H2020 Grant Agreement No. 857125

ATLAS

Agricultural Interoperability and Analysis System

D1.1 Project Handbook

Deliverable no.	D1.1
Work package	WP1
Dissemination level	PU
Due date of deliverable	2019-11-01
Actual submission date	2019-10-31

Author(s)			
Partner	**First name**	**Last name**	**Email**
Fraunhofer	Stefan	Rilling	stefan.rilling@iais.fraunhofer.de
Contributor(s)			
Partner	**First name**	**Last name**	**Email**
Fraunhofer	Julian	Theis	julian.theis@iais.fraunhofer.de

Ethics & Security Ass.	This deliverable is excluded from ethics & security assessment
Approval Date	-
Remarks	-

Gender-proofing	Gender-sensitive language Gender aspects in research not applicable to this deliverable
Proofing date	2019-10-31
Remarks	-

Version	Date	Released by	Comments	Document status
0.1	2019-10-05	Stefan Rilling	initial version	draft
0.2	2019-10-18	Stefan Rilling	After kick-off meeting	draft
0.3	2019-10-28	Stefan Rilling	Internal review	draft
1.0	2019-10-31	Stefan Rilling	Ready for submission	Final

Table of Content

1   Introduction

This document is the central information reference for the ATLAS project. It describes documentation and communication procedures that are to be used within the project, both for exchange of information internally and externally to the project consortium. Particularly, it provides guidelines for 1) creating project related documents and formal deliverables; 2) communication among partners, without conflicting provisions of the "Consortium Agreement"; 3) conditions for usage of shared project infrastructure for file storage and exchange, and (4) conditions for use and publication of shared project foreground, e.g. during dissemination (excluding exploitation that will be subject to individual agreements among partners).It serves also as a reference for quality management of deliverables and dissemination material and for decision-making processes, including gender-proofing, ethical & security assessment, and risk management.

After the submission of this document as a deliverable, the ATLAS project handbook will be maintained as a living document throughout the lifetime of the ATLAS project, to be updated whenever necessary.

This report has gratefully used earlier work by the EU research projects FP7 CIPRNet [1] and H2020 RESIN [2].

2   Project Key Data

Grant Agreement number: 820999

Framework Programme: H2020

Call: DT-ICT-08-2018-2019

Programme(s):   5.i. Information and Communication Technologies;

H2020-DT-2018-2020 – Call Digitising and transforming European industry and services: digital innovation hubs and platforms

Topic(s):   DT-ICT-08-2018-2019 – Agricultural digital integration platforms

Project officers: Olavi Luotonen, Doris Marquardt

Instrument: Innovation Action

Start date: October 1st, 2019

Duration: 36 months

Maximum EC contribution: 12,890,976.25€

Person power: 1399.5 PM

3   Project Members

Up to date contact information for specific persons, including mail addresses can be found on the ATLAS Confluence. As this document is a public deliverable, the mail addresses will not be included in the following table.

No	Participant Name	Short Name	Contact Persons
1	FRAUNHOFER IAIS	Fraunhofer	Stefan Rilling
			Julian Theis
			Jacob Stanly
			Stefan Kollmer
2	AGRICIRCLE AG	AC	Peter Fröhlich
3	ETHNIKO KENTRO EREVNAS KAI TECHNOLOGIKIS ANAPTYXIS	CERTH	Dimitrios Moshou
			Xanthoula Eirini Pantazi
			Afroditi Alexandra Tamouridou
4	AGRO APPS I.K.E.	AGA	Stelios Kotsopoulos
			Grigoris Mygdakos
5	UNIVERSITA DEL SALENTO	US	Giulio Reina
			Rocco Galati
6	CONSIGLIO NAZIONALE DELLE RICERCHE	CNR	Annalisa Milella
			Eugenio Cavallo
			Antonio Petitti
7	AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY ELECTRONICS FOUNDATION AEF	AEF	Norbert Schlingmann
			Klaudia Lach
8	NATIONAL OBSERVATORY OF ATHENS	NOA	Iphigenia Keramitsoglou
			Panagiotis Sismanidis
9	FORSCHUNGSZENTRUM JULICH GMBH	FZJ	Heye Bogena
			Harrie-Jan Hendricks-Franssen
			Cosimo Brogi

10	ELLINIKOS GEORGIKOS ORGANISMOS - DIMITRA	SWRI	Andreas Panagopoulos
			Vassilios Pisinaras
11	TECHNISCHE HOCHSCHULE KOLN	IBL	Eduard Dietrich
			Thomas Kuklok
			Joerg Lommatsch
			Elmira Eslami Bidgoli
12	STATIUNEA DE CERCETARE DEZVOLTARE PENTRU VITICULTURA SI VINIFICATIE MURFATLAR	SCVM	Aurora Ranca
13	Deutsche Landwirtschafts-Gesellschaft e.V.	DLG	Klaus Erdle
			Florian Schiller
14	ROBOT MAKERS GMBH	RobMak	Jochen Hirth
15	METEOMATICS AG	Meteo	Martin Fengler
			Nadja Omanovic
16	LIBELIUM COMUNICACIONES DISTRIBUIDAS SOCIEDAD LIMITADA	LIB	Javier Siscart
			Javier Solobera
17	Seelmeyer & Woltering KG	SW	Michael Seelmeyer
18	LATVIJAS AUGLKOPJU ASOCIACIJA	LAA	Peteris Skrastins
19	ETAM	ETAM	Manolis Tsantakis
			Maroulla Schiza
			Ioanna Antonopoulou
			Maria Zacharaki
20	KUNNE STEPHAN	SK	Stephan Künne
21	LIEDER FALK	FL	Falk Lieder
22	MUNCHHOFF FRIEDRICH-CHRISTIAN	GutDer	Christian Münchhoff

