

# HACID - Deliverable

# Quality Assessment Report

## Year 3

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101070588. UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) funds the Nesta and Met Office contributions to the HACID project.

<b>Deliverable number:</b>	D1.8
<b>Due date:</b>	31.08.2025
<b>Nature<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Report
<b>Dissemination Level<sup>2</sup>:</b>	Public
<b>Work Package:</b>	WP1
<b>Lead Beneficiary:</b>	CNR
<b>Contributing Beneficiaries:</b>	MPG, Human Dx, Nesta, MET Office

---

<sup>1</sup> The following codes are admitted:

- R: Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports)
- DEM: Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs
- DEC: Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc.
- DATA: Data sets, microdata, etc.
- DMP: Data management plan
- ETHICS: Deliverables related to ethics issues.
- SECURITY: Deliverables related to security issues
- OTHER: Software, technical diagram, algorithms, models, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The following codes are admitted:

- PU – Public, fully open, e.g. web (Deliverables flagged as public will be automatically published in CORDIS project's page)
- SEN – Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement
- Classified R-UE/EU-R – EU RESTRICTED under the Commission Decision No2015/444
- Classified C-UE/EU-C – EU CONFIDENTIAL under the Commission Decision No2015/444
- Classified S-UE/EU-S – EU SECRET under the Commission Decision No2015/444

# Document History

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Partner</b>
V1	5.8.2025	Production of first draft	Vito Trianni	CNR
V2	14.8.2025	Following the input from all partners, information from the available assessments (M28 and M32) was assembled, and the risk management plan updated.	Vito Trianni	CNR
V3	29.8.2025	Integrated information from the M36 assessment.	Vito Trianni	CNR
V4	2.9.2025	Review for quality assessment	Ralf Kurvers	MPG
V5	2.9.2025	Final version	Vito Trianni	CNR

# Table of content

<b>Document History</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of content</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Findings, Recommendations and Actions</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. Period M24 - M28	4
2.2. Period M28 - M32	5
2.3. Period M32 - M36	6
<b>3. Risk Management</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Conclusions</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>11</b>

# 1. Introduction

This document reports on the quality assessment processes and outcomes conducted during the third year of the HACID project, i.e., from September the 1st, 2024 to August the 31st, 2025. The quality control processes have been defined in the Quality Management Plan (QMP, Deliverable D1.5). The report follows the same methodology introduced in the Quality Assessment Report of the first and second year (Deliverable D1.6 and D1.7). First, we discuss the activities performed for quality review during the periodic assessments, and the corresponding findings, recommendations and actions. Then, we provide a risk management report (see [Section 3](#)), in which old and newly identified risks are discussed along with planned contingency measures.

## 2. Findings, Recommendations and Actions

During the second year, quality assessment was conducted every four months, involving all WP leaders in reviewing the activities performed in their respective work packages. Following the review of the activities, a cross-project evaluation is conducted by CNR in order to identify recurring problems and make recommendations for corrective actions.

In the second year, there have been several consortium meetings and associated GAs. The consortium met physically in Berlin in March 2025, while online consortium meetings took place on September the 18th, 2023 and on April the 11th, 2024. Since May 2024, the project transitioned from this periodic meeting cadence to a monthly consortium meeting, and associated GAs if necessary.

### 2.1. Period M24 - M28

The period between September and December 2024 led to the M28 quality assessment (see Annex I). During this period, an interim review was performed, during which demonstration of the DSS prototypes was presented.

#### **Finding 1: Delays**

The quality review revealed that there are several delays in most of the workpackages, also due to dependencies. These delays are mainly due to the complexity of the development and design activities, plus some additional issues related to bureaucracy (mostly at CNR) that slows down the acquisition of services and instruments.

**Recommendation:** The current load of activities to be performed and the cumulated delays have led the consortium to request an extension of 6 months for the project. This applies to all beneficiaries and the associated partners.

#### **Review of previous actions**

With respect to the previous period, the communication issues have been largely solved thanks to regular meetings organised on a weekly basis (for specific activities) or on a monthly basis at the consortium level. There is a raised awareness about the main risks and critical paths, which however needs to translate to effective actions to avoid cumulating delays.

## 2.2. Period M28 - M32

The period between January and April 2025 led to the M32 quality assessment (see Annex II).

### **Review of previous actions**

As mentioned, the consortium decided for a project extension, which was granted after the official request. This led to a re-planning of the activities including the additional 6-months timeframe, as well as the resource allocation. An attentive planning was made to compensate for the accumulated delays, which however still remain a relevant issue.

