**Evaluation report for project**

[**AC-ACH.XX.XXXX**](https://ims.euro-fusion.org/fp9/Workpackage#?aWpId=4557&aTaskId=6507&aDelivId=22883)

**by the E-TASC Scientific Board (2024)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project references:** | |
| ACH\* | ***Title to be put here (to be prefilled)*** |
| Project Ref. links |  |
| Coordinator\* | ***<Name> <Surname> (<Beneficiary>)*** |
| Beneficiaries involved\* | ***List of other beneficiaries involved in the project*** |
| Connected activities (other TSVVs, ACHs, WPs, EnR etc.) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation panel references:** | |
| Scientific Board\* | ***E-TASC Scientific Board (SB)*** |
| Board composition\* | ***Frank Jenko (SB Chair); Bastiaan Braams; Rui Coelho; Andreas Kirschner; Kai Nordlund; Eric Serre; Par Strand; David Tskhakaya; José Luis Velasco; Laurent Villard; Fulvio Zonca*** |
| Board secretary\* | ***Denis Kalupin (FSD CO)*** |

***Purpose of the report***

*After three years of providing computational expertise to EUROfusion code developers through the established Advanced Computing Hubs (ACHs) since 2021, it is sensible to evaluate the effectiveness of the work, the profile of expertise, and customer satisfaction with the current implementation. Consequently, the E-TASC scientific board (SB) plans to conduct a comprehensive review of five operational ACHs, presenting recommendations to the programme manager for activities covering up to the end of 2025 and the extension period of 2026-2027.*

#### 1. Summary

Brief description of the project’s background and goals (to provide context).

|  |
| --- |
| **Background and goals of this ACH (as stated in the original proposal)** |
|  |

Concisely state the most important conclusions and recommendations. The text should be usable as a stand-alone document (*max. 1/2 page*).

|  |
| --- |
| **Executive summary of main findings and recommendations** |
|  |

#### 2. Evaluation

Main findings of the review panel w.r.t. the evaluation questions listed in Annex I (*max. 1 page*).

|  |
| --- |
| **Main findings regarding this ACH** |
|  |

#### 3. Recommendations and general lessons learned

Recommendations based on the main findings, aimed at improving or modifying the ongoing project and making specific suggestions in clear, simple, actionable language (*max. 1/2 page*).

|  |
| --- |
| **Recommendations to improve or modify this ACH** |
|  |

Identify good practices in the project implementation that could be generalized to other projects. Moreover, provide observations, insights, and suggestions which may help improve the interactions between the various players and stakeholders in the context of E-TASC, incl. TSVVs, ACHs, EnR, WPs, and the wider community (*max. 1/2 page*).

|  |
| --- |
| **Important general lessons learned (concerning E-TASC as a whole)** |
|  |

#### Annex I: Evaluation questions

Following **key questions** shall be addressed by the review.

1. **Customer satisfaction**

Customer satisfaction is the ultimate key performance indicator (KPI) driving the maintenance of support teams. While other KPIs indirectly contribute to this goal, direct measurement is achieved through customer surveys. Key questions for these surveys include:

* Was it possible for customers to receive the support they requested, up to the desired level?
* Were reported issues or requested developments resolved within the allocated time, or do requests remain open indefinitely?
* Do customers find the current mode of interaction with the ACH team effective, or do they see opportunities for improvement? If so, how?
* Do customers think that the process of assigning ACH resources is easy and transparent, or can it be further improved?

1. **ACH competences**

Ensuring the right competences within ACHs, with a balanced mix and sufficient manpower, is crucial for the support teams' effectiveness. With emerging techniques such as increased use of artificial intelligence, machine learning methods, and a potential shift in computing resources toward greater GPU utilization, it becomes essential to reevaluate the ACH profiles established several years ago. Key questions for these surveys include:

* Are the competences customers requiring for enhancing their codes available within the existing ACHs? If not, need to be specified.
* Do customers anticipate potential obstacles to the progress of their codes due to a shortage of ACH manpower with specific competences?
* Do customers believe the current balance between High-Performance Computing (HPC), Integrated Modelling (IM), and Data Bases (DB) needs reconsideration? If so, in which direction?

1. **ACH satisfaction**

Ensuring the continuous, smooth operation of ACH teams and the maintenance and development of essential competences requires addressing emerging issues in personnel allocation or task distribution over recent years. Key questions for these surveys include:

* Were ACHs able to fulfil all requests with the required competences and manpower? If not issues and solutions to prevent recurrence need to be indicated.
* Was it feasible to maintain the human resources of ACHs at the level agreed from the beginning of the work programme? If not, the challenges faced and propose corrective measures taken or recommended need to be specified.
* Was it possible to provide training to ACH team members and/or enhance the overall competences of the ACH? If not, challenges and propose solutions for future improvement need to be indicated.
* Does the current process of assigning tasks to ACHs facilitate the smooth and continuous operation of support teams, or are there opportunities for further enhancement? If so, improvements are to be suggested.