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# Introduction

In the scope of the INNOLEA project and to what is foreseen in the Grant Agreement, the consortium decided that it is to the benefit of the satisfaction of its quality objectives to prepare a Project Quality Plan (PQP).

The objective of this Quality Plan is to ensure the production of concrete and high–quality results in line with the project objectives.

In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Plan is to facilitate the project’s management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It will be the use of these guidelines that will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

# Aims and Objectives of the Quality Plan

This document is for internal use by the project team and will act as a guide for the internal quality management of the Project.

The main purpose of this Project Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the INNOLEA project lifecycle. In particular:

* To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
* To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables.
* To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration
* To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled.
* To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

# Project Management Structure

## Project description

INNOLEA, is a project funded by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building for Higher Education programme, that aims to fill the gap in the area of specialized services for the leather sector, with the establishment of four leather centres in Universities of Jordan (2) and Egypt (2). Through totally new services such as a) quality testing, b) certification of products, c) training, d) informative seminars on fashion trends, e) on new ways of organization of production and f) on funding opportunities and g) the organization of trade missions and h) support of participation in exhibitions, the leather sector will have a valuable ally for its further development. The project also aims to create a link between University research and the leather sector that will foster innovation and the manufacturing of high value quality products.

## Partners

The INNOLEA partnership is comprised by a total of 12 partners:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P1 | **NTUA** | National Technical University of Athens | **Greece** |
| P2 | **SVU** | South Valley University | **Egypt** |
| P3 | **AAST** | Arab Academy for Science Technology & Maritime Transport | **Egypt** |
| P5 | **JUST** | Jordan University of Science and Technology | **Jordan** |
| P6 | **ACI** | Amman Chamber of Industry | **Jordan** |
| P7 | **BAU** | Al-Balqa Applied University | **Jordan** |
| P8 | **CIAPE** | Centro Italiano Per L'Apprendimento Permanente | **Italy** |
| P9 | **CRETHIDEV** | Creative Thinking Development | **Greece** |
| P10 | **CTIC** | Centro Tecnológico das Indústrias do Couro | **Portugal** |
| P11 | **UPB** | Universitatea Politehnica din Bucuresti | **Romania** |
| P12 | **KTU** | Kauno Technologijos Universitetas | **Lithuania** |
| P13 | **INCDTP-ICPI** | Institutul National de Cercetare-Dezvoltare Pentru Textile Si | **Romania** |

## Work Packages

The work-plan spans over 36 months and foresees 5 Work Packages:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **WP1** | Preparation (research and state of the art) |
| **WP2** | Development (capacity building and setting up of leather centres) |
| **WP3** | Quality plan |
| **WP4** | Dissemination & exploitation |
| **WP5** | Management |

## Organizational Structure/Roles

The management structure in the INNOLEA project reflects the consortium’s determination to maintain focused goals and balanced activities among its members. The objective of the management procedures will be to optimize resources in terms of budgetary, strategic and technical efficiency.

The structure of the project management will consist of:

**The Project Coordinator (PC) –** The Project Coordinator is responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, financial and administrative management including the preparation of budget and reports, timeliness and accomplishment. The PC will supervise and coordinate all activities, ensuring that all partners are working towards the same objectives; contractually, technically and administratively. The PC will ensure that all partners’ contributions meet the Management Plan expectations.

The coordinator’s main responsibilities are the following:

* To ensure the effective flow of information between partners,
* To manage the project’s decision-making process,
* To ensure the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines,
* To assure the project’s deliverables quality and of the processes leading to them,
* To coordinate the technical/support activities for the Activities,
* To serve as the only representative of the Consortium to the European Commission (EC),
* To perform evaluation of the project activities and report on project progress to the Executive Agency and the EC,
* To act as the Financial Officer within the Consortium and manage the preparation of financial statements for the EC.

**The Project Steering Committee (StC).** The StC, chaired by the PC, will be composed by one representative of each partner and will supervise the implementation of the whole programme. The StC is the project operational decision-making and arbitration body, which will implement the provisions of the Grant Agreement and shall decide on the following matters:

* strategic orientation of the project;
* identification of the Foreground that could be the subject matter of protection and consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities;
* allocation of the co-ownership shares over Foreground obtained by several participants; acquisition of rights from third parties, if applicable;
* take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project;
* implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets;
* elaborate progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants’ work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables;
* in case of default by a contractor, to propose to the Steering Committee to review participants roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

**The Quality Manager (QM).** In order to achieve the quality objectives of the project, a Quality Manager (QM), was appointed; CRE.THI.DEV will be in charge of that task.

