ARESIBO

HORIZON 2020

D1.1 Project and Risk Management Plan

ARESIBO

Augmented Reality Enriched Situation awareness for Border security
ARESIBO – GA 833805

Deliverable Information

Deliverable Number: D1.1
Date of Issue: 30/06/2019
Document Reference: N/A
Version Number: 1.1

Nature of Deliverable:
Report

Author(s): ADS
Keywords:
Abstract:

Work Package: #1

Dissemination Level of Deliverable:
Public (PU)

Document History

Date	Version	Remarks
01.06.2018	**1.0**	**-**
30.06.2019	**1.1**	**-**

Document Authors

Entity	Contributors
ADS	**Chrobocinski, Philippe**

Legal Disclaimer

Disclosure Statement

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
BMS	Business Management System
DOA	Description of Action
EC	European Commission
GA	Grant Agreement
OQOTOC	On Quality, On Time and On Costs
PMB	Project Management Board
PRMP	Project and Risk Management Plan
REA	Research Executive Agency
TC	Technical Committee

Executive summary

The ARESIBO Project and risks management Plan (PRMP) 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 PRMP is consistent with ADS procedures and Business Management System (BMS). The PRMP does not repeat the procedure defined in the Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement. These 2 documents are used as applicative references for the PRMP.

1 Introduction

This document defines the project management processes and procedures to be used within the ARESIBO project.
Such processes and procedures shall be driven by the following general principles:

- Lean and efficient management that:
  - meets the EC & REA requirements;
  - meets the needs of the project;
  - minimizes overhead;
  - maximizes effort available for project delivery;
- Technical work shall be driven and managed by the Level 1 WP Leaders and coordinated through the ARESIBO Technical Committee composed of the Coordinator, the Technical Manager and the WP leaders.
- Focus on the project objectives
- Focus on what we need to produce, rather than "what we need to do"

The reference documents in the next section define the contractual requirements that the project must comply with. This document supplements, and does not attempt to copy, those contractual requirements as this document is intended to be used as a stand-alone document with low risk of obsolescence or conflict with other documents.
If any partner requires further guidance on any project management matter not covered in this document, a request should be made to the Coordinator in the first instance.

2 Reference Documents

The following documents define the contractual requirements that all project partners are required to comply with:

Grant Agreement N°833805 (which includes DOA, Grant Preparation Forms and annexes)
This is our contract with the European Commission which defines what has to be done, how and the relevant efforts...
Consortium Agreement
This defines the partners obligations towards each other.

Each of the above documents was established at the start of the project, and copies were supplied to each partner. Each document could potentially be updated independently of the others during the course of the project following a prescribed process. In the event of any such update, the latest formal issued version shall apply.
In the event of a conflict between this document and any of the contractual documents referenced above, the contractual document(s) shall take precedence.

3 Project Management Board

The project is contractually managed by the coordinator supported by the Project Management Board. The Project Management Board consists of:

- The coordinator,
- The Technical Manager,
- One representative of each partner (each partner in the consortium has one vote for each voting session),
- The Security Manager,
- The Ethical Manager.

The PMB is in charge of all the actions related to the contractual project management. 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

Most of the work within this project will be focused within the technical WPs managed by the Level 1 WP Leaders, who may delegate some responsibilities to the Level 2 Task Leaders.
Each Level 1 WP Leader is responsible for ensuring that his/her work package produces the required deliverables, as specified in the DOA, on time, within budget, and with the required quality.
The Level 1 WP Leader of each open work package shall provide a report every 3 months on the progress of his/her work package to the Technical Manager using a standard reporting format. If the Level 1 WP Leader becomes aware of any arising that threatens the delivery of the work package or achievement of the project objectives, the Level 1 WP Leader shall notify the Technical Manager and the Coordinator immediately rather than wait until the next monthly report is due. If there is likely to be a knock-on effect on any other WPs, then the Level 1 WP Leader shall notify the Level 1 Leaders of those WPs also.
Further details of the management structures and processes are provided in the DOA and the Consortium Agreement.
If a project participant has any difficulty or requires any help to deliver their obligations, they are expected to ask for help from their Level 2 Task Leader or Level 1 WP Leader, or the Technical Manager or Coordinator as appropriate.

5 Collaboration and Communication

5.1 Overview

The success of a project of this nature will depend on effective collaboration between partners, and efficient and effective communication is vital for such collaboration.
The following means of communication are anticipated:

Shared data environment

A Web-based shared document library will be set up in the private part of the Web site.

