EPICURE

HIGH-LEVEL SPECIALISED APPLICATION SUPPORT SERVICE IN HIGH-PERFORMANCE COMPUTING

Project Title	High-level specialised application support service in High-Performance Computing (HPC)
Project Acronym	EPICURE
Project Number	101139786
Type of Action	DIGITAL JU Simple Grants
Topic	DIGITAL-EUROHPC-JU-2022-APPSUPPORT-01-01
Starting Date of Project	2024-02-01
Ending Date of Project	2028-01-31
Duration of the Project	48 months
Website	www.epicure-hpc.eu

D1.1- Project Management and Risk Management Plan

Work Package	WP1 | WP Project Coordination and Management
Task	T1.1 | Project Management and Financial Coordination
Lead Authors	Alberto Lanzanova (CSC), Emmanuel Ory (CSC), Ville Savolainen (CSC)
Contributors	Noora Tiihonen (CSC)
Peer Reviewers	David Vicente (BSC), Andrew Emerson (CINECA)
Version	V0.1
Due Date	2024-02-29
Submission Date	2024-02-26

Dissemination Level

X	PU: Public
	SEN: Sensitive – limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement
	EU-RES. Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
	EU-CON. Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
	EU-SEC. Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)

Version History

Revision	Date	Editors	Comments
0.1	2024-02-01	Alberto Lanzanova (CSC)	First version of the deliverble ready to be reviewed.
0.2	2024-02-08	AlbertoLanzanova (CSC)	Second version of the deliverable based on the reviewers' comments.
0.3	2024-02-22	AlbertoLanzanova (CSC)	Third version of the deliverable based on the PMB comments

Co-funded by the European Union

EuroHPC Joint Undertaking

1.0	2024-02-26	AlbertoLanzanova (CSC)	Final version submitted to the portal

Glossary of terms

Item	Description
DoA	Description of Action
EAB	External Advisory Board
EC	European Commission
EuroHPC JU	EuroHPC Joint Undertaking
PMB	Project Management Board
PMO	Project Management Office
ToC	Table of Contents
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader
GA	Grant Agreement

Keywords

Compliance, ethics, quality plan, risk management, risk register

Executive Summary

This document presents quality control processes and templates for internal verification and document review for all formal deliverables and milestones of the EPICURE project. The document also presents a project-wide Risk Register that includes analysis of their potential effect on the project, steps that have been taken or are planned to reduce the effect, and steps to be taken should the risk transpire and create an issue for the project.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction *5*

1.1 Quality Plan **5**

1.2 Risk Register **6**

2. Deliverable Management *6*

2.1 Deliverable Lifecycle **7**

2.2 Deliverable Production **8**

2.2.1 Authors 8

2.2.2 Schedule 8

2.2.3 Deliverable Formatting 9

2.3 Deliverable Reviewing **9**

2.3.1 Reviewer Appointment 10

2.3.2 Review Schedule 10

2.3.3 Review Process 10

2.4 Approving the Deliverable **11**

2.5 Submitting the Deliverable to the Granting Authority **11**

2.6 Disseminating Work Conducted Under the Deliverable **11**

2.6.1 Uploading Deliverables to the EPICURE Website and Public Repositories 11

2.6.2 Dissemination of Work Conducted Under the Deliverable 12

3. Milestone Management *12*

3.1 Milestone Lifecycle **12**

3.2 Milestone Production **12**

3.2.1 Authors 13

3.2.2 Schedule 13

3.3 Milestone Reviewing **13**

3.4 Approving the Milestone **13**

3.5 Submitting the Milestone to the European Commission **13**

3.6 Disseminating Work Conducted Under the Milestone **14**

4. Monitoring and Reporting *14*

4.1 Periodic Reports to the Granting Authority **14**

4.2 Internal Reports **14**

4.2.1 Internal Technical Reports 15

4.2.2 Internal financial Reports 15

5. Risk Identification and Management *15*

5.1 Identifying New Risks: Roles and Responsibilities **15**

5.2 Assessing the Risk **16**

5.3 Adding New Risks to the Risk Register **17**

6. Reviewing and Monitoring Risks *17*

6.1 Reviewing Existing Risks 17

6.2 Closing Risks 17

Annex I – Internal Reporting Schedule 18

Annex II – Periodic Reports to the Granting Authority 18

1. Introduction

The EuroHPC Joint Undertaking (JU) is deploying a European-wide High-performance Computing infrastructure, comprising several supercomputers, that range from small petascale, to large high-end pre-exascale and exascale systems, topping the relevant global rankings.