The duty of the QM is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to the selected standards for Quality Assurance and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The QM will design a proper evaluation process and be responsible for creating a set of indicators.

**The Quality Committee (QC).** In order to achieve the quality objectives of the project, a Quality Committee (QC), was formed during the kick-off meeting, and was composed of representatives from all partners.

The duties of the Quality Committee is to assist the Quality Manager

**External Quality and Evaluation Committee-** In order to ensure a neutral review and a consistency assessment of the project deliverables versus project target groups’ needs/expectations, an External Quality and Evaluation Committee will be composed **of selected stakeholders,** persons of high esteem in a field relevant to the subject of the project, European project management and quality management. The EQEC will conduct constructive evaluation by working according to the terms set by the project QM and the Project Coordinator and will provide feedback and remarks on key deliverables as well as the overall progress of the project against project target groups’ needs/expectations.

The members of the External Quality Committee will be proposed and selected by partners **P1- NTUA, P2-SVU, P5-JUST, and P11-UPB**, who will be responsible for one member of the External Quality Committee each.

**Work Package Leader (WPL).** For each Work Package, a leader has been appointed. The WPLs are responsible for the overall coordination, progress and good execution of their respective Work Packages, independently of their own involvement in the implementation of the tasks in the Work Package. The WPLs report to the Project Coordinator. The Work Package Leader is, in the first instance, the person who will be contacted by the Project Coordinator as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and of the assigned Work Package.

**Task Leader (TL).** Each Work Package may have more than one separate subtasks and deliverables. For this reason, different partners may be appointed as Task Leaders(TL). Each TL will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of a specific task. The TLs report to the WPL. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the task will be organized and chaired by the TL. The Task Leader is, in the first instance, the person who will be contacted by the WPL as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and of the assigned Task.

## Partner Task Involvement

Specific involvement of partners in the tasks of the project:

