ELABORATOR

Deliverable 1.2

Quality Management Plan

CIVITAS Sustainable and smart mobility for all

THE CIVITAS INITIATIVE IS CO-FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

Funded by the European Union

Document Control Page

Deliverable number	D1.2
Deliverable title	Quality Management Plan
Deliverable version	V1.0
Work Package number	WP1
Work Package Title	Project Management
Due date of delivery	31/08/2023
Actual date of delivery	01/09/2023
Dissemination level	PU - Public
Type	R – Document, Report
Editor(s)	UBRIS
Contributor(s)	George Oikonomou (UBRIS), Theo Tryfonas (UBRIS)
Reviewer(s)	Vasilis Sourlas (ICCS), Vangelis Angelakis (LIU), Hans Skov-Petersen (UCPH)
Submitted by (Project Coordinator)	Vasilis Sourlas (ICCS)
Project name	The European Living Lab On Designing Sustainable Urban Mobility Towards Climate Neutral Cities
Project Acronym	ELABORATOR
Project starting date	01/06/2023
Project duration	42 months
Rights	ELABORATOR consortium

Document History

0.1	18/08/2023	George Oikonomou, UBRIS	Draft for internal review
0.2	29/08/2023	Theo Tryfonas, UBRIS	Draft finalisation
0.3	*30/08/2023*	*Vasilis Sourlas, ICCS*	*Review comments*
0.4	*30/08/2023*	*Vangelis Angelakis, LIU*	*Review comments*
0.5	*31/08/2023*	*Hans Skov-Petersen, UCPH*	*Review comments*
1.0	*01/09/2023*	Theo Tryfonas, UBRIS	*Final version for submission*

Project Executive Summary

ELABORATOR stands for 'The European Living Lab on designing sustainable urban mobility towards climate neutral cities'. The EU-funded project uses a holistic approach for planning, designing, implementing and deploying specific innovations and interventions towards safe, inclusive and sustainable urban mobility. These interventions consist of smart behaviour and policy adaptation tools, space redesign and dynamic allocation, shared services, and integration of active and green modes of transportation.

They will be specifically co-designed and co-created with a broad array of local stakeholders including relevant authorities who will be identified as "vulnerable to exclusion" (V2E) Interventions will be demonstrated in a number of cities across Europe, starting with six Lighthouse cities and six Follower cities with three principal aims:

I. to collect, assess and analyse user needs and requirements towards a safe and inclusive mobility and climate neutral cities;
II. to collect and share rich information sets made of real data, traces from dedicated toolkits, users' and stakeholders' opinions among the cities, so as to increase the take up of the innovations via a twinning approach;
III. to generate detailed guidelines, policies, future roadmap and built capacity for service providers, planning authorities and urban designers for the optimum integration of such inclusive and safe mobility interventions into Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMPs).

ELABORATOR Lighthouse cities

- Milan (Italy)
- Copenhagen (Denmark)
- Helsinki (Finland)
- Issy-les-Moulineaux (France)
- Zaragoza (Spain)
- Trikala (Greece)

ELABORATOR Follower cities

- Lund (Sweden)
- Liberec (Czech Republic)
- Velenje (Slovenia)
- Split (Croatia)
- Krusevac (Serbia)
- Ioannina (Greece)

Social Links:

Twitter

LinkedIn

For further information please visit www.elaborator-project.eu

Project Partners

Organisation	Country	Abbreviation
INSTITUTE OF COMMUNICATION AND COMPUTER SYSTEMS	EL	**ICCS**
POLIS AISBL	EL	**POLIS**
EVROPSKI INSTITUT ZA OCENJEVANJE CEST	SI	**EURORAP**
INTERNATIONAL ROAD ASSESSMENT PROGRAMME	UK	**IRAP**
UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL	UK	**UBRIS**
MULTICRITERI-MCRIT AIE	ES	**MCRIT**
INSTITUT D'ARQUITECTURA AVANCADA DE CATALUNYA	ES	**IAAC**
COMUNE DI MILANO	IT	**CDM**
STEFANO BOERI ARCHITETTI SRL	IT	**SBA**
THINGS SRL	IT	**THIN**
AGENZIA MOBILITA' AMBIENTE E TERRITORIO SRL	AMAT	**AMAT**
KOBENHAVNS KOMMUNE	DK	**CPHK**
KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	DK	**UCPH**
ANALYSE & TAL F.M.B.A	DK	**A&T**
FORUM VIRIUM HELSINKI OY	FI	**FVH**
TEKNOLOGIAN TUTKIMUSKESKUS VTT OY	FI	**VTT**
SOCIETE D'ECONOMIE MIXTE ISSY - MEDIA (SEM ISSY MEDIA)	FR	**ISSY**
COLAS	FR	**COLAS**
IFP ENERGIES NOUVELLES	FR	**IFPEN**
URBAN RADAR	FR	**URAD**
AYUNTAMIENTO DE ZARAGOZA	ES	**AYZG**

