



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**BESTSDI**

BESTSDI – Western Balkans Academic Education  
Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for  
Spatial Data Infrastructures

*With the support of the Erasmus+ program:*

*Higher Education – International Capacity Building  
N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

# Task Report

## Task T4.5: Dissemination and Exploitation

### Version 1.0

#### Author(s)/Organization(s)/Partner number:

Gjorgji Gjorgjiev / UKIM / 04  
Zlatko Srbinoski / UKIM / 04

#### Work Package / Task:

WP4 – Dissemination and Exploitation / Task 4.5 – Exploitation

#### References:

Project Management Plan / Plan for Dissemination and Exploitation of Results (DER)

#### Short Description:

This report is a deliverable of Task Group 4.5 – Exploitation. It contains part of the Dissemination and Exploitation activities of the partner Universities, including Consortium Agreement.

#### Keywords:

Report, SDI, Dissemination, Exploitation, Consortium Agreement.

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein*



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**BESTSDI**

BESTSDI – Western Balkans Academic Education  
Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for  
Spatial Data Infrastructures

*With the support of the Erasmus+ program:*

*Higher Education – International Capacity Building  
N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

#### Revision History:

| Revision | Date       | Author(s)                             | Status | Description                                      |
|----------|------------|---------------------------------------|--------|--|
| V0.1     | 14/08/2019 | Gjorgji Gjorgjiev<br>Zlatko Srbinoski | Draft  | First outline and method                         |
| V1.0     | 14/10/2019 | Gjorgji Gjorgjiev<br>Zlatko Srbinoski | Final  | Finalized version including<br>received comments |



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**BESTSDI**

BESTSDI – Western Balkans Academic Education  
Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for  
Spatial Data Infrastructures

*With the support of the Erasmus+ program:*

*Higher Education – International Capacity Building  
N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. Task 4.5 Exploitation .....</b>                                     | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>3. Indicators and deliverables .....</b>                               | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>4. Task and responsibilities of Task group members .....</b>           | <b>8</b>  |
| <b>5. Communication within the work package.....</b>                      | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>6.1. Analysis of the dissemination materials.....</b>                  | <b>11</b> |
| <b>7. Consortium agreement .....</b>                                      | <b>14</b> |
| <b>7.1. Analysis of the research .....</b>                                | <b>14</b> |
| <b>8. Conclusions.....</b>  | <b>25</b> |
| <b>9. References.....</b>   | <b>26</b> |
| <b>10. Annexes .....</b>  | <b>27</b> |
| <b>Annex I - Structure of dissemination materials .....</b>               | <b>27</b> |
| <b>Annex II – Consortium Agreement (Memorandum of Understanding).....</b> | <b>29</b> |



## 1. Introduction

The specific BESTSDI project objectives are to develop, test and adapt new curricula, courses, learning material and tools within the field of SDI. By the incorporation of SDI and other modern concepts based on spatial data and information, students of the new courses will provide efficiently spatial data and services to SDI users when entering the job market. In parallel, the project also introduces SDI and related concepts in undergraduate and graduate study programs of academic institutions which professional profiles are well recognized as SDI users, raising awareness among the students and professionals about the relevance of SDI and advantages of well-organized, harmonized and accessible spatial data.

In this context, the specific objective of the project is to develop appropriate curricula, courses and their content for both target groups (SDI providers and SDI users) of academic institutions, as well as for vocational LLL training initiatives. This includes the development of:

- SDI compulsory course for undergraduate study programs in geodesy;
- SDI modules for graduate study programs in geodesy and geoinformatics;
- SDI user course components (not necessarily full courses) for undergraduate study programs of partner faculties;
- SDI elective courses for graduate study program of partner faculties (SDI users);
- Development of sustainable training courses (life-long education) of broad scope of professionals.

The goal of **Work Package 4 (WP4): Dissemination & Exploitation** is efficient dissemination of project results and information about SDI in partner countries but also in the whole region and outside of it. This dissemination should raise the general knowledge about SDI in the target sectors (data management and SDI users), to increase awareness of the project and its results within its main target groups (students, institutions professionals and external universities) and to assure that the project results will be maintained and further developed after the completion of the project.

It has also the goal to define future exploitation model between partners and set a model for future projects.

WP4 covers the entire project period, but intensive activities will be conducted in the years 2 and 3 of the project lifetime, namely when products and results will be available for dissemination and exploitation. This gives time to develop dissemination and exploitation activities focused on target groups in relation to types of products and materials project will produce.

Dissemination and exploitation activities will be coordinated with activities of Task group T5.3 National Stakeholder Coordination. Namely, coordination of stakeholders on partner countries national level is defined as an independent specific task aiming to emphasize the importance of coordination of stakeholders in an effort to develop study program content harmonized with



their needs and to disseminate the project results to broad audience. This task will be executed at national level, organized by the National Coordinator, executed by national partners and supported by PO.

The dissemination & exploitation is carried out by WP4 that is split into five tasks:

Task 4.1 – Development of a Communication Plan

Task 4.2 – Life-long learning (LLL) courses for professionals

Task 4.3 – Production of dissemination material

Task 4.4. – Development Plan for Dissemination and Exploitation of Results (DER)

Task 4.5. – Dissemination and exploitation execution

The initial activities in the frame of WP4 was developing the "Communication plan". For the purpose of efficient communication, the task 4.1 "Development of Communication Plan" is defined. The deliverable of work in this task group was the Communication Plan (CP) of the BESTSDI project.

