European Partnership
on Radioactive Waste Management

Deliverable 1.2: Quality Management Plan

Version 2.0

Work Package 1

Co-funded by the European Union under Grant Agreement n°101166718.

Document information

Project Acronym	**EURAD-2**
Project Title	**European Partnership on Radioactive Waste Management-2**
EC grant agreement No.	**101166718**
Work Package Title	**Programme Management Office**
Deliverable No.	**1.2**
Deliverable Title	**Quality Management Plan**
Lead Beneficiary	**Andra**
Contractual Delivery Date	**March 2025**
Actual Delivery Date	**March 2025**
Dissemination level	**PU**
Authors	**Théodon Louise (Andra), Holt Erika (VTT), López Marta (Amphos 21), Matuzas Vaidas (JRC), Ormai Peter (PURAM), Pellegrini Delphine (ASNR)**

To be cited as:

Théodon L., Holt E, López M., Matuzas, V., Ormai, P., Pellegrini, D. (2025): Quality Management Plan. Version as of 13/02/2026 of deliverable D1.2 of the European Partnership EURAD-2. EC Grant agreement n°:101177718

Disclaimer

Acknowledgement

Status of deliverable		
	By	Date
Delivered (Lead Beneficiary)	Andra	27/11/2024
Reviewed (Reviewers) Version1	Holt E., López M., Matuzas V., Ormai P., Pellegrini D.	12/02/2025
Reviewed (Reviewers) Version 2	Holt E., López M., Matuzas V., Ormai P., Pellegrini D.	13/03/2025
Verified (WP Leader)	Andra	13/03/2025
Approved	General Assembly members	26/03/2025
Submitted to EC (Coordinator)	Andra	27/03/2025
Updated	Andra	08/01/2026
Reviewed	Holt E., López M., Matuzas V., Ormai P., Pellegrini D.	27/01/2026
Approved	General Assembly members	06/03/2026

eurad 2
European Partnership
on Radioactive Waste Management

Dissemination level: PU
Date of issue of this report: **06/03/2026**

Page 3

Executive Summary

The Quality Management Plan (QMP) outlines the approach and procedures for ensuring that EURAD-2 meets established quality standards. This plan outlines the methodologies, procedures, and tools necessary to maintain consistency, accuracy, and excellence in all aspects of the partnership's activities.

The primary objective of this deliverable is to define the quality expectations and processes for monitoring and maintaining quality throughout the partnership and should serve as a reference to the Consortium for the efficient coordination and execution of the partnership, ensuring smooth collaboration among participants.

In addition, the QMP promotes transparency and accountability by outlining clear roles, responsibilities, and decision-making processes related to quality management.

This deliverable serves as a strategic and operational guide for the effective implementation of EURAD-2, promoting effective collaboration, timely execution, and the achievement of scientific, technical, and financial objectives.

Change log

- Added clarification on the inclusion of possible end-users without modifying the official definition (Chapter 3.1.9.1).
- Introduced the requirement for each EURAD-2 document to have a DOI (via Zenodo) (Chapter 5.1)
- Updated the review process (Chapter 5.3.1) and added references to specific guidance documents (Chapter 5.4).
- Included guidance on storing large files on ProjectPlace (Chapter 7.1.2).
- Added a reference to the email prioritisation guide (Chapter 7.3).
- Introduced a new chapter on GDPR (Chapter 12).
- Updated Appendix G on deliverables classification.
- Added a new appendix for External Advisory Board members (Appendix F).
- Added a new appendix describing how to upload a document to Zenodo (Appendix G).
- Editorial changes

Keywords

Quality Assurance, Standards, Process optimisation, Review, Roles and responsibilities, Key Performance Indicators, Deliverables, Reporting protocols

Table of content

List of figures

List of Tables

Glossary

AE: Affiliated Entity

AP: Associated Partner

APC: Article Processing Charge

AWP: Annual Work Programme

BCC: blind carbon copy

CO: Confidential

CSO: Civil Society Organisation

CSOff: Chief Scientific Officer

DoA: Description of Action

DT: Destructive Test

DTM: Difficult-to-Measure

EAB: External Advisory Board

EC: European Commission

EU: European Union

EJP: European Joint Programme

EUG: End-user Group

GA: General Assembly

GDF: Geological Disposal Facility

HLW: High Level Waste

ICS: Interactions with Civil Society

IP: Intellectual Property

IPR: Interim Progress Report

KM: Knowledge Management

KPI: Key Performance Indicator

LCA/LCC: Life Cycle Assessment / Life Cycle Costing

LILW: Low and Intermediate Level Waste

NDT: Non-Destructive Test

PMO: Programme Management Office

PR: Periodic Report

PU: Public

QMP: Quality Management Plan

RACI: Responsible, Accountable, Consulted and Informed RD&D: Research, Development and Demonstration

RE: Research Entity

RWM: Radioactive Waste Management

SEN: Sensitive

SF: Scaling Factor

SOTA: State of the Art

S&T: Scientific and Technical

THMC: Thermal–Hydraulic–Mechanical–Chemical

SRA: Strategic Research Agenda

TL: Task Leader

TRL: Technology Readiness Level

TSO: Technical Safety Organisation

WMO: Waste Management Organisation

WP: Work Package

WPL: Work Package Leader

1. Introduction

1.1 Objective

The Quality Management Plan defines the quality principles and procedures that the EURAD-2 participants (Beneficiaries, Affiliated Entities and Associated Partners) will have to comply with during the execution of the partnership. This will ensure that the partnership will meet the relevant requirements set by the European Commission (EC) and the quality of all deliverables produced in this context.

In particular, the plan defines a set of rules for the organisation of the day-to-day cooperative work of participants, including the procedures to be used, the reporting mechanisms, the organisation of meetings, and the preparation of documentation for submission to EC.

1.2 Overview

The management of the EURAD-2 partnership is based on the following principles:

- EURAD-2 participants are collaboratively working towards achievement of the EURAD-2 shared vision, common objectives according to agreed governing principles. This requires that work is carried out considerately and respectfully by all, fostering relationships that respect diversity, different roles and boundaries, and respect the knowledge, insight, experience and expertise of other;
- Work must be organised and planned in a result-driven way. Whilst the internal organisation of work is up to each participant (as long as it meets its commitments), the interactions between participants working at distance must be based on the delivery of results. Common planning must hence be a reference for all contributors and must always be up-to date;
- EURAD-2 participants must deliver their commitments as stated in the Grant Agreement Annex 1 (Description of Action). In case a commitment cannot be delivered, the participants are expected to provide without undue delays the explanation as well as a credible recovery plan;
- The collaboration between EURAD-2 participants is based on mutual understanding and trust, consensus and joint decision-making. The rules for such decision making need to be clearly defined;
- Effective collaboration requires central coordination and logistical support. The coordination mechanisms and communication flow inside and outside of EURAD-2 are delivered by the Programme Management Office.

The present document describes a set of guidelines aimed at implementing these principles in the context of EURAD-2 both at the partnership and work package level. In particular, compliance to the guidelines will reduce overhead costs, ease the work of the management activities for all EURAD-2 participants, and will ultimately increase efficiency and quality of the work done. It is imperative, therefore, that all EURAD-2 participants understand and use the rules, standards and suggestions as specified in these guidelines. The success and quality of EURAD-2 will depend on the effectiveness of collaboration between the participants.

2. Contractual framework

2.1 Grant Agreement and its Amendments

The Grant Agreement is signed between the EC and EURAD-2 Beneficiaries. It defines the rights and obligations that govern the grant. It consists of a core text and appendices.

This document was signed by the EC and the Coordinator. Each Beneficiary signed an Accession Form. In addition, each Affiliated Entity signed a Declaration of Honour. The Grant Agreement entry into force is July 09, 2024. Start of the action is 1st October 2024 for a duration of 60 months.

Any Amendment to the Grant Agreement will be presented for approval by the General Assembly.

The Grant Agreement and its potential Amendments can be found on the EC Participant portal. They will also be uploaded to the EURAD-2 general workspace on ProjectPlace.

2.2   Consortium Agreement

The Consortium Agreement is the internal agreement between EURAD-2 Beneficiaries establishing their rights and obligations with respect to the implementation of the action in compliance with the Grant Agreement. It is signed by each Beneficiary. The Affiliated Entities and Associated Partners sign a Declaration of Honour (Appendix of the Consortium Agreement) to ensure that they are complying with the different obligations and conditions of the Consortium Agreement.

2.3   Applicable EU legislation

Horizon Europe Framework Programme Regulation (EU) 2021/695 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 April 2021 establishing Horizon Europe – the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation

Euratom Research and Training Programme 2023-2025 European Commission Decision C(2024) 3263 of 24 May 2024

Rules for Participation Regulation (EU) No 1290/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 of December 2013

Financial Regulation 2018/1049 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 July 2018 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union

3.   Governance

The governance of the partnership is described in the Consortium Agreement, which provides a description of the role and composition of the governing bodies as agreed upon by all Beneficiary. Additional information regarding the governance is provided below.

