

Cooperation and teamwork - Positive factors

The importance of meeting physically

- The kick-off meeting in Copenhagen and the meeting in Extremadura was extremely important
- The impact of face-to-face meetings was so much higher than the online meetings
- We work when we meet
- Over time we have built trust in the project team. Physical meetings have been important building this trust. We have found each other
- Very productive during our physical meetings – good dialogue

Dedication and learning

- All partners have been very committed; this is very genuine and unique.
- Strong motivation has been shown from all partners
- Cooperation is great and we have learned a lot
- The learning of partners has become very good

Capability of change

- We have been able to adjust and learn from each other
- We have been very agile developing and changing the scope
- Sharing knowledge with each other
- Great dynamic and free speak – sometimes ‘hot’ but seems to be okay
- Worked differently – found our own way
- We solved problems on the run and when needed

Competence

- Strong professionals
- Multidisciplinary team – a lot of capabilities and competences in the project
- The project has developed to be more technically oriented than original planned
- We had to improve the technical competence into the project team, i.e. handled but a bit late
- We have competencies that have been very aligned with EHDS (partly without knowing).

In general

- International project set-up is very good
- Manage to use PCP as a tool!
- Well-coordinated application phase
- Although all last-minute changes and updates we manage to get a solid partnership that is strongly aligned and trust each other
- The evaluation process and selection of the tenders was very well
- Excellent support by knowledge partners also on admin support
- We should be proud, a complexed project with late developed partnership. We got 21 bids, which is quite a success

Cooperation and teamwork - Negative factors

Change of focus

- Difficult to change the scope of the project, from more service to more technological scope, Crane is more as an ICT research project.
- Unbalance of the project; change of content of the project; change of focus
- Frustrating for some of the stakeholders changing the focus/scope
- Very late to find a tech expert. The tech expert entered the project just before the submission

Change of partners and stakeholders

- Changing partner from Österbotten in Finland to Agder in Norway just 2 days before submission
- Changing partner from Norwegian Centre for e-health research to OUS.
- This late entrance also caused some delays, and challenges. Difficult to start up and have a common view

Partners

- Many partners
- Cultural personality differences
- Many of the stakeholders have low experience and knowledge concerning Horizon projects

Work situation

- We were working separately but after meeting we were working more collectively and smoothly
- Difficult with deliveries during holiday
- Covid – no physical meeting. The project team did not meet physically before June 2021
- Some unbalance in the application, added to some difficulty since workplan and team was not addressed this could have been excellent to readapt the workplan

Admin: structure, planning and communication

- Challenge to coordinate
- Poor structure in the meetings, especially in the beginning.
- Deadlines were tight and could have been planned better. Poor structure and deadline
- Unclear what to do, and by whom
- Difficult to follow the emails and many meetings and some meetings are too long
- Information coming from different sources and not one Project platform – project space
- Time management is not the best and therefor the feedback on the work done is very difficult to give quality feedback
- Didn't manage to start working as soon as we would have needed
- Lack of information flow in right time
- Tight time plan in many WPs
- Other distribution of the budget. Better budget for the tech team.

In general

- Very hard start; experienced some tension in the beginning
- Takes time learning from each other
- A very technical focus
- More patients and health professional recruited for the workshops should have been done

- Hard to explain our project, especially the technical parts

Cooperation and teamwork - Improvements

Common level of understanding

- It's important to develop and agree upon a vision early. Defining the vision should be the first step. Define the focus and vision from the beginning. Agreeing on the vision early! Clarifying the focus!
- Establishment of a common level of understanding early of the vision, the concept, focus and project goals Crucial a structure. Clear focus from the beginning – same kind of understanding
- Agree on the vision early on, have all partners understand what the project is about

Physical meetings

- It's important to have physical meetings early and frequently. Digital meetings are not enough. The impact of the face-to-face meeting was tremendous – social part important
- Spend more Earlier kick off and first meetings, physical meetings are superior – This secures a joint point of departure and common view
- We should have used more time in the beginning to learn to know the different partners
- Better interaction during the application phases
- Meet physically more often to align and keep developed trust
- More physical meetings – perhaps also WP-based?

