D1.1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 883302.

Deliverable Information

Work Package: WP1

Deliverable Number: D1.1

Date of Issue: DD/MM/YY

Version Number: 0.2

Nature of Deliverable: Report

Dissemination Level: PU

Author(s): Lead Beneficiary (ADS) P. Chrobocinski

Keywords: < Project, management, quality, plan.>

Abstract: This deliverable describes the Project's Management Plan that all the consortium shall consult for the organizational procedures.

Document History			
Date	**Version**	**Stage – remarks**	**Contributors**
01/11/20	1.0	Draft	Philippe Chrobocinski (ADS)
03/01/21	1.1	Final version after review	Philippe Chrobocinski (ADS)

Executive Summary

The ISOLA Project Management Plan (PMP) has been set up for ensuring that 1) the project achieves its goals as specified in the Description of Action and 2) that the outputs of the projects respect the OQOTOC criteria (On Quality, On Time and On Costs). It allows the coordination team and the partners to manage the project easily and to properly manage the risks. The current PMP is consistent with ADS procedures and Business Management System (BMS). The PMP does not repeat the procedure defined in the Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement. These 2 documents are used as applicative references for the PMP and are not replicated in this document.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
BMS	Business Management System
CA	Consortium Agreement
DOA	Description of Action
EAB	External Advisory Board
EC	European Commission
GA	Grant Agreement
IM	Innovation Manager
OQOTOC	On Quality, On Time and On Costs
PC	Project Coordinator
PMB	Project Management Board
PMP	Project and Management Plan
PMT	Project Management Team
PSO	Project Security Officer
QARMT	Quality Assurance & Risk Management Team
QEG	Quality Evaluation Group
REA	Research Executive Agency
STM	Scientific & Technical Manager
TC	Technical Committee

Table 1. List of acronyms.

1 Introduction

In this document the processes of the ISOLA's management plan are described. In this document all the guides, rules and roadmap of the project are presented. More specific in Section 2 the contractual documents on which it is based are presented. In Section 3 The Project Management Board (PMB) is listed. In Section 4, the technical management procedures are described. In Section 5, the communication and collaboration tools are listed. In Section 6 the all the required information about ISOLA's meeting are described (types of meetings, organization, minutes, etc.). In Section 7, the procedures that must be followed during deliverables' preparation are described. In Section 8, a description of internal progress reporting is depicted, while in Section 9 the internal cost and Budget reporting is proposed. Section 10 includes the risk and issue management and finally Section 11 the reporting to the EC is described.

This document must be advised by every partner of the Consortium in case that there are questions on the management of the project. All the processes described here are designed with the goal of an efficient management which meets the EC & REA requirements and the needs of the project, minimizes the overhead and maximized effort available for project delivery. Every partner must focus on the project objectives and the approach should be "what we need to produce" rather than "what we need to do".

There are 3 levels of management in the ISOLA project. Level 1 includes the WP leaders, who are responsible for the quality assurance of the deliverables of their work package. ADS as the leader of WP1 will be responsible for the management of the other WP leaders. Level 2 includes the executives of the project management and more specific the Project Management Team (ADS), the Scientific & Technical Manager (CERTH), the Project Security Officer (CENTRIC), the Innovation Manager (IDM), the Quality Assurance &Risk Management Team (ADS) and the External Advisory Board. Level 3 is at the top and includes of course the Project Coordinator who will be the only contact with the EC and the Project Management Board which includes the PC, the STM, the PSO, the IM and one representative from each partner.

The technical work of the project shall be driven at first by the Level 1 WP leaders who will be responsible to organize and deliver the required documents and services of their WP. WP leaders will be coordinated by the Coordinator (ADS) and the Scientific & Technical Manager (CERTH) which will compose the ISOLA's Technical Committee together with the other WP leaders.

This document does not attempt to copy or replace in any case the contractual requirements that are described in the documents listed at Section 2. This document aims to be used as a stand-alone guide for all the partners with low risk of obsolescence or conflict with the contractual documents. If any partner continues to have questions and requires further guidance on PMP which are not covered in this document, a request should be submitted to the PC in the first instance for further clarifications.