FUNDACION CIRCE CENTRO DE INVESTIGACION DE RECURSOS Y CONSUMOS ENERGETICOS	ES	**CIRCE**
JOC RENTAL S.L	ES	**MYR**
ANAPTYXIAKI ETAIREIA DIMOU TRIKKAION ANAPTYXIAKI ANONYMI ETAIREIA OTA	EL	**ETRIK**
URBANA	EL	**URB**
LUNDS KOMMUN	SE	**LUND**
LINKOPINGS UNIVERSITET	SE	**LIU**
SENSATIVE AB	SE	**SENS**
STATUTARNI MESTO LIBEREC	CZ	**LIBER**
CESKE VYSOKE UCENI TECHNICKE V PRAZE	CZ	**CVUT**
MESTNA OBCINA VELENJE	SI	**MOV**
AV LIVING LAB, D.O.O.	SI	**AVLL**
INTERNET INSTITUTE, COMMUNICATIONS SOLUTIONS AND CONSULTING LTD	SI	**ININ**
GRAD SPLIT	HR	**SPLIT**
SVEUCILISTE U ZAGREBU FAKULTET PROMETNIH ZNANOSTI	HR	**FPZ**
CITY ADMINISTRATION OF THE CITY OF KRUSEVAC	RS	**KRUS**
MUNICIPALITY OF IOANNINA	EL	**IOANN**
PLATOMO GMBH	DE	**PLAT**

List of abbreviations and acronyms

Acronym	Meaning
CA	Consortium Agreement
CCAM	Cooperative, Connected and Automated Mobility
DMPO	Data Management and Protection Officer
DoA	Description of Action
EEAB	External Expert Advisory Board
EC	European Commission
FMEA	Failure Mode and Effects Analysis
GA	General Assembly
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GRA	Grant Agreement
NDA	Non-disclosure Agreement
PC	Project Coordinator
PMBoK	Project Management Body of Knowledge
PU	Public
QA	Quality Assurance
QC	Quality Control
QMe	Quality Metric
QMP	Quality Management Plan
SUMP	Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans
TM	Technical Manager
TMT	Technical Management Team

VRE	Vulnerable to Exclusion
VRU	Vulnerable Road User
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader

Table of Contents

Contents

List of tables

Deliverable executive summary

Deliverable D1.2 – "Quality Management Plan" (QMP) of ELABORATOR aims at providing a single point of reference for the quality management processes implemented during the project.
The QMP defines guidelines to ensure the overall project quality. It sets the basis for high-quality project outcomes and primarily applies to deliverable management, reporting and dissemination activities. It also describes the project organisation, roles and responsibilities related to Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) activities. QA comprises managerial actions aiming at high-quality output, whereas QC is used to verify the quality of the output.
This deliverable complements D1.1 – "Project management plan". D1.1 describes the overall project management and introduces elements that are essential to a proper understanding of the present document, for instance the detailed organisational structure of the project and risk management.
The QMP covers the following topics:

- Introduction to quality assurance and quality control.
- Description of QA and QC roles.
- QA activities and procedures, including but not limited to:
    - A definition of the roles and responsibilities of each partner in the consortium with regard to quality issues.
    - Guidelines to define quality metrics associated with technical activities carried out in the project. This part complements the outputs resulting from all technical WPs.
    - Harmonisation of ELABORATOR's communication elements, such as templates for deliverables and internal or European Commission (EC) reports. This part complements the outputs resulting from WP8 – Outreach, dissemination and exploitation activities.
- QC activities and procedures, including but not limited to:
    - A methodology for peer reviewers to guarantee that the project deliverables are of high-quality and meet scientific standards and project objectives.
    - Clear deliverable evaluation criteria to monitor all phases of their development process.