Second task (LLL course execution) was one of the key activities in the frame of WP4. First results of this task were presented on the Podgorica workshop.

Dissemination and exploitation of project results depends on available products and materials. For this purpose, task group (T4.3) was established to organize, prepare and support production of project products project curriculum primarily, but also other documents, leaflets, web-site notices, e-newsletter, etc.). This task was finished in the beginning of the year 3 of project lifetime.

In task 4.4. the Plan for Dissemination and Exploitation of Results, including the analysis of target groups and their perception of SDI before project results was disseminated, development of tools and methods for dissemination and the dissemination plan was created. This Plan was base for creating the Report for Task 4.5.

WP4 Expected results are:

- Ensure strong internal and external visually recognizable communication to all detected target groups;
- Ensure execution of LLL courses to sufficient number of professionals to promote SDI and develop sustainable LLL model;
- Develop and produce products and materials for dissemination and exploitation;
- Execute development and exploitation plan ensuring expected effects on target groups as planned;
- Develop model for future usage of products and material, as well as future cooperation.

Milestones for this WP was:

- PMB meetings held, foreseen documents approved (M12);



- LLL courses held (M24 - M30 – M36);
- Documents and material disseminated at foreseen events (years 2 and 3 of project, M36);
- Consortium agreements signed (M30);
- Final conference held (M36).

## 2. Task 4.5 Exploitation

Based on TG4.4 developed Plan for Dissemination and exploitation of Results (DER) and TG4.3 produced materials for dissemination and exploitation of the project results TG4.5, in coordination with project partners was responsible for execution of mentioned Plan, providing support to partners, taking care for sufficient material available and monitor execution of exploitation.

It was provided support to partners to organizing their own events through consultation and looking for project internal and external lecturers or additional materials.

TG4.5 will support work of TG5.3 National Stakeholder Coordinators in their specific promotional part of activities towards external SDI stakeholders.

TG4.5 also prepared Consortium agreement of future use of project products and materials as well as future cooperation in projects.

The persons dealing with the execution of this task are the task leader, the task deputy leader and all partners contributing to the deliverable. The contact information of these persons is as follows:

| Role               | Name  | Organisation           | e-mail   |
|--------------------|---|------------------------|--|
| Task leader        | Gjorgi Gjorgiev                             | UKIM Skopje (P04)      | <a href="mailto:gorgi.gjorgiev@gf.ukim.edu.mk">gorgi.gjorgiev@gf.ukim.edu.mk</a> ;   |
| Deputy Task leader | Ymer Kuka                                   | UNI Prizren (P16)      | <a href="mailto:ymer.kuka@uni-pr.edu">ymer.kuka@uni-pr.edu</a> ;   |
| Member             | Zvonimir Nevistić<br>Vesna Poslončec-Petrić | UNI Zagreb FoG (P01.1) | <a href="mailto:znevistic@geof.hr">znevistic@geof.hr</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:vesna.posloncec@geof.hr">vesna.posloncec@geof.hr</a> ;                                   |
| Member             | Nikola Kranjcic                             | UNI Zagreb FGE (P01.2) | <a href="mailto:nikola.kranjcic@gmail.com">nikola.kranjcic@gmail.com</a> ;   |
| Member             | Danny Vandebroucke;<br>Joep Crompvoets      | KU Leuven (P02)        | <a href="mailto:danny.vandebroucke@kuleuven.be">danny.vandebroucke@kuleuven.be</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:joep.crompvoets@kuleuven.be">joep.crompvoets@kuleuven.be</a> ; |



