval of next meeting

CMU leader proposed two choices: 21-25 Jan 19 and Jan 28 - Feb1 for the third meeting that will be held at CMU. The members discussed and selected Jan 28 - Feb 1 period for the third meeting.



5. Action Items			
Action	Assigned to	Due Date	
Reports for task 1.2	Rui Lima	First week of October, 2018	
Reports for task 1.3	Wichai	Second week of October, 2018	
Reports for WP1	Wichai / Rui	Mid November	
6. Attachments (documents/handouts to bring, reading material, etc.)			
Description		Prepared by	
6. Next Scheduled Meeting			
Date		Time	
Location			