3.1   Governance bodies

3.1.1   Colleges

With respect to quality control, the Colleges have members in various work packages who are responsible for production of documents and associated quality control. For the overall Partnership, the Colleges have the possibility to also write position papers to express their views on issues that may include quality control. Such position papers may serve to open up a new discussion, to clarify a certain point-of-view, or to instigate a well-defined action. For a position paper to be effective, it is recommended that the paper clearly mentions its aim in the introductory section. A position paper should be directed to both the Bureau and PMO and stored on ProjectPlace in the appropriate folder on EURAD-2 General workspace (EURAD Colleges Position Papers). During its next Bureau meeting, the Bureau members will discuss the position paper and decide whether:

- they can reply directly to the concerned College;
- a more thorough discussion is needed within the Bureau and/or PMO. If the question should be addressed to the GA. The Bureau then distributes the paper further to its respective Colleges and informs the Colleges and PMO of the outcome of its discussion.

3.1.2   General Assembly

The responsibility of the GA in terms of quality management includes approving the overall Quality Management Plan (D1.2) and evaluate the partnership progress against the KPIs, based on information provided by the Programme Management Office (PMO). To enhance EURAD-2's management and

performance, the PMO will systematically gather feedback after each GA. Additionally, the GA must ensure, based on the information provided by the PMO that main quality risks are addressed efficiently and that corrective actions are implemented.

Efforts by GA members cannot be reported as an expense to the European Commission. However, travel costs incurred for attending in-person General Assemblies can be reported within the respective period under their organisation's budget.

The list of GA members is provided in Appendix A. If changes of GA members occur, they are reported at every GA. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made..

3.1.3   Bureau

The Bureau ensures that quality management expectations are met at a strategic level. It must ensure that the Colleges' view is duly represented and respected, that technical activities are in line with the Strategic Research Agenda and supports the PMO in implementing the quality management procedures described in this deliverable.

The Bureau will consistently have a designated slot at each General Assembly to provide an update on their perspectives regarding the partnership's progress.

Each Bureau member organisation is allocated a budget for the first two years of the partnership to support activities carried out by the Bureau, including activities of quality management, ensuring the efficiency and high added value of the work. Funding for the additional years of the partnership will be documented upon additional EC funding (anticipated 2026). In addition, each organisation receives funding to cover travel costs for participation in General Assemblies and Bureau/PMO meetings. This budget allocation is subject to adjustment should a member step down from his/her role.

The list of Bureau members is provided in Appendix B. If changes of Bureau members occur, they are reported at every GA. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made.

3.1.4   Programme Management Office

The PMO is responsible for developing and maintaining all quality management procedures, tracking performance metrics, ensuring that all deliverables meet predefined quality criteria and that the quality of the scientific/technical reporting from each WP is adequate and that uniform standards are applied. It must provide guidance to WPL on best practices ensuring a continuous improvement across all WPs.

Each PMO member organisation[1] is allocated a budget to cover their effort for the first two years of the partnership, including activities of quality management, ensuring the efficiency and high added value of the work. Funding for the additional years of the partnership will be documented upon additional EC funding (anticipated 2026). In addition, each organisation receives funding to cover travel costs for participation in General Assemblies and Bureau/PMO meetings. This budget allocation is subject to adjustment should a member step down from his/her role.

The list of PMO members is provided in Appendix C. If changes of PMO members occur, they are reported at every GA. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made..

3.1.5   Chief Scientific Officers

The Chief Scientific Officers (CSOffs) will evaluate the progress reports, ensuring that they are of the required quality. They will assess that critical deliveries are in line with the planned work. They will review the foreseen scientific quality assessment measures and make recommendations for enhancement,

---

[1] Excluding JRC

ensuring that the findings are credible, On the request of WPL or PMO, they may organise internal reviews to do so.

Depending on their status, the Chief Scientific Officers will either have a subcontract with the Coordinator or if their employer (organisation) is part of the Consortium, they can be allocated some budget via the organisation to support the planned activities. They will generate short written reports after each GA. The reports are addressed to the Coordinator who will share them with the GA, Bureau and PMO. Where appropriate, reports can be uploaded on ProjectPlace / EURAD-2 website.

Responses to CSOffs comments and feedback will be duly reported and stored to ensure transparency and accountability. The specific mechanisms for documenting and tracking responses will be determined as the project progresses, ensuring alignment with project requirements and best practices.

The list of Chief Scientific Officers is provided in Appendix D. If changes occur, they are reported at every GA. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made..

3.1.6   Coordinator

The Coordinator is the intermediary between EURAD-2 participants and the EC.

In terms of quality management, it must ensure that all documentation follows European Commission guidelines. The Coordinator monitors compliance by all participating organisations with their obligations under Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement.

The Coordinator collects, reviews and submits information collected by the PMO on the progress of the actions and reports and other deliverables (including financial statements and related certification).

3.1.7   Work Package Leaders and Task Leaders

The Work Package (WP) Leaders and Task Leaders form what is called the WP Board. The WP Board ensures that the WP is progressing according to the agreed specifications, milestones and planning as described in the WP description and Annual Work programme.

The WPL ensures that the first quality control of each deliverable / milestone is done within the WP by implementing quality control measures such as peer reviews and validation checks. The WP Board is also responsible for reporting the work progress, any WP deliverables and eventual modifications of the WP work programme to the Programme Management Office.

WP Leaders assure maintaining scientific excellence in all steps and contribute to dissemination of WP activities and results, in closed link with the Bureau and the PMO.

They report WP progress, including technical achievements, schedule and budget adherence, status of deliverables and milestones, risks and any 'slight modifications' to the PMO, notably: advancement/postponement of a delivery date, transfers of task/budget from one partner to another or from one category of cost to another.

In the case of any 'major deviation' of the WP compared to the initial Work programme (e.g. one of the tasks cannot be delivered), the PMO will immediately inform the Bureau to start working on a remediation together with WP Board, to be approved by the GA if changes to the Grant Agreement are needed.

3.1.7.1   Appointment of WP Leaders

The WP Leaders are appointed according to their competences, technical expertise and leadership experience. The leadership of a WP is assigned to an individual rather than to the organisation. Any change in WP leadership must be previously reviewed by the Programme Management Office based on a list of criteria (Factsheet n°4 – WP Leaders criteria). The names of the WP Leaders are given in Appendix E. If changes of WP Leaders occur, they are reported at every GA. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made..

3.1.7.2 Meetings

WP Leaders are invited to attend monthly meetings organised by the Coordinator to provide general information about the partnership and are expected to attend General Assemblies and annual events.

3.1.7.3 Effort

Each WP Leader organisation is allocated a budget in Task 1 of the corresponding WP. In addition, a baseline portion of the R&D WPL's effort for managing the WP is financed in WP1 PMO to be able to finance this at 100%.

3.1.8 External Advisory Board

The External Advisory Board (EAB) has no role in quality management of internal documentation as their role is to provide information on external issues that could have an interaction with EURAD-2.

The EAB members are subcontractors to the Coordinator. They will generate a brief annual written report. which will be submitted to the Coordinator. The Coordinator will then share the reports with the GA, Bureau and PMO. Where appropriate, reports can be uploaded on ProjectPlace / EURAD-2 website. When necessary, responses to EAB comments will be duly reported and stored to ensure transparency and accountability. The specific mechanisms for documenting and tracking responses will be determined as the project progresses, ensuring alignment with project requirements and best practices. The list in Appendix is updated to reflect any changes when new version of the Quality Management Plan is made

3.1.9 User Groups

EURAD-2 has two different types of user groups: end-users and stakeholders.

3.1.9.1 End-user group

End-users (EUG) are defined to be waste owners, waste generators, waste management organisations and regulators, others than those (institutes or persons) participants in a specific work package. In addition to this official definition, representatives of ministries may join the EUG, as well as Technical Safety Organisations (TSOs).TSOs may participate in the EUG provided they have a mandate from their regulator to represent it within the group, specifically for work packages in which the regulator itself is not a member of the EUG.

They are expected to provide feedback to the programme via attendance to workshops, review of draft documents. They have access to work package insights and have opportunities to guide the programme direction without any voting power, approval rights or budget allocation. After Programme Management Office approval, any organisation willing to join this focused group will be required to sign a non-disclosure agreement. This document will be shared by the Coordinator.

The EUG shall be open to EU-members and non-EU members, in line with the strategy for EU international cooperation in research and innovation (COM(2012)497).

There is no financial contribution from EURAD-2 to participants in the EUG. This means that the travel costs, including meeting and workshop participation fees are not covered by EURAD-2. There is no financial contribution from EURAD-2 to the staff costs of the EUG. If EUG is having any role in quality control of documents, like reviews of deliverables, this is done on a voluntary basis with the comments checked by the WP Leader.