| ***WP#*** | ***Deliverable description*** | ***Sub-task*** | ***Partners involved*** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***WP1:PREPARATION (research and state of the art)***  ***WPL: P5 (JUST)*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *WP1.1* | *Methodology Pack* |  |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* | *P6* | *P7* |  | *P9* | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *WP1.2* | *National Research reports* | *Desk research* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Field research* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* | *P6* | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Writing* |  | *P2* |  | *P5* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP1.3* | *EU Best practices database* |  | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P12* |  |
| *WP1.4* | *Cross-country research report* |  |  |  |  | *P5* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***WP2: DEVELOPMENT (capacity building and setting up of leather centres)***  ***WPL: P11 (UPB)*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *WP2.1* | *Training toolkit* | *Macrostructure /methodology* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P9* |  | *P11* |  |  |
| *Microstructure* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P9* |  | *P11* |  |  |
| *Training materials* |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P8* | *P9* | *P10* | *P11* |  | *P13* |
| *WP2.2* | *Capacity Building programme report* | *Selection of staff* | *P1* | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Advanced training in EU premises* |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P8* | *P9* | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *training programme report* |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P8* | *P9* | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *WP2.3* | *Equipment* | *Drafting of specifications* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *International bidding procurement* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Delivery & setup of equipment* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP2.4* | *Leather centres services* |  |  | *P2* |  |  |  | *P7* |  | *P9* | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *WP2.5* | *Pilot test reports* | *Pilot phase of leather centres* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Pilot test report evaluation* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P10* |  |  | *P13* |
| *WP2.6* | *Activities brochures* |  | *P1* | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP2.7* | *Collaboration platform* |  |  |  | *P3* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***WP3: QUALITY PLAN***  ***WPL: P9 (CRE.THI.DEV)*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *Transverse: quality management* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P9* |  |  |  |  |
| *WP3.1* | *Quality and evaluation Plan* |  | *P1* | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* | *P6* | *P7* | *P8* | *P9* | *P10* | *P11* | *P12* | *P13* |
| *WP3.2* | *Quality and evaluation Reports* |  | *P1* | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* | *P6* | *P7* | *P8* | *P9* | *P10* | *P11* | *P12* | *P13* |
| ***WP4: DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION***  ***WPL: CIAPE*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *WP4.1* | *Dissemination and Exploitation Plan* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P8* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.2* | *Data base for contacts & Mailing* |  |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* | *P6* | *P7* | *P8* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.3* | *Project website and online collaterals* | *Project website* |  |  |  |  | *P6* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Facebook and Twitter pages* |  | *P2* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Periodic newsletters* |  | *P2* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.4* | *Dissemination material* | *project templates, logo and corporate image for the newsletter* |  | *P2* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.5* | *Sustainable business model for Leather centres* |  |  |  | *P3* |  |  | *P7* | *P8* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.6* | *Production of background papers for the round tables* |  |  |  | *P3* |  | *P6* | *P7* | *P8* |  |  |  | *P12* |  |
| *WP4.7* | *Roundtables* |  |  |  | *P3* |  | *P6* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.8* | *Recommendations* |  |  |  |  |  | *P6* | *P7* |  |  |  |  | *P12* |  |
| *WP4.9* | *Follow up to the recommendations* | *Follow-up at national and regional level* |  | *P2* | *P3* | *P5* |  | *P7* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Drafting a report of actions* |  |  | *P3* |  | *P6* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP4.10* | *Final conference* |  |  | *P2* | *P3* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***WP5: MANAGEMENT***  ***WPL: NTUA (PC)*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | *Transverse: management activities for the project* |  | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.1* | *Management Plan* | *Management Plan (1)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.2* | *Interim Report* | *Interim Report (1)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.3* | *Final Report* | *Final Report (1)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.4* | *Kickoff meeting* | *Kick-off meeting in ~~Greece (Athens)~~ Jordan (P5-JUST-Irbid)* | *P1* |  |  | *P5* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.5* | *2nd meeting* | *2nd meeting in Athens, Greece (P1-NTUA) ~~Jordan (P5-JUST-Irbid)~~* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.6* | *3rd meeting* | *3rd meeting in Romania (P13-ICPI-Bucharest)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P13* |
| *WP5.7* | *4th meeting* | *4th meeting in Lithuania (P12-KTU-Kaunas)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P12* |  |
| *WP5.8* | *5th meeting* | *5th meeting in Egypt (P2-SVU-Qena (Luxor)) ~~Portugal (Alcanena)~~* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | *P10* |  |  |  |
| *WP5.9* | *6th meeting* | *6th meeting in Italy (P8-CIAPE-Rome)* | *P1* |  |  |  |  |  | *P8* |  |  |  |  |  |
| *WP5.10* | *Final meeting* | *Final Meeting in Egypt (P3-AAST-Alexandria)* | *P1* |  | *P3* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **P1** | NTUA |  | **P8** | CIAPE |
| **P2** | SVU |  | **P9** | CRETHIDEV |
| **P3** | AAST |  | **P10** | CTIC |
| **P5** | JUST |  | **P11** | UPB |
| **P6** | ACI |  | **P12** | KTU |
| **P7** | BAU |  | **P13** | INCDTP-ICPI |

## Project management arrangements

In order to manage time, the PC will establish from the beginning of the project strict monitoring of the tasks execution according to the agreed plan. The initial tasks’ planning is based on the proposal and will be subject to minor adaptations as the project progresses (Annex 1).

A partnership agreement (PA) explaining the terms, conditions, right, and duties of each partner will be signed between the PC and each partner representative. This agreement will be the reference in case of conflict; in case of conflicts, the coordinator will make decisions after discussing the matter with all partners. If the conflict is of strategic importance for the successful completion of the project it will be brought to the StC which will take the final decision after voting, with the vote of the coordinator counting double if necessary for achieving majority. In all cases, the PA will be the reference.

# Quality Management Strategy

Ultimately, the extent to which the project has reached its objectives will be determined by the number of leather centres established and fully operational, in Jordan and in Egypt by the end of the project. However, before reaching this final stage, certain indicators of effectiveness must be determined in order to guarantee the reaching of the project goals and objectives, each of which is related to a certain standard (requirement or metric), a measure of the success in producing the project results with the desirable level of quality. These indicators are described in some detail in the Logical Framework Matrix of the project proposal. The QM will use these indicators to measure the rate of success of foreseen results on a regular basis.

Indicators are described from a qualitative and quantitative point of view from the perspectives of the overall implementation of the project and particular project objectives.