To date, part of the responsibilities of the Hosting Entities is the provision of support services to users that are selected by EuroHPC JU to access the systems. These services are currently limited primarily to Level 1 support which mostly entails a help desk support for day-by-day operational issues and problems.

The EPICURE project aims at enhancing this offering by establishing and operating a distributed but coordinated European-wide high-performance computing application support service, to encourage the best possible uptake of the systems by European scientists and researchers.

Application Support Teams (ASTs) will be implemented by the EPICURE project in current and future EuroHPC Hosting Entities, in collaboration with key support actions funded by the EuroHPC JU and will provide their services aiming primarily at Level 2 and 3 application support. This support focuses on application porting, optimisation and execution of key applications for a selected number of projects, which have been allocated time by the peer-review process managed by the EuroHPC JU. These services include the organisation of specialized training events and workshops in the context of high-profile international HPC events.

Finally, the EPICURE project will develop a single point of contact (in the form of a European HPC Application Support portal) that will allow European HPC users - from public and private sector including SMEs - to retrieve information on the systems offered by the Joint Undertaking, their architectures, their access mechanisms, and the support services available.

1.1 Quality Plan

The Quality Plan defines the methodology that all partners shall apply throughout the EPICURE project when delivering project documents and internal reports. It forms a common standard for the entire project lifecycle. This document describes quality assurance processes for the production, review, and approval of the deliverables and milestones to be submitted to the European Commission (EC) according to the EPICURE Description of the Action (DoA), and covers issues related to internal monitoring and reporting.

The Project Management Office (PMO) is responsible for establishing the project quality process and ensuring that the project quality is maintained across the whole consortium and throughout the project. The PMO defines the quality standards for the project and supports the consortium in applying the defined procedures, tools, documents, and templates. As part of this work, the PMO monitors on a regular basis the application of the Quality Plan through actions such as verification of documents and deliverables, participation in reviews, and maintaining the EPICURE Risk Register (Section 1.2).

The Quality Plan shall be applied:

- By all partners and
- For all deliverables and milestones, and, when necessary, for internal reports

Consortium partners shall supervise and check the work performed by their own staff in accordance with the EPICURE Quality Plan.

This Quality Plan should be interpreted with reference to:

- The Terms and Conditions for EC contracts
- The EPICURE DoA, available in the project shared Wiki.

Different events may cause the content of this document to be modified. For instance:

- Evolution of project characteristics
- Changes of the techniques or tools

Any project partner may request amendments and each amendment must be reviewed by the PMO and approved by the EPICURE General Assembly.

1.2 Risk Register

The EPICURE Risk Register is a tool available and maintained in the EPICURE SharePoint file sharing service.

The Risk Register is used to identify, assess, monitor, and manage risks that might arise in the project. A risk is an event which, when materialising, can have an adverse impact on the objectives of the project. The Risk Register acts as a central repository for all risks identified by the project and provides information such as the risk probability, its potential impact, and the measures that should be taken to reduce the probability of the risk to materialise or mitigate its impact (risk management plan).

The Risk Register is the repository in which all identified risks are documented and maintained, regardless of their category. The risks identified at the stage of the preparation of the project proposal and described in the DoA (foreseen risks) form the basis of the initial Risk Register, which includes recognised risks per work package (WP), as well as project-level risks that impact on other WPs. Risks within a WP can be risks originating from a WP or risks having impact on a deliverable or milestone of a WP.

Each risk in the Risk Register initially contains:

- A description of the risk.
- The WPs primarily affected.
- The probability of its occurrence (low, medium, high).
- The impact level in case that the event actually occurs (low, medium, high).
- Planned risk-mitigation measures (actions taken in advance to reduce the probability and/or impact of the event).

The Risk Register is a living document and will be regularly maintained throughout the lifespan of the project (see section 5.1. for roles and responsibilities). As part of this, the Risk Register will be updated to include information on risk materialisation and actual risk-mitigation measures undertaken for each materialised risk, in accordance with the State of Play section provided for each risk on the EC Funding & Tenders Portal.

2. Deliverable Management

This section describes the quality assurance process for the management (production, review, approval, submission, and dissemination) of deliverables to be submitted as part of the EPICURE project, as planned in its DoA and approved by the Consortium. It defines standard rules and procedures related to deliverable production and documentation to be applied by all partners throughout the project.