In ProjectPlace, a dedicated folder called "Public Document', where documents can be uploaded to be shared with external stakeholders who do not have an account on ProjectPlace. These public documents can be accessed with or without a password, upon receiving a link to the specific file. This

folder can be used as a restricted location where EUG can access only files the WP or EURAD-2 want to share with them.

3.1.9.2 Stakeholders

Stakeholders are a wider group of interested parties and users of the programme outcomes who are not required to sign any EURAD-2 related document. They are invited to public events to follow the progress of the programme and are the main target audience for dissemination activities at the programme level and at the WP level.

There is no financial contribution from EURAD-2 to stakeholders. This means that the travel costs, including meeting and workshop participation fees are not covered by EURAD-2. There is no financial contribution from EURAD-2 to the staff costs of the stakeholders.

3.2 Main interactions

The main interactions of the participants are described below. Other interaction between bodies may occur.

Interactions regarding WP matters should primarily take place at the WP level (WP Leader and Task Leaders). If any issues arise, individuals should contact the Coordinator. Under no circumstances should individuals contact the organisational structure or the EC Policy Officer directly. It is the sole responsibility of the Coordinator to escalate such issues, if necessary.

3.2.1 Interactions between GA, Bureau and PMO

Outside the GA meetings, information or requests can also be exchanged between the bodies as follows:

- From a GA member representing the beneficiary institute directly to the Coordinator (secretariat) who will then inform the PMO (e.g. for administrative matters).
- From a GA member to the Bureau, via its Bureau representatives.
- From a College to the Bureau, via the Bureau representatives of the College.
- From one College to the others

3.2.2 Interactions between Bureau and PMO

Bureau/PMO meetings are facilitated by the PMO. Both PMO and Bureau shall prepare the items they are responsible for (to be agreed in advance while preparing the agenda items for these Bureau/PMO meetings). Materials for these meetings, when possible, are to be sent one week in advance and each participant must become familiar with the materials before the meeting in order to be as efficient as possible during the actual meeting time. After each Bureau/PMO meeting, a summary of discussions/actions is prepared by the PMO, reviewed by the Bureau, finalised and uploaded on ProjectPlace. These minutes are accessible for all EURAD-2 organisations in the main EURAD-2 general workspace on ProjectPlace.

In addition to the Bureau/PMO meetings, regular contacts by email/phone are established between the PMO (Coordinator) and the Bureau Chairperson. This role consists in taking good note of the possible requests from the PMO and putting those requests on the agenda of the next Bureau meeting or starting an immediate discussion (if urgent). The Bureau Chairperson(s) may also be invited to specific points of the agenda of the regular PMO meetings.

3.2.3 Interactions between Bureau and Colleges

The Bureau is the main body through which discussions among the different Colleges are mediated, before approval within the GA. The Bureau members interact with their respective College members:

- On request of WP leaders when the entire College needs to be addressed (e.g., when sending out questionnaires). The Bureau may, in this case, also decide to allow WP leaders to interact directly with the Colleges;
- On request of the PMO when strategic decisions need to be approved, such as, update of the strategic research agenda, etc.;
- On request of another College, e.g., upon distribution of a position paper;
- In order to prepare decisions to be taken at the GA, which were prepared within the Bureau and/or with the PMO;
- Following the internal rules of each College.

Besides this, Bureau members are also acting as representatives of their College, and thus College members may address their Bureau members in order to discuss individual proposals, concerns or questions either within their own College, or with the other Colleges through the Bureau.

3.3   Decision-making processes

Three types of decisions are identified in the partnership's processes. The table below presents the responsibility assignment matrix (RACI). RACI stands for Responsible, Accountable, Consulted and Informed. Each role is assigned to decisions to ensure clarity and efficiency. The matrix provides a comprehensive view of who is directly responsible for completing a task (R: Responsible), who has ultimate accountability for decisions (A: Accountable), who should be consulted for input (C: Consulted), and who needs to be kept informed of progress or outcomes (I: Informed).

In general, any decision linked to management aspects will be led by the PMO, with the Coordinator being responsible for the action. The strategic decisions will be led by the Bureau and any decision linked to WP management aspects will be initiated by the WP Leaders.

		WPL	PMO	Bureau	CSOFFs	GA	Coordinator
Management	Amendment (includ. addition of a new Beneficiary / Affiliated Entity)		I	C	I	A	R
	Settlement of payments					A	R
	Periodic reports	R	C	I	I	A	R
	Annual Work Programmes	R	C	I	I	A	R
	Budget revision	C	C	C		A	R
	Dissemination Plan	C	C	C		A	R
Strategic	Update of founding documents		I	R	C	A	I
	Procedures to define new waves of WPs		C	R	C	A	C
WP Management	Modification in a WP - not requesting an Amendment	A	I	C	I	I	R
	Major change in a WP - to be added in an Amendment	R	C	C	C	A	R
	Deliverable	A	C		I	I	R

Table 1 Responsibility assignment matrix

4. Scientific and technical content

The Partnership should remain flexible to include new activities in order to be as needs-driven as possible, and to allow later inclusion of new organisations that would be mandated during the course of an implementation phase. This flexibility is ensured by allocating about 80% of the available budget to

WPs starting at Month 1 (first wave). The remaining 20% of the budget shall be allocated to existing or new WPs that will be approved by the GA during the course of EURAD-2 (anticipated as the second wave). Additional funding from the European Commission is also anticipated and will be allocated to existing or new WPs. This additional funding is anticipated to be allocated as part of a second wave process (2026) defined by the Bureau and work approved by the General Assembly.

5. Deliverables and milestones

5.1 Coding

Each document circulating within EURAD-2 shall be filed with a unique code, regardless of the filenames and referencing conventions that each partner is free to use in local archives. EURAD-2 Data Management Plan (D1.3) details the file naming convention and additional guidance on issues for accuracy in tracking and storage of data.

In addition to this, each deliverable, milestone and Roadmap documents (Theme Overviews, State-of-Knowledge, Domain Insights) are required to have a Digital Object Identifier (DOI) to allow permanent and reliable linking and accurate indexing and citation. The DOI must be added on the front page of the document. This applies also for restricted / sensitive classified deliverables.

The creation of the DOI should be made via Zenodo (see Appendix G) and is the responsibility of the authors of the document.

5.2 Authorship and disclaimer

All EURAD-2 deliverables should be marked with the authorship clearly attributed to the contributing individuals and organisations. Reference to reviewers names and organisation should also be made to indicate quality control management procedures are followed. The reviewed deliverable must be archived on ProjectPlace.

All documents should include the approved EURAD-2 disclaimer:

"All information in this document is provided "as is" and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user, therefore, uses the information at its sole risk and liability. For the avoidance of all doubts, the European Commission or the individual Colleges of EURAD-2 (and their participating members) has no liability in respect of this document, which is merely representing the authors' view."

5.3 Classification and review process

5.3.1 Deliverables

The Bureau and PMO have established a standardised classification system for all EURAD-2 deliverables to ensure consistent quality assurance and appropriate levels of review. The classification defines three review levels:

- Low: review by the WP Leader and PMO representative
- Medium: includes the Low-level review + additional review by an individual who was not involved in drafting the deliverable but may belong to the WP
- High: includes the Low-level review + an external review conducted by someone not affiliated with the WP.

This classification is uniformly applied across all WPs, based on the type of deliverables, as follows:

- Initial State of the Art report (SotA): Low
- Final SotA: High

- Outcomes to Member States and end-users: High
- White/green papers: Medium
- Annual work programmes and periodic reports: Low
- All others (excluding PMO and KM WPs): Low

The detailed classification of each deliverable is provided in Appendix F.

For SotAs, green and white papers, an additional review by a Knowledge Management WP representative and by Chief Scientific Officers will be conducted (see details in the process below).

Each WP Leader is responsible for planning the review process for deliverables within their scope. For deliverables classified as High, WPLs should prioritise early engagement with reviewers to avoid delays.

While most reviews are expected to be conducted by organisations participating in EURAD-2, exceptions may occur for deliverables requiring external expertise. It is important to note that external reviewers are not compensated through the EURAD-2 budget, regardless of their affiliation.

The procedure of quality control review of documents should not last more than 2 months in total for Low and Medium deliverables and 3 months in total for deliverables classified as High. The sequence for the quality control process of deliverables is noted in the following steps:

Step 1: Initial Validation within the WP

Responsibility: WP Leaders and Task Leaders

Actions:

- Confirm that the deliverable meets its objectives and adheres to EURAD-2 standards.
- Ensure a scientific / technical quality control check of the deliverable
- Review deliverable content for adherence to EURAD-2 standards.
- Address any immediate gaps in content and structure.
- Storage of document on ProjectPlace and ensure access to reviewers (KM Leadership or external reviewers) when needed

Outcome: Deliverable is deemed ready for formal review as per its classification level.

Step 2: Assign Reviewers

Responsibility: WPLs.