Quality will be measured by using tools such as the monitoring and evaluation questionnaires issued regularly by the QM and answered by all partners, as well as evidence collected during project activities.

In particular, during project execution, the quality of the project and its deliverables are measured against selected quality standards regarding:

* Project Processes, to ensure the involvement and alignment of all partners according to the topics and tools to measure effectiveness.
* Project Deliverables, to measure the degree of achievement of the expected results, both in qualitative and quantitative form.

For each project component, both project processes and deliverables, one or more indicators is set, accompanied by the relevant metrics, according to which compliance is measured. The complete list of indicators and metrics is shown in the evaluation plan (see Annex 2).

### Project Management Metrics

Regarding the project management arrangements and progress, the following metrics are established:

* Efficiency of project management
* Adequacy of the internal communication process
* Efficient follow-up of the project progress
* Efficient time management
* Evaluation of progress
* Effectiveness
* Meetings
* Events

These are measured either on a six-month basis, using the data provided via the Progress Reports or after the implementation of the relevant actions, using satisfaction surveys (meetings, events, project progress).

### Key Deliverable Metrics

Regarding the project deliverables, the following categories are evaluated:

* Documents
* Websites
* Trainings

Documents are evaluated against a set of criteria regarding completeness, relevance, thoroughness, clarity, format consistency, etc, before their finalization, so are the simple webpages for the dissemination of the project. The training of the trainees will be a satisfaction survey among trainees.

# Project Quality Assurance

**Project Quality Assurance (QA)** is the measurement of the quality systems and processes to ensure the quality standards are met.

The project quality is assured through the monitoring and evaluation of the project processes that are used to develop the project activities and its deliverables.

The quality of the key project processes will be monitored and assessed through components that are grouped according to the method of evaluation.

## Internal measurement of satisfaction among partners

* Efficiency of project management
* Adequacy of the internal communication process

Each partner must rate the performance of the partnership for these components in a questionnaire which will be distributed among partners, using an online tool, such as Google Forms or similar.

The efficiency of project management and the adequacy of the communication in the partnership will be evaluated once in the middle of the project (after 18 months) and once at the end. Standard questionnaires will be used (see Internal Evaluation, Annex 3). Furthermore, after each meeting a section of the meeting evaluation questionnaire will be dedicated to the evaluation of the current state of the partnership and the project progress (see Meetings Evaluation, Annex 4).

The survey will be delivered to partners within 10 days after the end of the 1st term and 1 calendar month before the end of the project. Partners must respond within 1 week after the uploading of the survey.

The QM, within 10 days after the deadline of the surveys, will collect all the answers from the partners, perform a statistical analysis and integrate them into a report which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress, including any suggestions for changes and improvements. The report will be uploaded in the Quality Section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

In case the QM, upon processing the results finds that one or more are below the expected performance, notifies the PC in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

## Meeting and event evaluations

### Partnership Meetings

Meetings’ effectiveness will be measured internally, by all participants. Each partner must rate the effectiveness of the meeting in a questionnaire which will be distributed among partners, using an online tool, such as Google Forms or similar, after the end of each partnership meeting. Standard questionnaires will be used (Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire, Annex 4).

The questionnaires include closed questions (5-point or 4-point Likert scales, as required) as well as open-ended questions for remarks, comments and suggestions.

The survey for the effectiveness of the meetings will be uploaded within 10 days after the conclusion of the meeting works. Partners must respond within 1 week after the uploading of the survey. The QM, within 10 days after the deadline of the surveys, will collect all the answers from the partners, perform a statistical analysis and integrate them into a report including this analysis (statistical, quantitative) of the data, as well as any suggestions for changes and improvements. The report will be uploaded in the Quality Section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

The meeting is considered approved if the weighted average for the percentage of agreement is more than equal than 70% of answers. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

### Events

The effectiveness of events for the dissemination of project results will be measured by all participants. After the end of the event, each participant will be asked to rate several aspects of the event in a questionnaire; evaluations will be done on the spot using hardcopies of the standard document (Event Evaluation Questionnaire, see Annex 5). The questionnaires include closed questions (5-point or 4-point Likert scales, as required) as well as open-ended questions for remarks, comments and suggestions.

At least 80% of the registered participants of the event must fill in a questionnaire to gain significant conclusions.