The QMP is structured as follows:

- Chapter 1 – Introduction describes the key concepts of quality management and outlines the QMP structure.
- Chapter 2 – QA plan presents the project's quality management principles in a comprehensive manner to help partner beneficiaries carry out their activities with a high standard of quality.
- Chapter 3 – QC activities provides a set of procedures for optimal monitoring of the project quality and production of deliverables.
- Chapter 4 – Conclusion summarises the main points of the deliverable.

1 Introduction

This section outlines key concepts about project quality used in this the document. Our Quality Management Plan (QMP), mainly relies on the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBoK), a set of standard terminologies and guidelines for project management. The body of knowledge evolves over time. Its most recent version was released in 2021. The PMBoK is the result of work done by the Project Management Institute[1],highlighting the importance of quality planning, quality assurance and quality control as essential aspects of the project management plan. These quality management processes are defined in Table 1.

Table 1 Project quality management processes

Quality management processes	What
Quality Planning When: **-Before the production process.** **-If quality assurance activities find a quality issue involving project changes and an update of the project management plan.**	The QMP determines the quality requirements, how they will be measured and controlled. In ELABORATOR, it is implemented via this deliverable, along with relevant procedures from D1.1. **Outputs**: The QMP should contain at least: 1. The quality assurance procedures that must be followed during the generation of outcomes and collection of data. 2. The quality control procedures that should apply on the generated outcomes.
Quality assurance When: **During the production process, throughout the duration of the project.**	Quality assurance is related to the prevention of errors that could affect quality. It ensures that the processes are in place to produce the project deliverables at the applicable level of quality, by asking the following questions: 1. What are the applicable quality standards? 2. How is quality measured? 3. Who measures it? 4. What is measured? 5. When is it measured? 6. What are the criteria for rejection? 7. What are procedures for re-submit and re-assessment in case of rejection? Quality assurance creates and analyses the systems to measure and control quality, in order to create confidence that quality deliverables will be produced. **Outputs**: A continuous quality management system is in place.
Quality control When: **After the production process.**	Quality control is inspection for quality. Quality control measures the quality level of individual products and deliverables and accepts or rejects them based on the criteria developed by quality assurance. **Outputs**: Quality is monitored on project outputs. Measures are taken to reach the expected quality, which may result in a change to the QMP.

[1] https://www.pmi.org/pmbok-guide-standards/foundational/pmbok

1.1 Purpose of the deliverable

The QMP is delivered as part of WP1 and serves as a guideline and reference to enable a successful collaborative work towards achieving the project objectives with the highest quality. The document establishes Quality Assurance (QA) and Quality Control (QC) procedures, which are carried out through the following activities:

- Liaising with the Technical Management Team (TMT) about the quality status of project results.
- Supporting the Project Coordinator (PC) and the project managers by monitoring and mitigating quality risks.
- Defining ELABORATOR's quality procedures and providing guidelines for the production and peer review of project outputs.
- Supporting the Deliverable Leaders (DLs) in maintaining a high standard of quality in their reports.
- Monitoring the development of the internal reports and deliverables corresponding to project tasks, in liaison with the TMT.
- Supporting the Communication Manager (CM) with the production of high-quality presentations and papers from the participants.

1.2 Intended Audience

The dissemination level of D1.2 is public (PU) and is meant primarily for (a) all members of the project consortium, and (b) the European Commission (EC) services, but it will also be available to those external to the project.

This document is intended to serve as an internal guideline and reference for all ELABORATOR beneficiaries, especially the governance bodies such as the General Assembly (GA), the TMT, and the External Expert Advisory Board (EEAB).

2 Quality assurance plan

Quality Assurance (QA) is a primary component of a project quality system and comprises a set of processes to ensure that project deliverables meet the planned quality standards.
In ELABORATOR, the QA plan:

- specifies the necessary tools (SharePoint, quality registers) and quality metrics;
- defines roles and responsibilities of all parties involved in the quality processes; and
- establishes QA procedures to obtain project deliverables at a high-quality level.

2.1 Quality assurance tools

2.1.1 SharePoint: Document sharing platform

For document storage and sharing ELABORATOR will use MS SharePoint, hosted by ICCS. This will be the project's sole consortium-wide document management and collaboration platform. All draft and submitted deliverables will be saved on SharePoint. Quality management tracking tools and procedures will also be accessible there.

2.1.2 Quality registers

The outputs of the quality management processes operated in ELABORATOR include three documents:

- Deliverable register. This file monitors deliverables' writing and submission processes. It is based on the list of deliverables as described in the Grant Agreement.
- Quality metrics register. It includes a set of indicators to be monitored during the project and simple, effective methods for measuring project quality performance.