23	LATVIJAS BIOLOGISKAS LAUKSAIMNIECIBAS ASOCIACIJA	ALOA	Līga Logina-Kaļčenko
24	FODJAN GMBH	FJAN	Carsten Gieseler
			Kristin Esche
25	Landwirtschaftsbetrieb Fröhlich	PF	Peter Fröhlich
26	Stamatios Oikonomou	OIK	Stamatios Oikonomou
27	Agrotikos Sineterismos Proionton Agias "KISSAVOS"	ACK	Georgios Zeikos
28	ANWENDUNGSZENTRUM GMBH OBERPFAFFENHOFEN	AZO	Ulrike Daniels
			Stefanie Biermeier
29	DARZKOPIBAS INSTITUTS	LatHort	Edgars Rubauskis
			Līga Lepse
			Jānis Lepsis
30	KTIMA GEROVASSILIOU OINOPOIIA ANONYMI ETARIA	KTIMA	Argirios Argiriou

4   Project Infrastructure

The technical infrastructure of the project is provided, administrated and maintained by Fraunhofer. The usage of this infrastructure is mandatory for all consortium members. Deviations from this have to be communicated to the coordinator.

4.1   ATLAS mailing lists

List administrators: Julian Theis (Fraunhofer), Stefan Rilling (Fraunhofer)

The mailing lists are only available for list members, only the list administrators can add new members. Currently, the following mailing list have been established:

List address	List Members
atlas.all@iais.fraunhofer.de	All consortium members
atlas.wp1@iais.fraunhofer.de	Partner's lead personnel
atlas.wp2@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP2 partners
atlas.wp3@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP3 partners
atlas.wp4@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP4 partners
atlas.wp5@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP5 partners
atlas.wp6@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP6 partners
atlas.wp7@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP7 partners
atlas.wp8@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP8 partners
atlas.wp9@iais.fraunhofer.de	WP9 partners

4.2   ATLAS Confluence, JIRA and ownCloud

ATLAS uses *Confluence* and *JIRA* as shared workspace and project management software. Both are commercial products of Atlassian[1]. ATLAS will furthermore provide an *ownCloud* space for sharing documents and larger amount of data.

Fraunhofer will create the user accounts for the consortium members. Accounts are only granted for partners of the consortium and the ATLAS Confluence space and JIRA project can only be accessed by members of the consortium with respective access rights. It is possible to grant specific permissions (view/edit pages, comment on pages, etc.) to anonymous users.

---

[1] https://www.atlassian.com/

However, at the time of writing this handbook this option is disabled. ownCloud folders can be shared with external persons.

4.2.1 ATLAS Confluence

Confluence organises workspaces as wikis[2], i.e. workspaces are organised in pages (think of a Wikipedia article) of different types (e.g. file lists, meeting notes, task reports, etc.). Fraunhofer IAIS maintains a Confluence server, where ATLAS has a workspace, which you can find at https://jira.iais.fraunhofer.de/wiki/

The general Confluence documentation can be found here.

4.2.2 ATLAS JIRA

JIRA is an issue tracking software for agile project management, usually applied for software development, but also useful for general project management. ATLAS will utilise JIRA for both. Fraunhofer IAIS maintains a JIRA server, where ATLAS has a project space, which you can find at https://jira.iais.fraunhofer.de/jira/secure/Dashboard.jspa

The general JIRA documentation can be found here.

At the moment, ATLAS employs a Kanban[3] approach for project management:

- For each substantial task of the project a card is generated (e.g. *T1.1 Management of the consortium*).
- These tasks can be broken down into sub-tasks (e.g. *D1.1 Project work plan*), which are also represented by cards.
- Every task can have one of four statuses: *TO DO, IN PROGRESS, IN REVIEW, DONE*. Tasks that are planned, but have not started yet, get the status *TO DO*, tasks that have started get the status *IN PROGRESS*, while finished tasks first go IN REVIEW and then get the status *DONE*.
- For each status there is a column on the Kanban board. Tasks start in the TO DO column and move through IN PROGRESS towards DONE as they are being worked on, allowing a high-level monitoring on the work in the project.
- Every work package / task leader is responsible to keep the cards associated with their work package / task up to date and add additional cards whenever necessary.

Every task must have one *reporter* (i.e. the person who created the task), one *assignee* (i.e. the main responsible person), a number of *deputy assignees* (i.e. other persons – potentially from different partners – working on the task), as well as a due date. In addition, tasks can

---

[2] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wiki
[3] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kanban

have different priorities, as well as labels. They can also be commented on and have attachments.

4.2.3   ATLAS ownCloud

The ATLAS ownCloud can be found at https://owncloud.fraunhofer.de/. All relevant documents will be placed there within a dedicated folder structure. The template documents for the deliverables will also be placed on the ownCloud. User accounts for the ownCloud will be created by Fraunhofer. Other file sharing / document sharing tools should not be used within ATLAS without consolidation of the coordinator.

5 Dissemination

5.1 General Rules for Dissemination

This section summarises the dissemination obligations of all partners set forth in the ATLAS Grant Agreement and Consortium Agreement.