Each partner holding an event will be responsible for the collection of the responses by the participants of the event, summarizing the responses into a comprehensive tabulated form which will be sent to the Quality Manager for analysis. A template spreadsheet will be provided by the QM in the Quality Section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

The partner-host of the event must deliver the data within 10 days after the end of the event. The QM, within 10 days from receiving the data will perform a statistical analysis and integrate them into a report including this analysis (statistical, quantitative) of the data, as well as any suggestions for changes and improvements. The report will be uploaded in the Quality Section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

The event is considered approved if the weighted average for the percentage of agreement is more than equal than 70% of answers. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

## Quality Control of project deliverables

Quality Control (QC) is the direct measurement of the quality level of the project deliverables. A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to the project objectives, timely delivery according to the time-schedule agreed in the project Work Plan and adequacy according to the quality criteria set out in the Evaluation Plan.

Project deliverables are generally classified into tangible ones (document based, electronic or printed) as well as intangible deliverables, such as trainings/workshops/seminars, developed and launched electronic platforms for training, communication, dissemination etc.

The key deliverables of the INNOLEA project as identified in the Evaluation Plan, consisting of the results of the Work Packages, will be monitored according to the associated monitoring actions and assessed according to the quality indicators that are proposed.

All key deliverables shall undergo an internal review and/or external validation process prior to their finalisation and sign-off. The type of evaluation(s) that a deliverable may undergo is described in the Evaluation Plan.

### Internal evaluation process for key document deliverables

Document deliverables that are identified as key in the Evaluation Plan shall undergo an internal evaluation process by the partners involved in the task.

When a document deliverable is finished, the TL uploads it in the relevant Dropbox folder, after he/she has checked it for its compliance with theDocument Template (see Annex 6), the provisions laid out in Chapter 8 of the Quality Plan, the requirements set out in the Evaluation Plan and the general objectives of the project.

The reviewers then must check the document for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness. The reviewers must verify whether the deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective, identify problems and/or deviations from requirements and suggest improvements to author.

Review evaluations should include the following information:

* Thoroughness of contents
* Completeness of contents
* Clarity of contents
* Comprehensiveness of contents
* Correspondence to project objectives
* Relevance of contents to task objectives
* Format (layout, spelling, compliance to the template, logos etc.)

As a first step, reviewers should use standard communication methods for corrections, additions and improvements to the deliverable. When the deliverable has reached the final stage, the TL will ask the reviewers to use the standard Deliverable Evaluation form (see Annex 7) in order for the task to be completed. The standard Deliverable Evaluation form will be placed in the Quality Section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

Once the document is approved it takes the status of “final version/version 1.0” and is placed in the relevant section of the shared file space in Dropbox.

The overall review and finalisation process of the document must be concluded within 1 week of the posting of the first draft, unless there are justified extensions to this deadline. No more than 2 extensions of deadlines can be given. The Approval check must be concluded within 5 days from posting the final version of the document.

### Internal evaluation process for websites, platforms etc.

Deliverables such as websites for the dissemination of results, as identified in the Evaluation Plan, shall undergo an internal evaluation process by the partners involved in the task prior to going live for use.

When such a deliverable is ready for review, the TL notifies the partners after having consulted the provisions laid out in the Deliverable Evaluation Form, and the general objectives of the project.

As a first step, reviewers should offer corrections, additions and improvements to the delivered site or platform via e-mail. The reviewers must verify whether the deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective, identify problems and/or deviations from requirements and suggest improvements to the TL.

Review evaluations should include the following information:

* Correspondence to project objectives
* Thoroughness of contents
* Completeness of contents
* Relevance of contents to task objectives
* Format (layout, spelling, logos, etc.)
* Consistency of information and format throughout the website
* Usability

The TL will ask the reviewers to use the standard Deliverable Evaluation form (see Annex 7), which will be placed in the Quality Management Dropbox folder. Once the deliverable is approved, the task is closed and the website/platform can go live for public use.

The overall review and finalisation process of the deliverable must be concluded within 1 week of the posting of the first draft, unless there are justified extensions to this deadline. No more than 2 extensions of deadlines can be given. The Approval check must be concluded within 5 days from posting about the final version of the deliverable.

### Internal Evaluation of the Training courses

The effectiveness of the training will be measured by all trainees. After the end of the training, each participant will be asked to rate several aspects of the training in a questionnaire; evaluations will be done on the spot using hardcopies of the standard document (Training Evaluation Questionnaire, see Annex 8), or online versions of this document, as convenient***.*** The questionnaires include closed questions (5-point or 4-point Likert scales, as required) as well as open-ended questions for remarks, comments and suggestions.