### **Finding 1: Delays**

The project is still impacted by delays that motivated the request for extension that was submitted and approved. The new plan gives more time but there remains a need to review the planned experimentation in the light of the time horizon available and the difficulties so far encountered.

**Recommendation:** Contingency measures must be accurately planned to face risks in the difficulties of running experimentations, both for medical diagnostics and climate services.

### **Finding 2: Participatory AI activities**

Following the delays in the production of prototypes for the climate service use case, the activities to be performed for participatory evaluation and validation cannot be reliably performed as initially planned. This could result in lack of appropriate data for the participatory framework to provide useful recommendations.

**Recommendation:** It has been decided to execute the foreseen activities with early prototypes, partially replanning the activity to adapt to the available technical components. On the one hand, this could result in a lower user satisfaction than expected, but on the other hand it will be possible to incorporate the obtained feedback in the tools under development.

### **Finding 3: Extra costs for LLM usage**

Due to the inclusion of LLMs in several experimental activities within the medical diagnostics application domain, HDX is incurring extra costs that were not initially planned. These costs directly derive from the experiments we are running, but are also indirectly associated with the incentivisation of users to participate in the experiments. Users are rewarded with “impact points” within the Human Dx platform, which can be exploited to query the integrated chatbot, hence resulting in a cost for HDX. As such costs were not initially planned, HDX is facing resource constraints.

**Recommendation:** We have decided to minimise the usage of LLMs within the HDX platform to reduce direct costs to the minimum. Also, we decided to run pilot studies to find minimum rates for user rewarding. Trailing costs should be covered by other partners that have capacity for experimental studies.

### **Finding 4: Expert fatigue**

It was found that the effort required by climate experts to support experimentation and validation of the HACID DSS is rather high. Long experimental sessions and high user fatigue may lead to difficulties in recruitment and dropouts, posing a risk to the success of the experimental and validation activities.

**Recommendation:** We decided to explore different options for contingency measures to reduce fatigue and compensate for the requested effort.

## 2.3. Period M32 - M36

The period between May and August 2025 led to the M36 quality assessment (see Annex III).

### **Review of previous actions**

With respect to the previous period, an effort has been made to catch up with much of the delays and plan forward to ensure that all activities are executed with care. Several choices have been made to make the activities run smoother without sacrificing any relevant activity. We have therefore better planning about future activities, and a series of contingency measures that however need to be better specified. Concerning the execution of participatory AI activities, the available prototypes were refined and tailored to run the planned activities. Extra costs have been minimised through careful planning, but how to redistribute these is still under investigation. Finally, to deal with the complexity of the experimental activities in the climate service use case, we are minimising the amount of effort required to each participant through a simplified experimental protocol. However, remuneration issues are still being discussed. We have defined possible contingency measures by exploiting LLMs for decision support, however details should be discussed prior to adoption.

### **Finding 1: Trailing delays**

The development of the prototype for the HACID DSS is still not complete, and this delay is the cause of highest concern. An increased effort in planning and development of activities is necessary, giving priority to technical aspects that can unlock experiments and validation.

**Recommendation:** Increase resources for the development of the HACID DSS application, so as to close it as soon as possible. Develop the contingency measures in more detail for what concerns those technical aspects that cannot be sorted out in due time (e.g., by implementing ad-hoc solutions).

### **Finding 2: experimental costs for LLM usage**

The way in which experimental costs incurred by HDX could be shared by other partners is still under discussion. Once these costs are minimised, it is necessary to find the right ways of ensuring a fast and equitable payment.

**Recommendation:** Evaluate direct invoicing from the US branch of HDX, as well as transfer of budget among partners.

### **Finding 3: Expert fatigue**

The issue about recruitment of users and the effort required for experiments is still not completely cleared. There are multiple options for recruitment, which could be limited to experts from the Met Office, but could also open up to other experts from academia, as well as to doctoral students. Reaching out to these stakeholders is not easy, however. Hence, the main source could remain the Met Office, although it is not clear how to incentivize participation.

**Recommendation:** Evaluate the expert network sizes to determine the best pool to draw from. Determine incentivization methods that can also work for Met Office personnel (e.g., internal agreement with the division of origin).

### 3. Risk Management

The quality assessment activities include the management of risks the project may incur. This corresponds to evaluating the existence of precedently identified risks and the appropriateness of the mitigation and contingency measures identified, as well as the identification of new risks. During the third year, additional risks have been included (Risk 15 to Risk 17). The assessment of the previously identified and new risks is provided below.

