

**NDPHS Strategy Working Group 2014
Fifth Meeting
Stockholm, Sweden
10 February 2015**

Reference	SWG2014 5/5/1
Title	Definition of various types of projects vis-à-vis which the NDPHS plays a role
Submitted by	Secretariat
Summary / Note	This document contains a revised proposal regarding the definition of various types of projects vis-à-vis which the NDPHS plays a role, revised in line with the comments expressed during the SWG 4 meeting
Requested action	For discussion and decision

1. Background

According to the NDPHS Evaluation Report 2013,¹ projects will continue to play an important role in the NDPHS. At the same time, as noted in the NDPHS Evaluation Report 2013, **“the opinion about what actually can be called a ‘NDPHS-project’ varies.”** To address this problem, the Strategy Working Group (SWG) has been tasked to “define what a ‘NDPHS project’ is.” As decided by the CSR 22, it is for the CSR to “adopt a clear-cut definition of a ‘NDPHS project,”” whereas the SWG bears the main responsibility for proposing the definition.

2. Definition of a “Project”

Before types of projects, vis-à-vis which the NDPHS plays a role, can be discussed, it is important to arrive at a common definition what constitutes a “project.”

As noted in the NDPHS Evaluation Report 2013, the lack of a definition of a “project” leads to a “fear that the Expert Groups will only focus on the nitty-gritty of down-to-earth work with target groups.” Among the Evaluation Consultant’s recommendations supported by the CSR was that “the definition of a project should include the development of reports or documents, not only direct implementation of methods with the target-group.”

To address this recommendation, the Secretariat proposes to use the following definition of a project (also used by the European Commission):

“A project is a series of activities aimed at bringing about clearly specified objectives within a defined time period and with a defined budget.”

¹ Available at: http://www.ndphs.org//documents/3726/CSR_22-6-1_Independent_Evaluation_%20of_%20the%20NDPHS_%202013.pdf.

3. Types of projects vis-à-vis which the NDPHS plays a role

As agreed by the SWG 4 meeting, it is proposed to **abandon the “NDPHS-labeled” project approach and divide all projects, vis-à-vis which the NDPHS plays a role, into two groups** described further down. To which group a given project belongs, or should belong, should depend exclusively on the NDPHS’s role vis-à-vis the project.

3.1. “NDPHS project”

Background information

The Secretariat **originally** suggested that, in publicly available NDPHS documents as well as during official interventions by the NDPHS representatives, the term “NDPHS project” would be used only regarding the projects where the NDPHS acts as a beneficiary² or, if applicable, a project partner.

The only NDPHS body having a legal capacity and, therefore, able to assume the role of a project beneficiary (a lead partner) or a project partner is the NDPHS Secretariat. Consequently, the Secretariat suggested the following definition: **“A “NDPHS project” is a project where the NDPHS Secretariat acts as a project beneficiary (a lead partner) or a project partner.”**³

The proposed definition of a “NDPHS project” was thoroughly discussed during the SWG 4 meeting (cf. meeting minutes⁴). In particular, Norway noted that defining an NDPHS project as a “project where the NDPHS Secretariat acts as the beneficiary (lead partner)” as suggested by the Secretariat might give the wrong signals to the Partner Countries, whereas Russia suggested that if one NDPHS Partner initiated a project, involved at least two more NDPHS Partners and wished to claim/label it as a NDPHS project, it would be an issue for a CSR decision.

Proposal

Consistent with the above, the following revised definition of a **“NDPHS project”** is proposed:

² The meaning of the term “beneficiary” in this context is referring to EU grant contracts terminology, according to which, the beneficiary is the lead partner (other project partners can be “co-beneficiaries), responsible for implementing the project in accordance with the grant contract, as well as the owner of the title and intellectual property rights to the project’s results, reports and other documents.

³ The Secretariat took a restrictive approach in proposing the above definition, as it advises careful approach to claiming the ownership rights of a given project. In an unlikely, but theoretically possible worst-case scenario, wrong labelling may even give rise to an intellectual property rights dispute. Depending on the applicable legislation, the intellectual property rights over a project are usually vested in the beneficiary or the beneficiary and project partners. For example, Article 7.1 of the General Conditions of the ADPY project’s Grant Contract stipulates as follows: “Ownership of, and title and intellectual and industrial property rights to the Action’s results, report and other documents relating to it shall be vested in the Beneficiary.”