At least 80% of the registered participants of the training must fill in a questionnaire to gain significant conclusions.

The partner holding the training will be responsible for the collection of the responses by the participants of the training, summarizing the responses into a comprehensive tabulated form which will be sent to the QM for analysis. A template spreadsheet will be provided by the QM in the Quality Section of the Dropbox. The responsible partner must deliver the data within 10 days after the end of the training. The QM, within 10 days from receiving the data will perform a statistical analysis and integrate them into a report including this analysis (statistical, quantitative) of the data, as well as any suggestions for changes and improvements. The report will be uploaded in the relevant section of Dropbox.

The training is considered approved if the weighted average for the percentage of agreement is more than equal than 70% of answers. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

# Quality Evaluation Plan

Quality criteria and indicators to be achieved, as they have been described in Chapter 5, are in detail described in the following tables, in the form of a Quality Evaluation Plan. The Evaluation Plan identifies:

1. For project processes:

* The project processes subject to quality assurance.
* The quality standards and expectations for that process.
* The quality assurance activity – e.g., quality evaluations or reviews - that will be executed to monitor that project processes are properly followed.
* How often or when the quality assurance activity will be performed.
* The person responsible for carrying out and reporting on the quality assurance activity.

1. For Deliverables:

* The major deliverables of the project that will be tested for acceptable quality level.
* The quality standards and satisfaction criteria established for the project deliverable.
* The quality control activities that will be executed to monitor the quality of the deliverables.
* How often or when the quality control activity will be performed.
* The person responsible for carrying out and reporting on the quality control activity.

The Evaluation Plan is included in Annex 2.

# Reporting

A monitoring mechanism facilitated by a 6-Month Progress Report (PR) will be established, providing a consolidated status of the project.

The information required for the evaluation compilation of the PR of the project shall be provided by the partners and WP leaders using the Progress Evaluation Form (annex 9).

Based on the information provided in the Progress Evaluation Forms, a Project Progress Report is prepared for all activities of the project and the project Evaluation Plan is updated with the information.

At the end of the project, the Quality Manager will prepare a Project Assessment Report to assess the project’s overall implementation and documenting findings and recommendations.

The Evaluation Plan will serve also as a Monitoring Tool for the collection of information about the status of processes and deliverables with regard to their quality characteristics.

# Document Control

## Document Storage and Accessibility

The Dropbox platform will be the main document repository for visibility and use by all partners when needed.

All partners will have access (for reading) to all documents and the activity/task leads will have access for more advanced tasks (like managing, creating writing, and removing) to the activity folders. The main structure of the repository on the tool is the responsibility of the Project Coordinator.

## Document Format

All documents essential to the progress of the project must be named using their title, version number, status (draft or final) and the relevant code of the deliverable.

Example: INNOLEA-QualityPlan-v01-draft

If there are several editions of a document (eg a newsletter), a reference number at the end of the title is necessary (R1-R2-etc).

Example: INNOLEA-Newsletter-R1-v01-draft

In communication, the documents can simply be referred to with their title and their sequential reference number (if any), for example “Quality Plan” or “Newsletter R3”.

All documents will be saved in MS Word, MS Excel or MS PowerPoint compatible or .pdf file types. A template (including font, built-in header, footer, page numbers, etc.) to be used for the creation of Word documents will be available to all partners, posted as a separate document in the Quality Management folder in Dropbox (see annex 6: Document Template)

Templates of the documents to be used for the peer evaluation of deliverables, meeting evaluations, event evaluations shall also be placed in the Quality Management Dropbox folder.

Final versions of documents should be marked as final and uploaded to Dropbox in read-only format.

Documents or other material that is addressed to the public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs etc) must bear appropriate logos and disclaimers, according to EC projects visual identity requirements.

The documents that fall under these rules include all products of the project, such as deliverables, progress reports, minutes, Quality plan, management plans, etc.

All produced documents will be assigned a distribution/access level: Partnership (Confidential), Public, or restricted to certain recipients.

## Exchange of Documents

All documents and computer data files should be stored as much as possible in the Dropbox workspace. Partners should notify via e-mail when a file has been added or changed.