Actions:

- Identify reviewers for Medium and High classified deliverables
- Engage reviewers early for High-classification deliverables to mitigate scheduling risks.
- For specialised deliverables requiring external expertise, secure external reviewers from outside EURAD-2 organisations if necessary.

Outcome: Reviewers are confirmed and timelines are agreed upon.

Step 2 bis (only for SotAs, green and white papers)

Responsibility: KM representative and in some cases Chief Scientific Officers

Actions:

- Review deliverable: check that the structure, content and format is consistent with expectations. For white papers, this refers to the guidelines described in the white paper factsheet [2] provided by WP2 Knowledge Management leadership.
- For white papers only, consider the scientific position being presented, needs of the international nuclear community and check the clarity of the messaging and that the recommendations are robustly underpinned.

---

[2] https://andra-fr.projectplace.com/#direct/document/746981189

Outcome: Deliverable is deemed ready for external review or in case an external review is not foreseen, approval becomes the PMO's responsibility.

Step 3: Conduct Review

Responsibility: Assigned external reviewers.

Actions:

-   Review deliverable content for accuracy, clarity, alignment with objectives, and adherence to EURAD-2 standards.
-   Provide written feedback detailing: strengths of the deliverable, specific areas for improvement, clear recommendations for modifications, if any.
-   Ensure feedback aligns with the deliverable's scope and intended audience.

Outcome: A consolidated set of comments and recommendations is shared with the WP Leader

Step 4: Address Reviewer Feedback

Responsibility: Deliverable authors (WPLs and Task Leaders (TLs)).

Actions:

-   Review all feedback received from assigned reviewers.
-   Revise the deliverable to incorporate recommendations, ensuring all concerns are addressed and the traceability of modifications.
-   Engage reviewers for clarification if necessary.

Outcome: Deliverable is updated and prepared for final approval.

Step 5: Final Review and Approval

Responsibility: PMO representative.

Actions:

-   Conduct a final review to confirm that all feedback has been adequately addressed. If not, the PMO representative must contact the WP Leader, who should make the necessary corrections until the version is deemed satisfactory.
-   Validate the deliverable for compliance with EURAD-2 objectives and standards.

Outcome: Deliverable is approved and ready for submission or dissemination.

Step 6: Submission to Coordinator

Responsibility: WP Leader and authors of the document

Actions:

-   Inform Coordinator that the deliverable is ready for submission
-   Include a DOI number

Outcome: Deliverable is available in PDF version with its DOI number

Step 7: Submission to European Commision and Dissemination

Responsibility: Coordinator

Actions:

-   Submit the final approved deliverable to the European Commission
-   Disseminate public deliverables within web page and store all deliverables on ProjectPlace

Outcome: Deliverable is successfully submitted

5.3.2 Milestones

Validation of milestones is normally done at the WP level. If a milestone is in a form of a document and serves as a base for exchange with another WP, a validation by the other WP leaders concerned shall be pursued as well to allow that expectations from both sides are properly accounted for. For milestones documents addressing the entire EURAD-2 community, the PMO/Bureau, if necessary, can ask the WP leader to send the milestones documents for feedback. This is notably applicable for surveys, external to the WP, where a review is needed to ensure coherence. No formal validation should intervene at the PMO/Bureau level for milestones.

Milestones can serve as an intermediate document or memo to show work is progressing towards a deliverable, for instance showing the background information or boundary conditions established before the work moves forward. The WP Board together with the authors can decide if a milestone report is made public and shared for instance on the EURAD-2 web page.

5.4 Specific guidances

A Factsheet on the production of white papers is available[3]. It must be followed by each WP producing a white paper.

A Guidance on the content of the deliverables "Outcomes to Member States" is available[4]. It must be followed by each EURAD-2 WP.

6. Scientific Publications

Unless it goes against their legitimate interests, each EURAD-2 participant must as soon as possible disseminate its results by disclosing them by appropriate means (other than those resulting from protecting or exploiting the results), including ensuring open access to peer-reviewed scientific publications relating to results. Dissemination should not override any Intellectual property (IP) protection.

The European Commission promotes the overall concept of Open Research by supporting open access in its framework programmes, aiming to improve science and innovation in the public and private sectors. By making project results and data accessible to all societal actors, other researchers, innovators and the public, they can find and re-use these for their own specific needs. In this way further research is encouraged, novel solutions can be found, and complex challenges can be tackled.

7. Internal communication tools and procedures

7.1 ProjectPlace

EURAD-2 uses ProjectPlace® as a smart collaborative project management tool ISO-27001 certified that brings teams together to improve day-to-day collaboration, communication and storing/sharing of documents (contractual documents, working documents, drafts, templates, meetings material and minutes, deliverables, milestones, list of contacts, etc).

This section describes the workspace areas that are active for EURAD-2.

A complete and detailed **manual of use for ProjectPlace** is provided and available at the following link: https://service.projectplace.com/pp/pp.cgi/r1158572523.

---

[3] https://andra-fr.projectplace.com/#direct/document/746981189
[4] https://andra-fr.projectplace.com/#direct/document/807225702

European Partnership
on Radioactive Waste Management

A training session about most common features of ProjectPlace, is available on EURAD-2 website: https://www.ejp-eurad.eu/news/training-projectplace

The Capacity storage is 525.00GB and the number of individual person (email) licenses is 1050, as of 2024.

The access rights to ProjectPlace are requested via the WP Leader to the secretariat. An annual review of the access is planned to ensure alignment with current needs.

7.1.1   EURAD-2 General workspace

The EURAD-2 general workspace area is dedicated to the partnership, where EURAD-2 participants (Beneficiaries, Affiliated Entities, Associated Partners) have access and can find:

- Contractual documents;
- Contact list;
- GA information (agenda, materials, presentations, key actions…);
- Information about dissemination events;
- Published deliverables;
- Factsheets;
- Position Papers;
- Templates;
- Etc…

The access to this workspace is limited to 3 main contacts per organisations (Beneficiary, Affiliated Entities and Associated Partners) involved in EURAD-2, GA members, PMO members, Bureau members, WP and Co-WP leaders.

The Associated Partners are granted access to ProjectPlace based on their role within the Partnership:

- The organisations leading a WP or a specific task have full access to the EURAD-2 General workspace.

- The organisations without a leadership role have restricted access to the EURAD-2 General workspace. They do not have access to financial information (including reporting) and contact list.

7.1.2   WPs workspaces

Each WP has its dedicated workspace area to share documents, information and to facilitate WP internal communication.

The access to the WPs workspaces shall be granted to WP and Co-WP Leader and WP contributors. As the number of licenses is limited (1050 licenses) for the overall activities, it is recommended to provide access to ProjectPlace WP areas to active contributors to EURAD-2 and/or WPs. A punctual contributor shall not have access to ProjectPlace and should receive documents/materials from his/her colleagues.

For the proper execution and coordination of the WPs, the following folders and content are mandatory:

- Background documents: full description of WPs
- Meetings: slides and minutes for each meeting
- Deliverables
- Milestones
- Publications: organised by year

The WP leader has the necessary administrator rights to manage/change access rights to the folders but should always notify the secretariat of additions / changes in order to track the number of available licences.

Meetings recordings can be stored temporarily on ProjectPlace but must be deleted once the minutes of the meetings are finalised and issued.

7.1.3   WPLeader workspace

This area is dedicated to the working interactions between the WP leaders and the PMO.

The access to this workspace is restricted to WP and Co-WP Leaders and PMO members.

7.1.4   Bureau-PMO workspace

This area is dedicated to the working interactions between the Bureau and the PMO.

The access to this workspace is restricted to Bureau and PMO members.

7.1.5   PMO workspace

This area is dedicated to the working interactions of the Programme Management Office.

The access is restricted to PMO members.

7.2   Meetings / workshops / events

In a multi-organisational collaborative partnership such as EURAD-2, procedures are defined to facilitate operations and management of the programme. Their objectives are not to create management tasks with a heavy structure but to give to each participant simple tools to allow activities to be managed properly. This section describes the procedures concerning the meetings: different types of meeting, responsibilities of participants, agenda and minutes.

In order to rationalise travels and time, it is recommended to organise meetings combined with other meetings within EURAD-2 and outside EURAD-2 (e.g. EURADWASTE conference, IGD-TP Exchange Forum, etc.)

The "meetings" tab on EURAD-2 general workspace (ProjectPlace) shows all events of interest to the EURAD-2 community. This general vision should also allow participants to plan EURAD-2 meetings avoiding any overlaps.

7.2.1   Responsibilities for meetings participants

Each participant to a meeting is expected to contribute to the meeting preparation by providing if required:

- Her/his contributions to the agenda;
- Preparation of presentations;
- Working documents: normally the main subjects discussed during a meeting are documented by papers or presentations. As far as possible, these materials should be distributed in advance to allow enough time for participants to familiarise with them prior to the meeting.
- Feedback on the minutes;
- Execution of actions and respect of decisions.