**Risk 1.** Difficulty in aligning top-down and bottom-up generated KGs into the DKG (WP2)

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 2.** The DKG for climate services is delayed posing at risk experimentation and demonstration (WP2, WP3, WP4, WP7).

*Contingency measure:* Limit the scope to climate models to speed up deployment. Use only the top-down components.

*M28 Assessment:* The full DKG model is now available and undergoing evaluation. Data collection needs to be completed, especially in a bottom-up fashion.

*M32 Assessment:* After evaluation, several limitations have been recognised and a new version is under development. Considering the extension of the project, these activities are still under control.

*M36 Assessment:* The development is nearly completed. It was decided to remove the bottom-up information extraction in order to focus on top-down quality information in support of the experimentation.

*Priority:* Medium

**Risk 3.** Dynamic concept network representations in the dashboard is confusing to users (WP3)

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 4.** Low participation in experiments using live social interaction due to timing constraints (WP4)

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 5.** Evaluation ratings from experts in settings without ground-truth is not sufficiently discriminatory (WP5)

*Contingency measure:* Introduce additional rating dimensions (e.g., explainability or trust). Evaluate trade-offs in a multiobjective space.

*M28 Assessment:* In the London consortium meeting (Nov 2024) an empirical paradigm was developed that allows for benchmarking solutions in settings without a ground truth (climate services). However, this paradigm needs to be validated before being able to close this risk.

*M36 Assessment:* We decided to focus on four dimensions for evaluation, and piloted this with users during one experimental activity. The results of our evaluation provide sufficient discrimination.

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 6.** Demonstration inside the Human Dx platform too costly (WP6)

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 7.** Difficulty in recruiting sufficiently large and diverse set of experts for climate service (WP4 WP7)

*Contingency measures:* Expand the pool towards graduate and post-graduate students in climate science (and use a smaller pool of engaged experts to elicit gold-standard answers, see also Risk 5). Design more light-touch activities and

coincide engagement with existing events within the relevant expert community.

*M28 Assessment:* Risk still applies. We are now planning a comms campaign to increase the visibility of the project within and outside of the Met Office during the spring to prepare for the large recruitment required for the evaluation phase.

*M32 Assessment:* In July 2025, an exercise will be performed to evaluate the responsiveness of the community.

*M36 Assessment:* To recruit climate scientists, we will leverage diverse channels and networks at the Met Office. Without the use of monetary incentives, we aim to identify opportunities to coordinate asynchronous sessions with other events, thereby engaging climate scientists effectively.

*Priority:* High

**Risk 8.** Concurrent deployment of the components for experimentation in the Human Dx platform does not give sufficient time for the two planned experimentation sessions.

*Contingency measure:* Replan the development and deployment phases in order to give sufficient time for running the first experiment before launching the second.

*M28 Assessment:* The design and implementation of CLINIFLOW is almost complete. The current plan is to start pilot data collection for CLINIFLOW in January 2025, followed by the actual data collection thereafter. Since the development of MDT is more involved, this setup will naturally lead to a deployment of MDT after CLINIFLOW data collection will be completed.

*M32 Assessment:* The second scenario has been completely replanned to enable exploitation of features that are mostly already available in the platform. Risk is therefore under control but needs to be monitored.

*M36 Assessment:* We have converged on a feasible setting, now the development of the features is not anymore an issue.

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 9.** Insufficient number of solvers for analyses in the medical diagnostics domain.

*Contingency measure:* Promote cases in the user feeds more often, incentivise participation.

*M28 Assessment:* Collection for MetaMed study is nearing completion ( $\geq 20$  solves per case for 30 cases). Analytics indicated that the post-solve survey added to elicit the meta information led to a large dropout rates, which is one reason for the slow data collection. Future data collections (CLINIFLOW & MDT) will not use such post-solve surveys and should thus show faster data collection. However the reduced amount of exposure via the "feed" functionality may reduce the speed with which data is collected.

*M32 Assessment:* Collection for MetaMed study has completed and should suffice. CLINIFLOW is currently in the piloting phase and we will soon have a clearer understanding of the efficiency of data collection (using HDX's impact points incentives) and whether this necessitates pursuing alternative data collection plans. MDT is currently in the design stage and will be optimized to rely on as few experts per case as possible.

*M36 Assessment:* For CLINIFLOW, we have planned a feasible path to obtain a sufficient number of responses in due time. For MDT, we are going for recruitment through agencies. In both cases, however, there is still some risk of not meeting the target. As a contingency measure, we may reduce the number of solves to be obtained.