# Communication and management related activities and tools

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the Executive Agency and between the PC and the European Commission is very crucial for the successful implementation of INNOLEA project.

Schedule control is responsibility of the PC and Work Package/activity leaders. Changes from the initial planning will be documented in the progress reports with proper justifications.

Day by day communication among the members of the partnership is conducted using e-mail. Skype meetings are done if and when deemed necessary to complement the main mode of communication, eg if persons external to the partnership are involved or if face-to-face communication is necessary to increase efficiency. For emails, for the avoidance of any confusion, special attention should be paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is posted to the relevant area of the Dropbox.

External communication with the Executive Agency for ERASMUS+ and with the European Commission is the responsibility only of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.

The main communication tools are summarised in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tool** | **Type of communication** |
| [**Dropbox**](https://ap.adminproject.eu/) | Document repository tool |
| **e-mail** | The main form of communication |
| **Telephone** | Urgent communication |
| **Meetings** | Scheduled meetings for project management and technical workshops |

## Meetings

Meetings are important to ensure the progress of and to maintain the technical and social relationships among the partners in the project. 4 Meetings have been planned for the successful monitoring of project progress and results:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description** | **Place** | **Date** |
| *Kick-off meeting (P5-JUST-Irbid)\** | *Irbid Jordan* | M2 |
| *2nd meeting (P1-NTUA)* | *Athens, Greece* | M8 |
| *3rd meeting (P13-ICPI)* | *Bucharest Romania* | M14 |
| *4th meeting (P12-KTU)* | *Kaunas Lithuania* | M20 |
| *5th meeting (P2-SVU) \** | *Qena (Luxor) Egypt* | M25 |
| *6th meeting (P8-CIAPE)* | *Rome Italy* | M30 |
| *Final Meeting (P3-AAST)* | *Alexandria Egypt* | M36 |

(\*): the 5th meeting was originally scheduled to be held in Portugal. According to a unanimous decision of the kickoff meeting, it was decided to be held in Qena, Egypt, insteady.

During project meetings, the work already done will be presented, jointly reviewed, and - when necessary - possible steps for improvements agreed. Having the necessary information at certain points in time on actual variances against the planning, it allows to decide suitable corrective/preventive actions when detecting lacks or gaps related to the project scheduling and/or planning. These measures, decided after analysing the associated risks (in delays, additional costs, overall implications), are to assure that the project meets the declared project objectives and targets, and produces the foreseen results, according to the project planning.

Each meeting should be attended by preferably the same team of project participants in order to assure smooth project execution. The host of the meeting and the coordinator are jointly responsible for preparation of agenda for each transnational meeting. During the meeting a list of the project participants has to be signed. After each meeting, the minutes will be written down. The minutes have to be accepted by all project partners and stored at the relevant folder on the Dropbox.

Decisions in partner meetings will be made based on simple majority should consensus not be reached. If the distribution of votes is even, the PC vote decides.

# Conflict Resolution

In the course of the project, partners will have to agree on and develop specific outputs. Usually, agreement is first reached through regular contact, followed by official confirmation via electronic mail, letter or minutes. For important issues, agreement may be a report to be signed by those responsible for decisions. Non-technical factors such as resource allocation and contractual terms also need to be agreed and documented in writing. The Project Coordinator should immediately take action if potential conflict situations arise. Technical issues/conflicts within contractual commitments that do not involve a change of contract, a change of budget and/or a change of resources/overall focus will be discussed/solved by the Project Coordinator. Decisions will be normally taken through consensus. However, after a reasonable amount of time has passed for illustration and defence of conflicting positions, in order to avoid deadlock in project operational progress, the approval by a two-third majority of partners will be sufficient. If the decision being taken is unacceptable to partners found in the minority positions, then the problem is elevated to a higher level at the partners in conflict. If again the problem cannot be resolved the Project Coordinator has to call a management meeting to vote it out and in case of a tie cast the decisive vote or call a new management meeting within 4 weeks.

Major conflicts requiring change of contract will be discussed at managerial level. If no resolution is possible, then the standard Red-Flag procedure will be used as last resort. The Project Coordinator has to inform the partners in writing of any decisions to enforce a final solution by majority vote at least one week in advance. In addition, the PC will inform the Executive Agency in writing and discuss the topics with the Agency before a final decision is made. Any changes regarding budget/contractual issues will be reported to the Agency and occur upon approval only.

# Annexes
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