The editors of these files are, in order of priority: PC > Risk & Quality Manager (RQM) > Work Package Leaders (WPLs). Any changes are made to these documents are discussed in the following TMT meeting.

2.1.3 Quality metrics (QMe)

ELABORATOR brings together many different areas of expertise. In this context, it is important to establish a clear list of assessment criteria so that the performance of each WP and each project activity can be evaluated. This is the purpose of defining certain quality metrics (QMe).
According to PMBoK, "A quality metric specifically describes a project or product attribute and how the control quality process will measure it." Quality metrics are used both in the QA process (when writing deliverables or working on the project) and the QC process (when checking deliverables against quality metrics).
All QMes are fully described in the quality metrics register, which is an Excel file managed by the RQM throughout the duration of the project. For the sake of clarity, it is accessible to all project members on SharePoint. This file is intended to evolve throughout the project and will naturally consider and aggregate some performance indicators used by project managers and WPLs (e.g., dissemination). Ultimately, this file should help the RQM to get a regular overview of the quality level of a variety of project attributes.
The currently identified QMes can be found in the Annex.

2.1.4 Milestones

Complementary to the metrics mentioned above, milestones have been defined to ensure that the project progresses according to the schedule. These milestones are listed in the deliverable register file and are regularly checked by the PC and the TMT to ensure their successful completion. As with the other registers, updates and additions of milestones can be made by the WPLs, if necessary. Up to the time of writing of this deliverable, the milestones are as specified in the Grant Agreement and also appear in deliverable D1.1 - Project management plan.

2.2 Quality assurance roles

This section lists the governance bodies that have a direct responsibility in project quality management, as well as their roles. The complete project organisation, including the different management structures are described in deliverable D1.1.

2.2.1 Operational bodies

Operational bodies are fully detailed in D1.1. The two most important decision-making bodies in the context of quality management are:

- The **Project Coordinator (PC)**, ICCS, is responsible for the successful and smooth running of the entire project and coordinates the Project according to EC rules and the terms of the grant agreement and the consortium agreement. The PC has full authority over all aspects that may affect the quality of the project and is responsible in particular for: (a) chairing ELABORATOR decision-making bodies; (b) monitoring and controlling the deliverable drafting and submission processes.
- The **Technical Management Team (TMT)** monitors the operational execution of the project. It is chaired by the PC and is composed of four managers and the WPLs (see D1.1). The Technical Manager (TM) (a.k.a. Technical and Innovation Manager) is also a key person responsible to monitor and align all technical activities across the project, irrespective of WP/task and solution.

The quality assurance roles in ELABORATOR are distributed to most of the participants according to their level of involvement and responsibilities. Especially, the Risk & Quality Manager (RQM) has an important role in quality management. All roles are summarised in Table 2 below.

Table 2 Discreet roles in ELABORATOR's governance structure

Body	Role in the project	Role regarding quality management
Work package leaders	- Act at WP level. - Are responsible for the executive management of the individual WPs. - Are supported by the task leaders. - Are responsible for tracking the delivery of the final deliverables of the WP.	Are part of the TMT.
Task leaders	- Act at task level. - Are responsible for the executive management of the individual tasks.	Coordinate the preparation, quality control and submission of the

	- Are supported by the task participants.	deliverables related to their task.
Deliverable leaders	- Are either task leaders or members of the TMT in order to ensure the proper communication of their activities. - Must ensure the entire life cycle of deliverables' development.	Have the full responsibility for the deliverable production process with expected quality standards and for submitting them on time.
Task participants	- Contribute to the tasks to which they are allocated. - Must contribute to the project deliverables resulting from tasks that involve them.	N/A
Solutions implementation leaders	- Responsible for the successful implementation of each solution they are assigned with. - Are involved in the technical validation and demonstration of the solutions.	Report to the corresponding WPLs and to the TMT.
Technical & Innovation Manager (UCPH) (i.e., Technical Manager)	- Crucial and active role in the overall coordination of the technical activities. - Acts at project level. - Leads the task related to Technical and Innovation Coordination (T1.2) to ensure that the project coordination develops favourable conditions for innovation and takes necessary actions to make certain that the innovations are effectively exploited after the end of ELABORATOR.	- Is part of the TMT. - Quality control and overall risk management. - Monitoring and control of the production of deliverables.
Data Management & Protection Officer (LIU)	- Acts at project level. - Leads the Data Management related task (T1.3) and will ensure project coordination in terms of the collection, storage and handling of project data, as well as their publication as part of the Open Research Data Pilot (ORDP). - Ensures adequate dealing with data privacy and data protection regulations.	Is part of the TMT.
Risk & Quality Manager (UBRIS)	- Acts at project level. - May be involved at WP level (upon request or through the TMT meetings).	- Leads the Quality assurance and risk management task (T1.4), thus ensuring high quality of deliverables and outcomes of the overall project targets.