5.1.1 Early information on planned dissemination

See ATLAS Grant Agreement, Article 29, and ATLAS Consortium Agreement, Section 8.4.2.

- **All partners** have to be informed **30 calendar days** before publication of results.
- Partners may object within **15 calendar days** after the receipt of the publication notice.
- Communication activities (e.g. blog news) do not require prior notification. **Exception:** If communication activities contain results, background, or confidential information the consent of the relevant partners is necessary.

5.1.2 Monitoring of dissemination

- Dissemination activities are monitored as part of WP2.
- **Each partner is responsible for reporting every dissemination activity to partner ETAM**

5.1.3 Credits to the EU

See ATLAS Grant Agreement, Article 29.4.

Funding Acknowledgement

Disclaimer

"The sole responsibility for the content of this publication lies with the authors. It does not necessarily represent the opinion of the European Union. Neither the EASME nor the European Commission are responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein."

When and how to acknowledge funding?

The following table provides a decision aid for when to include funding acknowledgement and disclaimer.

Material type	Funding Acknowledgement	Disclaimer	Notes
Social Media	✓	✓	Flag in header, shortened text in about field (Tweets/Content do/does not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission
Press releases	✓	✓	Reference to the Horizon2020 programme and the funding received should also be made within the body of the press release.
Brochures	✓	✓	Flag and text:
Websites	✓	✓	Flag and text in footer:
Video	✓	✓	Flag and text, including "This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 776528".
Business cards	✓		Flag and short text (Co-funded by the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union):
Roll-up banners	✓		
Postcards (and other goodies)	✓		Flag and short text (Co-funded by the Horizon 2020 Framework Programme of the European Union)
Newsletter	✓	✓	Flag and text
Presentations	✓	✓	Flag and text
Reports / Deliverables	✓	✓	Flag and text
Policy documents / factsheets	✓	✓	

5.2   Authorship Guidelines

5.2.1   Joint publications

Decisions about authorship for scientific publications should be guided by accepted international guidelines for ethical conduct and authorship. In order to be able to agree on authorship, plans for project-related publications need to be communicated to all other beneficiaries well in advance (see also the rules of the Consortium Agreement). All persons who have made substantial professional contributions to the research must be included as authors; their names will be in order of the importance of the contribution. To qualify as primary author of a scientific paper, a person should have had a major role in at least three out of these six activities:

(1) Formulation of study hypotheses,
(2) Design of the study or project,
(3) Data collection,
(4) Analyses of results,
(5) Interpretation of the results, and
(6) Writing up the publication.

5.2.2 Deliverables

Decisions about (co-)authorship, contributor status and acknowledgements for deliverables should be guided by the following rules

(1) Contributors of substantial amounts of text in the draft document will be mentioned as **authors**.
(2) Persons providing written comments and text revisions in the draft documents and extensive comments in emails (or other documentation) will be mentioned as **contributors**.
(3) Persons contributing to case studies, discussions, and oral comments will be mentioned in a special **acknowledgements** section, detailing the nature of the contribution.

6 General rules for assessment of ATLAS deliverables and dissemination material

6.1 Deliverables

All deliverables have to undergo a **quality assessment** (see section 7), including **gender-proofing** (see section 8). Some deliverables have to undergo an additional **ethical and security assessment** (see section 9).

6.2 Communication and Dissemination Material

All communication and dissemination materials have to undergo a **gender-proofing** (see section 8). If communication/dissemination material covers results of the project, this material has also to undergo an **ethical and security assessment** (see section 8).

7 ATLAS quality management

To ensure their quality and applicability all ATLAS deliverables will be reviewed internally before delivery to the Commission.

7.1 Quality management responsibilities

1. The coordinator (CO) is the general ATLAS quality manager. The coordinator is responsible to make sure that deliverables conform to the formal criteria for submission and for actual submission of deliverables.
2. Each work package leader (WPL) is the quality manager for the according work package.
3. The WPL can assign one or more internal reviewers to review a deliverable draft, preferably a staff member working in that work package who is not one of the deliverable authors (given staff number, this may not always be possible).

7.2 General quality management process

The following table depicts the ideal quality management process for deliverables (with "D" for the week of the due date of the deliverable). Its steps are described in detail below.

Step		D-6w	D-5w	D-4w	D-3w	D-2w	D-1w	D
2	Draft ready	■	■	■				
3	Internal review	■	■	■				
	Ethics & security assessment		■	■				
5	Revision & WP leader check				■			
9	CO check					■	■	
10	Address CO requests						■	
11	Final revision							■
13	Submission							■

1. The WPL responsible for a deliverable assigns at least one reviewer for the deliverable. The reviewer(s) should be independent from the authors and ideally from one of the WP participants. In case of a large or key deliverable, the WPL shall assign multiple independent reviewers. The list of deliverables and assigned reviewers is maintained on Confluence.
2. The **deliverable draft should be ready six to four weeks before the due date** for (WP) internal review, gender-proofing, as well as ethical and security assessment (if applicable). For deliverables that have to undergo an ethical and security assessment, the draft should be ready six weeks before the due date, for deliverables without such and assessment requirement, the draft should be ready five weeks before the due date, and for short deliverables that do not need an ethical and security assessment, the

draft should be ready four weeks before the due date. To streamline the review process as much as possible, the authors of the deliverable should conduct a **preliminary gender-proofing during the drafting of the deliverable**. The due date is the last day of the month specified in the ATLAS deliverables table (see Annex I – DoA). **It is mandatory to use the latest deliverable template (found on ownCloud) for creating the deliverable.**

3. The internal review should be completed as early as possible, but **no later than within two weeks after receiving the deliverable draft**. The internal review has to include a **gender-proofing**, according to the ATLAS gender proofing checklist(s) (see section 8.3.1).