2 Reference Documents

The PMP is based on the following documents, which define the contractual requirements that all project partners are required to comply with. The first document is the Grand Agreement (GA No. 883302), which includes the DoA, the Grand Preparation Forms and annexes and is the contract between the partners of the consortium and the EC. This

document determines what has to be done, how this has to be done and which partner has to provide the appropriate efforts to complete the project. The second document is the Consortium Agreement (CA), which defines the responsibilities and obligation between the partners of the consortium. Those documents where established at the start of the project and every partner has a copy of them. In case that something needs to be changes, there is a specific procedure for this to happen which has to be justified accordingly. In any case, the latest version of those documents is the one that shall apply. If some parts of this document are in conflict with both the GA or the CA the contractual documents shall take precedence.

3 Project Management Board

The Project Management Board supports the work of PC in management at the strategic level of the project (Level 3). The PMB is responsible (a) to ensure that the partners of the consortium fulfil their contractual obligations, (b) to ensure that the partners have an effective communication flow between each other and also between them and the EC, (c) to monitor how the whole project progresses in terms of performance, user-friendliness and impact achievements, (d) to request all necessary corrective actions of WP leaders in case that there are risks or delays or deviation from the initial Work Plan of the project, and (e) to ensure the compliance of the project with legal, contractual, ethical, financial and administrative regulations and self-assessment procedures.

The Project Management Board consists of:

- The Project Coordinator
- The Scientific & Technical Manager,
- The Project Security Officer,
- The Innovation Manager,
- One representative of each partner (each partner in the consortium has one vote for each voting session).

The coordinator is the unique point of contact with the EC and relays if needed the information and decisions from the PMB to the PO.

4 Technical Management

Level 1 WP Leaders are responsible for the effective and on-time completion of the tasks and preparation of deliverables within their WP. WP leader may also delegate some responsibilities to the Task leaders of their WP. More specific, each WP leader is responsible (a) to monitor and plan the scientific and technical work of the WP by collaborating with task leaders and all the participants in this WP, (b) to ensure that that everything in the WP (objectives, milestones, deliverables) progresses in accordance to the time-table and any deviations must be reported immediately to STM and PC, (c) to concatenate all the partners information and prepare the reports for submission following the steps described in Section 7. If a participant of the WP reports that has difficulty to deliver the obligations that is responsible, she/he is expected to ask for help first from the relevant Task leader, then from

the relevant WP leader, at next stage from the STM and at final stage if no one can provide assistance, she/he is expected to ask for help from the PC.

In addition, the WP leaders shall provide a report every 3 months on the progress of her/his WP to the STM using a standard reporting format that will be available to everyone in the project's wiki. If the WP leader realizes that something is not developed as planned and there are risks in crucial parts of the project such as the objectives, the milestones or the deliverables of the WP, she/he shall immediately notify the STM and the PC and shall not wait until the next programmed report. If the actions of a WP will create a knock-on effect to other WPs then the WP leader is responsible to report this to those WP leaders.

5 Collaboration and Communication

5.1 Overview

A critical factor on the success of a project of this size with so many partners from heterogeneous fields in the consortium and so many deliverables that have to be submitted is based on the efficient and effective collaboration which can be achieved if the appropriate tools of communication are established. In the following table the basic means of communication between the partners are listed and briefly described:

Communication tool/path	Description
Private Shared data environment (Project's Wiki)	A Web-based shared document library is set up where every necessary information of the project is available to all members of the consortium. This library is password protected and requires access credentials from every partner.
Email	Emails is a communication tool that is expected to be widely used between the members of the consortium. It is very important to ensure that the emails are sent to the appropriate recipients, without disturbing other partners that are not interested in the content of the email. In a few words not every email is for everyone. The sender must ensure that every member within the email addresses has to take some action by reading this email or those that are in cc are really interested in the content of the email. Group mailing lists have been created for specific activities in the project such as the WP lists, the general mailing list, the PMB mailing list and the administration mailing list. Those lists must be used sparingly and when this is necessary in order to avoid information overload.