2.1 Deliverable Lifecycle

Each of the EPICURE deliverables to be submitted to the Granting Authority will have to undergo an internal review process to present them in an appropriate manner for evaluation by the external reviewers and the Commission. For each deliverable, there will be at least two reviewers selected, with at least one of the reviewers being from a different organisation than the one to which the deliverable lead partner belongs to. A member of the PMO may serve as an additional (third) subject content reviewer where desired. Each deliverable is forwarded to the Project Management Board (PMB) for further feedback prior to submission of the deliverable to the EC.

To support the production of deliverables, the PMO will maintain a deliverable release schedule. This schedule will take into account the due dates of deliverables for submission to the Granting Authority and the time required for the quality assurance procedure, including deadlines for submitting deliverable drafts for review, commenting and a final quality check by the PMO. This schedule will be maintained on the project Eduuni- Wiki site. The PMO will maintain the deliverable release schedule and remind the Work Package Leaders (WPL) of the required steps and guide the authors and reviewers where needed. The due dates for each EPICURE deliverable are also hosted on the Wiki, under sections specific to each WP. For reference, see for example WP2 specific section.

The due date for submitting a deliverable to the Granting Authority is the last working day of the respective month. An overview of a deliverable lifecycle is illustrated in table below. This process is described in further detail in the following sections. The PMO has the responsibility to collect the deliverables, ensure that the internal reviews are performed in a timely fashion and that the deliverables are submitted to the Commission on schedule.

Time before the submission	**Deliverable production and review actions**
6 weeks	• WPL appoints the deliverable author(s) - if not appointed earlier - and informs the PMO. • The WPL, in collaboration with the partner organisation responsible for a given deliverable, will appoint at least two reviewers - if not appointed earlier - and informs the PMO. • The deliverable author(s) uploads to the EPICURE SharePoint service a draft table of contents (ToC) and inform the WPL and appointed reviewers.
4 weeks (1 month)	• The author(s) uploads the first complete draft of the deliverable for review. • A maximum of *five working days* will be allowed for the review (for deliverables uploaded to SharePoint at an earlier stage, the first review period may be extended)
2 weeks	• The author(s) of a deliverable are responsible for consolidating the input received from the reviewers and sending a second draft to the PMB for final comments. • The PMB must provide any feedback on the deliverable within *three working days* after

	receiving the draft. If the deliverable is submitted to the PMB at an earlier stage, the commenting period may be extended in agreement with the PMB.
4 working days	• The author(s) of a deliverable consolidate a final version of the deliverable document and submit it to the PMO for final quality check and layout.
4-1 working days	• The PMO submits the deliverable to the EC.

2.2 Deliverable Production

All EPICURE deliverables should take the form of written reports so that they can be submitted to the Granting Authority via the EC Funding and Tenders Portal. All deliverables should follow the formatting guidelines given in the deliverable template (available in the project wiki) and respect the guidelines presented in this document.

The information provided in the deliverables must be reliable. This also means that all background information used should be appropriately supported by references. As a general principle, the responsibility for content of each deliverable is always with the author(s).

2.2.1 Authors

For each deliverable, a responsible person shall be designated by the work package leader (WPL) relevant to the deliverable. The WPL may also serve as a deliverable author. Co-authorship is possible, provided it has been agreed by the WPL. Contributors to the deliverable shall be clearly identified at the beginning of the deliverable document. The WPL is responsible for communicating the author assignments to the PMO. There can be as many co-authors as needed, but the main responsible author will coordinate the production of the deliverable and ensure that it is ready for internal review on time. Co-authorship needs to be agreed upon in advance with the WPL. All contributors to the deliverable shall be clearly identified at the beginning of the deliverable document.

This assignment should be made as early as possible, preferably at the beginning of the reporting period during which the deliverable is due but no later than six weeks before the submission deadline of the deliverable.

2.2.2 Schedule

The author(s) of a deliverable shall upload to the EPICURE SharePoint service a draft table of contents (ToC) of the deliverable at least *six weeks* before the due date of the deliverable (which is the last day of the due month) and inform the WPL and appointed reviewers.