Email

Email is expected to be widely used. Care shall be exercised to avoid information overload, i.e. senders shall ensure emails are sent to the appropriate recipients, rather than sending everything to everyone. In particular, the following rules should be respected: 1.The sender should verify that any name put in the addressee list is here for action and 2. The sender should verify that any name put in the cc list is really interested in the content of the e-mail. Group mailing lists will be used for specific activities within the project (WP lists).

Telephone

The telephone is expected to be widely used. Callers shall be considerate and take account of time differences, office hours and known holidays in the different partner countries, especially if calling to a mobile number or if it is believed that the recipient's office phone could be connected through to a mobile number. A contact list was established at the beginning of the project and will be maintained by the coordinator.

Teleconference

Teleconference is expected to be widely used if more than two partners need to be involved. Some partners may not have the facility to initiate a teleconference, in which

case they may ask another partner to do so if a teleconference is the most efficient and effective way to achieve the required communication.

Video Conference

Video conference may be used, although some partners may not have the facility, and may not be suitable if more than two partners need to be involved.

Webex

Webex is a convenient and effective way to communicate if Internet access and a telephone are available. Documents and presentations may be opened and viewed simultaneously by all participants. Some partners may not have the facility to initiate a Webex, in which case they may ask another partner to do so if a Webex is the most effective and efficient way to achieve the required communication. In particular, the coordinator (ADS) can easily set up Webex meeting.

Meetings

Meetings are the most effective way to progress, but they are expensive in time and travel. Some meetings are required (plenary meetings, every 4 months), whilst others will be discretionary and specific. If the meeting is discretionary, alternatives shall be considered first. Even if meetings are scheduled, partners should continue to communicate through other means, and resist the temptation to "save things up" for the next meeting.

5.2 Partner contact register

The coordinator shall maintain and distribute a register of contact details and roles for all individuals within the partner organisations who are involved in 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 organisation shall notify the Coordinator. The Coordinator shall collect all such requests, and shall update and re-distribute the register from time to time.

6 Meetings

6.1 Types of meetings

The following kinds of face-to-face meetings are envisaged:

- Plenary meetings (every 4 months),
- EC Review (at M18 for the first one and at the end of the meeting),
- ARESIBO Project Management Board (PMB) (every 6 months),
- ARESIBO Technical Committee (TC) (every 6 months, collocated with the PMB meeting with teleconference at intermediate 3 months),
- WP Working Meetings (WP) (at discretion of WP Leader),
- Other Meetings (as required/ad hoc).

6.2 Organisation of meetings

As a general principle, Dates and locations of meetings should be fixed at least 1 month (preferably longer) in advance of each meeting, in order to take advantage of cheaper travel and to ensure good attendance by the most appropriate people.

A named meeting organiser, who will be the focal point for all organisational and administrative matters, shall be appointed for each meeting. The meeting organiser need not

be the same person as the meeting chairperson, and need not be a member of the host organisation. The meeting organiser may delegate certain responsibilities (e.g. chairing, hosting, travelling advice) to other named individuals.
The meeting organiser shall liaise with the meeting host and announce the location of the meeting as soon as possible, as the proximity of the location to attendees' other commitments can influence their available dates.
The meeting organiser may canvass the potential attendees to determine their availability and preferences for meeting dates. A tool such as www.doodle.com may be used for that purpose.
If it is not possible to agree an ideal date(s) when all potential attendees are available, the meeting organiser shall make a compromise decision, taking into account the purpose of the meeting, the known availability and preferences of the potential attendees, and the relative importance of each potential attendee actually attending.
At least 1 month (preferably longer) before the meeting, the meeting organiser shall confirm the date(s), location, and the start and finish times, and shall supply travel and hotel information.
The meeting attendees shall confirm their attendance and provide any necessary security information at least 1 week before the meeting, 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.

6.3 Preparation

At least 1 month before the meeting, the meeting organiser shall issue a draft agenda, making clear which partners are expected to have specific responsibilities such as chairing a session or delivering a presentation. The agenda may be refined during the weeks leading up to the meeting, and shall be finalised at least 1 week before the start of the meeting. Late changes to the agenda will be permitted only if all affected participants agree.
Presentation slides should be prepared in advance of the meeting, and sent to the meeting organiser by a specified date before the meeting if so requested.
If not sent before the meeting, the slides should be given to the meeting organiser on a memory device during the meeting, or sent as soon as possible after the meeting, so that they can be distributed with the meeting minutes.

6.4 The actual meeting

A named meeting chairperson, who will be responsible for the overall conduct of the actual meeting, shall be appointed. The chairperson may be, but need not be, the same person as the meeting organiser. The chairperson may delegate specific responsibilities (e.g. timekeeping, minute taking, domestic matters) to other named individuals.