|        |   |                              |  |
|--------|---|------------------------------|--|
| Member | Jelena Kilić  | UNI Split (P03)              | <a href="mailto:jkilic@gradst.hr">jkilic@gradst.hr</a> ;   |
| Member | Andreas Wytzisk   | HBO (P05)                    | <a href="mailto:andreas.wytzisk@hs-bochum.de">andreas.wytzisk@hs-bochum.de</a> ;   |
| Member | Bilbil Nurce  | PUT FCE (P06.1)              | <a href="mailto:billnurce@gmail.com">billnurce@gmail.com</a> ;   |
| Member | Edmond Hoxha<br>Spartak Kucaj<br>Boris Strati<br>Perparim Hoxha | PUT FGN (P06.2)              | <a href="mailto:ehoxha63@gmail.com">ehoxha63@gmail.com</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:spartaku_2005@yahoo.it">spartaku_2005@yahoo.it</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:b_strati@yahoo.com">b_strati@yahoo.com</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:hoxha.p@gmail.com">hoxha.p@gmail.com</a> ; |
| Member | Ilirjan Myteberi  | AUT Tirana (P07)             | <a href="mailto:imyteberi@ubt.edu.al">imyteberi@ubt.edu.al</a> ;   |
| Member | Slavko Vasiljević   | UNI Banja Luka<br>(P08)      | <a href="mailto:slavko.vasiljevic@aggf.unibl.org">slavko.vasiljevic@aggf.unibl.org</a> ;   |
| Member | Zeljko Marusic  | UNI Mostar (P09)             | <a href="mailto:zeljkomarusic@fpmoz.ba">zeljkomarusic@fpmoz.ba</a> ;   |
| Member | Suada Džebo   | UNI Sarajevo FCE<br>(P10.1)  | <a href="mailto:suada.dzebo.gf@gmail.com">suada.dzebo.gf@gmail.com</a> ;   |
| Member | Melisa Ljusa  | UNI Sarajevo FAFS<br>(P10.2) | <a href="mailto:melisa.ljusa@gmail.com">melisa.ljusa@gmail.com</a> ;   |
| Member | Rejhana Dervišević  | UNI Tuzla (P11)              | <a href="mailto:rehhana.dervisevic@untz.ba">rehhana.dervisevic@untz.ba</a> ;   |
| Member | Edmond Hajrizi<br>Naim Preniqi<br>Hazer Dana                    | UBT (P12)                    | <a href="mailto:ehajrizi@ubt-uni.net">ehajrizi@ubt-uni.net</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:naim.preniqi@ubt-uni.net">naim.preniqi@ubt-uni.net</a> ;<br><a href="mailto:hazer.dana@ubt-uni.net">hazer.dana@ubt-uni.net</a> ;   |
| Member | Gojko Nikolic   | UCG FF (P13.1)               | <a href="mailto:gojkorn@ac.me">gojkorn@ac.me</a> ;   |
| Member | Milić Čurović   | UCG BTF (P13.2)              | <a href="mailto:curovic@t-com.me">curovic@t-com.me</a> ;   |
| Member | Milorad Janić   | UNI Beograd (P14)            | <a href="mailto:milorad.janic@sfb.bg.ac.rs">milorad.janic@sfb.bg.ac.rs</a> ;   |

**TABLE 1: TASK LEADER, DEPUTY TASK LEADER AND CONTRIBUTORS OF TASK GROUP 4.5**

The report for T4.5 is structured as follows. Section 3 briefly introduces the relevant task deliverables and associated indicators. Section 4 described task responsibilities of task group members, while section 5 is about the communication within the task activities.

In section 6 the methodology for collecting dissemination information is described. Also, the result of dissemination activities was analysed.

The last part of this Report is dedicated to Consortium Agreement. In section 7 are analysed the results of the questionnaire about CA. The CA itself is presented in Annex 2.



### 3. Indicators and deliverables

The task will produce the following deliverables:

| Number | Title  | Date    |
|--------|--|---------|
| D4.5-1 | Dissemination and exploitation activities (events, etc.) | M15/M36 |
| D4.5-2 | Consortium agreement                                     | M24     |

**TABLE 2: PLANNED DELIVERABLES FOR T4.5**

The task is monitored and evaluated by the following indicators and targets.

| Number | Indicator | Assessment method                      | Target value  |
|--------|-----------|--|---|
| 1      | I4.5-1    | Dissemination events organized         | Minimally 2 per partner   |
| 2      | I4.5-2    | Visibility of own dissemination events | Minimally 50 participants per partner                                     |
| 3      | I4.5-3    | Visibility at external events          | Participating at minimally 5 events Minimally 5 presentations per partner |
| 4      | I4.5-4    | Signing consortium agreement           | 90%   |

**TABLE 3: INDICATOR(S) FOR T4.5**

### 4. Task and responsibilities of Task group members

The tasks and responsibilities of the Task group leader are:

- manage and coordinate work of the task group,
- organize preparation and discussion on drafting and finalization of the Plan,
- organize support to task group members in execution of their tasks,
- deliver final the Plan to the Project Office

The tasks and responsibilities of the Task group deputy leader are:

- support management and coordination of task group work as requested by Task group leader,
- contribute in discussion about production of drafting the Plan,





Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**BESTSDI**

BESTSDI – Western Balkans Academic Education  
Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for  
Spatial Data Infrastructures

*With the support of the Erasmus+ program:*

*Higher Education – International Capacity Building  
N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

- contact Task group members for their contribution,
- draft and circulate the minutes of meetings.

Regarding Task group member's tasks are following:

- active participation in production of the Plan,
- providing necessary information and data on national level,
- timely and detailed answer to the requests of the Task group leader,
- timely and efficient communication with task group members and
- actively participate in TG meetings.

## 5. Communication within the work package

For the purpose of internal communication between the workshops, the Project Office (PO) established e-mail list and Moodle platform for communication and implementation and monitoring of tasks including information and data on submissions, implementation of surveys and working documents exchange.

Initial data and information collection will be conducted by task group members. Additionally, Communication Plan, delivered by TG4.1 and Dissemination & Exploitation Plan, delivered by TG4.4 will be used as input for production of dissemination material.

Timeframe of T4.5 can be described as long-term task (lasting two years) and task leaders and TG members will communicate in following manner:

- Regular communication – via e-mail messages and through the Moodle platform;
- Regular Skype meetings are not foreseen, but they will be organized with all or some of partners if necessary;
- Initial discussion is foreseen on Q5 workshop in Mostar on 6 – 7 November 2017;
- Follow up discussions and monitoring of exploitation results on each consecutive project workshop.