4. If applicable, the **ethical and security assessment** should start one week after the start of the internal deliverable review (see section 9.2 for an explanation of the process).

5. The reviewer reviews the deliverable draft and sends the review[4] to the WPL and to the author(s) of the deliverable. The possible results of the review process are:
   a. **ACCEPT**: The deliverable is acceptable in its current form and the PM should submit it to the Commission. The WPL proceeds with → Step 8.
   b. **ACCEPT w. REVISION**: The deliverable is in principle acceptable, but some minor changes are needed. The author(s) should revise the deliverable. No further WP internal reviewing is required. The author(s) proceed with → Step 6.
   c. **REVISE**: The deliverable is not acceptable in its current form. The author(s) proceed with → Step 6.

6. The author(s) revise the deliverable according to the review results. The author(s) should document how the remarks of the reviewer are addressed. The author(s) should upload the improved deliverable to ownCloud and inform the WPL **within one week after receiving the request for quality improvement**.
   a. The review result was ACCEPT w. REVISION: The WPL proceeds with → Step 7.
   b. The review result was REVISE: The deliverable has to be reviewed again (preferably by the same reviewer). The WPL assigns a reviewer. The reviewer proceeds with → Step 5.

7. The WPL checks the review and ensures that requests are addressed by the author(s) within one week after the internal review has been completed (see step 6).

8. The WPL uploads the (improved) deliverable to ownCloud and informs the CO. If the WPL or the coordinator is the main author of the deliverable, changes need to be approved also by the internal reviewers.

9. The CO checks the deliverable. If necessary, they should issue a request for further improvement to the author(s) **and** the WPL **within 14 days after receiving the deliverable draft**.

10. The author(s) should upload the (improved) deliverable and the documentation on how they addressed any remarks to ownCloud and inform the CO **within one week after receiving the request** for further improvements.

11. The deliverable is very likely ready for submission. If not, the author(s) should address the final requests by the CO **immediately**.

12. The CO ensures that the pre-final deliverable is either
    a. Excluded from ethical and security assessment
    b. Has been approved by an ethics and security reviewer

---

[4] The review should comprise the commented/adjusted Word file in track changes mode as well as further general remarks in the preamble of the draft deliverable. These remarks will be removed before the submission of the deliverable.

Being free of security issues and satisfactory quality provided, the CO removes any internal remarks of the draft and submits the deliverable to the Commission in electronic form (PDF). The CO stores the submitted deliverable on Confluence.

7.3   General quality criteria

This subsection gives an overview of the quality criteria that should be applied to ensure the quality of the deliverables.

7.3.1 Formal criteria

- Is the deliverable formatted according to the ATLAS deliverable template?
- All deliverables shall use British English language and be spell-checked and grammar-checked before final submission.
- Is the deliverable well written, readable, and understandable by the target audience?
- Is the deliverable written in gender-sensitive language? (see section 8.3.1)
- Is the deliverable easy to understand (also taking the target group into account)?
- Has the deliverable a clear, understandable, and logical structure?
- Is the dissemination level assigned correctly?
- Are all authors and contributors named?
- Are IPR to foreground respected?
- Have ethical and security screenings been performed, if applicable (see section 9)?

7.3.2 Criteria on content

- Is the objective of the deliverable clear?
- Is the deliverable able to serve its purpose?
- Is the content of the deliverable in compliance with what is expected according to the Description of Action?
- Is the deliverable itself coherent and complete?
- Does the deliverable contain all the necessary information?
- Does the deliverable contain an appropriate level of detail?
- Is the appropriate terminology used and explained if necessary?
- Does the deliverable avoid unnecessary duplication of contents (contents that is already contained in another deliverable)?
- Does the research covered by the deliverable sufficiently address ethical, security, and gender aspects, if applicable? (see Sections 8 und 9)
- Does the deliverable report on all results as expected to be produced according to DoA?

8 Gender aspects in publications and research

ATLAS will take special care to identify and address gender aspects in its publications as well as its research. The following sections provide guidance and checklists to ensure all ATLAS publications (including deliverables, videos, etc.) employ gender-sensitive communication. In addition, they contain guidance on how to address gender aspects during research activities.

All communication and dissemination material (articles, videos, deliverables, etc.) should be checked by the responsible author(s) and – if applicable – by the responsible reviewer.

8.1 Research, publications, and directives regarding gender aspects in publications and research

The following is a non-exhaustive list of relevant resources regarding gender aspects in publications and research.

European Commission policy documents

- European Commission: Communication From The Commission To The European Parliament, The Council, The European Economic And Social Committee And The Committee Of The Regions. Strategy For Equality Between Women And Men 2010-2015 (SEC(2010) 1079 / SEC(2010) 1080)
- European Commission: Actions to implement the Strategy for Equality between Women and Men 2010-2015. Commission Staff Working Document accompanying the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions. (SEC(2010) 1079/2)
- European Commission: Strategy for equality between women and men 2010-2015: Publications Office of the European Union, 2011.
- European Commission: Strategic Engagement for Gender Equality 2016-2019: Publications Office of the European Union, 2015.

