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AGENDA

1. Project data and status
2. Management structure: some reminders from the GA and the CA
3. Quality assurance:
   1. few rules for e-mails and documents
   2. reporting
4. The deliverables up to M6: timing and reviewers assignment
5. The UIC extranet
PROJECT DATA

- Starting date
  - 1 September 2010

- Reporting periods
  - P1: 1 September 2010 - 31 August 2011
  - P2: 1 September 2011 - 31 August 2012
  - P3: 1 September 2012 - 31 March 2014

- Total costs
  - € 21,775,289.80

- Total funding
  - € 13,115,064.00

- Pre-financing
  - € 6,994,700.80
  - of which € 655,753.20 are transferred to the Guarantee Fund
PROJECT STATUS

• Grant Agreement
  – signed by ASTS on 3.8.2010
  – countersigned by EC on 13.8.2010

• Consortium Agreement
  – Signed and distributed to all partners by DHL

• Form A
  – 27 out of 28 have been signed by the corresponding partner and countersigned by ASTS
  – we will soon (as soon as we receive the bank account information) pay them the pre-financing (pro-quota)
  – missing partners (they will not be paid until we receive the signed Form A)
    • RCA
THE MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE (FROM THE CA)

Steering Board
SP leaders and co-leaders

For all issues regulated by the Consortium Agreement requiring voting from all the partners

General Assembly
All partners

Technical Coordination Committee
SP leaders and co-leaders

SP1 Technical Committee
All partners participating to SP1

SP6 Technical Committee
All partners participating to SP6

WP1.k Technical Committee
All partners participating to WP1.k

WP6.j Technical Committee
All partners participating to WP6.j
The Ethical Board, will monitor any potential ethical issue of the project and it will be composed by:

- one senior representative from each SP Leader and/or Co-Leader organisation (see Table 2)
- one representative of the FUNDP partner
- one Independent Expert on personal data/privacy issues selected during the first 3 months of the project.

The Ethical Board will involve members of EU bodies

Annual Ethical Report
## LEADERS AND CO-LEADERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Project</th>
<th>Leader Number</th>
<th>Leader Short Name</th>
<th>Co-Leader Number</th>
<th>Co-Leader Short Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SP0 Project Management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ASTS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>DAPP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP1 Dissemination and Exploitation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>UNIFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP2 Functional and Technical Railway Security Specification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ASTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>T3S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP3 Integration at Sub-Mission Level (physical &amp; operational assets)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ALS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP4 Integration at Sub-Mission Level (transported assets)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>T3S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP5 Global Integration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>BT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP6 Future Design for Security</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>TNO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>SARAD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Regarding technical issues, the general principle shall be that they are to initially resolved by the leader of the level where they arise:
  – by the Tasks Leader, if it is a matter of activities within the same tasks;
  – by the Work Package Leader, if the conflict raised within two or more tasks in the same WP;
  – by the Sub Project Technical Committee, if the conflict is a matter between two or more WPs in the same SP;
  – by the Technical Coordination Committee, if it is a matter between Sub-Projects.
**FREQUENCY OF MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>When called by the Steering Board and in any case at M1 (today), M12, M24 and M42 (i.e. at each review)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Board</td>
<td>Every 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Coordination Committee</td>
<td>Same as the Steering Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project Technical Committee</td>
<td>Whenever needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP Technical Committee</td>
<td>Whenever needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEETINGS PREPARATION AND ORGANISATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ordinary meeting</th>
<th>Extraordinary meeting</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Adding agenda items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly</td>
<td>45 calendar days</td>
<td>30 calendar days</td>
<td>21 calendar days</td>
<td>14 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steering Board</td>
<td>45 calendar days</td>
<td>15 calendar days</td>
<td>15 calendar days</td>
<td>10 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Coordination Committee</td>
<td>15 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>2 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Project Technical Committee</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>2 calendar days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP Technical Committee</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>7 calendar days</td>
<td>2 calendar days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUALITY ASSURANCE

• Deliverable reviewing process:
  1. Each SP leader manages the editing process but …
  2. Final draft ready for review
      EU deadline - 3 weeks
  3. Final version ready for submission to EC
      EU deadline
REVIEWERS