## 6. Methodology

In accordance with the guidance of the documents used in the creation of the dissemination material (especially the T4.1, T4.4 and T5.1 reports), the basic determinants of this material can be analyzed.

The methodology for the analysis of the dissemination material is conducted through a standard form shown in Annex 1 *Dissemination an exploitation executon*. The dissemination analysis is based on the following data:

- Type of dissemination:
  - WEB news;
  - Journal news;
  - Press conference;
  - TV interviews;
  - Meeting;
  - Invited lectures;
  - Exhibition boots;
  - Conference paper;
  - Conference presentation;
  - Poster presentation;
  - Journal paper;
  - Chapter in the book;
  - Book Brochure;
  - Leaflet;
  - Other.
- Name of dissemination activity;
- Short description of the activity;
- Organizer;
- Target group:
  - Teachers;
  - Students;
  - Public;
  - Professionals;
  - Scientists;
- Web site;
- Date of the activity;
- Location;



- Language;
- Level of dissemination:
  - Local;
  - National;
  - Regional;
  - Global;
- Project partner;
- File attachment.

## 6.1. Analysis of the dissemination materials

From the beginning of the project until August 2019 a total of 108 dissemination activities were registered.

According to the structure of the dissemination material, the directions of analysis can be differentiated according to the following categories:

- Type of dissemination;
- Target groups;
- Language;
- Level of dissemination and
- Project partner responsible for dissemination activity.

The results of the analysis by type of dissemination material are presented in Table 4.

| Type of dissemination   | Units | Percent (%) |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------|
| WEB news                | 43    | 29,1        |
| Journal news            | 6     | 4,1         |
| Press conference        | 3     | 2,0         |
| TV interviews           | 6     | 4,1         |
| Meeting                 | 20    | 13,5        |
| Invited lectures        | 5     | 3,4         |
| Exhibition booth        | 11    | 7,4         |
| Conference paper        | 6     | 4,1         |
| Conference presentation | 27    | 18,2        |



|                     |   |     |
|---------------------|---|-----|
| Poster presentation | 0 | 0,0 |
| Journal paper       | 7 | 4,7 |
| Book / Brochure     | 3 | 2,0 |
| Leaflet             | 6 | 4,1 |
| Chapter in the book | 0 | 0,0 |
| Other               | 5 | 3,4 |

**TABLE 4: TYPE OF DISSEMINATION**

From the results presented in Table 4 it can be concluded that most of the dissemination activities refer to the first category "WEB news", which comprises 29,1% of the total dissemination material.

The share of individual target groups in the dissemination material is shown in Table 5. It should be emphasized that individual dissemination materials have multiple target groups - resulting with the fact that the sum of percentages is greater than 100%.

| Target groups | Units | Percent (%) |
|---------------|-------|-------------|
| Teachers      | 93    | 86          |
| Students      | 85    | 79          |
| Public        | 30    | 28          |
| Professionals | 17    | 16          |
| Scientists    | 10    | 9           |

**TABLE 5: TARGET GROUPS**

From the results presented in Table 5 can be concluded that most of the dissemination activities and materials refer to teachers (86%) and students (79%).

Table 6 shows the categorization of dissemination activities according the language in which they were implemented.

| Language | Units | Percent (%) |
|----------|-------|-------------|
| English  | 36    | 33          |
| National | 72    | 67          |

**TABLE 6: LANGUAGE OF DISSEMINATION**



Unsurprisingly, the majority (67%) of dissemination activities are carried out in the national languages of the BESTSDI project participants.

The following table shows the results of dissemination activities by dissemination level - in terms of the spatial limitation of the activity.

| Level of dissemination | Units | Percent (%) |
|------------------------|-------|-------------|
| Local                  | 13    | 12          |
| National               | 48    | 45          |
| Regional               | 26    | 24          |
| Global                 | 21    | 19          |

**TABLE 7: LEVEL OF DISSEMINATION**

According to the level of dissemination, the national level is dominated by 45% of the total dissemination activities.

In the last part of this analysis, the dissemination activities were classified according to the responsible partner. The purpose of this section is to show the partners' engagement with this activity within the project.

| Dissemination activities per partner | Units | Percent (%) |
|--------------------------------------|-------|-------------|
| FOG - Zagreb                         | 45    | 38          |
| FGE - Varaždin                       | 3     | 3           |
| KU - Leuven                          | 3     | 3           |
| UNIST - Split                        | 1     | 1           |
| UKIM – Skopje                        | 10    | 8           |
| HBO – Bochum                         | 2     | 2           |
| PUT FCE - Tirana                     | 2     | 2           |
| PUT FGM - Tirana                     | 2     | 2           |
| AUT - Tirana                         | 0     | 0           |
| UBL – Banja Luka                     | 5     | 4           |
| UNMO – Mostar                        | 3     | 3           |



|                      |    |   |
|----------------------|----|---|
| UNMO – Mostar        | 7  | 6 |
| UNSA FAFS - Sarajevo | 2  | 2 |
| UNTZ - Tuzla         | 10 | 8 |
| UBT - Pristina       | 1  | 1 |
| UCG FF – Nikšić      | 10 | 8 |
| UCG BF – Podgorica   | 4  | 3 |
| UNBG - Beograd       | 0  | 0 |
| UNS FTS – Novi Sad   | 7  | 6 |
| UNS FCE - Subotica   | 1  | 1 |
| UPZ - Prizren        | 1  | 1 |

**TABLE 8: DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES PER PARTNER**

From the results presented in Table 7 it can be seen that most of the activities (36%) have been conducted by project coordinator The Faculty of Geodesy from Zagreb. It is also notable that most of the partners have minimal (or no) dissemination activities.