*Priority:* High

- Risk 10.** Definition of methods exploited within the medical diagnostics use case do not generalise to the climate service use case.  
*Contingency measure:* Perform an early assessment of the generalisation ability of methods. Deploy specific methods for climate services.  
*M28 Assessment:* Risk still applies. We are in the process of creating canonical climate-service cases and illustrative solutions to prototype solution summarization and aggregation methods.  
*M36 Assessment:* We are now following different paths for experimentation that do not necessitate translation of results, but would allow comparison in a qualitative way. This is done without the need of additional resources. Hence, the risk is considered closed.  
*Priority:* Risk closed
- Risk 11.** The UKCP chatbot developed within the climate service case study is not sufficiently integrated into the HACID DSS.  
*Contingency measure:* Plan usage of the UKCP chatbot as an alternative DSS and compare the trustworthiness between the AI-based and Hybrid CI approaches.  
*M24 Assessment:* This is still a risk and to mitigate it more formally, a trilateral meeting between the JCEEI, Met Office and CNR will be organised in early 2025 to understand how best to integrate the chatbot into the project.  
*M32 Assessment:* New opportunities of integration of the UKCP chatbot comes from the generation of solutions for the climate case. The risk can be closed.  
*Priority:* Risk closed
- Risk 12.** Uncertain outcome of automatic information extraction methods based on RAG for populating the DKG for climate services.  
*Contingency measure:* Limit DKG to data that can be directly scraped from the web. Use manual insertion when data is not sufficient.  
*M28 Assessment:* Risk still applies. No additional information at this time with respect to the M24 assessment  
*M32 Assessment:* Currently, the need for bottom-up data extraction is being evaluated and possibly this activity will not be necessary any more.  
*M36 Assessment:* We have decided to not perform this activity any more as the DKG contains sufficient information to support experimentation. The risk is closed.  
*Priority:* Risk closed
- Risk 13.** Off-the-shelf LLM models (e.g., for generating embeddings) are not sufficiently accurate for climate services.  
*Contingency measure:* Perform model fine-tuning exploiting resources provided by Met Office. Exploit methods that do not rely on LLMs.  
*M36 Assessment:* The need to use LLMs for the experimental activities is now largely reduced. Hence, the priority risk is being downgraded. We keep monitoring this for future activities.  
*Priority:* Low
- Risk 14.** Delay in prototype development and integration can impact demo and experimentation.  
*Contingency measure:* Move resources towards integration of components. Request for extension of the project duration.  
*M28 Assessment:* Risk still applies, at least in WP6. Most functionalities are ready, but a complete end-to-end demonstration of the integration has not yet been achieved.

*M32 Assessment:* Demonstration was performed in a prototype environment for both use cases. New developments and feature integrations are under control. Given that a new risk 17 has been added for WP7 only, this risk is now closed.

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 15.** Stakeholder fatigue should they be contacted multiple times on what may be perceived to be similar interactions

*Contingency measure:* Reduce effort through planning experimental activities that can be performed either in an engaging way or at the natural pace of participants.

*M28 Assessment:* As the detailed planning for the evaluation phase has been developed, it is becoming clear that more collaborative planning is required to ensure that we are making best use of points of engagement. Otherwise there may be a risk of low engagement in the future.

*M36 Assessment:* The risk is now closed as the experimental phase has converged to running online experiments at the participant pace.

*Priority:* Risk closed

**Risk 16.** Stakeholder effort to produce a contribution in CS is too high for online experiments to succeed

*Contingency measure:* Consider incentivisation to participate and complete, also rewarding quality. Develop training sessions and tutorial videos. Hackathon-style events for training interested users.

*M36 Assessment:* Currently, the effort is quite large. We will have to plan experimentation in an appropriate way with a committed pool of experts. Monetary incentives could still be considered.

*Priority:* High

**Risk 17.** Delay in prototype development and integration can impact experimentation.

*Contingency measure:* Instead of producing algorithms for collective solutions from multiple users, we will consider two contingency measures: 1) creation of solutions guided by LLMs, and 2) aggregation of solutions performed by LLMs. These activities are ongoing within side-projects (e.g., in collaboration with University of Exeter), and can leverage available knowledge produced within the project (e.g., UKCP chatbot, logic-augmented generation). In case experimentation is too delayed, we will move resources to exploit these side activities.