• Deliverables are reviewed by
  – 2 different reviewers
  – plus FUNDP for the ethical content

• Reviewers are:
  – EITHER
    • senior staff from partners organisations that have not contributed to the specific deliverable
  – OR
    • external persons who agreed to review
FILE NAMING

• A fixed format for file naming:
  PRAIL_<YYYYMMDD>_<SWW>_<partner>_<title>_R<nn>

• where
  --<YYYYMMDD> is the date of the last revision of the document
  --<SWW> represents the SP and the WP to which it refers to
  --<partner> is the partner short name
  --<title> is the document title (summarised ...)
  --R<nn> is the revision number (00, 01, 02, ....)

• Please STRICTLY follow the above rule
E-MAIL POLICY

• Each message subject shall start with
  PRAIL_<SWW>

where
  – <SWW> represents the SP and the WP to which it refers to

• Please use meaningful subjects!

• If not followed there is a high risk that your email is not handled properly
DELIVERABLES

• Delivery date
  – the last day of the month indicated in the Annex I (DoW)
• or
  – 30 days after the last day of the month indicated in the Annex I (DoW)?
• EC REA should clarify
## DUE DELIVERABLES UNTIL M6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Resp. partner</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D02.1 Quality Control Manual</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>ASTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D13.4 Workshop and Conferences Organisation (v.1)</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14.2 PROTECTRAIL Public Website</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21.1 Stakeholders Requirements for Railway Security (v.1)</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>DUCTIS</td>
<td>TCDD</td>
<td>TNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D22.1 Regional Disparities in Railway Security Sector (v. 1)</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>UNIFE</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23.1 Prioritised Stakeholders Requirements for Railway Security (v.1)</td>
<td>M4</td>
<td>PKPPLK</td>
<td>MORPHO</td>
<td>SNCF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DUE DELIVERABLES UNTIL M6 (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deliverable</th>
<th>Due date</th>
<th>Resp. partner</th>
<th>Reviewer 1</th>
<th>Reviewer 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D01.1 Summary report no. 1 of Teleconference with a PO (REA)</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>ASTS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D11.1 Railway Security Actors Handbook</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D23.4 Terrorist preparation and attack scenarios for each specific sub-mission (v.1)</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>PKPPLK</td>
<td>UIC</td>
<td>SSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D24.1 Security Functional Specification (v.1)</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>ASTS</td>
<td>PKPPLK</td>
<td>ED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D26.2 Privacy and Ethics Recommendations (v.1)</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>FUNDP</td>
<td>KU</td>
<td>BT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DUE DELIVERABLES UNTIL M6 (CONT.)

• There are some timing problems since ...
  – D21.1 Stakeholders Requirements for Railway Security (v.1)
  – D23.1 Prioritised Stakeholders Requirements for Railway Security (v. 1)
• ... are both due at M4
• DUCTIS and PKPPLK should synchronise themselves to be able to deliver on time
  – a point in the agenda for SP2 kick-off
KICK-OFF FOR SP3, SP4 AND SP5

- It is planned to anticipate the start of the work on SP3, SP4 and SP5
  - most likely in coincidence with the next Steering Board meeting
    - M5 instead of M9 for SP3 and SP4
    - M5 instead of M7 for SP5
  - in order to define
    - a common approach to design, develop and integrate
    - common tools (e.g. for requirements, data modelling, etc.)
REPORTING

• From SP leaders
  – monthly technical report on the SP
    • objectives of the period
    • results achieved
    • problems
    • identified risks and mitigation actions
  – basis for the discussion at the Steering Board Meeting

• Towards EC
  – except the reports due at the end of each period, currently progress reporting is based on:
    • 6-monthly phone conference
    • minutes of the phone conference (deliverable)
NEXT MEETING

• Steering Board
  – quarterly meetings

• SB2
  – date
    • 1-3 February 2011
  – venue: UIC Paris
  – it will also host the SP3, SP4 and SP5 kick-off

• SB3
  – date
    • 12-14 April 2011
  – venue: UIC Paris (to be confirmed)
THE UIC EXTRANET

• The floor to Marie-Helene Bonneau to briefly explain the UIC Extranet

https://www.uic-online.com
Thank you!