		- Supports project coordination in achieving the milestones. - Acts in support to the TMT (in particular WPLs) for implementing the QMP and management of quality processes. - Is part of the TMT.
Communication manager (POLIS)	- Acts as project level. - Leads the Outreach, Dissemination and Exploitation WP (WP8) to ensure that the project is well coordinated for achieving excellent outreach with public events, scientific publications and presentations.	Is part of the TMT.

2.2.2 Strategic and decision-making bodies

These bodies are also fully described in D1.1. They have a general role in QA, as explained in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Strategic and decision-making bodies in ELABORATOR

Body	Role in the project	Role regarding quality management
General Assembly (GA)	Ultimate decision-making body of the ELABORATOR consortium, consisting of at least one representative per beneficiary.	Validate actions if the grant agreement is affected.
Technical Management Team (TMT)	Responsible for the proper execution and implementation of the decisions of the GA.	Propose internal quality processes, common templates and communication tools.
External Expert Advisory Board (EEAB)	Formed by external experts on specific topics who will regularly advise project contributors on their work.	With its high-quality technical expertise, ensures quality in terms of relevance to the latest technical advancements

2.3 Quality assurance procedures

This section describes a series of procedures used to ensure a high standard of quality in the activities and outputs of the project.

2.3.1 Deliverables

The project deliverables are official documents that are formally submitted to the EC. They are listed in deliverable D1.1 and in the grant agreement.

2.3.1.1 General principles

All content generated through ELABORATOR must be fully consistent with the scope of the project and with the expected impact of the task with which it is associated. In particular, high quality of text and figures are critical. Some good practices regarding form and style while drafting deliverables are:

- Use of the Project templates. Microsoft Word should be preferably used.
- Purpose of the document and an initial Table of Contents (ToC) defined, by responsible task leader, before starting work on the content of the document.
- A complete executive summary of the entire document is provided.
- Technical and English proofreading, by two independent consortium members, and inclusive language check, are applied before submission. Figures and tables should be relevant and have appropriate titles. Captions should be inserted using the automatic numbering in Microsoft Word.
- Cross-referencing of section numbers must be used to avoid generating errors following text updates.

To ensure high-quality content, DLs and contributors must liaise and communicate efficiently and regularly. Lapses must be relayed to the WPLs as well as the PC. The text should be relevant and must reflect the vision of the project.

2.3.1.2 Deliverable structure

Microsoft Word Templates

All Microsoft Word templates are available on the project SharePoint platform. Their use is mandatory for all deliverables. Deliverables must not override the structure defined in the templates. These templates include a document control sheet (Annex) that serves as a change tracking system. These templates are structured as follows:

- Cover page
- Control sheet
- Table of contents
- List of figures (if not empty)
- List of abbreviations (if not empty)
- Executive summary
- Introduction
  - Project introduction (required if public deliverable)
  - Purpose of the deliverable
  - Intended audience
- Content
  - A ToC and a high-level description need to be defined before writing
- Conclusion
- Annexes (if not empty)

Naming convention

All deliverables should be named using the following structure: “ELABORATOR-DN.N-Name [- vX.X].docx”. Version indication at the title is optional, since SharePoint supports versioning, but is strongly encouraged.

2.3.1.3 Deliverable life cycle

WPLs are responsible for the **monitoring** of the activities related to a deliverable, including quality aspects and the respect of deadlines. DLs are responsible for the **execution** of the activities related to a deliverable. WPLs report the progress to the TMT following the guidelines and timeframe set out in this document. The complete deliverable life cycle is described in Table 4 below. These elements also describe the processes related to the handling of deliverable files and their owners. Peer reviewing activities are part of quality control and hence defined in the next chapter.
If there is a conflict, problem or need for assistance in any of the steps described below, then the DL can interact with the WPL, which in turn can involve the RQM, if needed.