The first complete draft of the deliverable shall be uploaded to SharePoint for review no later than *one month (4 weeks)* before the deliverable due date. If the first draft is uploaded to SharePoint latest four weeks prior to the deliverable due date, a maximum of *five working days* will be allowed for the review. For deliverables uploaded to SharePoint at an earlier stage, the first review period may be extended in agreement with the reviewers, provided that other deadlines concerning the deliverable production process are adhered to, as described in this document. Authors are encouraged to involve the reviewers in the production of the deliverables as early as possible. The reviewers must provide

constructive suggestions for improvement, using the track changes and/or commenting features to provide feedback directly in the document.

The author(s) of a deliverable are responsible for consolidating the input received from the reviewers and sending a second draft to the PMB for final comments *14 calendar days* (at the latest) before the deliverable deadline. If the deliverable is submitted to the PMB 14 days prior to the due date, the PMB must provide any feedback on the deliverable within *three working days* after receiving the draft. If the deliverable is submitted to the PMB at an earlier stage, the commenting period may be extended in agreement with the PMB, provided that other deadlines concerning the deliverable production process are respected. The author(s) of a deliverable consolidate a final version of the deliverable document and submit it to the PMO, after which the PMO uploads the deliverable to the EC Funding & Tenders Portal. The PMO must be given a *minimum period of four working days* to perform a final quality check of the document and to submit the deliverable to the Funding & Tenders Portal.

If the author foresees that a timely production of the deliverable will not be possible, it is their responsibility to alert the WPL and the PMO immediately to enable corrective actions. The PMO will inform the Granting Authority project Officer (PO) of any delays to deliverable submission. In case of major delays to deliverable submission exceeding one month, the PMO is responsible for contacting the Granting Authority Project Officer for corrective arrangements.

2.2.3 Deliverable Formatting

A standard deliverable template shall be used by all partners. The PMO is responsible for distributing the template for the deliverables. This template, a Microsoft Word document named “EPICURE-Deliverable Template.docx”, is available on the EPICURE Eduuni-wiki site.

The deliverable authors are responsible for ensuring that the deliverable document complies with editing guidelines and examples set out in the deliverable template, including that the content conforms to the graphical identity of the project, in order to produce standardised project documents. The PMO may perform final (minor) editorial checks and formatting corrections prior to submitting the deliverable to the EC.

Upon commencing the work on a deliverable, the template shall be renamed EPICURE_DEL_WPx_Dx_y_V0_1.doc(x), where WPx is the WP number, Dx_y is the deliverable number and version is an identification of the document version specified by the author. The version number shall be less than 1.0 in versions not submitted to the EC. Version numbers above zero indicate that the deliverable is in process, with version 1.0 being the version submitted to the EC. Further to being included in the document file name, the document version number shall be used on the deliverable title page. As an example, the current deliverable file is named: EPICURE_DEL_WP1_D1_1_V1_0. doc(x) (when submitted to the EC).

Each deliverable submitted as part of the project will have a classification attribute. This attribute defines the confidentiality level:

- Public (PU) — fully open (automatically posted online on the Project Results platforms).
- Sensitive (SEN) — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement.
- EU classified — RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision 2015/444.

2.3 Deliverable Reviewing

Each of the EPICURE deliverables to be submitted to the Granting Authority will undergo an internal review process to ensure their quality and compliance with the objectives set for each in the DoA.

2.3.1 Reviewer Appointment

The WPL, in collaboration with the partner organisation responsible for a given deliverable, will appoint at least two reviewers for each deliverable within the relevant WP. The assignment of the reviewers will be made as early as possible, no later than six weeks before the final due date, typically at the same time when the ToC of the deliverable is uploaded to the EPICURE SharePoint service. The WPL is responsible for communicating the reviewer assignments to the PMO.

At least one of the reviewers will be selected from an organisation different to the one to which the deliverable lead partner and authors belong. Where desired, a member of the PMO may serve as a an additional (third) technical and subject content reviewer for a deliverable. Following consolidation of feedback from the appointed reviewers, an updated draft of the deliverable document is circulated for further comments from the PMB. The purpose of this commenting round is to provide an open forum for all PMB members to provide feedback on the deliverable and further improve the document contents, prior to the deliverable being submitted to the EC Funding & Tenders Portal.

2.3.2 Review Schedule

The deliverable review schedule must adhere to the timeline for deliverable production outlined in Section 2.2.2 Schedule. Due dates to be listed in schedules for deliverable production maintained by the PMO (Section 2.1 Deliverable Lifecycle) represent the minimum number of days to be allocated to each step of the deliverable production process.