⁴ Available at: http://www.ndphs.org/?mtgs.swg2014_4_vilnius

A “NDPHS project” is a project with regard to which the CSR has taken a decision that the NDPHS would be involved and in which:

- **The NDPHS Secretariat is involved as a project beneficiary (a lead partner) or**
- **An institution named by the CSR or a respective Expert Group acts as a project beneficiary (a lead partner).**

A written confirmation of the project beneficiary (except when it is the NDPHS Secretariat) that the project partners agree that the project is labeled a “NDPHS project” must be secured in advance.

If a NDPHS Partner initiates a project involving at least two more NDPHS Partners and wishes to have it labeled a “NDPHS project,” it shall submit its written request to the CSR for decision. The request will be submitted through the NDPHS Secretariat.

The Secretariat proposes that – **in other cases**, i.e. when the existence, subsequent results or impact of a project is a direct outcome of the NDPHS’ work, but neither an institution designated by the respective Expert Group or the Committee of Senior Representatives nor the NDPHS Secretariat are a beneficiary or a partner in a given project – **the following term should be used.**

3.2. “NDPHS-facilitated project”

The Secretariat proposes to reinforce the term that was used in the NDPHS Strategy 2010-2013 – a “NDPHS-facilitated project” – to indicate that a given project is attributable to the NDPHS. In order to conclude that a project is NDPHS-facilitated, it is important to determine **that the objectives, specific products or results in question have been made possible through the cooperation within the NDPHS network.**

Having in mind the foregoing, the Secretariat proposes as follows:

A “NDPHS-facilitated project” is a project which is made possible through the cooperation within the NDPHS network, i.e., where one or more NDPHS structures play a role vis-à-vis it by (one or a combination thereof):

- Taking an initiative to **formulate a project proposal** in collaboration with project partners;
- Contributing in a meaningful way to the **implementation of the project or at least one of its work packages** (the achievement of the objectives and/or results, development of specific products, etc.);
- Contribute in a meaningful way to raising the findings from the **project level to a policy level**;
- Having the project financed through the NDPHS Secretariat.

Visualization of application of the NDPHS Secretariat-proposed rules to various types of projects

Project examples		Role that NDPHS structures play vis-à-vis project					Level of NDPHS involvement	Proposed label
Name	Countries from which Project Partners originated	PAC	CSR	EG/TG	Associated EG	Secretariat		
Alcohol and Drug Prevention Among Youth - ADPY (Grant 2012/284-486)	Russia, Iceland, Lithuania, Sweden, Finland		CSR took decision that NDPHS would be involved			The NDPHS Secretariat acted as a project beneficiary (the Lead Partner)	✓	"NDPHS Project"
Building capacity in prevention of HIV and associated infections among youth at high risk in the Northern Dimension area (Grant Contract: 2013/313-700)	Russia, Finland, Poland, Latvia		CSR took decision that NDPHS would be involved			The NDPHS Secretariat acted as a project beneficiary (the Lead Partner)		
Northern Dimension Antibiotic Resistance Study - NoDARS (Grant Contract 2014/344-660)	Sweden, Russia, Finland, Latvia, Norway, Poland, Germany		CSR took decision that NDPHS would be involved			The NDPHS Secretariat acted as a project beneficiary (the Lead Partner)		
BARN - Infection Prevention and Control (NDPHS Seed Money Project)	Sweden, Russia, Lithuania, Latvia					Funded through NDPHS Seed Money Grant	✓	"NDPHS-facilitated project"
HATBAI (EUSBSR Seed Money Grant)	Finland, Poland, Russia			HIV/AIDS & AI EG helped to develop the project proposal and contributed to the implementation				
Healthification - Implementation of Health in All Policies on the local level for more effective prevention of non-communicable diseases (NDPHS Seed Money Project)	Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Estonia			NCD EG helped to develop the project proposal and contributed to the implementation		Funded through NDPHS Seed Money Grant		

ImPrim	Finland, Belarus, Estonia, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Sweden		Project findings were presented to the CSR	PPHS EG helped develop the project proposal and contributed to the implementation			✓	"NDPHS-facilitated project"
INTEGBALT (EUSBSR Seed Money Grant)	Latvia, Lithuania, Finland			PPHS EG helped develop the project proposal and contributed to the implementation		The NDPHS was a Project Partner		
ICT for Health	Denmark, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Russia, Sweden		Project findings were presented to the CSR		eHealth for Regions network project		✗	At the moment neither "NDPHS Project" nor "NDPHS-facilitated project" according to the Secretariat-proposed rules
PrimCareIT	Finland, Sweden, Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania		Project findings were presented to the CSR		eHealth for Regions network project			