The hosting organisation should give information related to start and end times and, where appropriate, requirements for hotels. The hosting organisation is responsible for the coffee breaks and lunches. Depending on the meetings, the PMO/Bureau/WP leaders will have the special responsibility of contributing to the definition of meeting objectives, the preparation of decisions, of the agenda, and minutes.

7.2.2   Costs for organising a meeting

Costs for organising the GA meetings and annual events are secured in the PMO WP budget and are reimbursed at 100% by the EC contribution. Costs for organising a WP meeting are reimbursed at the

WP funding rate. To reduce expenses, it is recommended to organise meetings in EURAD-2 participant's premises with available room capacity whenever possible.

In case budget was not sufficiently foreseen for organising meetings, some budget transfer from one category of cost to another or from one partner's budget to another is possible.

After the financial reports, the PMO will closely look at the expenses for travels and meetings and may propose budget revision in case budget planned for travel and meetings seems inappropriate. If in doubt, the WP leader should always consult with the secretariat to get pre-approval of meeting travels that will be potentially claimed as costs from the WP participants.

7.2.3 Hybridisation of meetings

Each meeting should specify the level of hybridisation it will offer. Note that different sessions within a single meeting can have varying levels of hybridisation. The levels are defined as follows:

- 0 star: No online participation. For example, technical visits are entirely in-person.
- 1 star: Online participants can only listen to the session. They may not hear audience questions or be allowed to raise questions/comments.
- 2 stars: Online participants can listen to the session and participate through the chat.
- 3 stars: Online participants can listen to the session and ask questions verbally.

7.2.4 Agenda

Prior to each meeting, an agenda should be distributed in advance to the participants and uploaded on ProjectPlace. The agenda will inform participants about the items that will be discussed/approved upon (and information about background documents ('Materials') to be reviewed prior to the meeting). Participants will be given the possibility to suggest changes to the agenda. Whenever changes to the agenda are proposed, their eligibility needs to be considered by the partner organising the meeting, and an updated version of the agenda may be re-circulated. Coordination work benefits from a well-structured agenda.

The basic agenda structure to be used covers the following points:

- Type of meeting;
- Level of hybridisation;
- List of planned decisions/approvals to be made;
- List of background documents ('Materials');
- List of participants;
- Place;
- Opening and welcome;
- Objectives of the meeting and agreement about the agenda;
- Remarks on previous minutes and ongoing actions (if appropriate);
- Meeting specific subjects (Explanation of subject, issues to be decided upon, actions to be taken etc.);
- Summary, action points, and closing.

7.2.5 Minutes

Draft minutes must be circulated, and will be subject to approval by all participants, according to the deadlines and rules defined on a case-by-case basis. The minutes shall reflect major items for discussions/actions.

Minutes should contain the following information:

- Meeting date;
- Location;
- Participants;
- Objectives of the meeting;

- Actual agenda;
- List of documents distributed during the meeting (if appropriate);
- and for each point addressed as part of the agenda:
  - o summary of discussion (if relevant);
  - o decisions;
  - o open issues;
  - o actions;
  - o supporting information (if relevant).
  - o summary of the action list (including tasks, responsible person, deadline).

Once finalised the minutes are shared with the participants and uploaded on ProjectPlace. A meeting minutes template is available on ProjectPlace.

7.3   Correspondence by email

When communicating via email, ensure that information is addressed only to the relevant parties involved. If necessary, the secretariat will forward questions to the PMO, Bureau, or other appropriate parties.

When sending emails to a large group of recipients, add their addresses in the BCC (blind carbon copy) field to protect their contact details from potential misuse, prevent potential spam and to comply with GDPR regulations. Additionally, if further clarification or questions arise, these should be sent directly to the secretariat instead of replying to all recipients. The secretariat will reinstate the appropriate recipients in the response if required.

A guide for the prioritisation of emails is available[5] and defines a standardised email prioritisation system, subject line structure and notice to improve clarity, response times and information management. This approach is piloted by the Programme Management Office for the first half of 2026 and, if effective will be extended to the full Consortium in autumn 2026.

8. Reporting and Annual Work Programmes

The reporting procedures described below will help to ensure the achievement of the scientific and technical objectives of the WPs and of the overall program, as well as compliance with costs and schedule.

The annual clock is presented below.

8.1   Reporting procedures

An annual Periodic Report (PR) must be submitted to the EC to cover the previous 12-month period. The PR must be submitted to the EC 60 days after the end of the period, i.e. end of November each year.

This report consists of two main components: a Technical Report and a Financial Report.

---

[5] https://andra-fr.projectplace.com/external/project_report/0/11ab935942ac499cbe5b5ec83028b92d

The Technical Report provides detailed information on the work performed during the reporting period. It includes an explanation of the tasks carried out under each WP and an overview of progress made toward achieving the objectives. This includes a summary of milestones reached, deliverables completed, and any deviations from the planned activities, with justifications for these differences. Additionally, the report addresses the dissemination and use of project results, as well as any communication activities undertaken during the period.

The Financial Report comprises an individual financial statement submitted by each Beneficiary and their Affiliated Entities for the reporting period. This section also includes a detailed explanation of how resources were utilised to support the project activities. Together, these components ensure transparency and accountability in meeting the project's objectives and managing its resources.

Specific templates, guidelines and instructions prepared by the PMO will be sent to EURAD-2 participants at least one month before the period ends. It will also be made available on ProjectPlace under the folder "Reporting".

In order to improve the process, feedback with areas for improvements will be shared after each reporting period with all EURAD-2 participants.

In addition to the annual Periodic Report, an Interim Progress Report (IPR) will be prepared during the first and final years of the partnership. These reports will cover the work completed over each six-month period within those years. The purpose of the IPR is to enable close monitoring of activities during these critical years, helping to identify and address any potential risks of deviations from the planned objectives early on. The content of each IPR will be directly incorporated into the corresponding Periodic Report, ensuring consistency and continuity in reporting.

- **Early-Sept.**   Coordinator provides template to WPL

- **Early Oct.**   WPL send the document to PMO representative for review

- **End Oct.**   End of iteration

- **Early Nov.**   Coordinator compiles the AWP

- **Mid-Nov**.   Coordinator send the final draft of the AWP to the General Assembly for approval

- **November**   Coordinator submits the Periodic Report to the EC

Figure 1 Indicative timeline for PR

8.2   Annual Work Programmes

As stipulated in the Grant Agreement, there is an obligation to submit an Annual Work Programmes (AWP) each year.

The AWP provides a detailed description of activities for the twelve-month periods, as the action develops in line with the objectives and description of work agreed under Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement. The AWP contains the details of the implementation of the action regarding the integration under the overall programme, set of activities, annual deliverables, specific resources and costs of the beneficiaries – organised in a table format – as well as a detailed narrative description of the work.

The programmed activities are those planned to be carried out in full or simply initiated during the relevant twelve-month reporting period.

<div style="border:1px solid #000; background:#bcd3e8; padding:1em;">

- **Early April**   Coordinator provides template to WPL

- **Early May**   WPL send the document to PMO representative for review

- **End May**   End of iteration

- **Early June**   Coordinator compiles the AWP

- **Mid-June**   Coordinator send the final draft of the AWP to the General Assembly for approval

- **End-June**   Coordinator submits the AWP to the EC

</div>

Figure 2 Indicative timeline for AWP

9. Templates

To ensure consistent branding, proper disclaimers, visibility of EU funding, and a unified image of the partnership, templates are made available to the entire Consortium via ProjectPlace. The following templates must be used:

- Deliverable
- Milestone
- Minutes of meeting
- PowerPoint
- Poster
- Word
- Background image for video meetings

To facilitate the preparation of events, a presenter sheet is also available.

For the preparation of IPR, PR and AWP, the PMO acts as facilitator. PMO prepares templates to collect the necessary inputs from each WP. These templates are made available to each WP Leader. Clear instructions as well as timeline are sent to WP leaders. The PMO shall also prepare specific templates to collect inputs for the Periodic Report:

- Template for the technical report from each WP (similar to the template for collecting inputs for IPR);
- Templates for the financial report to be completed by each Beneficiary/Affiliated Entity (Use of Resources table).

Templates for dissemination are addressed in the EURAD-2 Dissemination Strategy.

10. Evaluation of EURAD-2 outputs

The partnership's impacts are guided by the six drivers, as established in EURAD(-1) 2023 SRA, which are to: implement safe long-term waste management solutions, develop tailored solutions, gain scientific insight, support innovation for optimization, enhance societal engagement and build a strong and robust knowledge management. Each of these is further explained in the table below.