Telephone	Communication between partners via telephone is also expected to be widely used. It is a more direct communication especially in cases that time is important and actions must be taken as soon as possible. However, the callers shall take under consideration the time differences, the office hours and known holidays in different countries of the partners.
Teleconference\Video conference	Teleconferences or video conferences are also expected to be widely used in this project. A teleconference is necessary when more than two partners must be involved. There are platforms available for starting teleconferences and it must be ensured that the most appropriate one will be chosen each time, which can be used by every participant of the teleconference. The most commonly used platforms are Webex, Zoom, GoToMeeting and Google Meet which are also going to be used in this project in different occasions.
Meetings	Meetings are for sure the most effective way for the partners to communicate between each other. The progress of the project is accelerated when there is a meeting between the partners, because many issues can be discussed and solved immediately by the corresponding individuals. However, the meetings are expensive in time and travel costs. Some meetings are required, for example plenary meeting every four months. There are also discretionary meetings, which could also be arranged by using other means (e.g. teleconferences). Due to the pandemic the meetings of the ISOLA project are postponed until further notification from the agencies responsible for health safety.

5.2 Partner contact register

The PC and STM shall maintain and distribute a register of contact details of all the partners in the consortium. The contact details can also be found in the private web shared library of the project. If a new person joins the project, or a change or correction to the existing data is required, or a person leaves the project, the affected person or a member of their

organization shall notify the STM and the PC. The PC and STM shall collect all such requests, and shall update and re-distribute the new contact details from time to time.

6 Meetings

During the ISOLA's project there are different kind of meetings that are envisaged. The plenary meetings which will occur every four months, in which all the members of the consortium are going to participate and watch the progress of the whole project and decide on further actions. Review meetings by EC are also going to take place at months 12, 24 and 36 at the end of the project. The PMB is going to schedule its meetings every six months. The TC's meetings are also scheduled to be organized every six months, collocated with the PMB meetings. TC will have also a teleconference at intermediate three months. Each WP leader can also arrange her/his WP meetings when this is necessary. Other types of meetings can also take place if it is required. Due to the pandemic of COVID-19 all those meetings are postponed at this moment for safety reasons, until the health organizations decide on the contrary.

6.1 Organisation of meetings

There will be one person responsible for the organizational and administrative matters of the meeting which is called the organizer. The meeting organizer need not be the same person as the meeting chairperson or member of the host organization. He can be a different person who may delegate certain responsibilities (e.g. chairing, hosting, traveling advice etc.) to other individuals of the consortium.

The meeting organizer has to collaborate with the meeting host and announce the location of the meeting as soon as possible to the other potential attendees because they may have other commitments in close locations which can affect their available dates. Then the meeting organizer has to determine the availability and preferences of attendees' meeting dates. Thera are tools that can help him in this work and www.doodle.com is one that is commonly used. If is not possible to agree to an ideal date(s) when all are available, then the meeting organizer has to make a compromise decision taking under consideration the purpose of the meeting and who are the necessary attendees that can contribute the most in this meeting that must be present.

Preferably longer that one month before the meeting, the organizer shall confirm the date(s), the location and the start and finish times. She/he shall also supply travel and hotel information. The attendees shall confirm their attendance at least one week before the meeting and provide any necessary security information, or by the date specified by the meeting organiser, whichever is earlier. Late requests for attendance may only be granted at the discretion of the meeting organiser and the meeting host.

6.2 Preparation

The meeting organizer shall disseminate a draft agenda to the attendees making clear which partners are expected to have specific responsibilities in the organization of the meeting (chairing sessions, delivering presentations etc.) at least one month before the meeting. The agenda can be updated during the following weeks but it shall be finalised at least one week before the meeting. The agenda can have late changes if all the affected participants agree on this.

Presentation slides shall be sent to the organizer by a specified date before the meeting if so requested. In case that this is impossible, the slides must be given to the organiser on a memory device during the meeting or sent as soon as possible after the meeting to be included in the meeting minutes that will be distributed to all partners.

6.3 The actual meeting

The chairperson, who may but need not be the same as the organizer, will be responsible for the overall procedure of the actual meeting. This person may also delegate responsibilities to other named individuals such as the timekeeping, the minute taking and others.

6.4 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting are issued within two weeks of the actual meeting and the responsible for them is the meeting organizer. The form of the minutes is at the discretion of the organizer, but at minimum they should include:

- The meeting purpose
- The attendance list
- The summary of important discussions
- The record of decisions and action points

The minutes shall be issued together with the copies of slides that were presented. The writing of minutes is often considered a burden, and sometimes takes a long time. An efficient way is to use the slides presented at the meeting as the basis of the minutes. If that option is followed, the slides may be modified during or after the meeting to take account of the discussions, an attendance list, list of decisions and list of actions can be added, and the resulting file can constitute the minutes and can be distributed promptly.