Table 4 Deliverable life cycle & process owners

When	Owner	Actions	Supporting tools
At any time	WPL	- Responsible for the respect of deadlines and the monitoring of the deliverable progress throughout its life cycle.	SharePoint/Deliverable register, e-mails
4 months before deadline	DL	- Provides description of "Purpose of the deliverable" and "Intended audience"	SharePoint/ Draft version folder

3 months before deadline		- Complete ToC – up to Level 3 with high level description.
		- With all task contributors:
		  - Agree on ToC.
		  - Share drafting responsibilities between contributors.	

Writing process		- Monitors progress continuously, corrects errors and ensures consistency across contributions. - Regularly interacts with WPL. - Iteratively updates: purpose – audience – conclusion – executive summary.	
2 months before deadline	WPL	- Verify the availability of two peer reviewers not contributing to the deliverable with the support of the RQM. A third reviewer may be appointed by the RQM if needed (this may include the RQM themselves). - Informs peer reviewers about the review date.	SharePoint/Deliverable register, e-mails
1 month before deadline	DL	- Merges input from all contributors. - Performs final editing of the first draft and consolidates the deliverable. The DL may optionally decide to conduct a WP internal review.	SharePoint/Draft version folder, e-mails

		- Notifies the WPL by e-mail when consolidation is done.	
3 weeks before deadline		- Launches peer review.	
10 days before deadline	Reviewers	- Send comments to DL.	
3 working days before deadline	DL	- Takes into account reviewers' comments. - Creates a final version of the deliverable and uploads it to the folder named Final version. - Sends the final version to the WPL, the RQM and the PC.	SharePoint/ Final version folder, e-mails
Final check period	PC, RQM, WPL	- Final check of the deliverable file before submission. - Last-minute changes are managed by the WPL, with the assistance of the RQM.	
Deadline	PC	- Submits the deliverable to the EC.	EC portal (unless printed copies are requested)

2.3.2 Internal reporting

Partners are responsible for keeping their organisation contact details up to date:

- By updating the administrative data on the EC Participant Portal.
- By informing the PC about contact details or internal organisational changes.

The PC is responsible for updating SharePoint and the project contact database.

In order to ensure an effective and efficient internal coordination, internal communication involves the organisation of meetings, whether physical or virtual. Categories of meetings are summarised in deliverable D1.1.

Each meeting is led by a chairperson, who is usually the initiator of the meeting, or appointed by the initiator, for example a WPL. The chairperson is responsible for producing the meeting minutes using the corresponding template. The chairperson distributes the meeting minutes to attendees for review within 10 days. If there are any comments, the chairperson introduces them in the document and shares a reviewed version of the minutes. Attendees have again 10 days to provide feedback. If there are no comments, the minutes are considered accepted and they are shared with the PC by the chairperson, and through SharePoint. As an alternative a meeting may be recorded after the consensus of all participants. In this case the record file is uploaded to SharePoint within 2 days after the meeting. Meeting categories are defined in D1.1.

A meeting minutes' template is available in SharePoint and its use is mandatory for all partners. All meeting minutes' documents should be named using the following structure: "yyyy mm dd - ELABORATOR - meeting name [- vX.X].docx".

2.3.3 Dissemination activities

Task leaders and WPLs have to inform the communication manager and the WPLs about intended dissemination activities. A reference to the project (name, grant agreement number) must be made in all communication materials.

Regarding presentations, the Microsoft PowerPoint templates available in SharePoint can be used. Depending on the nature of the dissemination activity, the timeframes and the exact dissemination procedure for internal communication and permission to disclose project information will be specified in D8.2 – Dissemination and communication strategy, plan and tools – Version I (M06).

Dissemination reporting tool: WP8 leader is responsible for developing the dissemination reporting tool that is shared with all partners. Partners record all results of their dissemination efforts in this tool.

Dissemination guidelines: External communication of the project results follow the guidelines established by the EC as stated in article 17 of the Grant Agreement. This article sets mandatory rules regarding the use of the European emblem, the information on the EU funding, the disclaimer excluding Commission responsibility and presents the consequences of non-compliance.

2.3.4 Financial reporting

The financial management is carried out by the PC. Each member of the consortium must provide every six months a periodic financial report to declare the actual project costs (including the personnel and other costs) incurred during the execution of the project for each WP, explaining the nature of the mentioned costs. WPLs and the PC review the reports and verify that the work has been properly carried out.