Gender mainstreaming resources from the European Commission

- European Commission – DG Human Resources and Security: Gender mainstreaming.
- European Commission – DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities: Manual for gender mainstreaming – employment, social inclusion and social protection policies, 2008.
- European Commission – DG Employment and Social Affairs: EQUAL Guide on Gender Mainstreaming, 2005.
- European Commission: A Guide to Gender Impact Assessment, 1998.
- European Commission – DG Development and Cooperation: Toolkit on mainstreaming gender equality in EC Development cooperation, 2004.
- European Commission – DG Research and Innovation, Yellow Window Management Consultants, Engender, Genderatwork: Toolkit Gender in EU-funded research. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2011.

Research projects and other resources

- European Commission – DG Employment: EU Gender Equality Law. Prepared by Susanne Burri and Sacha Prechal, 2008.
- European Commission – DG Justice Compendium of practice on Non-Discrimination/Equality Mainstreaming, 2011.
- European Institute for Gender Equality: Toolkit on Gender-sensitive Communication. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2018.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Principles of Gender-Sensitive Communication. United Nations Development Programme, 2017.
- United Nations Development Programme: Gender mainstreaming in practice: a toolkit. Edited by Nadja Dolata and prepared by Astrida Niemanis, Dono Abdurazakova, Shannon Brooker, Anneli Gustafsson, Mamura Nasirova, Jafar Javan and Louise Sperl, 2007.
- National Commission for the Promotion of Equality: Gender Mainstreaming in Practice – Step-by-Step Guide for Gender Impact Assessment, 2012.
- Gendered Innovations project
- Gender Dimension toolkit
- Gender Equality in Academia and Research – GEAR Tool
- GenPORT

8.2   Terms of reference

Source: EIGE Gender Equality Glossary and Thesaurus: https://eige.europa.eu/thesaurus

Term	Meaning
Gender-sensitive language	Realisation of gender equality in written and spoken language attained when women and men and those who do not conform to the binary gender system are made visible and addressed in language as persons of equal value, dignity, integrity and respect.
Gender-neutral language	Language that is not gender-specific and which considers people in general, with no reference to women and men.
Gender-discriminatory language	The opposite of gender-sensitive language. It includes words, phrases and/or other linguistic features that foster stereotypes, or demean or ignore women or men. At its most extreme it fails to treat the genders as equal in value, dignity, integrity and respect.

8.3   Gender-sensitive communication

ATLAS publications follow the Toolkit on Gender-sensitive Communication [3] by the European Institute for Gender Equality and UNDP's Principles of Gender-Sensitive Communication [4]. Based on these recommendations four principles of gender-sensitive communications are established:

1. **Ensure that all genders are represented**

All genders should be seen, heard, and treated equally in media dissemination and communication products. It is important to ensure that quotes from different genders are included in press releases, stories, and other communications. Gender binarism will be avoided in all forms used internally and with a public audience. An "other" tick box in the 'gender' field will be included in forms like registration forms, consent forms and questionnaires.

Additionally, attention will be paid to presenting female voices in traditionally male roles and vice versa contributes to deconstructing stereotypes and gender norms. In photographs and video depictions, a balance will be portrayed between male and female participants listening and speaking. When preparing dissemination and communication materials and when planning events and workshops, it will be planned and clarified how different gender's voices can be captured (after [4], p. 2).

2. **Avoid gender stereotypes**
*"Stereotypes are generalised images about people within a society. A gender stereotype is a preconceived idea where women and men are assigned characteristics and roles determined and limited by their gender. […] **These stereotypes hurt people of all genders by placing expectations on what people should be.** In many cases unconscious cultural stereotypes will be expressed through the language we use, meaning people use these expressions even when they do not hold these assumptions. **Repeating these stereotypes reinforces the assumptions at their core, therefore you should actively avoid stereotypes in the language you use."* ([3], p. 23)

What you should do to avoid gender stereotypes (see [3], p. 24-30 for more details):

- Avoid gendered pronouns (he or she) when a person's gender is unknown
- Avoid irrelevant information about gender (e.g. "female lawyers" where "lawyers" would suffice)
- Avoid gendered stereotypes as descriptive terms
- Avoid gendering inanimate objects
- Avoid using different adjectives for women and men
- Avoid using stereotypical images

3. **Avoid Invisibility or Omission**
Male gendered language is often used to describe the experience of all human beings. This practice ignores the experiences of other genders as equal members of the human race and contributes to their omission from public life (see [3], p. 31).

What to do to avoid invisibility (see [3], p. 31-36 for more details):

- Do not use 'man' as the neutral term
- Do not use 'he' to refer to unknown people
- Do not use gender-biased nouns to refer to groups of people
- Take care with 'false generics', i.e. gender-neutral language may ignore key gender elements of the subject under discussion
- Consider choice of voice-over artists, photographs/drawings/images, and the gender of individuals given in examples when creating communication and dissemination material

- Ensure balanced gender representation in speaking, representative and presenting roles
4. **Avoid subordination and trivialisation** (see [3], p. 37-40 for more details)
Avoid language that reinforce men's traditional dominance over women or belittle or insult women by
- always using the same naming conventions for men and women,
- not always putting the male version first (e.g. "husband and wife" vs. "wife and husband"),
- not using diminutive affixes to denote that the referent is female, and
- not objectifying people through references or comments on their physical appearance.

8.3.1 Checklist for gender-sensitive language

The following is the ATLAS gender-sensitive checklist employed for all communication and dissemination materials during their review. The author(s) and (internal) reviewer – if applicable – are responsible to make sure their communication and dissemination material follows ATLAS's guidelines for gender-sensitive communication.