If nobody has objected within two weeks of the minutes being issued, then those minutes shall be deemed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

6.5 Follow up

The meeting organizer shall be responsible for ensuring that actions are followed up in a timely manner.

7 Deliverables

7.1 General Requirements

In this project there is a large number of deliverables that have to be completed, meaning that must be uploaded to the Participant Portal, according to the GA. Every effort shall be made to complete each deliverable by the due date and not have delays. The success of the project depends on the correct submission of the deliverables because they may be vital inputs to other WPs or other tasks within the same WP. So, if the deliverables are not on time and with the required quality, knock-on effects may be caused to other tasks or WPs. This shall not happen because the trials' and demonstrations' dates are fixed and there is no room for delays. Delivery within budget is important because if partners overspend on a deliverable, they will need to find savings elsewhere in the project, or support the project's requirements from their own resources. Delivery with the required quality is the most

important of all and the procedures to achieve this are described on the following sub-sections.

7.2 Quality control

The absolute perfection is not required, which in most cases can be achieved at great cost and at the expense of reduced scope and depth (documents) or capability (equipment). Nevertheless, all deliverables must be fit for their intended purpose. To achieve this the documents must follow some rules described below:

For a document to be fit for purpose, it must:

- be easy to read. The authors shall take under consideration that English is not the native language of many partners. So, long sentences with complicated phrases and stylistic effects from other languages must be avoided.
- be clear, consistent and unambiguous,
- contain the required information,
- not repeat paragraphs of the DoA. The DOA is the major reference document and is always consultable. In particular, the deliverables should not include the description and objectives of the project from the DOA and any other item that is not directly related to the deliverable purpose,
- avoid duplication of parts of other deliverables if not necessary for the document self-comprehension,
- not contain any unnecessary information (annexes are permissible if you need to provide background or gain recognition for other relevant work done),
- not integrate copied elements from other documents unless they are essential for the document to be understandable on a stand-alone basis,
- Finally, concision should be targeted for each deliverable. Given the large number of deliverables in the project, the time to write them and to review them will take a huge time for the consortium (and therefore cost a lot), so any economy in this domain will be profitable for the implementation of the project.

Poor quality can be less obvious at first, but can cause enormous problems later. Therefore, procedures shall be followed to ensure that all deliverables are fit for their intended purpose.

7.3 Procedure for ensuring documents are fit for purpose

The Quality controls is a very important procedure in the ISOLA project. The quality of the processes and deliverables are the responsibility of everybody involved in each project activity. The organizations have to align their internal quality control procedures to ISOLA project tasks. There is a Quality Evaluation Group (QEG), which includes the PC, the STM, and the WP leaders. The final quality control task is performed by the Coordinator.

The procedure of Quality control is responsibility of everybody involved in each project activity. The quality control task performed by the Coordinator at project level will not substitute the internal quality control used in the various partner organizations for their internal work. All partner organizations should ensure that their existing internal quality control procedures are applied to ISOLA project tasks. However, as part of their role, the PC, the STM, the IM and the TC will act as Project Quality Evaluation Group. The objectives of

the project's QEG are to ensure the appropriate application of the procedures in ISOLA and to control the main outputs (mainly documents) of the Project/Work Packages & organising reviews.

- With reference to **Project Deliverables**: each project deliverable is assigned to one leading responsible partner. This partner takes the responsibility that the deliverable is of high quality and timely delivered. The responsible partner assures that the content of a deliverable is consistent with the team-workings of the deliverable and that the particular objectives related to the goals of the project are met. Any issues related to deliverables, endangering the success of the work package or the project, have to be reported by the WP leader immediately to the Project Management and discussed within the Coordination team.

7.3.1 Reviews for Documentation/Deliverables

A Reviews Process involving each partner and selected reviewers is adopted in the Consortium to ensure the quality of deliverables and of any other external publication with regard to the technical content, the objectives of the project and to adhere to formal requirements established in the Grant and Consortium Agreements. Review process ensures that publications and deliverables comply with IPR of the partners. For external publications as well as for project deliverables, the review process will involve all Consortium partners and requires the approval of the Project QEG. Three different "color" groups are defined. The "Green team", which includes the partner responsible for the deliverable and the other authors of the deliverable which will prepare the first draft of the deliverable. The "Orange team", which includes the WP leader and the responsible for the deliverable. The WP leader will make comments on the first draft of the deliverable. The "Red team", which includes the members of QEG with the assigned internal reviewers.