At the end of each reporting period, all partners are required to provide a financial statement to the PC. The template will be available on time, financial data are entered manually, and overall figures are generated automatically by predetermined formulas. All partners submit their financial statements to ICCS electronically no later than 30 days after the end of the reporting period. After gathering all partners' inputs, ICCS will fill in the portal session previously opened by the EC. The financial data entered into the portal must be verified accurately by each partner, validated and signed electronically only by the authorised representative (PFSIGN). Afterwards, the PC will submit them to the EC on behalf of the consortium partners.

The due date of the financial reports is 60 days after the end of each reporting period. The established meetings' scheme will ensure the follow up of these reports as a priority task and dedicated meetings (or conference calls) will be set 2 months prior to the end of each reporting period to monitor the development of the report and data collection.

3 Quality control activities

This chapter describes the quality control procedures established to verify the quality of each project deliverable.

3.1 Deliverable life cycle progress

Each step of the processes described in the previous chapter have to be completed according to an established timeframe and corresponds to a percentage of advancement as described in Table 5 below.

Table 5 Deliverable life cycle progress (with completion percentage)

Advancement	Name	Description
10%	First draft of the deliverable's ToC completed	Corresponds to the preparation of the first table of contents. It includes the overall deliverable scope, the scope of each section and indicates the partner in charge of preparing each section.
40%	Half of the sections are completed	Corresponds to the completion of 50% or more of the sections drafted in the ToC. This state of advancement has to be reported by the DL to the Task and WPLs, and the WPL reports this to the TMT.
80%	Deliverable content completed	Corresponds to the completion of all the content of the deliverable. This also includes the WP internal review steps, which are the responsibility of the DL. The deliverable is available for peer-review. This state of advancement has to be reported by the leader of the deliverable to the Task and WPLs, and the WPL reports this to the TMT.
90%	Peer review completed	This state corresponds to the completion of the peer review of the deliverable, by two project members that didn't participate extensively in the creation of the document. For technical deliverables, the peer-reviewers need to fill Table 7 and send it to the DL for consolidation and revision for the final version.
100%	Deliverable submitted to the EC	This state is reached with the submission of the deliverable to the EC by the PC. The PC will perform a final check and submit the deliverable to the EC according to the established deadline.

3.2 Peer review process

All deliverables will be peer-reviewed by two experts within the consortium. To this matter, the RQM has developed a deliverable register to have a view on all deliverables, their status, and the reviewers that are allocated. Before this process is carried out, a WP internal review, managed by the DL, is carried out in order to obtain a consolidated version. The detailed steps of the peer review process are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6 Peer review process

When	What	Owner	Supporting tools
2 months before the submission deadline	The WPL verifies the availability of the two allocated peer reviewers, and if not available updates the allocation, with the assistance of the RQM if needed.	WPL	WPL updates the deliverable register file accordingly
2 months before the submission deadline	The WPL notifies the peer reviewers about their assignment with an indicative date to start the review.	WPL	E-mail
Any time	Peer reviewers can consult the deliverable register file to see their assignments as well as an overview of the deliverable properties.	Peer reviewers	SharePoint
3 weeks before the submission deadline	The DL uploads the deliverable to be reviewed on SharePoint and formally assigns it to reviewers. Reviewers can edit and comment the document.	DL	SharePoint
Maximum 10 days before the submission deadline	Each peer reviewer returns a review form to the DL. The deliverable itself must be directly commented with the "Track Changes" option in Microsoft Word and sent back to the DL. Peer reviewers may contact the DL or consult the RQM if needed.	Peer reviewers	SharePoint If needed: "Track Changes" comments on Microsoft Word
3 working days before the submission deadline	The DL, assisted by the contributors who will focus on their own sections, finalises the deliverable based on the comments received.	DL	SharePoint

3.3 Peer review evaluation table

To review a technical deliverable, each reviewer completes a "review form", also stored on SharePoint. This review form contains:

- The "peer review evaluation table" as shown in Table 7, which may be updated with specific evaluation criteria, depending on the deliverable technical requirements.
- A free evaluation field.

Table 7 Internal peer review form for deliverables

Criteria	Definitely	Satisfactorily	Somewhat	Not at all	Not applicable
Deliverable matches the description of the task it relates to					
Objectives are clear and in line with the planned task activities					
Issues at project level are properly treated (e.g., conflict with other WPs)					
Authors responds to readers' needs (defined through deliverable objectives)					
Technical approaches used are appropriate					
Content is well organised					
Issues raised are relevant					
Achievements are clearly stated					
Contents contribute to the state of the art					
Conclusions (if any) are valid					
Deliverable is complete (no major parts missing)					
Deliverable is formally correct (aligned with the quality management plan)					
Any additional criterion to be added by WPL					

4 Conclusions

ELABORATOR's quality management plan covers all the procedures, control measures and operating practices intended to ensure that all project activities are carried out with a high standard of quality. It complements the project management plan (see D1.1) and must be carefully examined and followed to ensure the proper implementation of the project and the high quality of its deliverables. This work is also crucial to the other project tasks and serves as a reference point for process monitoring, in both technical and managerial terms.