*M32 Assessment:* This risk is branched from N. 14 at month 32 in order to focus on WP7

*M36 Assessment:* Development is nearing the end, thanks to renewed efforts on all sides. Still, the overall functionality of the new web app needs to be closely assessed. Also, the development of aggregation algorithms is still not possible due to the lack of information about case solutions. The activities related to contingency measures are being planned in parallel.

*Priority:* High

## 4. Conclusions

The third-year quality assessment exercise revealed that some measures lead to the expected results, while further action is necessary to catch-up with delays. However, most of

the compelling risks have been closed, and the path towards delivery is more clear. As the project is nearing the end, it is recommended to attentively monitor risks and take timely action where impact can be high.

## Annexes

In the following pages, the Quality Review Checklist for M24, M28 and M32 are provided.

**Annex I - M28 Quality Assessment Checklist**

Project Quality Review	
Project Name:	HACID
Project Coordinator:	Vito Trianni
Review Date:	31/12/2024
Overall Score:	97%

WP	Score	% Quality Compliance	Included?
WP1	250	100.00%	Yes
WP2	243	97.00%	Yes
WP3	250	100.00%	Yes
WP4	240	96.00%	Yes
WP5	248	99.00%	Yes
WP6	225	90.00%	Yes
WP7	238	95.00%	Yes
WP8	245	98.00%	Yes

Area	Average Score	Average % Quality Compliance	Included?
Scope	50.00	100.00%	Yes
Schedule	43.44	86.88%	Yes
Cost	29.69	98.96%	Yes
Quality	29.69	98.96%	Yes
Risk	39.69	99.22%	Yes
Communication	49.69	99.38%	Yes

Overall key assessment	
<60%	Critical /significant issues or major process non-compliance.
60% < ... < 90%	Unless immediate action is taken, project may become red.
>90%	No significant non-compliance foreseeable at this time.

Scoring legend		
No	Nothing done or no answer	0
Not much	Something done, but very limited	2.5
Partially	Some work done, but not to the required/expected level.	5
To a great extent	Most work done, requires little more effort	7.5
Yes	Work done according to program	10
N/A	This check is not applicable to this project.	-



ID	Findings	Impact	Recommendation	Action Details (effort & responsible)
1	There are delays in the production of software and prototypes	Some activities are delayed and pose at risk the collection of experimental data	Increase attention on the timeline for development of prototypes for the two case studies. The timeline of the project should be revisited	CNR requests an extension of the project of 6 months.
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

WP1		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP2		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Partially	5		There are delays in producing the DKG that are influencing the experimentation, to some extent In general, there is some underestimation of the time required to complete actions
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>242.5</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	

WP3		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		There are delays in the production of the CKG, which influence other activities
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		There are delays in the production of the CKG, which influence other activities
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP4		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	To a great extent	7.5		The planning of the experiments and the delivery of new data has gone a bit slower than anticipated.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	To a great extent	7.5		Running platforms on HDX more complicated than anticipated. Unclear how quickly enough data can be collected. Alternative plans are being developed.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	

WP5		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	To a great extent	7.5		There is a dependency between the outcomes of participatory activities and the final designs/development of the prototype. We share the results of participatory activities in a timely manner with partners to allow for them to make decisions about the tool development in line with the findings of the participatory engagements.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		Main risk to the delivery of WP5 is the prototypes being ready so we can complete the participatory evaluation
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		We are monitoring this risk with partners and coming up with alternative strategies for reviewing the prototype at an interim point.
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>247.5</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	

WP6		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is internal rough schedule for broken down tasks. There's a lack of documentation about the match between internal schedules and global planning
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Partially	5		Delivery of data for experiments has been delayed due to lack of responses from the community. Countermeasures are being deployed (e.g. HACID cases in feed)
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Partially	5		There is internal tracking of the status of the tasks of the WP, but it frequently falls out of sync with the overall project management.
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	To a great extent	7.5		The increased focus on LLMs in the scientific experiments has created additional external costs that have been covered pro-bono by HDX with its own funds, outside of HACID. A sustained use of these LLMs for HACID-related experiments may require additional funds in the future (from the EU Commission or as a redistribution from other partners).
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	To a great extent	7.5		Qualtrics data should be copied/backed up in the project's repository
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	To a great extent	7.5		Time Zone differences make communication harder than desired and introduces delays.
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	

WP7		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>75.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is a coarse schedule that is being followed, but more detail could be useful
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Partially	5		There are delays in the production of the prototype that have an impact on the overall experimental activities.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		There is a significant underestimation of the time required to produce the prototype and assemble it in a way that is useful for experimentation
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>237.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	

