

1. Background

- Under the Interbeef Agreement¹ “...*the Working Group shall (i) prepare the Project Plan for consideration and agreement by the Parties and (ii) instruct specific research projects in pursuance of the Project and disseminate the results of any such research to the Parties.*”
- At the January 2012 meeting of the Working Group a decision was taken to divide the R&D work required by the project plan between various research providers as follows²:
 1. ICBF (Andrew) to lead development of research proposal covering variance component estimation and use of cross bred data in weaning weight evaluations. Goal is to have this work completed in 2012.
 2. CMBC (Pavel and Czech colleagues) to lead development of research proposal for development of international beef genetic evaluations for Calving traits. Proposal to be finalised by May with work to be commenced in 2012.
 3. SAC (Kirsty) to lead development of research proposal for development of international beef genetic evaluations for carcass traits during 2012 with work to commence in 2013.
 4. INIA (Clara) to lead development of research proposal for development of international beef genetic evaluations for female fertility traits during 2012 with work to commence in 2013.
- A draft agreement for the use of data in this and other research has been developed³ and is currently under discussion.
- Feedback from the discussion on the agreement for the use of data in research has identified the need for clarity on the decision making process for InterBeef services including roles and responsibilities of research providers, the technical committee and the InterBeef Working Group.
- The purpose of this paper is to provide a basis for discussion and eventual agreement on the roles & responsibilities of the groups involved in undertaking the Project Plan.

2. Draft Key Points for Discussion

See appendix 1 for comments from Pavel Bucek that stimulated the writing of this document.

See appendix 2 for comments from Pavel following his receipt of a first draft of this document.

3. Proposal

Responsible Organisation	Key Responsibilities	Notes
SLU/Interbull Centre	Project Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain the Project Plan. • Consult with Service Users & Research Providers and Report to WG.
	Provision of Data for Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extract and provide data to research collaborators.
	Provision of Research Computing Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish computing facilities for use by research providers. • Provide research providers with access to suitable software. • Provide training and support in use of research computing infrastructure.
	Implementation of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review research proposal for relevance to project plan.

¹ Clause 10.4 on page 11.

² Minutes of Interbeef WG Meeting held on 12th January 2012.

³ InterBeef Research Use of Data. Draft Version 5.

Roles & Responsibilities in Improving InterBeef Services.

Responsible Organisation	Key Responsibilities	Notes
	Service Enhancements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review research results and determine plan for implementation of service enhancements.
	Co-ordination of Technical Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finalise and maintain membership. Communicate agenda, arrange meetings (virtual and face-to-face), reach consensus, record outcomes and provide reports to InterBeef WG.
InterBeef Technical Committee	Provide advice to the Working Group on the technical and scientific elements of InterBeef services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review and advise on Project Plan. Review research proposals. Review research findings. Review requests, suggestions and plans for changes to InterBeef services. Make recommendations to InterBeef WG.
InterBeef WG	Approve Project Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review Project Plan proposal from SLU. Consider recommendations of Technical Committee and Scientific Advisory Committee. Provide feedback on Plan. Adopt Project Plan and Revisions from time to time.
	Approve Research Proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review research proposals. Approve research which supports the Goals of Interbeef and are adequately resourced. Deal with any issues that arise in the course of research.
	Approve changes to InterBeef services.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review proposals and recommendations. Consider needs of Service Users. Make final decision on changes to InterBeef Services.
Research Provider(s)	Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appoint project leader. Ensure skills & knowledge required are available. Ensure very positive and enthusiastic leadership for agreed research areas.
	Team of Collaborators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Form a team of collaborators. Work with team to prepare proposals. Ensure team works effectively in undertaking and reporting result of agreed research. Ensure all members of the team have agreed to the terms relating to the use of data in research
	Research Proposal for Approval by WG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop using best practice science, promote and present research proposals to InterBeef WG. Ensure sufficient funding is available to undertake research in the proposal. Interact with WG and finalised agreed work.
	Conduct Research	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure all partners have agreed to terms of data use. Obtain data from SLU. Use SLU research infrastructure to conduct research.
	Report Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare written reports and provide to Technical Committee & InterBeef WG. Make presentations of research findings in relevant and agreed research, industry and ICAR forums. Liaise with SLU to ensure efficient and effective implementation of relevant research findings in enhanced InterBeef services. Prepare, obtain approval to publish and publish research findings in relevant scientific and technical publications.

4. Discussion

The above proposal is for discussion amongst members of the Interbeef WG.

Please refer all suggestions and queries to me directly.

I will prepare a final draft for consideration and adoption by the Interbeef WG when all feedback has been received.