Planning and coordination

- More efforts to make a workplan consistent with the developed scope. We should have been better in planning and sticking to the plan! Better planning to meet deadlines!
- How to follow the time plan is difficult with different cultures/personalities. Stick to agree plans – how can we improve this?
- Improve the Project Handbook to handle changes and challenges in the project
- Agree on the project handbook and follow it!
- Clear roles and expectation descriptions
- What the role of the different partners are, and what to deliver when is of crucial importance. We should have spent more time to update the workplan to make it clearer and more understandable
- Revisit and revise the workplan, since agile development may require updates to description
- Better organize the work for the non-wp-leading partners, so they know when to contribute, perhaps during an early workshop
- The process of reviewing documents should have been more structured
- Structuring how to cooperate should have been better from the beginning. The coordinator role is of crucial importance in a project like Crane, i.e. making process lean and efficient
- More communication, both internal and external
- Important to find a good date for the start/kick-off – not when a holiday coming up. Plan for holiday periods. The holidays are sometimes different from the partners home countries were
- Find the structure on how to work, sooner
- Agree on and use a cooperation tool. Project team space

- More traditional governance structure – separate consortium meetings from other meetings
- Less democracy in some ways... Not everyone needs to attend every meeting
- It has been a challenge to coordinate work packages. An overall lack of EU project experience is partly the reason for this challenge. We should have been better in learn from each other, i.e. building on different experience of EU participation. Some of this problem was problems meeting physically due to Covid
- The pre-evaluation of submitted bids should have been better

Competence

- Important to have the core competence from the beginning; We had a lack of technical competence in the beginning. This competence is now in place with Claus onboard. Hi is in line with state-of-the-art technologies
- Experiences from EU projects helps being efficient

Deliverables - Positive factors

Commitment and interest

- Strong interest among industry. Many bids...
- Managed to propose a call for tender that was unique and selling
- We have addressed a field, that experienced actors feels that we need to solve.
- Users onboard
- Challenge is fun and makes us improve!

An innovative project

- Disruptive approach that may disturb industry business models.
- Deliver a unique project in the end

The documents

- High quality of the deliverables
- There has been put a lot of effort in creating the deliverables
- Many pages but good result
- We did deliver in the end but not in always in time
- On the positive note the TD 1 & 2 seems to be understood by the contractors – most of them are happy
- D6.1 is very good, but we did not spend enough time to go through it and reflect in the team
- Content of deliverables was changed when needed
- We managed to deliver and we got a green light

Deliverables - Negative factors

Change

- Some of the deliverables where not tailored to the new scope
- Created some inconsistency due to change of scope.
- Might disrupt industry with our requirements

Needed skills and experience

- Lack of tech skills were a clear challenge. Lack of technical skills
- Lack PCP experience, and Horizon 2020 procedure.
- Lack of alignment between Insights User needs, challenges and requirements

Complexity

- Difficult and why and what the content
- Ended mismatch between different requirements
- Difficult to understand the core of Crane

Bidders

- 21 applications were too much
- Some of the bidder missed the core of the project
- Should have had a plan B handling so many bids.
- Maybe it would have been easier to state that the aim is to provide access health data or activity data to citizens.

The documents

- Sometimes difficult to understand and what should be included and why. We should have had an overview of the deliverables and why
- Sometimes difficult to understand who is doing what within the documents, i.e., who is responsible for processing what content. We were a bit lost in the beginning
- Some mismatches between documents
- The TD 1 and TD 2 documents is very long and maybe too long – with an improved quality review process they would be more sharp
- Made to many documents. High amount of deliverables
- Lack of quality control and alignment between deliverables
- Andre doc was not necessarily due changing the focus

The process of developing documents

- A lot of work after the review
- Not enough time for feedback. No time for reviewing deliverables
- Many meetings were consortium meetings, not WP-based
- Hard to find a model to get input from the other WPs
- Another governance model should have been used
- Difficult to understand the rolls & responsibilities of the buyer regions – SOTA and other docs
- Difficult to know what and when to deliver when you are not task lead – especially when you need to gather internal resources that are short of time
- Lack of vision influenced the deliverables in the beginning

Deliverables - Improvements

Documents

- Some of the documents should have been a joint deliverable, evaluation framework + requirements + selection criteria's
- Better overview of the required documents (internally)

- Better alignment between different deliverables.
- Overview of documents required
- The commotion should have better requirements

Planning

- Better planning to meet deadlines
- We must stick to agree plans
- The digital meetings should have been structured and implemented
- All meetings should have a specific agenda, not just for general discussions. But there should be a mix!
- A standard process on how a PCP process works should have been made and shared internally

The process of developing documents

- Meet physically more often to align results of deliveries
- Secure quality and review reading
- Present deliverables to the project team to ensure alignment and responsibilities
- Better distribution/organization of deliverables in the WPs, and the timing
- Ensure common level of understanding among the participants on what to deliver when, and who is responsible for what part of the document
- For the evaluation and the development of deliverables it could have been good to have more technical experts involved
- We should consider in using an external feedback team for ensuring quality control. Quality management from start – in cooperation!
- Better guidelines from the Commission
- Balance good enough vs. always perfect (perfection vs. pragmatic)
- Focus more on quality management early on