

Advanced Materials 2: Project Management Board

Minutes and Actions – Part 2

Systems – Equipment Booking and Logging

Dave Haddleton demonstrated the Warwick intranet-based AM2 booking and logging system highlighting the information that it captures, the control that an administrator has over user access and privileges and the potential for the system to be accessed by academics at other institutions through passwords. Julie MacPherson described the externally hosted “Faces” logging system that the Electrochemistry and Microscopy groups at Warwick have previously adopted and are applying to the AM2 equipment. It was suggested that the system could be investigated by Birmingham and potentially applied to record the access details required by the Project electronically.

Action: Julie MacPherson – to arrange for a member of the Electrochemistry research group to demonstrate the “Faces” system to Emma Melia and to oversee any changes/adaptations of the system required to meet the Project reporting requirements. Progress update at the next Project Management Board

Action: Emma Melia – to acquire details of the “Faces” system from the Electrochemistry research group at Warwick and send the information to the PIs and Facilities Managers at Birmingham.

Action: Jon Preece, Mike Adams, James Bowen and Stuart Arkless – to investigate the “Faces” system and determine how it could be tailored to the requirements of the equipment items and user groups at Birmingham in Chemistry and Chemical Engineering. Having experimented with the system, please inform the Project Manager how Birmingham wish to proceed. As stated in AG2.2, systems must be in place by no later than 31st March 2009. Progress update at the next Project Management Board

Note: Dave Haddleton had to leave the meeting at this point

Systems – Equipment Custodians

Emma Melia raised the issue of Custodians. The function and role of Custodians is still to be fully defined at Birmingham and at both institutions it may depend on the value, usage and role of the particular items of equipment. It was agreed that at Birmingham some equipment items will be managed by the Facilities Manager and may not require an academic Custodian. It was agreed that the roles of the Facilities Managers and Custodians would be discussed at the next Project Management Board meeting.

Action: Mike Adams – to send an updated list of Chemical Engineering Custodians to Emma Melia before the next Project Management Board meeting.

Systems – Output Collection

The issue of reporting outputs was raised by Emma Melia. It was clarified that all outputs (both business and academic related) are contractual and must be reported to AWM in the month that they are evidenced. Julie MacPherson suggested that academics might find a simple form which they can keep up to date a straight forward way of reporting outputs. Jon Preece raised the difficulty of not over burdening academics with paperwork and systems.

Emma suggested that she draft a form based on the AM1 system and circulate it to the Pls for discussion at the next Project Management Board meeting.

Action: Emma Melia – to develop and circulate a form for the collection of Project outputs

Output Timescales

Jo Tuck highlighted that the **ERDF contractual outputs** (Jobs Created, Businesses Created, Businesses Supported and Collaborations with the Knowledge Based) must be **completed by 30th June 2015**, where as the remainder of the contractual outputs can be completed by 30th June 2018. This has an impact on the required resources and profile of outputs and must be considered when assessing project performance.

Systems – Risks and Issues

Emma Melia requested that the Board members and attendees inform her as Project Manager of any Risks or Issues for AM2 as they arise. These are recorded in a log and reported to AWM as appropriate in the monthly claim document. The clarification was made that a Risk is an event or possibility which could occur and if it did would cause an Issue. A risk has a likelihood of occurring (percentage) and an impact on the delivery of the Project (low, medium or high) and the value of the Risk is calculated by multiplying one by the other. Risks are managed through contingency plans, mitigation strategies or variations to avoid the Risk. An Issue is a challenge which has occurred and must be dealt with as it is already impacting on the delivery of the Project. An Issue will have an Action Plan. An example of a risk is the recession causing difficulties for the Project to engage with regional businesses to deliver Business Assists (high impact, low probability), an example of an Issue is the Estates work at Warwick being delayed by departmental space allocation with the Action Plan that spend will be made up in 08/09 from Procurement.

Action: All (ongoing) – to email Emma Melia with details of any Risk or Issues which become apparent and could or will impact on the delivery of the project

Key Performance Indicators

The KPIs were discussed and it was agreed that any KPIs that the Project commits to must be achievable and measurable therefore the information required to report the KPI must be easily obtainable. It was suggested that KPI detail could be collected through monthly output forms, departmental data and

Action: Mike Adams, Jon Preece, Julie MacPherson and Dave Haddleton – to look at the list of KPIs and send details to the Project Manager of how many of each you have personally achieved over a given timescale. Also to send details of any KPIs listed which are impractical or any additional KPIs which the Project could measure. Finally, suggestions of the timescales for reporting these KPIs are requested (monthly, quarterly or six monthly for each KPI depending on what is practical).

Away Day

The final item discussed at the meeting was the Away Day. Potential dates were suggested in June, but it was ultimately decided that the date would be dictated by the timings of undergraduate exams, marking and results. It was agreed that the date and the purpose of the event should be circulated as soon as possible to raise awareness and potential attendance.

Action: Emma Melia - to check dates with undergraduate secretary at Warwick and circulate to Jon Preece and Mike Adams.

It was suggested that a venue in central Birmingham would probably be best for accessibility from both universities and that the day should be 10am – 4pm with lunch provided.

Action: Emma Melia – to call possible venues and request availability and prices following the agreement of a date for the event.

Julie MacPherson highlighted that the purpose and content of the event must be very clear to ensure that invited delegates recognise the value and potential of attending. She suggested that perhaps a range of Custodians and academics working in the six AM2 Research Themes could give five minute presentations on their research interests in morning sessions, followed by facilitated discussion groups in the afternoon.

Action: Emma Melia – to circulate a suggested list of attendees for PIs to add their contacts and thoughts to as well as a skeleton agenda for the day

Agenda Items for next Project Management Board:

- Procurement and Estates Updates
- Output collection methods and definitions
- Role of Equipment Custodians
- Launch Event
- Communications

Next Meeting: 30th March 2-4pm – University of Birmingham