Note that not all points of this list might be applicable to all materials. In this case, this should be noted and briefly explained.

Gender representation

- ☐ The material includes quotes from different genders
- ☐ The material presents female/male voices in non-traditional roles

Gender stereotypes

- ☐ The material avoids gendered pronouns when a person's gender is unknown
- ☐ If the material asks a person to self-report their gender, the option 'other' is available
- ☐ The material does not include irrelevant information about people's gender
- ☐ The material does not gender inanimate objects
- ☐ The material includes a wide mix of people in different environments
- ☐ The material portrays a balance of genders in listening and speaking roles, and in leadership and support roles.

Invisibility or Omission

- ☐ The material does not use 'man' or 'he' when referring to the experiences of all people
- ☐ The material has a balanced gender representation in photographs/images/drawings, examples, etc.

Subordination and trivialisation

- ☐ The material uses the same naming conventions for all genders when referencing
- ☐ The material does not always put the male version first
- ☐ The material does not use diminutive affixes

8.4   Addressing gender aspects in research

The following checklist is from the Toolkit Gender in EU-funded research [5] published by the Directorate-General for Research and Innovation of the European Commission (see [5], p. 16). For detailed information, please refer to this publication.

As with the checklist for gender-sensitive language, please note that not all points of this list might be applicable to all research areas. In this case, this should be noted and briefly explained.

Research idea phase

☐ If the research involves humans as research objects, has the relevance of gender to the research topic been analysed?
☐ If the research does not directly involve humans, are the possibly differentiated relations of men and women to the research subject sufficiently clear?
☐ Were literature and other sources relating to gender differences in the research field reviewed?

Methodology

☐ Does the methodology ensure that (possible) gender differences will be investigated: that sex/gender-differentiated data will be collected and analysed throughout the research cycle and will be part of the final publication?
☐ Does the deliverable/article/etc. explicitly and comprehensively explain how gender issues will be handled?
☐ Have possibly differentiated outcomes and impacts of the research on women and men been considered?

Research phase

☐ Are questionnaires, surveys, focus groups, etc. designed to unravel potentially relevant sex and/or gender differences in the data?
☐ Are the groups involved in the project (e.g. samples, testing groups) gender-balanced? Is data analysed according to the sex variable? Are other relevant variables analysed with respect to sex?

Dissemination phase

☐ Do analyses present statistics, tables, figures and descriptions that focus on the relevant gender differences that came up in the course of the project?
☐ Are institutions, departments and journals that focus on gender included among the target groups for dissemination, along with mainstream research magazines?

Have you considered a specific publication or event on gender-related findings?

9 Ethical and security assessments

9.1 Issues and background

During execution of ATLAS, both ethical and security aspects may come to the fore. ATLAS shall take care of security and information sensitivity aspects to protect European citizen as well as public and private information. For both the ethical and security related aspects, this project handbook describes the specific project measures and procedures that all ATLAS consortium partners shall adhere to. The ATLAS consortium will make sure that all guidelines for ethical and security assessment as well as conducted research activities over the lifetime of the project will comply with relevant EU directives and regulations as previously identified in the ATLAS Grant Agreement, Annex I, part B, Section 5.

There are three main areas of concern with regard to the **ethical management** of the ATLAS project.

- The project needs to work in accordance with legal requirements established by the European Commission and national authorities, in particular concerning data protection and privacy issues. Personally Identifiable Information (PII) (privacy) that may be acquired during tests, field trials/experiments and pilot studies need to be properly secured for within the rules set forth by EC privacy legislation.
- ATLAS is a research project. As such, the project members need to display research integrity in their work, and adhere to common, established research practices, such as intellectual honesty, accuracy and transparency in their project activities.
- In order to avoid social and personal harm as a result of the project, it is important to consider and reflect on the possible implications of the ATLAS project outcome for research participants (individuals as well as institutions) and society as a whole. Therefore, the ATLAS project consortium needs to exhibit good, societally responsible, research practices.

It is important to establish a project environment that stimulates responsible behaviour and a reflexive attitude in relation to ethical issues. ATLAS partners seek for full compliance with ethical principles (including the standards of research integrity, avoiding fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or other research conduct, and applicable to international, EU and national law). The ATLAS consortium adopts the European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity [6].

The ATLAS consortium follows the policies on classified information and security rules for protecting classified information, as laid down in the EU Council Decision for protecting EU classified information (see [7], [8]).

Ethics and Security management is the responsibility of the coordinator.

9.2 Security measures and procedures

The ATLAS project is not expected to handle classified information. However, in case that information is assessed to be sensitive and is to be included in deliverables, it is the responsibility of the provider of that information to indicate the right level of security classification (be it private, national, or EU). The ATLAS partner(s) involved are requested to follow the adequate measures to handle such information (including its storage, processing and dissemination), with the understanding that they are screened up to that level.

In such a case, this may require an amendment of the originally indicated dissemination level of concerned deliverables, on which the WPL will inform the PM, who in turn will propose an amendment of the ATLAS DoA.

9.2.1 Security procedures accessing, handling, processing, and storing classified and/or sensitive data/information

1 Only ATLAS consortium partners cleared for handling sensitive and/or classified data/information shall be allowed to access, process, and securely store such data/information based upon the principles of need-to-know and need-to-access.
2 Within such an ATLAS partner organisation, only personnel cleared for handling that security classification level of data/information shall be allowed to access, handle, process, and securely store such data/information based upon the principles of need-to-know and need-to-access.
3 ATLAS consortium partners handling sensitive and/or classified data/information shall convince themselves about the right clearance(s) before releasing such data/information to another partner and its personnel, or (when it concerns processed data/information) to a third party and its personnel.
4 Classified data/information with a national or EU-security classification level marking shall be treated according to the prevailing procedures for such data/information.