The deadline for final feedback is **28th September 2012.**

Draft 3rd September 2012

Reference: Z:\Interbeef\Agreement\Research Use of Data\Roles and Responsibilities in Improving InterBeef Services v4.doc

5. Appendix 1 – Material arising from Bucek

The following is based on an email from Pavel Bucek dated 13th July 2012 and includes some additions and alterations that I have made.

- Key points
 - Object of the agreement and traits (breeds? countries?) that will be covered by the research partner. In particular, it is important to distinguish between research and implementation.
 - Responsibility of the research partner:
 - the research for these countries for the trait(s),
 - general description of proposed model and genetic parameters,
 - distribution of results and proposed outputs,
 - maybe a time schedule and rules for amendments (adaptation) of this schedule.
 - The organisation who will be responsible for the research could be the guarantor for particular traits. This maybe a condition, in the situation when a new country will join in, that this organisation will estimate new parameters, new models and so on.
 - Format of output(s) will be delivered in electronic form. The results must be in accordance with the International (Interbeef) standards.
 - The research team must inform the Interbeef working group in an appropriate time period about the changes in model and format of data.
 - If necessary, the research team must discuss important issues with the other partners.
 - It will not possible to give data and outputs to third persons without permission.
 - Responsibilities of organisation involved in research with data, delivery of data, term of data delivery to Interbull and for the research team.
 - Data format: the organisation who is responsible for data delivery is responsible for data quality and for coding of traits and fixed and random effects.

- If the research team will find some problems with data that will influence research, then the research team must inform some particular partner and give him or her an appropriate time period to repair it. If the particular organisation will not send repaired to the data research team, will we have to follow the appropriate procedure?
- Responsibilities for both research team and organisation which will deliver the data. All partners must ensure that they will use only data from Interbeef. They will present these results as Interbeef values.
- Change of model, traits definition:
 - Sometimes it is necessary to change the model on basis of good scientific and professional practice. Before any significant changes of the model, there must be a working discussion.
 - We should discuss the change of traits definition in participant countries and the procedures for these cases in Interbeef.
- Financial matters
 - Arrangement of funding.
 - Duration of research agreement and possible term of termination.
- Other designation
 - How will be arranged if some part in this scientific agreement will not be valid during the time.
 - Which law will be valid in the case of specific situation that is not covered in this scientific agreement?
 - During the time some of the points in this scientific agreement will lose its validity. How we will change our scientific agreement?
- Other comments
 - The research partner should be responsible for the traits. We should consider the situation when the recalculated parameters will be performed and so on. For example, if some country will join Interbeef. We should define responsibility of the research partner.
 - Interbull will provide a computer. We should include conditions for using of this computer and software into the agreement.
 - Also, Interbull will prepare to have responsibility for data protection. It could be also mentioned in the agreement.
 - Practical comment: sometimes it is used in research projects where there is no legal claim for the data for research. I mean that participation in the research is on a voluntary basis.
 - Your proposal covered that that organisation who receives the data must not do a breach of confidence on this data.
 - Maybe in this research agreement there should be mentioned how will be solved legal disputes will be solved and which law will be used (from which country).

6. Email from Bucek 20th August

The following is a copy of a letter from Pavel Bucek dated 20th August 2012 in response to an initial draft of this document:

Dear Brian,

Many thanks for the very important and key material for our work. I have read it very carefully. I have some points for clarification and/or for our discussion. Please confirm that you have received my comments. If you have any questions and/or points for clarification, please let me know. I am ready to answer very quickly.

Back to the data protection.

I think that all members of the research team should sign appropriate document. It will cover the situation if some member of the team will be from another organisation.

Perhaps in the future, when the research teams will be able to deliver results, maybe one question will arise- which procedure we will use for the final approval? If we take a look at to the current situation, we have several bodies in the Interbull organisational structure:

- *Service users representatives – managerial (political) body*
- *Interbeef working group*
- *Interbeef technical committee – which will have the first meeting probably in September*

The question is how to design an approval procedure for the results of the research team and how to implement comments and recommendation from service users and the time schedule of this approval. It seems that we will have three meetings during the year: the 1st ICAR, the 2nd in Stanstead and the 3rd will be the technical committee. In any case, I will support flexibility and focus on customer needs. It seems to me that we could follow this approach, which includes some important points for the checks and validation of results of research team:

- 1) *The Scientific team will be able to deliver first results (A first very important point is, for example, that members of research team will be from other countries. Perhaps you remember that you proposed adding some colleagues from France and Ireland to our scientific team). I fully support this approach because it will benefit all scientists and is value added. I think that it is possible to use this approach also in other research projects).*
- 2) *The Scientific team could send the results to the members of the technical committee and/or members of Interbeef working group. They could evaluate the results and proposals and review the scientific results and proposals from a scientific and technical point of view. If necessary, they should propose some recommendations, comments and maybe correct small mistakes. To be precise, this should be something like the procedure in excellent scientific magazines. These discussions should solve scientific aspects and technical details.*

Also, it is possible to use member of the Interbeef working group for this purpose and/or to combine both bodies (Technical committee and Interbeef working group).