Project documentation will be reviewed against the following criteria regarding form as well as content of the document:

- Format of the document according to the document templates.
- Identification and correction of typing mistakes, etc.
- Check of consistency:
    - with the overall scope of the document (e.g. it contains the right information, avoiding unnecessary information, etc.);
    - with previous relevant documentation (e.g. technical specifications vs requirements definition, no redundancy with other documents, etc.).
- Technical aspects of the documentation will be reviewed also by the Project QEG in order to ensure that the document meets the technical goals of the project, and that all technical information is advancing the current state of the art and the recent technological research level.

The procedures and timeline for the review project documentation are described in the table below. In each communication step via email the STM has to be included in "cc" until the document reaches the PC for the final submission.

When	Who	What
8 weeks before submission	The partner responsible for the deliverable.	1) Drafts a table of Contents (ToC) 2) Has a discussion with WP leader to review the ToC. 3) Assigns tasks to all involved partners. 4) Sets the respective deadlines.
8-4 weeks before submission	The involved partners of the deliverable.	Provide their feedback within the deadlines.
At least 4 weeks before submission	The partner responsible for the deliverable.	Sends the first draft to the WP leader for first comments.
5 working days after the first draft was sent	The WP leader	Sends the feedback on the first draft directly to the responsible partner for the deliverable
15 working days before submission	The responsible partner for the deliverable	1) Has updated the document based on WP leader comments and creates the semi-final version. 2) Sends this version to QEG.
	The QEG	Sends the document to two Internal Reviewers that have been assigned in advance.
5 working days after they received the semi-final version	The Internal Reviewers	Send their comments to QEG.

	The QEG	Consolidates and checks the reports and sends them to the partner responsible.
At least five working days before the submission	The responsible partner for the deliverable	Sends the final version of the document to the PC
	The PC	Submits the document to EC

7.4 Procedure for ensuring equipment deliverables are fit for purpose

Each further deliverable has the producer, some contributors and the consumers, who will finally use it. In WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 and WP7 are the most of those deliverables, which include the components and prototypes of the tools that are going to be used in the ISOLA system. Each producer shall identify the users that its deliverable affects and concerns and has to collaborate with them to meet their needs and their expectations. This can be achieved by using the methods described in Section 5. In most cases, the consumers of the equipment deliverables are partners from the other WPs which also use that equipment for their own deliverables, or partners in the integration team or representatives from the user community. If the demands of the consumers are too difficult to achieve in time and budget, a ranking and order of importance shall be negotiated and agreed.

Each equipment deliverable must be reviewed at the Beginning, the Middle and End of the development process. The consumers shall review the deliverable, considering if it meets its fitness for the specific purpose that it was created. They also have to take under consideration if (a) the equipment meets the specification produced in WP2, (b) the equipment interacts correctly and effectively with the other ISOLA systems, (c) the equipment performance reaches the levels that were defined at the beginning and finally (d) if the equipment is ready to participate in the integration level with all the other systems. Of course, each review shall take under consideration the nature of the equipment, its role to the whole system and the consequences if its performance is sub-optimal. Then the consumers shall inform the producers by writing a report (e.g. via email) of the results. Then the producer WP leader will record the results of the review and report them to the Technical Committee for further actions.

From a contractual point of view, it is not possible to deliver a piece of equipment or prototypes to EC. It is therefore necessary to accompany this deliverable (that will remain internal to the consortium) with a document that describes what has been produced. This document will be considered as the formal deliverable for EC and will give visibility for the reviewers to the real physical deliverable. So, it has to be illustrative (i.e. show the prototype and its main building blocks), explicative (explain the works that has been done to produce the components and to integrate them) and position the equipment in the development plan of the whole system. In addition, it has to explain the deviation from the initial specifications if any.

7.5 Procedure for ensuring event deliverables are fit for purpose

Event deliverables are generally confined to WP8 and WP9. They constitute the training, trials and dissemination events that are being undertaken. The producer of the deliverable shall identify the relevant consumers and engage with them early to understand their requirements and expectations. The consumers shall be considered as the TC members and representatives of the final audience of the event. If the consumers' requirements and expectations are too demanding in time or budget, a ranking and order of importance shall be negotiated and agreed.