Classified national/EU data/information and private company data/information shall only be shared with (subsets of) ATLAS partners based on a need-to-share, need-to-know basis while taking into account requirements set by the data/information owner concerning the release of such data.

9.3 Ethical assessment

This section contains a first description of the internal ethical assessment procedure for the ATLAS project.

For deliverables and dissemination materials that have to undergo an ethical and security assessment, the following process should be employed. For deliverables this process should be done in parallel to the internal review, as described in section 7.

1. For a normal deliverable draft, go to the next process step.

a. A **small deliverable or dissemination draft**, e.g. two pagers, press-announcements, and scientific and popular publications nearing a deadline may follow a quick-scan procedure. This requires an **email to the coordinator** asking for a **quick-scan** review. Such a request should be handled with priority by the coordinator and should be pre-announced as early as possible. After receiving the request, one member of the coordinator should take it up and provide a review decision (see step 5 below) within **two (2) working days**. Any found ethical or security issues make a revision of the material mandatory.

2. When a deliverables draft is ready for the (WP) internal review (see section **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**), the WPL shall – if required – ask for the assignment of an ethical / security reviewer by send a request to the coordinator. Input to be provided: expected date of completion of the review process and specific aspects / areas of the deliverable draft requiring special attention by the ethical reviewer.

3. In parallel to the internal review the deliverable draft should be forwarded to the ethical / security reviewer.

4. The ethical / security reviewer shall use the guidance for the ethical and security assessment provided within this document as reference for their review of the deliverable draft.

5. The ethical / security reviewer shall advice the consortium partner responsible for the deliverable about the ethical and security aspects of the deliverable:
   a. **No issues**
   b. **Ethical/security issue(s) requiring reprocessing** of the deliverable draft to remove the issue(s): As in the general quality management process, the consortium partner responsible for the deliverable shall revise the deliverable and report back to the ethical / security reviewer on how the issue(s) have been resolved.
   c. **Ethical/security issue(s) requiring** ethical / security **involvement**: The ATLAS coordinator shall be informed immediately. The steering committee has to assess the found ethical issues for general implications for the work in ATLAS and take corrective actions. The ethical / security has to be informed by the steering committee on the corrective actions taken.

6. The found ethical and security issues and the corrective actions have to be reported in the project periodic reports.

10 Risk management

10.1 Critical Risks

In view of the highly innovative character of the project, several risks are identified that may occur during the implementation of the ATLAS project. The important risks are summarised in the following. Impact and probability are estimated on a three-point scale, whereby the relative impacts of course differ according to the importance of the partner, task or deliverable that is at stake.

Risk	Risk description	Likelihood / Impact
Key persons leave consortium partner	Unavoidable in a big project. Critical knowledge or senior experience may disappear from the project.	Medium / Medium
Partner leaves consortium	Happens occasionally, often due to restructuring in partner organisations.	Low / High
Partner is unable to produce work on time	Lack of suitable capacities may lead to delays or even worse progress of insufficient quality that may have knock-on effects.	Low / Medium
Partner unable to effectively work with other partners and/or stakeholders	Contact and dialogue with other partners and stakeholders are essential to the ATLAS project.	Low / Medium
Deliverables from one WP not (in time) available for other WP	May have knock-on effects and delay other products.	Medium / High
Slow knowledge acquisition	It takes more time to gather basic data needed	Medium / Medium
Slow technical development	Stagnation of the technical development of databases and decision support tools	Medium / Medium
Integration problems with existing methodologies, systems and protocols	Developed methods and technologies do not align with existing methods, systems, and protocols, limiting interoperability, applicability, and usability.	Medium / High
Inadequate access to stakeholders	Access to various stakeholders that are central for ATLAS.	Low / High
Stakeholders ignore ATLAS results	As all projects, ATLAS runs the risk of developing tools that are never used and reports that end up in a drawer	Low / High

Not a European wide impact	Similarly the ATLAS results will be used on the pilot test sites, but may not be taken up by others	Low / High
Budget Excess	The ATLAS consortium is ambitious. This brings a risk of perfectionism and may lead to overspending to realise all the planned products and unplanned services to cities.	Low / Medium

10.2 Risk contingency plan

Risk	Contingency plan	Responsible
Key persons leave consortium partner	All partners work in organisations with a sufficient pool of staff that allows them to bring in other qualified personnel into the project. This should be prepared to achieve a timely hand-over of tasks. All project work will be rigorously documented to facilitate a smooth replacement of persons, if this should become necessary. The coordinator will map partners within the consortium having a similar profile and able to step in for each other.	Partner, coordinator
Partner leaves consortium	The first option is reassignment of tasks to other consortium partners. Work should be well documented to allow for transfer. If the partner possesses an expertise or capability that is unique in the consortium and essential for the execution of ATLAS, the consortium will seek for an alternative new partner that possesses the same or a similar expertise. In this case, an amendment of the Grant Agreement is required.	Coordinator
Partner is unable to produce work on time	Regular contacts between project co-ordinator and partners are necessary to identify problems in an early stage. The partners have some overlay of competences, which allows to find a solution if one partner is failing without decreasing the work quality and objective achievement. Other representatives from partner organisations may undertake or assist in the production of the work. In cases of extreme underperformance, the coordinator will assign work to another party, and process consequences for the budget of the partners involved.	Coordinator
Partner unable to effectively work with other partners and/or stakeholders	International research projects require effective communication and co-operation skills. Not all researchers have these capacities. If structural problems arise, partners and/or the coordinator will request other representatives from partner	Coordinator

