**Meeting summary**

**Date**: 17/10/2016 @ 11:30-12:30

**Subject**: Trilogue Tables Editor: preparation for the SC

**Participants**: Juraj Sykora, Elod Dudas, Gianluigi Alari, Michal Feherpataky, Georgios Kouklakis

**1. Preparation for the SC (logistics)**

- SC participants have already been received from the Council (Roland Genson, Andreas Lernhart, Juraj Sykora and Elod Dudas)

- Meeting room to be defined depending on the number of participants or in case presence in more than one location (BRX, LUX) will be needed.

- Timeslots suggested: Wednesday 9/11 at 10:00-11:00 or Thursday 10/11 at 09:00-10:00.

**Actions**

- CEU to confirm availability for the timeslots proposed

- EP or CEU to book the meeting room based on further info received for number of participants and presence location

**2. Joint analysis report**

EP has sent CEU the draft analysis report with an Executive Summary that can be used as material for the Note to the Secretary Generals. There is a placeholder for CEU to provide their part.

CEU agreed on the structure but find that the Notes of the SGs must be mentioned. Some minor corrections and comments will be sent with track changes to EP.

**Action**

CEU are going to send their corrections and comments to EP by end of this week (21/10).

**3. Project shape proposals**

EP prepared and sent CEU a table with proposed options to facilitate the discussion. The organization, the resources and the financial implications for the proposed options were not included and have to be added.

In general, both parties encourage the joint work, agree that the delivery synchronization is of primary importance and search for a solution that is the least expensive for both institutions. At the moment the CEU cannot state the project setup preference, as the availability of internal resources are not fixed and the decision on a common editing platform is likely to influence the choice.

Initial evaluation of the proposed options:

* **Option 1:** not favored.
* **Option 2:** CEU will have more information and evaluate this option after their planned meetings with the Commission.
* **Option 3, 4 and 5** present the least risk with regards to delivery synchronization.
* **Option 3:** It was suggested that the EP present to CEU (and their IT resources) what is available in the e-Parliament stack so that they can assess compatibility with the CEU infrastructure.
* **Options 4 and 5**: Favored by both parties with the reservation of the CEU on the resources and the outcome of the meetings with the Commission. Option 4 raises concerns to EP as being the most costly.
* **Options 6 and 7**: Rejected by both parties, non-feasible. Were included only for the completeness of the options.

**Actions**

CEU to contribute with information on organization, resources and financial implication.

CEU to evaluate the options after they have consulted with their IT for the availability of resources and after their planned meetings with the Commission.

Follow up of the actions by the end of next week or during the follow up meeting (27/10).

**Decision**

To present to SC the options that are agreed by both sides as preferred after considering the pros and cons and the availability of resources and provide estimation on the cost.

**4. Roadmap**

During the coordination meeting on 30/9 it was requested to provide the Steering Committee with a draft roadmap. The roadmap cannot be provided because it is dependent on the decision for the shape of the project and the resourcing of the project.

**Follow up meeting** for joint analysis and project shape on 27/10/2016 @ 11:00-12:00