Events shall be reviewed by representative consumers during the planning stages:

- Beginning: after the agenda and the overall script have been set.
- Middle: half way through planning the event and preparing the material for the event.
- End: shortly prior to the execution of the event (leaving sufficient time to address final comments).

At each stage, the following review check list shall be used:

- Does the plan for the event meet the original brief?
- Are the appropriate logistics in place? (Venue booked, invites to relevant individuals sent, catering organised, presenters/participants booked and briefed, etc.)
- Is the material content of the event appropriate and relevant? (Trials scenario, presentation material etc.)
- Is the overall event message sufficiently prominent? (i.e. will the consumers understand the purpose of the trial, training session or dissemination event?)

If the event is also associated with a deliverable document, the procedures for reviewing document deliverables shall also apply.

If the event is a deliverable by itself, it has to be accompanied by a synthetic document describing the event that will constitute the formal deliverable to EC.

7.6 Procedures for elaborating the classified deliverables

ISOLA will produce many EU-Restricted deliverables as they are described in the GA. There are some procedures that have to be respected.

1) Any EU-Restricted deliverable (in draft or final version) will be exchanged using an encrypted solution. ISOLA partners will acquire Zed Pro which is the cheapest effective solution.
2) The exchanges of Table of Contents (i.e. without sensitive content) can be done without encryption.
3) All EU-Restricted Deliverables need to be stored in secured repositories with a minimal protection by a password.
4) The EU-Restricted deliverables are not uploaded directly in the EC system. They are delivered through a notice in the deliverable list and the EC will provide a secured solution to deliver them through an encrypted channel.

8 Internal Progress Reporting

The WP Leader for each open WP shall prepare a report every three months following a prescribed format which will be available on the private online repository (wiki). The report shall be sent to the STM by the last working day of the last month. The STM shall concatenate the WP reports into a single word document and distribute to all TC members. The format of the file shall include the progress of the WP (deliverables submitted, milestones achieved etc.). It must also include (a) WP issues that potentially impact the rest of the project, (b) deviations that may occur explaining the reasons and proposed mitigation actions, (c) the WP risks by classifying them into levels (low, medium, high) on the impact that might have on the project or on the possibility to happen. Mitigation actions for the risks shall also be mentioned.

To be fully efficient, the internal progress reports need to be concise (mentioning only the points that are of interest for the rest of the project), accurate (with possibly concrete evidence/s) and focused.

The internal review reporting is very important for the project to be successful because it can help the WP leaders understand better which is the progress, the issues or the risks of their WP and probably can use external help to better manage their work with the support of the other WP leaders, the STM and the Coordinator.

9 Internal Cost and Budget Reporting

Partners have some obligations that are described in the GA and need to comply with. They are responsible for controlling their own spending to ensure that they retain the sufficient funds to accomplish their tasks in the development process and during the integration process and the demonstrations at the pilot use cases towards the end of the project.

Partners shall record their hours spent at Task level. Every 6 months, each partner will be asked to report their cumulative person-months spent on each Task. For each review with EC, each partner will be required to fill a financial claim form (Form C) and a Certificate of Methodology where required.

10 Risk and issue management

There may be issues or things that will not go as planned in any ambitious project. The goal of the risk and issue management is to minimize the possibility that something goes wrong and its impact if this happens. By risk we mean that something bad might happen which becomes an issue when this bad thing has already happened.

There are processes that shall be applied to all risks and issues that significantly threaten the project's objectives and goals. First, if any project participant becomes aware of a risk or issues shall inform immediately the WP leader. The WP leader shall perform an initial evaluation of the report and then inform the STM and the PC. Sometimes if this is necessary, the project participant can report directly to STM and the PC. The Coordinator shall maintain a register of risks and issues. An action plan with action points must be defined with the responsible partners to implement them for each risk or issue. If a risk actually happens, it becomes an issue and the PC adds it in the issue register. The PC and STM shall periodically review the risks and issues and ensure that all action plans are being implemented to reduce the possibility to happen or their impact.

The risks can be escalated at a higher level if deemed necessary during the risk reviews (Technical Committee or Project Management Board) or if requested by the risk owner who considers that the risk goes beyond his/her management capability and/or responsibility. The levels are: Task – WP – STM - PC-Technical Committee – Project Management Board (PMB).

The escalation of a risk to the PMB, led by the coordinator, may trigger an escalation to the Project Officer if it appears that the risk can have a major impact on the project.