Here we would like to emphasize that the number of dissemination activities is probably significantly higher, but given the fact that they are not registered through the Moodle platform - we were not able to analyze them.

## 7. Consortium agreement

The Consortium Agreement (CA) activities are described in detail in the Consortium Argument Report - "Consortium Agreement, Deliverable no. D4.5.2". Therefore, the following will analyze the results of the research related to the compilation of the CA text.

The CA itself, based on the aforementioned research is shown in Annex 2.

### 7.1. Analysis of the research

Research related to Consortium Argument contains three sets of questions:

- Form;
- Content;
- Time frame.

In the first group (Form), six questions were asked, with the following possible answers:



- What kind of the agreement would you prefer, with respect to obligations and rights?
  - Loose;
  - Medium;
  - Firm.
- What name of the agreement would you prefer?
  - Consortium Agreement;
  - Memorandum of Understanding;
- What should the agreement cover?
  - Results products activities;
  - Future communication;
- Should the agreement cover also relationships with third parties?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- Should we introduce time limit, and for how long?
  - Yes;
    - 3 years;
    - 5 years
  - No;
- Who is authorized or could be authorized to sign the agreement?
  - Rector;
  - Dean;
  - Both.

The set of questions regarding the content of the CA contains 11 questions with the following possible answers:

- Should some form of regulation on sharing and using of learning material developed under the project be included in agreement?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- What about license? For printed material, shall we recommend Amazon Direct Publishing or something similar?
  - Yes;
  - No;



- Don't know;
- Something similar;
- License need to be defined;
- Direct publishing;
- Should we agree on procedures for updating the learning material and how to make the updates available to the consortium?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- Should we introduce obligation to report annually about executed courses related to SDI and Project products?
  - Yes;
    - Per year
    - Per two years
  - Topic of the annual meeting
  - No;
- Should we agree to have annual meeting?
  - Yes;
    - Per year
    - Per two years
  - No;
- Should we agree to maintain BESTSDI web page?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- Should we agree to oblige ourselves on mutual exchange of information about developments in field of study programs?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- Should we agree to discuss joint project opportunities?
  - Yes;
  - No;
- Something else?
  - Yes;
  - No;





The third group, related to the time frame of the contract, contains three questions with the following answers offered:

- Can you estimate procedure and time necessary to sign the agreement at your institution?
  - 1 – 3 months;
  - 4 – 6 months;
  - 7 – 12 months;
- Which of offered signing models would be acceptable for you/your institution?
  - Project coordinator representative and all partners representatives sign agreement on one page;
  - Project coordinator representative and each partner representative sign agreement on one page;
- Should the agreement be between?
  - Depends of type of agreement;
  - All signing parties with equal weight;
  - The coordinator on one hand and all other signing parties on the other hand;
  - Several bi-lateral agreements between the coordinator on one hand and each of the other partners on the other hand;

The questionnaire was answered by 14 out of 16 partners in the BESTSDI project.

In the table below are the results of the responses and possible comments.

| Kind of the agreement, with respect to obligations   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Loose  | 2         | 14          |
| Medium   | 12        | 86          |
| Firm   | 0         | 0           |
| <b>Comment</b>   |           |             |
| KU Leuven: If the CA is too tight, the back office of KU Leuven will not be very keen to sign. Every CA should avoid: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Clauses on liability</li> <li>2) Financial arrangements</li> </ol> |           |             |

**TABLE 9: KIND OF AGREEMENT**



From Table 9 it can be seen that most partners prefer a "Medium" contract - in terms of liabilities.

| Name of the agreement  | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Consortium Agreement   | 2         | 14          |
| Memorandum of Understanding  | 12        | 86          |
| <b>Comment</b>   |           |             |
| KU Leuven: Everything that is signed is considered by our BA as a "contract" |           |             |

**TABLE 10: NAME OF AGREEMENT**

The results of the survey indicate that most of the partners prefer the name "Memorandum of Understanding - MoU".

Regarding the question "What should the agreement cover?", Some of the partners registered both answers, resulting in a sum of percentages greater than 100%.

| What should the agreement cover?  | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Results products activities   | 13        | 93          |
| Future communication  | 7         | 50          |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| Bochum: Agreement on how to collaboratively maintain BESTSDI deliverables |           |             |

**TABLE 11: AGREEMENT COVER**

The results in the Table 11 show that 93% of partners consider that the contract should cover "Results products activities".