Driver Shorthand	Driver Explanation
Implementation Safety	Contributing to the safe construction, operation and closure of deep geological repositories (and other disposal facilities), ensuring long-term safety.
Tailored Solutions	Supporting the development of tailored solutions for the management of various radioactive waste types in Europe: • Working together on scientific, technical, managerial, societal and regulatory issues of common interest and considering the full range of potential disposal solutions and waste groups accounting for IAEA's graded approach and taking economic aspects into consideration. • Increasing robustness of approaches by addressing cross-correlations, path dependencies and potential pitfalls in the RWM strategy.
Scientific Insight	Advancing state of the art science in waste management and disposal throughout the waste management chain: • Exploratory research in areas with significant uncertainty or in areas with high potential to improve knowledge.
Innovation for Optimisation	Supporting RWM innovation for optimisation: • Continuously managing uncertainty, improving robustness, reducing complexity, costs and other resources and optimising RWM routes and advancing technology and solutions to meet the needs of Member States.
Societal Engagement	Helping to engage with and maintain mutual trust with stakeholders, and awareness in RWM: • Fostering transparency and fruitful interactions with Civil Society along the different phases of a RWM programme.
Knowledge Management	Enhancing knowledge management and transfer between organisations, Member States and generations: • Capturing, maintaining, and efficiently developing skills, knowledge and infrastructure, in view of the long lead-times and the intergenerational dimension associated to RWM.

10.1   Key Performance Indicators

EURAD-2 will address all the targets identified in the Euratom work programme, by linking the targets to the drivers and further to concrete measurable actions of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). The landscape table on the next page shows the Euratom programme's expected impact, associated primary driver and the expected KPIs. It is acknowledged that in many cases there are more than one driver that can be associated with the impact targets, yet the primary one is summarized here. Each WP has defined KPIs that are integrated to the Table 2 below of expected impact metrics, while other targets are detailed at the whole EURAD-2 programme level outcome.

Table 2 Key Performance Indicators

European Partnership – EURAD-2			Monitoring and evaluation framework		
Overall vision: A step change in European collaboration towards safe radioactive waste management (RWM), including disposal, through the development of a robust and sustained science, technology and knowledge management programme that supports timely implementation of RWM activities and serves to foster mutual understanding and trust between Joint Programme participants.					
Objectives		**What is a measure of success?** Please use quantitative (Key Performance) and qualitative indicators, and link them to a point in time	**Which is the data source and methodology used** [project data, study, ….]	**Who is responsible for monitoring and providing the data / information When will it be collected?**	**Baseline and target**
General objectives (linked to impact indicators)	Implementation Safety	Number of involved **Technical Safety Organizations and Regulators**, both as participants and as End User Group or Stakeholder group members.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2023: 15 (TSO + Regulators) 2029: 20 (TSO + Regulators)
	Tailored Solutions, Innovation for Optimization	Number of involved **Waste Management Organisations or Waste Generators/Owners**, as a partner, End User Group or Stakeholder members.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2023: 16 WMOs, 5 Waste Owners 2029: 20 WMOs, 10 Waste Owners
	Scientific Insight	Number of involved **Research Entity** groups, as a partner, End User Group or Stakeholder members.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2023: 50 Research Entities 2029: 70 Research Entities
	Societal Engagement	Number of involved of larger **Civil Society** group members, as a partner, End User Group or Stakeholder members.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2023: 20 Civil Society 2029: 35 Civil Society
	Knowledge Management	Number of involved **Member States**	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2023: 21 Member States 2029: 23 Member States
Specific objectives* (linked to outcome/result indicators)	Implementation Safety	• Number of citations of the WP results / deliverables from TSO or regulators, in safety reviews, guidance by Member States Number of dissemination news/publications	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office collects information annually, specifically from TSO views	2026 = 1 citation, 3 publications 2029 = 3 citations, 4 publications

		shared with regulators forums (WENRA, SITEX, ETSON)			
	Tailored Solutions	• Number of citations (reference to EURAD-2 results as being the latest state of the art) by End Users to project results	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office collects information annually, specifically from End User view	2026 = 3 citations 2029 = 5 citations
	Scientific Insight	• Number of State-of-the-Art reports published. • Number of open access publications accepted. • Number of presentations given at scientific conferences. • Number of publications accepted in top tier / highest impact journals in the field	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 11 SotA, 24 publications, 64 presentations 2029 = 26 SotA, 120 publications, 120 presentations
	Innovation for Optimization	• Number of pre-patent notifications • Number of methods that demonstrate a change of TRL • Improvement of a process or a method statement (written document)	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 4 improvements of a process 2029 = 2 pre-patent notifications, 5 changes of TRL, 15 improvements of a process
	Societal Engagement	• Number of events where public or civil society is invited to participate. • Number of publications/deliverables that include civil society members contribution or review	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026: 9 events, 5 publications 2029: 15 events, 10 publications
	Knowledge Management	• Number of KM documents produced. • Number of trainings lectures provided. • Number of mobility actions (visits, trainings courses, conferences).	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 16 KM, 15 training, 50 mobility 2029 = 40 KM, 30 training, 100 mobility
Operational objectives* (linked to	Implementation Safety	• Number of events where regulators are invited to participate.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 12 events 2029 = 30 events
	Tailored	• Number of events for stakeholder	Project data	Project Management Office	2026 = 15 stakeholder events

output indicators)	Solutions	participation • Number of networking events allowing cross-disciplinary sharing (outside our sector)		collects information annually	,10 cross-disciplinary events 2029 = 25 stakeholder events 3 cross-disciplinary events
	Scientific Insight	• Number of news / Post / Blog	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 33 2029 = 55
	Innovation for Optimization	• Number of cross-WP initiatives (co-organised events, sharing of samples, …)	Project milestones, deliverables; WP reports	Project Management Office (PMO) collects information annually	2026 = 7 2029 = 14
	Societal Engagement	• Number of subscribers to newsletter • Number of followers on social medias • Number of non-scientific issues published.	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026: 800 subscribers 800 followers 1 non-scientific issue 10 early-stage participants 2029: 1000 subscribers 1000 followers participants
	Knowledge Management	• Number of PhD/postdocs/ students • Number of events where non-EURAD-2 students can participate. • Number of IAEA listed early-stage programmes participants registered to events / workshops / webinars	Project data	Project Management Office collects information annually	2026 = 100 students, 11 events, 10 early-stage participants 2029 = 150 students, 15 events, 6 early-stage

10.2 Risk register

By maintaining a dynamic and up-to-date risk register on ProjectPlace, the Consortium ensures proactive risk management, enabling timely responses to challenges and fostering a structured approach to risk mitigation. This tool supports transparency and accountability, ensuring all stakeholders are informed of potential threats and the strategies in place to address them. It is updated by the Coordinator based on WPs inputs provided in the Interim Progress Reports and Annual Reports.

An early notification template for risk documentation, made available on ProjectPlace, is a proactive tool designed to support the maintenance of the risk register by facilitating the early identification of potential issues, such as delays, cost increases, scope changes, or quality concerns. The Coordinator will ensure that all notifications are appropriately documented and securely stored. Furthermore, the Coordinator will liaise with the relevant bodies within the Consortium to promptly implement necessary measures to address the identified risks effectively.

11. Financial aspects

The detailed estimated budget for the first two years of EURAD-2 is provided in Annex 2 of the Grant Agreement. The detailed budget broken down by WP, by budget category and by partner (Beneficiary and Affiliated Entity) is available on ProjectPlace. It will be updated based on future funding allocations.

The co-financing is not subject to review by the Coordinator or the European Commission. It is the responsibility of the Parties to track this co-funding for audit purposes.

11.1 Budget transfers

A specific Factsheet ([Factsheet n°2](#) – Budget transfers) explaining the rules for budget transfers has been developed and is available on ProjectPlace. For adjustments / transfers within a WP, the WPL must inform its PMO representative and Coordinator about the details, explanation and confirmation that concerned organisations are in agreement with this transfer, reallocation of budget.

The approval of additional funding, for example production of KM documents and mobility applications, is subject to review by the concerned WP. The selection process follows a structured quality management procedure to ensure that funding decisions are based on a clear evaluation and award criteria, with a focus on value for money.

11.2 Budget follow-up

Annually in November, each Beneficiary and its Affiliated Entities submits its expenses made during the one-year period to EC (Financial Statement as well as explanations of Use of Resources). The Coordinator compiles all collected budget data in one integrated budget follow-up file. This budget follow-up table is uploaded on ProjectPlace and distributed to the WP Leaders. WP Leaders together with PMO check the actual budget vs. estimated budget and identify any discrepancies that may need to be sorted out.

11.3 Eligibility of costs

A specific Factsheet (Factsheet n°1) explaining the rules for eligibility of costs has been developed and is available on ProjectPlace.

11.4 Payments

According to the Grant Agreement, the following payments will be made by the EC to the Coordinator:

- **Pre-financing** providing the Beneficiaries and Affiliated Entities with a float;
- **Interim payments**, reimbursing the eligible costs incurred during the reporting periods;

- **Payment of the balance**, reimbursing the remaining part of the eligible costs and the amount retained for the Guarantee Fund.

The calculation and distribution of the payments will be done by Andra as Coordinator to the Beneficiaries (and then from the Beneficiaries to their Affiliated Entities). The proposed distribution will be presented for GA's approval before the payment is made.