- 3) *Another step could be that the particular research team will implement recommendations and comments from the technical committee and/or Interbeef working group finalise final version of research output.*
- 4) *A very significant point is that service provider must support the research proposal for the best practice and agree the final research results. I think that all research teams are very well aware with the particular research task. My opinion is that the research teams should be presented highly finalized results of research for practical use during the meeting with the representative of the service users (decision makers) after implementation of comments from technical committee and/or Interbeef working group. In the managerial (political) meeting, we should not discuss basic corrections of the results of research but instead focus mostly on strategy and key issues for implementation. The Results of research will be approved for practical use.*
- 5) *The particular research team will finalise its results on the basis of this discussion and then it could be possible to provide international genetic evaluation for the new trait.*
- 6) *Collaboration with the Interbull centre during the implementation. I mean here discussing points for clarification that may arise and so on. We should also describe this procedure (collaboration) with Interbull.*

Please note that it is only one way how to solve this problem and I think that it would be useful to have some procedure for the implementation of research in everyday practice.

Time schedule: It is an especially important point. We should discuss this point very carefully, because all research team are very well aware with the scientific matters, but it is possible that some problems will arise, for example, with data and maybe some other unidentified problems and it will take some time to solve it. We should find an appropriate compromise between flexibility and bureaucracy.

Guarantor of the traits; This point should be solved before the beginning of the research. I think that some other countries will join Interbeef and it will be necessary to estimate the new model and parameters. From practical point of view, it would be useful to know if a particular research team will be the guarantor of the trait and will be able to take care about this trait over the long term. I prefer stability and that each research team should be able to take care of particular traits over the long term. Another advantage is that this approach will ensure continuous development and will keep up state of the art with the best practice. I prefer direct responsibility of each research team. But it is my personal opinion. Maybe other colleagues will have a different opinion.

Change of model: We should also establish some procedure for the changing of the model. I propose these steps:

- 1) *Initiative (representative of the service users, research team, working group, technical committee, etc..)*
- 2) *Technical committee and/or Interbeef working group*
- 3) *Discussion with the representative of service users*
- 4) *Approval*

In any case, I think that basic evaluation should be made by a member of technical committee and/or Interbeef working group, then representative of the service users (decision makers) should work with the highly finalized proposal and approve or not approve the change of model and/or other changes. Another possible way is to prepare a special workshop in specific cases.

Point 3 in your material: I missed the Technical committee. If I remember our discussion during the meeting in Ireland, the technical committee (Joao's proposal) was established and the plan is to have the first meeting in September. I think that we should also implement the technical committee into these research matters. It seems to me that it would be very valuable to include the responsibility of the technical committee into your material, because it will play very important role and not only just practically. But, this committee should also lead technical development and have a vision for the future. I think that this technical committee should be involved in the evaluation of the research results. The advantage of this approach is that members of the Technical committee are from the countries directly involved in the project with data, and this fact is very important, because they will participate in the decision process.

All research partners will have an interest and should have the results of research in research and scientific magazines and journals (a refereed magazine or journal with high impact factor) and non-refereed magazines or journals for farmers. In that case, they must inform other partners about this fact and they must have permission to publish the general results in scientific magazines. We should define the approval procedure (the terms for approval, time period during this period research team will receive final decision, etc.). On this, publication policy is paramount. Conferences and Industry forums were mention in your material you sent me. In these cases, we should also have a publication procedure.

From practical point of view, it may be useful to discuss some operational problems with you or with Joao during the research.

If we take a look at to the basic prerequisite for good research data, we should define the structure of the file from the service users and also appropriate documentation connected with the data (parameters, model in particular country and so on) which, in my opinion, is very important for the research team. Maybe in some cases it will be necessary to provide some kind of specific questionnaire (for example fertility in Spanish research project, time schedule and frequency of international genetic evaluation, etc.)

For the future, we should also discuss the appropriate term(s) of International genetic evaluation (Interbeef) frequency and the time schedule after the results of research will be implemented.

Maybe a relevant point could be the duration of the research agreement and its possible termination notice. But this point it is only question for our discussion.