Answers to the question "Should the agreement cover also relationships with third parties?" are shown in Table 12.

| Relationships with third parties | Responses | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Yes                              | 9         | 64          |
| No                               | 5         | 36          |



|  |
|--|
| <b>Comment</b>   |
| KU Leuven: What will be the license applied to materials developed in EN and that can be potentially be re-used. |

**TABLE 12: RELATIONSHIPS WITH THIRD PARTIES**

The results from Table 12 indicate that most of the partners believe that the contract should also regulate third party relationships.

The results of the questionnaire related to the duration of the project are presented in Table 13.

| Time limit   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Yes  | 14        | 100         |
| 3 years  |           | 14          |
| 5 years  |           | 86          |
| No   | 0         | 0           |
| <b>Comment</b>   |           |             |
| Bochum: In terms of termination clause, example the MOU remains active unless partners agree to terminate cooperation. |           |             |

**TABLE 13: TIME LIMIT**

It can be seen from Table 13 that all partners consider that CA should be time limited. Most of the partners believe that this time limit should be 5 years.

The last question that concludes the form part of the questionnaire devoted to the person responsible for signing the contract.

| Authorized person | Responses | Percent (%) |
|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Rector            | 8         | 57          |
| Dean              | 4         | 29          |
| Both              | 2         | 14          |

**TABLE 14: AUTHORIZED PERSON**



At most partners, the Rector is responsible for signing the contract.

Following is an analysis of the answers to the questions related to the content of the contract.

The first question refers to the regulation of sharing and use of learning material developed under the project.

| Regulation on sharing and using of learning material   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Yes  | 14        | 100         |
| No   | 0         | 0           |
| <b>Comment</b>   |           |             |
| KU Leuven: this should be clarified: but might be limited to the materials developed in EN, not the localized materials. |           |             |
| Bochum: less individual regulations of the partner universities make this difficult.                                     |           |             |

**TABLE 15: SHARING AND USING OF LEARNING MATERIAL**

According to the results, all partners are open to exchange and use materials developed within the project.

Next comes the issue of licensing project material.

| License                    | Responses | Percent (%) |
|----------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| Yes                        | 2         | 14          |
| No                         | 1         | 7           |
| Don't know                 | 3         | 22          |
| Something similar          | 3         | 22          |
| License need to be defined | 4         | 28          |
| Direct publishing          | 1         | 7           |

**TABLE 16: LICENCE**

This is a question that has received a variety of answers, from which one cannot clearly decide the option for the licensing of published project material. However, the prevailing opinion is that the definition of licenses is first necessary.

The third question related to the content of the contract relates to the procedure for updating the learning material and how to implement the same updates within the consortium.



| Updating the learning material  | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Yes   | 14        | 100         |
| No  | 0         | 0           |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| <p>KU Leuven: Yes. You can put in the CA that partners will inform (the coordinator and each other) of new versions of modules developed as part of BESTSDI. Would not put it as an hard obligation.</p> <p>Bochum: Yes. but it will be hard to fix this without a budget.</p> <p>Mostar: Yes. It's best over syllabus.</p> |           |             |

**TABLE 17: UPDATING OF LEARNING MATERIAL**

Partners are of the opinion that a procedure for updating teaching materials developed within the project is necessary.

Following is the issue of periodic reporting of partners to the implemented FDI courses related to BESTSDI products.

| Report about executed courses   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Yes   | 9         | 64          |
| per year  |           | 50          |
| per two years   |           | 14          |
| Topic of the annual meeting   | 4         | 29          |
| No  | 1         | 7           |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| <p>Bochum: In terms of termination clause, example the MOU remains active unless partners agree to terminate cooperation.</p> |           |             |

**TABLE 18: REPORT ABOUT EXECUTED COURSES**

According to the given answers, most of the partners consider that it is necessary to report on the completed SDI courses at the annual meetings that will take place and are envisaged with CA.

The fifth question in the second part of the questionnaire concerns the organization of joint meetings during the period of validity of the contract.



| Annual meeting | Responses | Percent (%) |
|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| Yes            | 13        | 93          |
| per year       |           | 79          |
| per two years  |           | 14          |
| No             | 1         | 7           |

**TABLE 19: ANNUAL MEETING**

According to the responses, almost all partners agree to have annual meetings to discuss current issues related to BESTSDI.

The next question is about maintaining the web site as a basic means of continuing communication between partners.

| BESTSDI web page   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Yes  | 13        | 93          |
| No   | 1         | 7           |
| <b>Comment</b>   |           |             |
| KU Leuven: Yes, although for the partners continued access to Moodle might be more useful. |           |             |
| Bochum: Yes, if we provide funds for that.   |           |             |

**TABLE 20: BESTSDI WEB PAGE**

Almost all partners support the idea to continue existence and editing of the project web site.

The seventh question of the second group concerns the obligation to exchange information regarding the development of the field of study programs.

| Exchange of information about developments in field of study programs                                 | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Yes   | 11        | 79          |
| No  | 3         | 21          |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| Bochum: This could a fixed TOP of the annual meeting; we should avoid too many reporting obligations. |           |             |

**TABLE 21: EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ABOUT DEVELOPMENTS OF STUDY PROGRAMS**



Most of the partners support this idea, some of them believing that this information should be presented at the annual meeting.