6.5 Minutes

The meeting organiser shall be responsible for ensuring that the minutes are issued within 2 weeks of the actual meeting.
The form of the minutes is at the discretion of the meeting organiser. As a minimum, the minutes should cover the meeting purpose, attendance list, summary of important discussions, record of decisions and actions, and should be issued together with copies of the 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 2 weeks of the minutes being issued, then those minutes shall be deemed to be an accurate record of the meeting.

6.6 Follow up

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

7 Deliverables

7.1 General Requirements

The DOA included in the Grant Agreement (GA) defines a large number of deliverables and their due dates. Every effort shall be made to complete each deliverable by the due date. A deliverable is deemed to be completed when it has been uploaded to the Participant Portal.
Many of the deliverables are vital inputs to subsequent WPs, or to subsequent tasks within the same WP that produced the deliverable. Project success therefore depends on the production of deliverables:

- On time,
- Within budget,
- With the required quality.

On-time delivery is important because the dates of the scenario trials will need to be fixed well in advance. Late deliverables can cause knock-on effects and could jeopardise the success of the trials, and of the project.
Delivery within budget is important because if partners overspend on a deliverable, they will need to find savings elsewhere in the project, or subsidise the project from their own resources.
Delivery with the required quality is the most important of all and is dealt with in the following sub-sections.

7.2 Quality control

Definition: Quality = fitness for purpose
Absolute perfection is not required, and often can only 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.
For a document to be fit for purpose, it must:

- be easy to read (as for many partners English is not their native language, the structure of the sentences should be kept simple and should avoid stylistic effects from other languages that often do not exist in English),
- 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 number of deliverables in the project (>80), 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

Quality control is responsibility of everybody involved in the each project activity.
The quality control task performed by the Coordinator at project level will not substitute for internal quality control used in the various partner organisations for their internal work. All partner organisations should ensure that their existing internal quality control procedures are applied to MARISA project tasks.
However, as part of their role, the Project Coordinator, the Project Manager, the Innovation Manager and the Technical Board will act as Project Quality Assurance Team.
Objectives of the Project Quality Assurance Team are:

- to ensure appropriate application of the procedures in ARESIBO;
- 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 Quality Assurance Team.
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 Quality Assurance Team 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 hereafter.

- The partner responsible for preparing the deliverable, drafts a Table of Contents (ToC), assigns tasks to all involved partners and sets the respective deadlines (considering also time needed for quality review).
- Involved partners provide their feedback within the deadlines and the responsible partner prepares the first draft of the document.
- This draft is sent to the entire consortium for comments and improvements/additions. The feedback period for project partners should last at least five working days. Feedback is sent directly to the responsible partner who revises the document and prepares the semi-final version.
- The Quality Control Process begins based on the semi-final version of the deliverable. **This version has to be ready no later than 20 working days before the final deadline.** At least two Internal Reviewers have been assigned in advance (refer to the reviewers table).
- The Internal Reviewers send their comments (by five working days) to the Project Quality Assurance Team who consolidates and checks the reports and sends them to the partner responsible.
- This partner responsible for preparing the deliverable then improves the document based on received comments. In case the comments/suggestions cannot be realised, the reasons for this must be documented. If necessary (i.e. if there are too many comments on the first round), another round of comments from the Internal Reviewers takes place.
- The partner responsible addresses them appropriately and prepares the final version of the document, which is sent to the Project Coordinator (at least five days before the final deadline).

The Project Coordinator then submits the document to the EC.

7.4 Procedure for ensuring equipment deliverables are fit for purpose

As with the document deliverables, each further deliverable has a responsible producer, contributors and one or more consumers (who will use the deliverable and will consequently be affected by it).
Equipment deliverables are mostly confined to WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP6. They constitute the prototypes and components of the various systems that will be used in the trials.
The producer of the deliverable shall identify the relevant consumers and engage with them early on to understand their requirements and expectations. For equipment deliverables the relevant consumers are, in most cases, other WP partners who are supplying equipment that interacts with the deliverable, the WP integration team, and representatives of the user community.
If the consumers' requirements and expectations are too demanding in time or budget, a ranking and order of importance shall be negotiated and agreed.
The consumers shall review the deliverable, considering it's required purpose and its fitness for that purpose, and shall provide a report (e.g. by email) of the results. The producer WP leader shall record the results of the reviews and report the results to the Technical Committee in their monthly report.
In general, reviews shall be conducted at the Beginning, Middle and End of the development process for each equipment deliverable, using the following checklist:

- Is the equipment fit for its intended purpose?
- Does the equipment meet the specification produced in WP2?
- Does the equipment interact correctly with the other ARESIBO systems (example: it respects the ICDs defined in WP2)?
- Does the equipment perform as required?
- Is the equipment ready for the level of integration that will be undertaken?

