

EU Project Communication Readiness Check

Review audiences, languages, approvals, channels and content infrastructure

Project / organisation: _____

Programme: _____

Date: _____

This check is designed as a short practical review of how ready a project is to communicate.

For each question choose:

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Do not add the answers into a compliance score. A gap matters because of its practical consequence, not because it removes a point from a total.

01 Audiences

Have we identified 2-3 priority audiences rather than only broad categories such as “stakeholders” or “the general public”?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Do we know what each priority audience needs to understand, do or use?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Can we name a realistic route through which the project can reach each priority audience?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Have we considered accessibility, digital barriers or offline routes where they affect access to the communication?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Notes / next step

02 Languages

Have we decided which audiences actually need content in which languages?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Is there one identifiable master version of the core project description and other frequently reused information?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Do we have agreed terminology for the project name, programme references, acronyms and recurring technical terms?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Is there a defined way to review important content in each priority language?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Notes / next step

03 Approvals

Is it clear who can approve routine communication for publication?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Have we identified which content requires additional factual, consortium, rights or specialist review?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Is there a clear route for approval when the usual approver is unavailable?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Can the team identify the latest approved version without relying on someone's memory or inbox?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Notes / next step

04 Channels

Does every active channel have a defined audience and purpose?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Can the team realistically maintain the channels it has chosen with the available people and time?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Does the organisation retain appropriate access to each channel if a staff member or contractor leaves?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Notes / next step

05 Content infrastructure

Can the team quickly find current approved texts, templates, visual assets and relevant permissions?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Is it clear how public information is updated, errors are corrected and final results are published?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Is there a practical plan for keeping important results, files and access available after staff changes or the funded project ends?

☐ Ready ☐ Partly ☐ Not yet ☐ Not applicable

Notes / next step

Three priority actions

Look at the questions marked Partly or Not yet. Choose the three gaps that could create the clearest practical problem for communication.

1.

2.

3.

How to read the results

Audiences

Several gaps usually mean the project is producing content before establishing how it will reach the people who matter.

Languages

Several gaps point to translation, review or version-control risk.

Approvals

Gaps tend to appear later as delays or uncertainty about what may be published.

Channels

Gaps often indicate a maintenance, continuity or access problem.

Content infrastructure

Gaps mean useful communication may be produced without a reliable way to find, update or preserve it.

A small project may legitimately mark some questions Not applicable. The objective is a process proportionate to the project, not maximum administrative complexity.

Important

This readiness check is a practical planning tool. It is not legal advice, a programme audit, a compliance certificate or a substitute for checking the project's call documents, signed Grant Agreement, annexes and relevant programme manual.