To facilitate timely submission of the deliverables to the EC, authors are encouraged to submit deliverable drafts for review, commenting and final quality checks in advance of the listed due dates where feasible.

Should a designated reviewer be unable to perform the review within the required time frame, it is the responsibility of the WPL, in collaboration with the PMO, to identify a substitute. Changes to reviewer appointments should be performed as early as possible during the deliverable lifecycle.

2.3.3 Review Process

When the author(s) are ready to submit a deliverable for review, they inform the reviewers that the document is ready to undergo formal review, mentioning its exact location in the EPICURE SharePoint. If the WPL has not served as one of the deliverable authors, the WPL should be informed of the deliverable having been submitted for review.

The reviewer shall review the deliverable according to the following criteria:

- **Content**: The reviewer shall ensure that the content is appropriate and meets the intent and verifies that the deliverable meets the requirements specified in the DoA.
- **Correctness**: The reviewer shall ensure that the deliverable is technically correct, clear, consistent, and testable or verifiable (if appropriate).
- **Completeness**: The reviewer shall ensure that the topic is covered in a comprehensive fashion and no sections are incomplete.

The reviewer shall read the scope of the WP and the deliverable in the DoA, and list and describe any topic(s) or information related to the deliverable which appear to be missing.

The reviewer shall also provide suggestions as to what topic(s) or information the author(s) can add to ensure that the scope of the deliverable is complete. Reviewers are encouraged to give their opinion as to whether or not the results presented in the deliverable should be published also in another form (e.g. scientific manuscript, technical report or policy document, software release). Reviewers shall also identify, whenever possible, the novel results that could be highlighted and provide suggestions for target audiences.

Finally, the reviewer makes the decision if the deliverable can be approved with given modifications or whether the deliverable needs a re-review. In case a re-review is needed – which should remain an exceptional case – the reviewers, together with the author(s) of the deliverable, the relevant WPL and the PMO, shall agree on a limited period of extra time allocated to the author(s) to complete the work, after which the deliverable will be again submitted to the reviewers. If arranging for a re-review causes a delay to the deliverable preparation process that is likely to delay submission of the deliverable to the Granting Authority beyond the due date, the PMO is responsible for communicating this to the Granting Authority Project Officer. Delays caused by the re-review must be minor in nature. In the case of major (>1 month) delays to deliverable preparation, it is the responsibility of the WPL to communicate these to the PMO prior to the deliverable being submitted for review, to enable immediate corrective actions.

2.4 Approving the Deliverable

Once the review has been completed, and the deliverable has been approved by both reviewers and the PMB, the PMO will perform a final check of the document and formally approve the deliverable, after consulting the leader of the WP to which the deliverable belongs.

2.5 Submitting the Deliverable to the Granting Authority

The PMO is responsible for officially submitting the deliverable to the Granting Authority on schedule.

2.6 Disseminating Work Conducted Under the Deliverable

The work conducted under the deliverable and its results shall be made available to relevant stakeholders within and outside the consortium. WP6 will be contacted in such cases to coordinate the public dissemination activities in collaboration with the PMO, WPL and deliverable authors, and any other interested parties.

2.6.1 Uploading Deliverables to the EPICURE Website and Public Repositories

WP6 will make each public deliverable available via the public EPICURE website (www.epicure-hpc.eu) after it has been approved by the EC, together with a brief abstract summarising the document. After a public deliverable is accepted by the Granting Authority, the PMO will be responsible to upload it to B2SHARE or Zenodo. All public deliverables will be licensed under Creative Commons CC-BY.

The PMO will inform the project consortium by sending out an email to the consortium mailing list pointing out the submitted, accepted and published deliverable.

Deliverables with dissemination level other than “public” will follow the steps described above but will not be published on any public repository.

2.6.2 Dissemination of Work Conducted Under the Deliverable

In order to disseminate as widely as possible the work conducted for the deliverable to external stakeholders, appropriate options for turning the deliverable into targeted dissemination material will be considered.

Examples of such material include a press release, an article, a brochure, a poster, a video, or any other object that can convey in the most appropriate way the results of the work. The PMO, together with the WPL and deliverable authors, will be responsible for deciding on the action to take and will organise, in collaboration with WP6, the necessary effort and actions.