Official EC notification letters and distribution tables approved by the GA are available on ProjectPlace under the EURAD workspace area (Folder entitled Budget and Payments).

12. General Data Protection Regulation

All EURAD-2 documents must comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Therefore, no personal data (such as email addresses) shall be included in project deliverables or milestones.

In specific and duly justified cases, personal data may be included only if the explicit written consent of the concerned individuals has been obtained in advance and is stored. Any inclusion of personal data must be strictly limited to what is necessary.

Such inclusion must be clearly motivated by the need to support project implementation, communication, or dissemination activities, and must respect the principles of data minimisation, purpose limitation, and confidentiality in accordance with GDPR.

Appendix A.   Composition of the General Assembly

Organisation	Country	Type	GA representative
AGES	Austria	TSO	Christian Katzlberger
ANDRA	France	WMO	Stéphan Schumacher
ARAO	Slovenia	WMO	Leon Kegel
ASNR	France	TSO	Delphine Pellegrini
BASE	Germany	TSO	Tyler Oesch
BEL V	Belgium	TSO	Valéry Detilleux
BGE	Germany	WMO	Astrid Göbel
CEA	France	RE	Maxime Fournier
CIEMAT	Spain	TSO	Enrique M. Gonzalez Romero
CNRS	France	RE	Tomo Suzuki
COVRA	Netherlands	WMO	Marja Vuorio
CVREZ	Czech Republic	RE	Lucie Karásková Nenadálová
DEKOM	Denmark	WMO	Charlotte Hjorth
ENEA	Italy	RE	Alessandro Dodaro
ENRESA	Spain	WMO	Silvia Rueda Sánchez
FTMC	Lithuania	TSO	Arturas Plukis
FZJ	Germany	RE	Dirk Bosbach
GI-Bas	Bulgaria	TSO	Doncho Karastanev
HUN-REN EK	Hungary	RE	Margit Fabian
IAE	Lithuania	WMO	Gintautas Klevinskas
INCT	Poland	RE	Grazyna Zakrzewska-Koltuniewicz
IST-ID	Portugal	RE	Isabel Paiva
JRC	Netherlands	RE	Vaidas Matuzas
JSI	Slovenia	TSO	Marjan Kromar
KIPT	Ukraine	RE	Yevhenii Svitlychnyi
KIT	Germany	RE	Silvia Stumpf
KTH	Sweden	RE	Mats Jonsson
LEI	Lithuania	RE	Asta Narkuniene
NCSRD	Greece	RE	Anatasia Savidou
NES	Austria	WMO	Sabrina Dollinger
NJF	Slovakia	WMO	Miroslav Kover
NRG	Netherlands	TSO	Kelvin Browning
NTUA	Greece	TSO	Dimitris Mitrakos
ONDRAF/NIRAS	Belgium	WMO	Maarten Van Geet
POSIVA	Finland	WMO	Johanna Hansen
PURAM	Hungary	WMO	Bálint Nos
RATEN	Romania	RE	Crina Bucur
SCK CEN	Belgium	RE	Norbert Maes
SIIEG NASU	Ukraine	RE	Borys Zlobenko
SKB	Sweden	WMO	Anders Ström
SOGIN	Italy	WMO	Federica Pancotti
SSM	Sweden	TSO	Bo Strömberg

SSTC NRS	Ukraine	TSO	Yuliia Yesypenko
STUBA	Slovakia	RE	Vladimir Slugeň
SURAO	Czech Republic	WMO	Lucie Hausmannová
SURO	Czech Republic	TSO	Irena Hanusova
TNO	Netherlands	RE	Gert-Jan Heerens
TS Enercon	Hungary	TSO	Attila Baksay
TUS	Bulgaria	RE	Ivan Ivanov
UHelsinki	Finland	RE	Gareth Law
UTartu	Estonia	RE	Alan Henry Tkaczyk
VTT	Finland	TSO	Erika Holt

![eurad 2 European Partnership on Radioactive Waste Management] Dissemination level: PU
Date of issue of this report: **06/03/2026**

Page 36

Appendix B.   Composition of Bureau from Month 1 to Month 17

Organisation	Country	Type	Bureau member
ASNR	France	TSO	Christophe Debayle
BEL V	Belgium	TSO	Valéry Detilleux
BGE	Germany	WMO	Astrid Göbel
FZJ	Germany	RE	Dirk Bosbach
MITTA	Finland	AE (RE)	Xavier Pintado
NES	Austria	WMO	Sabrina Dollinger
SCK CEN	Belgium	RE	Elke Jacops
SSTC NRS	Ukraine	TSO	Kateryna Fuzik
TVO	Finland	AE (WMO)	Anne Kontula

Appendix C.   Composition of the PMO from Month 1 to Month 17

Organisation	Country	Type	PMO member
A21	Spain	AE (RE)	Marta Lopez
ANDRA	France	Coordination	Alessandro Russo
ANDRA	France	Coordination	Louise Théodon
ASNR	France	TSO	Delphine Pellegrini
JRC	Netherlands	RE	Vaidas Matuzas
PURAM	Hungary	WMO	Peter Ormai
VTT	Finland	TSO	Erika Holt

Appendix D.   Chief Scientific Officers appointed from Month 1 to Month 17

Christophe Bruggeman, SCK CEN, Belgium

Michael Egan, SSM, Sweden – from Month 1 to Month 12

Irina Gaus, Nagra, Switzerland

Appendix E.   WP Leaders from Month 1 to Month 17

	WP	Organisation	Country	Type	WP Leader
2	KM	BGE	Germany	WMO	Alba Valls, from Month 1 to Month 2 Alexandru Tatomir from Month 2 to Month 17
3	ASTRA	COVRA	Netherlands	WMO	Marja Vuorio
4	FORSAFF	VTT	Finland	TSO	Timothy Schatz
5	ICARUS	POLIMI	Italy	AE	Eros Mossini
6	STREAM	SOGIN	Italy	WMO	Anne Fornier, from Month 1 to Month 4 Federica Pancotti, from Month 4 to Month 17
7	L'OPERA	SCK CEN	Belgium	RE	Thierry Mennecart
8	SAREC	SKB	Sweden	WMO	Lena Zetterström Evins
9	InCoManD	ANDRA	France	WMO	Aurélien Debelle
10	ANCHORS	ASNR	France	TSO	Nadia Mokni
11	CLIMATE	A21	Spain	AE	Alvaro Sainz Garcia
12	RAMPEC	KIT	Germany	RE	Marcus Altmaier
13	OPTI	BGE	Germany	WMO	Philipp Herold
14	SUDOKU	RATEN	Romania	RE	Crina Bucur
15	DITOCO2030	IFE	Norway	AP	Réka Szoke
16	HERMES	PSI	Switzerland	AP	Sergey Churakov
17	CSFD	NAGRA	Switzerland	AP	Madalina Wittel
18	DITUSC	ONDRAF/NIRAS	Belgium	WMO	Stéphane Brassinnes

Appendix F.   External Advisory Board members

Simon Morgan (Chair of the External Advisory Board), representing Western European Nuclear Regulators association (WENRA)

Ali Awada, representing the European Partnership on nuclear materials (CONNECT-NM)

Joëlle Elbez-Uzan, representing the European Partnership on fusion research (EUROFUSION)

Julie Hollis, representing the association of the Geological Surveys of Europe (EuroGeoSurveys)

Cristina Muñoz-Reja Ruiz, representing the Sustainable Nuclear Energy Technology Platform (SNETP)

Appendix G.   Classification of deliverables

WP n°	D n° MS n°	Title	Lead participant	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery date (in months)	Review classification (H/M/L)
WP01 - PMO	D1.1	Dissemination Strategy	Andra	R	PU	6	L
	D1.2	Quality Management Plan	Andra	R	PU	6	L
	D1.3	Data Management Plan	Andra	R	PU	6	L
	D1.4	Annual Work Programme Y2	Andra	R	SEN	9	L
	D1.6	Evaluation of ICS activities	NTW	R	PU	18	M
	D1.7	Annual Work Programme Y3	Andra	R	SEN	21	L
	D1.9	Annual Work Programme Y4	Andra	R	SEN	33	L
	D1.10	Action plan following the mid-term evaluation	Andra	R	PU	36	M
	D1.12	Annual Work Programme Y5	Andra	R	SEN	45	L
	D1.14	Evaluation of the impacts of the programme	Andra	R	PU	56	H
	D1.15	Final evaluation of ICS activities	NTW	R	PU	56	H
WP02 - KM	D2.1	Report on the KM platform specifications	ASNR	R	PU	18	L
	D2.2	Report on the implementation of innovative and alternative methods	ASNR	R	PU	18	L
	D2.3	Report on recommendations for the long-term maintenance of critical infrastructure for RWM at the European level	GSL	R	PU	24	L
	D2.4	Report on recommendations for the long-term maintenance of critical infrastructure for RWM at the European level	GSL	R	PU	56	M
	D2.5	Report on the implementation of innovative and alternative methods including lessons learned	ASNR	R	PU	56	M
	D2.6	Outcome/impacts report of the KM Programme to	BGE	R	PU	56	H