The situation regarding the exchange of information related to the current scientific projects of the partners is very similar.

| Exchange of information about projects  | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Yes   | 10        | 71          |
| No  | 4         | 29          |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| Bochum: This could a fixed TOP of the annual meeting; we should avoid too many reporting obligations. |           |             |

**TABLE 22: EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ABOUT PROJECTS**

The penultimate question concerns the need for discussion on future joint scientific projects.

| Discuss joint project opportunities   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|---|-----------|-------------|
| Yes   | 14        | 100         |
| No  | 0         | 0           |
| <b>Comment</b>  |           |             |
| Bochum: Yes, this probably one of the most important goals of the future cooperation. |           |             |

**TABLE 23: DISCUSS JOINT PROJECT OPPORTUNITIES**

There is an undivided opinion that this is one of the most important issues that need to be regulated by the CA.

The last question in the second cycle refers to additional comments and does not provide any information / needs to supplement any of the CA content.

The last part of the Questionnaire related to the Consortium Argument deals with the time frame required to sign the contract, as well as determining the parties which shell sign the CA.

The first question needs to define / predict the time required for each partner to complete the signing procedure.

| Time necessary to sign the agreement | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|
| 1 – 3 months                         | 8         | 57          |



|               |   |    |
|---------------|---|----|
| 4 – 6 months  | 5 | 36 |
| 7 – 12 months | 1 | 7  |

**TABLE 24: ANNUAL MEETING**

For most partners, the time frame for signing a contract is 1-3 months.

The second question concerns the model under which the contract should be signed.

| Signing model  | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Project coordinator representative and all partners representatives sign agreement on one page | 0         | 0           |
| Project coordinator representative and each partner representative sign agreement on one page  | 14        | 100         |

**TABLE 25: SIGNING MODELS**

On this issue the partners consider that the project coordinator should sign the contract with each of the partners separately.

Finally, the last question in the questionnaire concerns the signatories of the contract and their rights / responsibilities.

| Should the agreement be between?   | Responses | Percent (%) |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| Depends of type of agreement   | 6         | 42          |
| All signing parties with equal weight  | 4         | 29          |
| The coordinator on one hand and all other signing parties on the other hand  | 4         | 29          |
| Several bi-lateral agreements between the coordinator on one hand and each of the other partners on the other hand | 0         | 0           |

**TABLE 26: AGREEMENT BETWEEN**

Although there are divergent opinions on this issue, most partners believe that the shape will depend on the definitive version of the contract.





## 8. Conclusions

Dissemination and exploitation are one of the most important activities in large projects, which ensure their visibility and allow project life extension. Within the BESTSDI project the WP4 is dedicated to the dissemination and exploitation of project results.

Dissemination activities in the BESTSDI project include a wide range of activities that include: information published on the WEB site and daily and periodical press releases, participation in conferences with presentations and papers, book publishing and more.

In order to analyze the dissemination activities in the project, a special application has been developed which contains the basic data on the dissemination activities. A total of 108 dissemination activities have been registered since the beginning of the project, most of which belong to WEB news. The number of dissemination activities is good, but the minimum participation of certain project partners is not satisfactory.

However, we consider that the number of dissemination activities is higher than shown, but some of them are not registered in the system.

Exploiting the project and making it possible to extend its lifespan is also an integral part of WP4. For the purpose of continuing project-related activities, a specific framework is needed to regulate future relationships between project partners. To this end, extensive research has been conducted which has resulted in the development and dissemination of a Consortium Argument (Memorandum of Understanding). This agreement regulates the extension of project related activities for a period of 5 years. The Consortium Argument is also a solid basis for enhancing collaboration between project partners and opens the possibility for joint participation in new projects.

So far, more than 90% of partner universities have signed the Consortium Argument.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union

**BEST**  
**SDI**

BESTSDI – Western Balkans Academic Education  
Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for  
Spatial Data Infrastructures

*With the support of the Erasmus+ program:*

*Higher Education – International Capacity Building  
N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

## 9. References

Bacic, Z. (2017): *Project management plan*. BEST SDI project.

Bacic, Z., Jovanovic, D., Popovic, D. (2017): *Development Plan for Dissemination and Exploitation of Results (DER)*. BEST SDI project.

Gjorgjiev, Gj., Bacic, Z. (2018): *Consortium Agreement, Deliverable D4.5.2*. BEST SDI project.

Posloncec-Petric V., Bacic, Z. (2017): *Communication Plan, D4.1*. BEST SDI project.



## 10. Annexes

### Annex I - Structure of dissemination materials

#### Task 4.5. – Dissemination and exploitation execution

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [T45](#) / [Dissemination Activities](#)  
/ [Dissemination activities table to be filled by partners](#) / [Add entry](#)

#### Dissemination activities table to be filled by partners

[View list](#)

[View single](#)

[Search](#)

[Add entry](#)

#### New entry

Type of dissemination:

Dissemination title:

Short description of activity:



HTML format ▾



Target groups: \*

Website (add name and URL):  
Url: \*  
Text:

Date when activity started:  
13 August 2019

Location: \*

Language:  
Albanian  
Belgian  
Bosnian  
Croatian  
English

Level of dissemination: \*  
Choose...