3. Milestone Management

EPICURE milestones are described in the EPICURE DoA. This section describes the quality assurance process for the management (production, review, approval, submission, and dissemination) of milestones to be submitted to the Granting Authority as part of the EPICURE project, as planned in its DoA and approved by the Consortium. It defines standard rules and procedures related to milestone production and documentation that all partners apply throughout the project.

3.1 Milestone Lifecycle

The WPL shall appoint a person called “milestone owner” for each milestone that belongs to the work package. The milestone owner is responsible for providing the necessary documentation for the official submission of the milestone to the European Commission.

When the milestone involves producing a written report, the report contents should be subjected to an internal review performed by the partner responsible for the milestone, or another project partner appointed by the WPL. When the primary output of the milestone is not a written report, the partner responsible for the milestone should produce a short (maximum one page) written summary describing activities undertaken to complete the milestone.

The PMO will maintain a list of milestone due dates for each milestone on the EPICURE Eduuni-wiki site, as well as a WP division under each specific (e.g. WP2). The due date of a milestone is always the last working day of the respective month.

The milestone lifecycle is described in further detail in the following sections. The PMO has the responsibility to collect the milestone reports and activity summary reports and ensure that that the milestones are marked as completed on the EC Funding & Tenders Portal on schedule accompanied with the respective documents.

3.2 Milestone Production

Milestone reports and documents summarising milestone activities will be prepared and uploaded to the EPICURE SharePoint. Both the milestone reports and summary documents will be produced using the EPICURE deliverable template (Section 2.2.3 Deliverable Formatting). Where feasible considering the milestone activity, the summary should outline and link to additional results and documentation produced in support of the milestone (e.g. workshop attendance lists, source code, links to published tools, details on submitted or approved publications).

3.2.1 Authors

For each milestone, a responsible person(s) shall be designated by the WPL relevant to the milestone. The WPL may also serve as a person responsible for the milestone, or as a milestone contributor. Contributors to the milestone shall be clearly identified at the beginning of the milestone reports and summary documents. The WPL is responsible for communicating the author assignments to the PMO.

3.2.2 Schedule

Each WPL may choose an appropriate schedule and method to produce their milestones before the official due date of the milestone, provided that the quality control procedures for milestones described in this document are met. Milestone reports and activity summary documents are to be uploaded to the EPICURE SharePoint and forwarded to the PMO at least four working days prior to the official milestone due date. The milestone will be marked as completed on the EC Funding & Tenders Portal by the PMO, accompanied where relevant by submission of the milestone reports or activity summaries.

If the author foresees that a timely production of the milestone will not be possible, it is their responsibility to alert the WPL and the PMO immediately. In the event of a major delay to a milestone submission (exceeding one month), the PMO is responsible for contacting the Granting Authority Project Officer to enable corrective actions. To ensure the timely submission of milestones, the PMO maintains a list of milestone due dates on the EPICURE Wiki. The due dates are to be considered hard deadlines and authors are encouraged to complete milestone activities in advance of the due dates where feasible.

3.3 Milestone Reviewing

Where a milestone involves producing a written report as its primary output, the report shall undergo an internal quality check involving as a minimum a subject content check completed by the partner responsible for the milestone. The WPL may also appoint another project partner to perform the review. The review should be carried out by a project member(s) who has not been appointed as an author of the milestone report.

Where desired, the WPL may establish a formal review procedure to ensure successful completion of the milestone activity, following the process described for EPICURE deliverables (Section 2.2 Deliverable Production). Where the primary output of the milestone activity is not a written report, the contents of the brief activity summary document should be internally checked for correctness by the partner responsible for the milestone.

3.4 Approving the Milestone

Once a review of the milestone has been completed and the milestone has been approved by reviewers, the PMO will formally approve the milestone, after consulting the leader of the work package to which the milestone belongs.

3.5 Submitting the Milestone to the European Commission

The PMO is responsible for officially marking the milestone as completed and submitting milestone reports or activity summaries to the Granting Authority on schedule.

3.6 Disseminating Work Conducted Under the Milestone

Guidelines for disseminating work performed in relation to a given deliverable also apply to EPICURE milestones (details in Section 2.6.2 Dissemination of Work Conducted under the Deliverable).

4. Monitoring and Reporting

This section describes the guidelines for the project reporting process, which allows monitoring the progress of the project and detecting potential problems at an early stage when they can be corrected more easily.