European Partnership on Radioactive Waste Management

			Member States and End-Users				
WP03 - ASTRA	D3.1	Green paper	COVRA	R	PU	12	M
	D3.2	State-of-the-art assessment of TRLs and R&D requirements for deep borehole disposal of radioactive wastes	EGIS	R	PU	15	L
	D3.3	White paper	SURO	R	PU	18	L
	D3.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	COVRA	R	PU	20	H
WP04 - FORSAFF	D4.2	Green Paper	Amphos 21	R	PU	12	M
	D4.3	White Paper	CEA	R	PU	18	M
	D4.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	VTT	R	PU	22	H
WP05 - ICARUS	D5.1	SotA on innovative NDT, DT, SF for use cases	SSTC NRS	R	PU	6	M
	D5.2	New NDT Prototypes	NRG	R	PU	36	L
	D5.3	New DT for DTM	DTU	R	PU	42	L
	D5.4	SF optimized demonstrations	ENRESA	R	PU	48	L
	D5.5	Outcomes/Impacts to Member States	POLIMI	DEM	PU	56	L
	D5.6	Extending the SotA on innovative NDT, DT, SF for current and new use cases	SSTC NRS	R	PU	57	H
WP06 - STREAM	D6.1	State of the art report (initial)	CIEMAT	R	PU	6	M
	D6.2	Optimized and innovative treatment technologies and conditioning matrices for organic and metallic waste	CSIC	R	SEN	48	L
	D6.3	LCA/LCC case studies	NNL	R	PU	55	L
	D6.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	SOGIN	R	PU	56	H
	D6.5	State of the art report (final)	CIEMAT	R	PU	57	H
	D6.6	Upscaling of treatment and conditioning processes using innovative binders	SCK CEN	R	SEN	57	L

WP07 - L'OPERA	D7.1	State of the Art on novel matrices for LILW immobilisation	SOGIN	R	PU	6	M
	D7.2	Representative conditions of disposal facilities for the long-term management of LILW	VTT	R	PU	9	L
	D7.3	Matrices long-term performance assessment for conditioned LILW	ANDRA	R	PU	55	L
	D7.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	SCK CEN	R	PU	56	H
	D7.5	Modelling approaches for the long-term behaviour of conditioned LILW	UniPi	R	PU	56	L
	D7.6	State of the Art on novel matrices for LILW immobilisation	SOGIN	R	PU	57	H
WP08 - SAREC	D8.1	State-of-the-Art report - initial	AMPHOS 21	R	PU	6	M
	D8.2	Interim Status Report	SKB	R	PU	30	L
	D8.3	Final meeting S&T report	SKB	R	PU	54	L
	D8.4	State-of-the-Art report - final	AMPHOS 21	R	PU	56	H
	D8.5	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	SKB	R	PU	56	H
WP09 - InCoMand	D9.1	SotA (initial)	BAM	R	PU	6	M
	D9.2	Ceramic container prototype	Galtenco	DEM	PU	36	L
	D9.3	Data collection	CIEMAT	DATA	PU	52	L
	D9.4	SotA (final)	HZDR	R	PU	56	H
	D9.5	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	Andra	R	PU	57	H
WP10 - ANCHORS	D10.1	State-of-the-Art report (initial)	SKB	R	PU	6	M
	D10.2	Report on assessment of measures for better quality control	Posiva	R	PU	54	L
	D10.3	Report on modelling validation and assessment cases	BGE	R	PU	56	L

eurad 2
European Partnership
on Radioactive Waste Management

	D10.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	ASNR	R	PU	58	H
	D10.5	State-of-the-Art report (final)	ASNR	R	PU	56	H
	D10.6	Report on Lab testing and multiscale experimental characterization.	MITTA	R	PU	56	L
WP11 - CLIMATE	D11.1	White Paper	BGE	R	PU	18	M
	D11.2	Synthesis report	AMPHOS 21	R	PU	18	L
	D11.3	Outcomes/Impacts to Member States	AMPHOS 21	R	PU	24	H
WP12 - RAMPEC	D12.1	SOTA (initial)	KIT	R	PU	12	M
	D12.2	Mid-Term Progress Report on RAMPEC Tasks 3, 4, 5.	CIEMAT	R	PU	30	L
	D12.3	Final Report on experimental studies.	SCK CEN	R	PU	52	L
	D12.4	Final Report on modelling studies.	PSI	R	PU	52	L
	D12.5	SOTA (final)	KIT	R	PU	56	H
	D12.6	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	ANDRA	R	PU	58	H
WP13 - OPTI	D13.1	Draft green paper: Existing actor views	TU Delft	R	SEN	6	L
	D13.2	Final green paper: Mutual Understanding of actors views about optimisation	BEL V	R	PU	14	L
	D13.3	Technical Key challenges for Optimization of HLW GDFs (white paper)	SURAO	R	PU	18	L
	D13.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	BGE	R	PU	20	H
	D13.5	Final Report	BGE	R	PU	24	H
WP14 - SUDOKU	D14.1	Initial State of the art report	SCK CEN	R	PU	12	M

	D14.2	R&D results on multilayer cover performances	AMPHOS 21	R	PU	54	L
	D14.3	R&D results on the transfer of mobile radionuclides in cementitious barriers as a function of their chemo-mechanical evolution and corrosion effect	ANDRA	R	PU	54	L
	D14.4	Effect of cover performances, CHM evolution of EBS and steel corrosion on the radionuclides release from the disposal zone	PSI	R	PU	56	L
	D14.5	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	RATEN	R	PU	57	H
	D14.6	Updated State of the art report	SCK CEN	R	PU	57	H
WP15 - DITOCO2030	D15.3	White paper: Position paper (Task5)	SURAO	R	PU	18	M
	D15.4	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	IFE	R	PU	22	H
	D15.5	Next-Generation Digital Twins: A State-of-the-Art Review and Gap Analysis for Optimizing Surface and Subsurface Radioactive Waste Management Facilities	VTT	R	PU	13	M
WP16 - HERMES	D16.1	Initial SOTA report	PSI	R	PU	12	M
	D16.2	Report on surrogate model development methodologies and documentation of cross benchmarking of methods efficiency	PSI	R	PU	42	L
	D16.3	Report on inverse modelling for THMC processes in repository system with surrogate models; Field scale models validation	UFZ	R	PU	42	L
	D16.4	Report on application of high fidelity/high computation throughput	TS Enercon	R	PU	42	L

		coupled models for bounding scenarios in repository nearfield					
	D16.5	Final SOTA	SCK CEN	R	PU	44	H
	D16.6	Impacts report for Member States and End Users	PSI	R	PU	46	H
WP17 - CSFD	D17.1	Initial SotA in demonstrating post-closure criticality safety	Nagra	R	PU	8	M
	D17.2	Experimental data needs to support post-closure criticality safety assessments	SKB	R	SNE	27	L
	D17.3	Methodology for assessing consequences of postulated post-closure criticality events	NWS	R	SEN	55	L
	D17.4	Communicating post-closure criticality safety	EIMV	R	PU	56	L
	D17.5	Final SotA in demonstrating post-closure criticality safety	Nagra	R	PU	56	H
	D17.6	Outcome/impacts report to Member States and End Users	Nagra	R	PU	56	H
	D17.7	Repository post-closure criticality scenarios and their assessment	Andra	R	SEN	58	L
WP18 - DITUSC	D18.1	Green Paper	FZJ	R	PU	12	M
	D18.2	Documentation of exchange with Eurad Community	FZJ	R	PU	14	L
	D18.3	White paper	ONDRAF/NIRAS	R	PU	16	M
	D18.4	Outcome/impacts report to MS&EU	KIT	R	PU	20	H

Appendix H.   Adding a document on Zenodo

The following fields must be completed when uploading a document to **Zenodo**:

- **Community**:
  Select a community by searching for *European Partnership on Radioactive Waste Management*.

- **Visibility**:
  If the document is classified as **public** within EURAD-2, it must be set to **Public** on Zenodo. If the document is considered **sensitive**, select **Restricted**.

- **Basic information**:
  - **Digital Object Identifier (DOI)**: select *"No, I need one"*. A DOI will then be assigned and available for future reference.
  - **Resource type**: select *"Publications/Project Deliverable"* or *"Publications/Project Milestone"*, as appropriate.
  - **Title**: always include *EURAD-2* followed by the document title.
  - **Publication date**: must be consistent with the date indicated in the document.
  - **Creators**: add each author of the document; include their **ORCID** identifier where possible.
  - **Description**: list the reviewers of the document.

- **Recommended information** (optional):
  Keywords and language may be added if relevant.

- **Funding**:
  Click **Add** and search for *EURAD-2*. Note that the search works by typing **EURAD** in capital letters (without "-2").

- **Other fields**:
  All remaining fields are optional and may be completed as needed.