Project partner(s):  
Sveučilište u Zagrebu (University of Zagreb)  
Katholieke Universiteit Leuven (Catholic University of Leuven)  
Sveučilište u Splitu (University of Split)  
Univerzitet "Sv. Kiril i Metodij" Skopje (St. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje)

File attachment:  
Maximum size for new files: 200MB, maximum attachments: 1

Files

You can drag and drop files here to add them.

Save and view    Save and add another

You are logged in as [Zlatko Srbinoski](#) (Log out)

T45



## Annex II – Consortium Agreement (Memorandum of Understanding)

Execution of European Union co-funded Erasmus+ Capacity Building in field of Higher Education project “Western Balkans Academic Education Evolution and Professional’s Sustainable Training for Spatial Data Infrastructures” – BESTSDI (Ref. no. 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP) created deliverables (learning material) which are result of cooperation of academic institutions – project partners. Mentioned cooperation in frame of BESTSDI project expanded during the project execution beyond the project limits towards academic education, research and knowledge exchange.

Having in mind specific interest of each institution, aiming to foster exploitation of BESTSDI results and future cooperation, project partners have defined and agreed on following

### Memorandum of Understanding

#### 1. Parties

This Memorandum of Understanding (herein referred to as MoU) is entered by following parties:

- University of Zagreb, Croatia
- Catholic University of Leuven, Belgium
- University of Split, Croatia
- Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, North Macedonia
- Bochum University of Applied Sciences, Germany
- Polytechnic University of Tirana, Albania
- Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania
- University of Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- University of Mostar, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- University of Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- University for Business and Technology, Pristina, Kosovo\*
- University of Montenegro, Montenegro
- University of Belgrade, Serbia
- University of Novi Sad, Serbia
- University of “Ukshin Hoti”, Prizren, Kosovo\*

This MoU document is signed between following parties:

- University of Zagreb, Croatia, Trg Republike Hrvatske 14, 10000 Zagreb, Croatia, represented for the purpose of signature of this MoU by prof. dr. sc. Damir Boras, Rector, the legal representative and
- University of **xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx**, represented for the purpose of signature of this MoU by **xxxxxxxxxx**, Rector, the legal representative



The MoU consist of identical content text signed between BESTSDI Project coordinator (University of Zagreb) and each partie individually.

By signing this MoU with Project coordinator, each partner accepts other partners which signed this MoU as equal partners.

## 2. Object of cooperation

The parties of this (MoU) declare the common interest for co-operation in academic education, research and knowledge exchange in the field of cartography, remote sensing, geoinformatics, spatial data infrastructure and other relevant topics such as the outputs of project **Western Balkans Academic Education Evolution and Professional's Sustainable Training for Spatial Data Infrastructures – BESTSDI** supported of the Erasmus+ program: Higher Education – International Capacity Building N° 574150-EPP-1-2016-1-HR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP. In particular in the following areas:

- Products (learning material in particular) generated within BESTSDI project
- Results derived with BESTSDI project
- Activities carried out after BESTSDI project
- Future communication and cooperation related with BESTSDI project outputs

## 3. Liability

No party of this MoU shell suffer legal consequences nor shell be held liable in any other way if failing the obligations under this MoU. However, the parties confirm that the provisions of the MoU represent their commitment and intention, without reservation, at the time of signing.

## 4. Responsibilities of the Parties

Each party has right to freely share and utilize the BESTSDI project outputs mentioned under Art 2 of this MoU.

Each Party has the responsibility to co-operate to the full in the exchange of information regarding implementation of developed courses and course materials as well as their amendment and upgrading. Moreover, each Party shall provide all other partners with academic data concerning their respective study program or courses developed and/or established based on the BESTSDI project.

All parties, without any restrictions, can share project BESTSDI project outputs with third parties.

## 5. Periodical meetings

The Parties shall meet each year for the purpose of fostering cooperation among the parties developed in frame of BESTSDI project.

The date, time and venue of such meeting shall be decided in join consultations.

Presence of join meetings could be managed based on online platforms without physical presence.



The parties, on the yearly meeting, shall inform other Parties on the following topics which are based on BESTSDI project outputs:

- Updating learning materials
- Executed courses related to SDI and their amendments
- Development of study programs
- Joint project opportunity discussions

### 6. Responsible officer

Each Party shall designate an administrative staff who was participant of the BESTSDI project to oversee and facilitate the implementation of any activities arising out of this MoU.

### 7. Termination and Renewal

This MoU will be effective from the date of the last signature hereto and will remain in force for a time period of five (5) years, with a possibility for renewal at the end of the five-year-period, subject to the Parties' written amendment.

Either Party may terminate this MoU by giving six (6) months' notice in writing to the other Parties.

### 8. Final provisions

This MoU states the entire agreement between the Parties with respect to its subject matter and supersedes any previous and contemporaneous or oral representations, statements, negotiations, or agreements.

This MoU may be appended with additional provisions by appendix agreed and signed by all parties.

For the Project coordinator

Rector

Prof. dr. sc. Damir Boras

For the Partner

Rector

xxxxxxxxxxxx

\_\_\_\_\_  
In Zagreb, .....2019.

\_\_\_\_\_  
In **xxxxxxx**.....2019.