However, the review process for each equipment deliverable shall be tailored to the nature of the equipment, its role in the ARESIBO system, and the consequences if it is sub-optimal in its fitness for purpose. Good judgement shall be used in determining the scope and timing of each review and the specific consumers to be consulted at each stage. The overall aim shall be to ensure that the equipment is fit for its intended purpose, and to detect any problems as early as possible during the development process.
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.
Each item of equipment shall be validated when delivered (by the development WPs), according to the tests specified in WP2. WP6 will perform an acceptance check when received from the development WPs. This acceptance check can be largely based on the results of the validation tests.

7.5 Procedure for ensuring event deliverables are fit for purpose

Event deliverables are generally confined to WP7 and WP8. 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.

8 Internal Progress Reporting

The WP Leader for each open WP shall prepare a report each 3 month following a prescribed format in an e-mail. Additional slides are not required. The report shall be sent to the Technical Manager by the last working day of the last month. The Technical Manager (TM) shall collate the WP reports into a single word document and distribute to all TC members.
The format shall be as follows:

1. WP progress (milestones achieved),
2. WP issues (i.e. issues that can potentially impact the rest of the project),
3. WP deviations and proposed mitigation solutions (planning or work content),
4. WP risks (a risk is described by: 1. A detrimental event that can occur, 2. The possible impact(s) of this event and its seriousness (Low, Medium, High), 3. The probability of occurrence of the event (Low, Medium, High) and 4. The proposed mitigation.

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 focussed.
The internal progress reporting will be the main formal source to identify issues and problems and allow us to be in a position to solve them. It is therefore of utmost importance for the WP

leaders not to neglect or ignore them as they can help to better manage their WP with the support of the other WP leaders, Technical Manager or Coordinator.

9 Internal Cost and Budget Reporting

Partners shall be responsible for controlling their own spending, and shall ensure that they retain sufficient funds to perform all their obligations. In particular, they shall ensure that they retain sufficient funds to support the integration process and the scenario trials towards the end of the project.
Partners shall record their hours spent at Level 2 Task level. Every 6 months, each partner will be asked to report their cumulative person-months spent on each Level 2 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

In any ambitious project, things may go wrong, especially in researched project where the feasibility is not guaranteed in the beginning. The aim of risk and issue management is to prevent things going wrong, and to minimise the impact if things do go wrong.

- Definition: a risk is something bad that might happen
- Definition: an issue is something bad that has already happened

The following process shall apply for all risks and issues that significantly threaten project delivery in accordance with the DOA or the achievement of project objectives:

- In normal circumstances, any project participant who becomes aware of a risk or issue shall inform his/her Level 1 WP Leader. The Level 1 Leader shall perform an initial evaluation and then inform the Technical Manager and the Coordinator.
- Although it is preferred that risks and issues are reported via the appropriate Level 1 WP Leader, it is permissible for any project participant to report directly to the Technical Manager and Coordinator.
- The Coordinator shall maintain a register of risks and issues.
- For each risk and issue, an action plan shall be defined. For risks, the primary objective shall be to prevent the risk from happening. For issues, the primary objective shall be to reduce the impact. An owner shall be defined who will be responsible for implementing the action plan.
- If a risk actually happens, it becomes an issue and an appropriate entry shall be made in the issue register.
- The Coordinator and Technical Manager shall periodically review the risks and issues and ensure that the action plans are being implemented.

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 – 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.

In performing their duties, the European Commission will, amongst other things, consider the following criteria:

- Have the Deliverables been produced on time and with the required quality?
- Have the milestones been achieved?
- What foreground has been generated?
- What steps have been taken to protect and exploit foreground IPR?
- What dissemination has been done?

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

A large number of deliverables, which must be of satisfactory quality. The responsible partner (lead beneficiary) for each deliverable shall 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 take many forms, for example:

- Updated content on the project Web site,
- Contributing an article to a technical journal (online or paper),
- Presentation at a conference,
- Giving an interview on television/radio,
- Display of equipment or posters, or distributing brochures at an exhibition,
- Demonstration of our capabilities to an invited 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.

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 after 18 months (first review) and every 12 months later, 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 every 12 months plus a certificate if the funding is more than 375 000 € 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-monthly intervals throughout the project (except for the first one which will be at Month 18). 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.