WP8		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		Some difficulties in defining the dates for videos and webinars
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		Organisation of outreach activities with stakeholders slightly underestimated.
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	

**Annex II - M32 Quality Assessment Checklist**

Project Quality Review	
Project Name:	HACID
Project Coordinator:	Vito Trianni
Review Date:	30/04/2025
Overall Score:	96%

WP	Score	% Quality Compliance	Included?
WP1	250	100.00%	Yes
WP2	250	100.00%	Yes
WP3	240	96.00%	Yes
WP4	243	97.00%	Yes
WP5	238	95.00%	Yes
WP6	235	94.00%	Yes
WP7	225	90.00%	Yes
WP8	248	99.00%	Yes

Area	Average Score	Average % Quality Compliance	Included?
Scope	49.69	99.38%	Yes
Schedule	44.38	88.75%	Yes
Cost	29.06	96.88%	Yes
Quality	30.00	100.00%	Yes
Risk	38.44	96.09%	Yes
Communication	49.38	98.75%	Yes

Overall key assessment	
<60%	Critical /significant issues or major process non-compliance.
60% < ... < 90%	Unless immediate action is taken, project may become red.
>90%	No significant non-compliance foreseeable at this time.

Scoring legend		
No	Nothing done or no answer	0
Not much	Something done, but very limited	2.5
Partially	Some work done, but not to the required/expected level.	5
To a great extent	Most work done, requires little more effort	7.5
Yes	Work done according to program	10
N/A	This check is not applicable to this project.	-



ID	Findings	Impact	Recommendation	Action Details (effort & responsible)
1	Delays are impacting the project, especially for experimentation activities that have not been completely defined yet	Risks of not executing experimentation and of not obtaining sufficient data	Develop contingency measures that can provide a minimum amount of data to be exploited for results	Discussions about contingency measures are being taken within the consortium, lead by CNR
2	Participator AI activities cannot be executed with the final prototype, due to unavailability of more refined software components	Risk of not obtaining quality data as expected by PAI framework	Execute the foreseen activities with early prototypes, although this could lead to the risk that user satisfaction is lower than expected	Coordinate with technical teams to run activities with the best possible prototype.
3	Experimental costs for using LLMs are being covered by HDX, although initially not planned	Extra costs cannot be covered by HDX and pose experimentation at risk	Minimise direct and indirect costs of experimentation linked to the the usage of LLMs. Consider the possibility about budget transfer among partners.	Replan and pilot experiments with minimisation of extra costs. Get informed about possible ways of budget transfer between participants that have room for covering experimental costs
4	Effort required by climate experts to support experimental activities is higher than foreseen	Long experimental sessions and high user fatigue may lead to difficulties in recruitment and dropouts, posing at risk the success of the experimental and validation activities	Explore different options for contingency measures to reduce fatigue and compensate for the requested effort	Initiate discussion among partners
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

WP1		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP2		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP3		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		There are still late fixes in the visualization and in the creation of entity linking pipeline Delays in production of the final deliverable
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Partially	5		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>240</b>	<b>96.0%</b>	

WP4		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	To a great extent	7.5		The planning of the experiments and the delivery of new data has gone a bit slower than anticipated.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	To a great extent	7.5		Designing and running studies on HDX more complicated than anticipated. Currently CLINIFLOW is in the piloting phase and we will soon have a clearer understanding of the efficiency of data collection and whether this necessitates pursuing alternative data collection plans.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>242.5</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	

WP5		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	To a great extent	7.5		We plan to complete all WP5 activities and deliverables within the original timeline of the project. This means that the participatory evaluation activities have to focus on earlier stage prototypes.
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	To a great extent	7.5		We are forecasting an underspend in the "other costs" category and potential additional staff resources that will be needed to account for supporting other partners' activities during the 6 month extension. We have applied to transfer money between these budget lines.
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		We have entered a justification for the transfer of funds between budget lines in the funder portal and are awaiting a response/approval.
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	To a great extent	7.5		The participatory evaluations of HACID prototypes will be with earlier versions of the prototypes than originally planned. This raises a risk of not meeting the output satisfaction KPIs but will also give more scope for adjustments as a result of stakeholder feedback.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	To a great extent	7.5		Concerns about timely completion of WP5 tasks and deliverables have been raised with partners and the project PI. We have rescoped participatory evaluation activities to correspond with the current status of the prototypes.
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	To a great extent	7.5		Meetings are undertaken in an ad-hoc manner to support the delivery of specific tasks/activities.
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>237.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	