It is useful to distinguish between two categories of reports:

- Periodic reports to the Granting Authority (months 18, 36 and 48).
- Internal reports (months 6, 12, 24, 30, 42). The first internal report in month 6 will be followed by an informal Granting Authority review.

4.1 Periodic Reports to the Granting Authority

The EuroHPC JU requests from the consortium a periodic report in months 18, 36 and 48, as defined in the Grant Agreement. All reports must be completed within 60 days after the reporting period has ended. These reports, which contain information on the work performed and use of resources in person-months for each WP by each partner, are submitted to the Granting Authority by the PMO via the EC Funding & Tenders Portal.

The project reports are accompanied by financial statements that are electronically submitted to the Coordinator via the Funding & Tenders Portal by each beneficiary directly, with the exception of Affiliated Entities, whose Financial Statement is submitted by their beneficiary. The periodic report, once it is ready and includes all necessary parts (Part A, Part B, financial statements) is submitted to the Granting Authority via the Funding & Tenders Portal in one single submission by the Coordinator.

In addition to the above-mentioned periodic report, the first internal report in month 6 will be followed by an informal project review by JU (see 4.2 for Internal Reports).

4.2 Internal Reports

Internal reporting of the progress of the project is done at months 6, 12, 24, 30 and 42. The internal reporting process involves two types of reports:

- A technical report (prepared as a .docx file)
- A financial report (prepared as a .xlsx file)

These reports are for internal use only and are not sent to the Granting Authority, with the exception of the first internal report, as it is used for the first JU informal review. They are only intended to help the PMO, WPLs and General Assembly to monitor the progress of the project and to detect any risk or deviation from the plan at an early stage in order to take the necessary actions on time.

The PMO is responsible for providing internal reporting templates on the project SharePoint. Both the technical and financial report templates include sections to be completed by each partner

organisation for each EPICURE WP. The internal reporting schedule is summarised in Annex I of this document.

4.2.1 Internal Technical Reports

The internal technical reports shall contain summary reports of the progress of the EPICURE WPs as a whole, consisting of overviews of work performed to complete the project objectives, tasks that have been implemented, and milestones and deliverables that have been submitted to the Granting Authority.

Technical reports shall be completed no later than 30 days after the reporting period and will use the technical reporting template provided by the PMO. Each WPL is responsible for ensuring that sections in the report concerning their WP contain appropriate and correct information on the progress of the work and are completed on time. To facilitate preparation of the technical reports, typically each partner shall be asked by the leader of the WP in which it is involved to produce a short bullet point list of work performed during the reporting period (i.e. the number of sections in the technical report to be filled in by a partner will correspond to the number of WPs they are involved in). The PMO will maintain a list of technical reporting deadlines and distribute reminders to WPLs to ensure the reporting is completed on time.

4.2.2 Internal financial Reports

Internal financial reports shall be delivered to the PMO no later than 30 days after the reporting period. Each partner is responsible for ensuring that this report contains appropriate information and is delivered on time.

The financial reports shall contain the following types of information:

- PMs spent by the partner for each WP.
- Actual costs used per partner.
- A comparison of used versus budgeted PMs for each partner within each WP and in total (this is automatically created in the Excel reporting template).
- A comparison of used versus budgeted actual costs for each partner within each cost category and in total (this is automatically created in the Excel reporting template).
- A justification for any deviations in reported versus budgeted PMs.
- A justification for any major deviations in the reported versus budgeted PM rate.
- An explanation of any unforeseen costs (not in the GA budget).

The PMO is responsible for providing and maintaining the Excel spreadsheet template on which the information shall be compiled. This template will be made available on the EPICURE Eduuni-wiki.

5. Risk Identification and Management

All risks shall be clearly documented in the Risk Register. This section provides guidelines to identify and analyse new risks, besides those already documented in the Risk Register.

5.1 Identifying New Risks: Roles and Responsibilities

Roles and responsibilities in the EPICURE risk management process are summarised in Table Below

Role	Responsibilities
WPL	• Identify new WP-level risks.
Risk Owner	• Track and review assigned risks together with the PMO.
PMO	• Identify new project-level risks. • Track and review assigned risks together with the risk owners / WPLs for WP internal risks and the PMB for cross-WP risks. • Manage the risk repository (including closing).
PMB	• Define management plans for cross-WP risks.
General Assembly	• Make decisions for further actions for risks having significant impact.