	organisations to undertake or assist in the production of the work. If that is not possible and conflicts may arise, the coordinator will assign work to another party, and process consequences for the budget of the partners involved.	
Deliverables from one WP not (in time) available for other WP	Regular contacts between WPLs about progress and commitments. Adapt timelines where possible. Optimise interaction between WP's rather than maximising individual WP activities. (Eventual) re-allocation of resources	WPL, coordinator
Slow knowledge acquisition	Timely action to limit task to what is reasonable or change (geographical) focus.	WPL, coordinator
Slow technical development	Timely action to organise interaction between partners to achieve simplifications or redistribute tasks.	WPL, coordinator
Integration problems with existing methodologies, systems and protocols	Timely action for realignment of method and tool development to comply with existing methodologies, systems and protocols.	Partner, coordinator
Inadequate access to stakeholders	The large network and experience of the other ATLAS partners and the ATLAS advisory boards help to get access to alternative groups of stakeholders. In case of inadequate access in a certain pilot city the work can be (geographically) refocused.	Partner, pilot city, coordinator
Stakeholders ignore ATLAS results	The ATLAS work plan and communication plan include a number of activities to engage stakeholders (public and private) at multiple levels. The pilot test sites and the centres of competence have a special role in connecting with local stakeholders. Although it can only be judged after the end of the project, if results are ignored, first signals of disinterest will need to be picked up. In discussion with the centres of competence and the local research partner(s) an alternative route will be explored. The adaption of advisory boards will be initiated through the steering committee.	Coordinator, pilot city, partner
Not a European wide impact	The ATLAS consortium consists of partners from the South West to the North East of Europe. Through the 2nd tier of cities direct impact will be extended. Dissemination through conferences, meetings, and collaboration with related projects should result in reaching wider audiences and stakeholders across Europe.	Coordinator, partner

Budget Excess	The partners will provide every nine months a financial report to the coordinator. The executive board (EXB) will discuss the overviews and keep control of and monitor resources allocated and used for respective work packages and tasks, and take timely measures if the budget might be exceeded.	Coordinator, WPL, (EXB)

10.3 Role of the partners and the coordinator in risk management

The monitoring of these risks, and the reporting of new, as yet unidentified risks, will be a task of everyone involved in the associated part of the work plan. In the end it is the responsibility of the coordinator to assess the possible occurrence of the risks, and to decide on the mitigation measures or, eventually, a modification of the work plan.

During the execution of the ATLAS project, regular meetings with the WP leaders will be held to monitor progress, stimulate interactions between respective work packages, seek for feedback and exchange lessons learned, and to respect timely delivery of intermediate results, project deliverables and milestones. Based on the experience from the first project year, the frequency of these meetings will be revisited for the following years.

The prevention of problems, avoidance of deviations from the project work plan, and mitigation of any risk arising as well as enhancement of the project success is an important task of project management in general.

Access to and involvement of stakeholders in both public and private sectors, whether they are end-users or solution providers, R&D organisations or regulators, is of utmost importance. Naturally, this broad network is available through the composition of the consortium itself.

This project handbook as well as the project groupware Confluence and JIRA, will establish roles, responsibilities, and procedures for proper execution of the ATLAS project, distinguishing between:

- **Persons responsible for (sub)tasks / deliverables:** who will identify risk, develop mitigation strategies and contingency plans for their (sub)tasks and monitor risk. They report potential risk factors to their WPL.
- **Work package leaders:** who will consolidate risk, and develop mitigation strategies and contingency plans on work package level. They report potential risk factors to the PM and other WPLs.
- **Project manager:** who is responsible for the risk management of the whole project. They identify risk, develop mitigation strategies and contingency plans, monitors risk and report risk status in the periodic progress reports to the EU, including planned contingency measures.

In the end, all partners are responsible for dealing with risk factors and actions as sketched in this contingency plan.

References

[1] E. Rome, E. Luiijf, E. Kyriakides: CIPRNet D1.20 Project Handbook. 02.07.2013, GA no. 312450.

[2] R. Willems, P. Bosch: RESIN D8.1 ESAG Reference Document and Boards. 31.08.2015, GA no. 653522.

[3] European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE): Toolkit on Gender-sensitive Communication. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2018.

[4] United Nations Development Programme (UNDP): Principles of Gender-Sensitive Communication. United Nations Development Programme, 2017.

[5] Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Yellow Window Management Consultants, Engender, Genderatwork: Toolkit Gender in EU-funded research. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2011.

[6] European Science Foundation: The European Code of Conduct for Research Integrity. March 2011, ISBN: 978-2-918428-37-4.

[7] European Council: EU, 2013/488/EU 15.10.2013 L274 Council Decision of 23 September 2013 on the security rules for protecting EU classified Information (a.k.a. EUCI). Online: http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32013D0488

[8] https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/general-secretariat/corporate-policies/classified-information/information-assurance/

[9] S. Dench, R. Iphofen, U. Huws: An EU Code of Ethics for Socio-Economic Research. Institute for Employment Studies, Report 412, May 2004.