The risk analysis cycle is organised with the WP reporting cycle. Each WP leader reports to the coordinator every 3 months, through a concrete and focused e-mail describing:

1. The progress of the WP
2. The deviations compared to the DOA,
3. An update of the risks.

The new risks, if major and/or if impacting the other WPs, shall be reported to the coordinator as soon as they appear in order not to delay the reaction through mitigation measures and actions.

11 Reporting to the European Commission

11.1 Overview

Throughout the project, the European Commission will monitor our progress and achievements in order to perform their duties and ensure that we are meeting our commitments and providing value for money to the European taxpayers. The EC will, amongst other things, take under consideration (a) if the deliverables have been submitted on time and if they have the required quality, (b) if the milestones have been achieved, (c) what foreground has been generated, (d) what actions have been taken to protect and exploit foreground IPR and € what dissemination activities occurred.

Such monitoring will be done primarily online through the Participant Portal:

http://ec.europa.eu/research/participants/portal/page/home

This is the entry point for electronic administration of the project. Each partner has his/her own login account, and is required to upload certain information from time to time, and is expected to be aware of the latest general and project-specific information available through the Participant Portal.

The following paragraphs provide details of the information required to be uploaded to the Participant Portal, and the procedures for uploading it.

11.2 Deliverables

There is a large number of deliverables, which must comply with the required quality level. The responsible partner (lead beneficiary) for each deliverable shall send the document to the coordinator that will upload the deliverable to the Participant Portal by the due date, after completing the project internal review process. The Coordinator shall then submit the deliverable via the Participant Portal.

11.3 Publications

The results of the project (subject to protecting the legitimate commercial interests of the project partners). In this context, "publication" means in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, otherwise the activity should be classified as dissemination rather than publication.

Details of all publications shall be entered on the Participant Portal by the partner who elaborated the publication or by the lead partner if more than one partner contributed to preparing the publication.

11.4 Dissemination activities

The consortium is required to disseminate the results of the project work (subject to protecting the legitimate commercial interests of the project partners). Dissemination can have the form of (a) a new content published on the project Web site, (b) an article or contribution to an article to a technical journal (online or paper), (c) a presentation at a conference, (d) an interview on television/radio, (e) display of equipment or posters or info-board or brochures at an exhibition and of course (f) demonstration of the project's capabilities to a group of potential users.

Dissemination can be to the general public (e.g. at a conference to which the public may attend) or to a restricted audience (e.g. presentation to a specialist group of users).

Details of all dissemination activities shall be entered on the Participant Portal by the partner who completed and submitted the dissemination, or by the lead partner if more than one partner was involved. Every dissemination material shall take the acceptance of the SAB in order to ensure that no EU-restricted information is going to be published.

11.5 Patents

The consortium is expected to take appropriate measures to protect the Foreground IP, for example by making applications to patent the inventions, register the trademarks, and register the designs.

Details of all such applications shall be entered on the Participant Portal by the partner who made the application or by the lead partner if more than one partner was involved.

11.6 Exploitable foregrounds

The production of a large amount of identifiable exploitable Foreground is expected. Such Foreground can include:

- General advancement of knowledge,
- Commercial exploitation of R&D results,
- Contribution to standards,
- Contribution to EU policies,
- Contribution to social innovations.

Details of all such exploitable foreground shall be entered on the Participant Portal by the partner who generated the Foreground or by the lead partner if more than one partner was involved.

11.7 Periodic and final reporting

Periodic Reports are required 2 months after the end of the period and a Final Report at the end of the project. The preparation of the reports will be initiated by the Coordinator, and all Partners will be required to contribute.

11.8 Financial reporting

Financial Reports (Form C) are required 2 months after the end of the period plus a certificate if the funding is more than 325 000 € direct costs (cumulated from the beginning of the project). Each partner shall enter their own financial report via the Form C Editor on the Participant Portal. The Coordinator shall review the partner financial reports and, when satisfied, shall submit them to the European Commission.

11.9 Review reporting

A Review Report is required to support the formal European Commission reviews that are scheduled at 12, 22 and 36 months. The preparation of the Review Reports will be initiated by the Coordinator, and all Partners will be required to contribute. The European Commission will use the information in the Review Report, together with all the information previously uploaded to the Participant Portal, to perform their review. The review may be done remotely, or the European Commission may require a specific meeting involving some or all of the partners.