All project members have access to the EPICURE Risk Register, but the management of the repository remains the responsibility of the PMO and the risk owner(s). This will ensure the validity and completeness of the information in the register. Each risk gets a corresponding reviewer (risk owner) who is usually the leader of the work package (WP) in which the risk might occur, or who is in the best position to mitigate the risk and reduce its impact through the activities of its WP.

It is the responsibility of the PMO to identify risks at project level and, when such risks might have a significant impact on the project, inform the General Assembly about it. Project-level risks may be identified directly by the PMO, following communication with WPLs, or communication between the PMO and other WP members. Should project-level risks be identified in relation to project management performance, these may be escalated by WPLs to the Project Coordinator for corrective actions.

It is the responsibility of WPLs to identify WP-level risks, that is, risks affecting a specific activity of their WP (e.g. the release of a deliverable, the completion of a specific activity or task, the under contribution of a partner to an assigned task, etc.). When a new risk is identified, the WPL shall inform the PMO, and the PMO shall inform the PMB when the risk might affect several WPs. Internal reports written by WPLs can also be used to identify new risks in a WP. Alternatively, less formal discussions can take place between a WPL and the PMO, or between a WPL and the PMB. In cases where WP-level risks concern conflicts and/or disagreements with the WPL, WP members should directly notify the PMO.

The PMB will be the main place where newly identified risks affecting several WPs are discussed, and management plans proposed. Risk analysis and mitigation measures envisaged by the PMB shall be reported to the General Assembly during the General Assembly teleconference. The General Assembly shall make decisions for further actions concerning risks which are likely to have a significant impact (medium to high) if occurring.

5.2 Assessing the Risk

The PMO, together with the relevant WPLs and risk owner(s), and in collaboration with the PMB when the risk involves several WP activities, shall assess the risk by evaluating the probability and impact of

its occurrence, and propose a management plan. This management plan shall describe how to reduce the probability of its occurrence or how to mitigate its impact by adequate actions.

Exceptional conditions or issues will be handled by the General Assembly including risk assessment and mitigation to ensure rapid resolution or corrective actions, if necessary, together with the EC.

5.3 Adding New Risks to the Risk Register

The PMO is formally responsible for maintaining the Risk Register and, therefore, adding new identified risks to the register. When adding a new risk, it should be described according to the procedures described in Section 1 and in the Risk Register introduction sheet.

6. Reviewing and Monitoring Risks

The Risk Register will be used throughout the project lifetime to aid monitoring identified risks and mitigating them. Risk mitigation activities are proactive and seek to reduce the likelihood of materialisation of risk events. If a risk event materialises, the corresponding management plans will be activated to reduce the impact of the risk.

6.1 Reviewing Existing Risks

Together with the PMO, the risk owner(s) tracks and reviews the risk periodically. The risk management is done iteratively. Every risk has a life cycle from the beginning up to its closure. In each phase of the life cycle, the status of the risk is (re-)assessed, including its probability and impact. Depending on the status of the risk, it may be necessary to implement alternative mitigation strategies, continue with existing strategies, or invoke contingency plans.

The PMO will ensure the regular review of the risks through its regular meetings. Risks will also be regularly reviewed by the PMB via meetings designated to risk reviewing every 3 months. Before each such meeting, PMB members will be asked to review the risk register and will have the possibility, together with the PMO, to bring any risk to the attention of the PMB by proposing the review of a specific risk as an agenda item. If a risk suddenly requires rapid action, the PMB will convene in an extraordinary meeting.

6.2 Closing Risks

If the risk review concludes that a risk has no relevance anymore, or if the probability of occurrence became negligible, it will be closed by the PMO via a status change in the Risk Register. The risk item remains in the Risk Register for future reference.

Annex I – Internal Reporting Schedule

Reporting Period	Due Date for Technical and Financial Reporting from Partners
01-02-2024 – 31-07-2025	31-08-2024
01-08-2024 – 31-01-2025	28-02-2025
01-08-2025 – 31-01-2026	28-02-2026
01-02-2026 – 31-07-2026	31-08-2026
01-02-2027 – 31-07-2027	31-08-2027

Annex II – Periodic Reports to the Granting Authority

Reporting Period	Due Date
01-02-2024 – 31-07-2024	31-08-2024(informal report)
01-02-2024 – 31-07-2025	30-09-2025
01-08-2025 – 31-01-2027	30-03-2027
01-02-2027 – 31-01-2028	30-03-2028