WP6		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>80.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is an internal rough schedule for broken down tasks. There's a lack of documentation about the match between internal schedules and global planning
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	To a great extent	7.5		The counter measurements deployed after M28 to address the delays in the experiments are working, but the collection of the data is still incomplete.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	To a great extent	7.5		There is internal tracking of the status of the tasks of the WP, but it sometimes falls out of sync with the overall project management. Since M28 there have been improvements to the sync between the partners.
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	To a great extent	7.5		The increased focus on LLMs in the scientific experiments has created additional external costs that have been covered pro-bono by HDX with its own funds, outside of HACID. A sustained use of these LLMs for HACID-related experiments may require additional funds in the future (from the EU Commission or as a redistribution from other partners).
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	To a great extent	7.5		Time Zone differences make communication harder than desired and introduces delays.
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>94.0%</b>	

WP7		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>32.5</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is a coarse schedule that is being followed, but more detail could be useful
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Partially	5		There are delays in the production of the prototype that have an impact on the overall experimental activities.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		There is a significant underestimation of the time required to produce the prototype and assemble it in a way that is useful for experimentation
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Partially	5		Task status reported during weekly catch up meetings
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	To a great extent	7.5		Anticipated slight underspend (ca. 0.5 FTE) from the Met Office end in delivering WP7
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		Full details to be shared in September once we have a better idea of the status of the DSS and experimentation
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Partially	5		Risks around stakeholder fatigue was identified early in the project. Given recent engagement in other projects that the Met Office is involved in, we are more sensitive with this issue. Additional mitigation measures will need to be discussed during the next quarter.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		Probably need to be wary that in the next phase, frequent/regular comms will be required between organisations (i.e. MPG and Met Office) that have not happened thus far.
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	

WP8		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		There are delays in producing videos and organising webinars
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>247.5</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	

**Annex III - M36 Quality Assessment Checklist**

Project Quality Review	
Project Name:	HACID
Project Coordinator:	Vito Trianni
Review Date:	31/08/2025
Overall Score:	97%

WP	Score	% Quality Compliance	Included?
WP1	250	100.00%	Yes
WP2	250	100.00%	Yes
WP3	235	97.92%	Yes
WP4	243	97.00%	Yes
WP5	245	98.00%	Yes
WP6	238	95.00%	Yes
WP7	230	92.00%	Yes
WP8	243	97.00%	Yes

Area	Average Score	Average % Quality Compliance	Included?
Scope	49.69	99.38%	Yes
Schedule	45.00	90.00%	Yes
Cost	29.38	97.92%	Yes
Quality	30.00	100.00%	Yes
Risk	37.81	97.66%	Yes
Communication	49.69	99.38%	Yes

Overall key assessment	
<60%	Critical /significant issues or major process non-compliance.
60% < ... < 90%	Unless immediate action is taken, project may become red.
>90%	No significant non-compliance foreseeable at this time.

Scoring legend		
No	Nothing done or no answer	0
Not much	Something done, but very limited	2.5
Partially	Some work done, but not to the required/expected level.	5
To a great extent	Most work done, requires little more effort	7.5
Yes	Work done according to program	10
N/A	This check is not applicable to this project.	-



ID	Findings	Impact	Recommendation	Action Details (effort & responsible)
1	Delays are still impacting the project, especially for experimentation activities in climate change adaptation management	Risks of not executing experimentation and of not obtaining sufficient data	Develop contingency measures that can provide a minimum amount of data to be exploited for results	Discussions about contingency measures are being taken within the consortium, lead by CNR
2	Experimental costs for using LLMs are being covered by HDX, although initially not planned. Despite being minimised through careful planning, these extra costs still exist.	Extra costs cannot be covered by HDX and pose experimentation at risk	Consider the possibility of budget transfer among partners.	Get informed about possible ways of budget transfer between participants that have room for covering experimental costs
3	Effort required by climate experts to support experimental activities is higher than foreseen	Long experimental sessions and high user fatigue may lead to difficulties in recruitment and dropouts, posing at risk the success of the experimental and validation activities	Explore different options for contingency measures to reduce fatigue and compensate for the requested effort. Identify potential pools of experts among doctoral students.	Continue the effort in restructuring the experimental and validation activities to guarantee that participants gets engaged and carry out the required task. Finalise evaluation of potential remuneration approaches for engaged participants.
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

WP1		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP2		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

WP3		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		Integration of the visualization tool into the DSS still ongoing
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>1</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	N/A	-		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>1</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>97.9%</b>	

