# D1.2 Quality Assurance Procedure

| Due Date: | Month 3 |
|---|---|
| Delivery: | Month 3 |
| Lead Partner: | UvA |
| Dissemination Level: | CO |
| Status: | Final, revised |
| Approved: | All partners |
| Version: | 1.1 |

# DOCUMENT INFO

| Date and version number | Author | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| 07.12.2015 v0.1 | Silvia Wissel | |
| 18.12.2015 v0.2 | Silvia Wissel | Including comments from partner MPG (David Coster) |
| 22.12.2015 v0.3 | Silvia Wissel | Including comments from UvA (Alfons Hoekstra) |
| 31.12.2015 v1.0 | Silvia Wissel | Including final comments from Tomasz Piontek |
| 12.07.2016 | Silvia Wissel | Including comments from the technical review, see section 2.6.c. The deliverables and progress of work are prepared through the collaboration of several experienced partners over a period of several months. Intermediate results are presented to the other WP leaders during regular teleconferences and during project meetings. Therefore we trust that our internal management and collaboration structure helps to mitigate the risk effectively. |

# CONTRIBUTORS

The contributors to this deliverable are:

| Contributor | Role | On-going work to be reported |
|---|---|---|
| Silvia Wissel (UvA) | Project Manager and author of this deliverable. | Also involved and/or responsible for the delivery of D1.1 |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

# 1 Executive summary

This document outlines the Quality Assurance (QA) Procedure that will be used in the ComPat project. It describes:

- the objectives of the procedure;
- the tasks in the DoA that it relates to;
- a description of this deliverable
- a detailed description of the procedure itself;
- a description of the QA procedure for software deliverables
- the procedures which are applied for publications of the ComPat project
- an analysis of the risks associated with the QA procedure.

# 2 Main body of the report

## 2.1 Objectives

The Quality Assurance Procedure is linked to the following objectives of WP1:

- Establishment of the management infrastructure for efficient and constant monitoring and operation of the day-to-day project activities under contractual terms;
- Handling of risks and contingencies.

D1.2 is part of WP1 Management, which oversees the overall technical, financial and administrative management of the consortium and the project's activities. The activities in this work package include all activities necessary to successfully manage and run the consortium.

## 2.2 Related tasks

D1.2 directly relates to Task1.2: Quality Control and work plan monitoring. According to this task the project management will manage and support the quality control and timely delivery of **project reports and deliverables**. Amongst others, this includes:

- the setting up and maintenance of an internal quality assurance procedure to monitor all deliverables before finalising them;
- monitoring of all project activities and ensuring that they lead to the required deliverables and are in line with the project programme;
- assuring that necessary actions are undertaken in case of delays or underachievement, and if required execute the appropriate contingency plan, to minimise any delays and their impact on dependent work packages.

## 2.3 Description of the Deliverable

The Quality Assurance (QA) Procedure will be set up and maintained to monitor all deliverables before finalising them. The deliverable also contains a risk analysis and contingency planning related to Quality Assurance and deliverables.

## 2.4 Quality Assurance (QA) Procedure for Project Deliverables (which are not software)

1. The first step in the QA Procedure is the check by the Corresponding Deliverable Editor of the quality of the content of the deliverable. The Deliverable Editor is appointed by the lead beneficiary of that deliverable. The Deliverable Editor will check the following points:
   - The deliverable covers the stated objectives;
   - The quality of the work described in the deliverable is of high standard and is in accord with what is expected;
   - The quality of the writing of the document is of high standard with respect to style, errors and organisation; readability; and illustrations. This is described in the Project Handbook.
   - The deliverable is complete, i.e. there are no missing parts, missing references, missing explanations of concepts;
   - The deliverable is clearly written and understandable by its potential readers.
2. The Deliverable should be written **in Word** unless otherwise agreed with the consortium. The deliverable editor must provide the consortium with a version which is readable for all and use the provided deliverable template. The format for the title should be as follows:
   **D[WP#].[D#]_[Short Title]_[lead partner].[version#]_[YYYYMMDD].[extension]**
   This is an example:
   **D1.2_QualityAssuranceProcedure_UvA_v0.1_20150712**
3. Next, to ensure that these standards of quality are achieved, each deliverable will be submitted for project-internal peer review four weeks before the delivery date of the deliverable. The peer reviewers will be at least two members of the consortium, who have not been directly involved in the work described in the deliverable. They will be selected by the Project Coordinator and Project Manager at least 5 weeks before the delivery date. They will read the submitted deliverable and suggest changes where necessary. During the review, the deliverable draft should also be accessible by all project members through the intranet.
4. The assessments of the peer reviewers are sent by email to the Deliverable Editor two weeks before the delivery date of the deliverable. The Deliverable Editor has one week for the revision of the deliverable.

5. The Deliverable Editor will send the revised version of the deliverable to the Reviewers to check whether the comments have been adequately addressed if possible within two days. The reviewer's comments and recommendations will be sent to the Project Manager and the Executive Board (EB) few days before the delivery date. The EB leader will ensure that the Deliverable Editor takes into account the suggestions of the reviewers in preparing the final document.

6. The Deliverable Editor will send the final version of the deliverable to the Project Manager before the delivery date.

## 2.5   QA Procedure for software deliverables

A similar procedure will be applied to software deliverables as described in section 2.4. However, the following should be added to step 1 under stated objectives: "The software should be appropriately documented and a user not familiar with the software should be able to install and run it. The main functionality of the software and its integration with other ComPat or external components should be checked by running basic tests."

## 2.6   Risk analysis and contingency planning

The following risks associated with the QA procedure can be identified:

a)   **Deliverable is not submitted to a project-internal peer review one month before the delivery date of the deliverable.**

| Probability | medium |
|---|---|
| Impact | Minor |
| Risk assessment | medium |
| Mitigation | Deliverable Editor to update WP leader and Coordinator about the progress of the deliverable. PM will start reminding Deliverable Editors 2 months before the delivery date of the deliverable. |

b)   **Peer reviewers do not complete their review of the deliverable within one week**

| Probability | Medium |
|---|---|
| Impact | Minor |
| Risk assessment | Minor |

| Mitigation | Project Coordinator to ensure timely appointment of reviewers. Project Manager to remind reviewers one week before submission that deliverable is due for submission, and to monitor the progress of the review. |
|---|---|

**c) Major problems with the deliverable are discovered by the peer reviewers**

| Probability | Small |
|---|---|
| Impact | Medium |
| Risk assessment | Minor-Medium |
| Mitigation | Progress of the deliverables will be checked regularly internally within the work packages through intra-WP meetings and teleconferences, and through the WP leader teleconferences. |

# 3  Conclusions

This deliverable has outlined the QA procedure of the ComPat project. The QA Procedure will be set up and maintained to monitor all deliverables before finalising them. It is part of the management infrastructure of the project that allows the Project Support Unit to monitor and operate the day-to-day project activities efficiently. It is linked to Task 1.2 of the project: Quality control and work plan monitoring. It has outlined the five different steps of the actual QA Procedure, and the additional objective of the QA Procedure for software deliverables. We have described the three most common risks associated with the QA Procedure, how probable they are to occur; the impact if they were to occur; the assessment of the risk; and ways to mitigate the risk.

# 4  References

- Annex I to the Grant Agreement of ComPat
- ComPat Consortium Agreement.