WP4		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>90.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	To a great extent	7.5		The planning of the experiments and the delivery of new data has gone a bit slower than anticipated.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>93.8%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	To a great extent	7.5		Designing and running studies on HDX more complicated than anticipated. Currently CLINIFLOW is at the end of the piloting phase and the main study will start in August. MDT is currently exploring external recruitment options for the more involved interactive design.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>242.5</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	

WP5		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	To a great extent	7.5		Due to delays with the prototype development, participatory evaluation activities have been carried out at an interim point. Doing this has not compromised the objectives of the participatory evaluations and allows for additional iteration during product development based on user feedback.
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Yes	10		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	Yes	10		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	To a great extent	7.5		We have transferred some of our budget between "Other costs" and "Personnel" (less than <20% of the original grant). This has been communicated to and approved by the UKRI.
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>245</b>	<b>98.0%</b>	

WP6		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is an internal rough schedule for broken down tasks. There's a lack of documentation about the match between internal schedules and global planning
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		The data collection for the past experiments is now complete. Lessons learned will be applied to the data collection activities for the upcoming experiments to address possible delays.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	To a great extent	7.5		
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	To a great extent	7.5		There is internal tracking of the status of the tasks of the WP, but it sometimes falls out of sync with the overall project management. Since M28 there have been improvements to the sync between the partners.
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>27.5</b>	<b>91.7%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	To a great extent	7.5		The increased focus on LLMs in the scientific experiments has created additional external costs that have been covered pro-bono by HDX with its own funds, outside of HACID. A sustained use of these LLMs for HACID-related experiments may require additional funds in the future (from the EU Commission or as a redistribution from other partners). Possible avenues are being explored.
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	To a great extent	7.5		Time Zone differences make communication harder than desired and introduces delays.
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>237.5</b>	<b>95.0%</b>	

WP7		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>70.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	To a great extent	7.5		There is a coarse schedule that is being followed, but more detail could be useful
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Partially	5		There are delays in the production of the prototype that have an impact on the overall experimental activities.
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		There is a significant underestimation of the time required to produce the prototype and assemble it in a way that is useful for experimentation. Another time intensive activity is recruiting experts.
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	To a great extent	7.5		Task status reported during weekly catch up meetings
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>87.5%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Partially	5		Risks around stakeholder fatigue was identified early in the project. Discussion have been made about possible solutions, including simplification of the experimental/validation activities and the remuneration of subjects. Contingency measures have been proposed. The details have to be defined in the next month.
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>92.0%</b>	

WP8		Quality Compliance			
		Answer	Score	Percentage	Comments
<b>Scope</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
1	Are Tasks description up-to-date with the project requirements?	Yes	10		
2	Are the identified Deliverables in line with the project development?	Yes	10		
3	Are tasks and deliverables descriptions documented?	Yes	10		
4	Are KPIs clearly identified and in line with project development?	Yes	10		
5	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Schedule</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>42.5</b>	<b>85.0%</b>	
6	Is there an approved schedule for activities within single tasks?	Yes	10		
7	Are dependencies with external activities being respected?	Yes	10		
8	Are the tasks/activities duration estimation appropriate to this time?	Partially	5		There are delays in the production of project Videos Sometimes lack of information about progress
9	Are tasks status / % of completion being tracked and documented?	To a great extent	7.5		
10	Is the resource allocation appropriate?	Yes	10		
<b>Cost</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
11	Are all costs and resources in line with the proposal?	Yes	10		
12	Are all costs related to the planned activities within each task correctly estimated?	Yes	10		
13	Are changes with respect to the project plan (if any) sufficiently documented?	Yes	10		
<b>Quality</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
14	Is there a quality control methodology for Deliverables in place?	Yes	10		
15	Are outputs correctly maintained in a project repository?	Yes	10		
16	Have corrective actions been taken when required?	Yes	10		
<b>Risk</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
17	Have new risks been identified and contingency measures planned?	Yes	10		
18	Are known risks continuously monitored?	Yes	10		
19	Are contingency measures for known risks continuously validated for applicability?	Yes	10		
20	Are risk mitigation plans being carried out?	Yes	10		
<b>Communication</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	
21	Is communication between partners involved in the WP satisfactory?	Yes	10		
22	Are there regular meetings for core WP activities?	Yes	10		
23	Is communication with partners involved in related WPs satisfactory?	Yes	10		
24	Do meetings and reports follow the planned frequency?	Yes	10		
25	Are meeting minutes distributed after meetings?	Yes	10		
		<b>0</b>	<b>242.5</b>	<b>97.0%</b>	