Together with the Grant Agreement and the Consortium Agreement, this document is to be regarded as a reference for the overall project quality management.

5 Annex

In this annex, we provide a view on basic QMP tools/files described throughout this Deliverable.

5.1 Templates

Three template categories are available on SharePoint:

- Meeting attendance register (Word)
- Meeting minutes (Word)
- Presentations (PowerPoint)
- Deliverables (Word)

5.2 Document Control Sheet

All deliverables will include in the beginning of the document "Document control sheet" according to the provided template, and as shown in Table 8:

Table 8 Document Control Sheet

Deliverable number	D1.2
Deliverable title	Quality Management Plan
Deliverable version	V0.1
Work Package number	WP1
Work Package Title	Project Management
Due date of delivery	31/08/2023
Actual date of delivery	DD/MM/YYYY
Dissemination level	PU - Public
Type	R – Document, Report
Editor(s)	UBRIS
Contributor(s)	George Oikonomou (UBRIS), Theo Tryfonas (UBRIS)
Reviewer(s)	[Name, organisation]
Submitted by (Project Coordinator)	[Name, organisation]
Project name	

The European Living Lab On Designing Sustainable Urban Mobility Towards Climate Neutral Cities

Project Acronym	ELABORATOR
Project starting date	01/06/2023
Project duration	42 months
Rights	ELABORATOR consortium

5.3 Version History

All deliverables will include in the beginning of the document "Document History" according to the provided template, and as shown in Table 9.

Table 9 Version History

Version	Date	Beneficiary	Description
0.1	*DD/MM/YYYY*	*[Name, organisation]*	
0.2	*DD/MM/YYYY*	*[Name, organisation]*	
0.3	*DD/MM/YYYY*	*[Name, organisation]*	

5.4 Deliverable Register

The current state of the deliverable register is as shown below:

Table 10 Deliverable Register

Del.	Deliverable Name	WP	Lead	Type	Dis. lvl	Due date		Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
D1.1	Project management plan	1	ICCS	R	PU	M03		UBRIS	LIU
D1.2	Quality management plan	1	UBRIS	R	PU	M03		ICCS	UCPH
D1.3	Innovation management plan	1	UCPH	R	PU	M06		UBRIS	ICCS
D1.4	Data management plan – version I	1	LIU	DMP	PU	M06		UBRIS	UCPH
D1.5	Data domain protocol for transport research	1	LIU	R	PU	M12		UCPH	UBRIS
D1.6	Data management plan – version II	1	LIU	DMP	PU	M18		UCPH	UBRIS
D1.7	Data management plan – version III	1	LIU	DMP	PU	M30		UCPH	UBRIS
D1.8	Innovation management report	1	UCPH	R	PU	M42		ICCS	LIU
D1.9	Data management plan final version	1	LIU	DMP	PU	M42		UCPH	UBRIS
D2.1	Inclusion plan	2	URB	R	PU	M09		LIU	POLIS
D2.2	Evaluation plan	2	THIN	R	PU	M12		IRAP	CIRCE
D2.3	The ELABORATOR co-creation playbook	2	LIU	R	PU	M12		URB	FPZ
D2.4	ELABORATOR technological toolkits for co-creation	2	CIRCE	OTHER	PU	M16		IAAC	UBRIS
D3.1	Feasibility and action plans for the ELABORATOR interventions – version I	3	THIN	R	PU	M12		IRAP	FVH
D3.2	Feasibility and action plans for the ELABORATOR interventions – version II	3	THIN	R	PU	M18		SBA	CVUT
D3.3	ELABORATOR twinning: Guidelines and templates towards the cross-case co-creation process	3	LIU	R	PU	M18		URB	IAAC
D3.4	Technical definitions of the Lighthouse cities interventions – version I	3	MCRIT	R	PU	M18		ETRIK	SPLIT
D3.5	Technical definitions of the Lighthouse cities interventions – version II	3	MCRIT	R	PU	M24		ETRIK	SPLIT
D3.6	Twinning inception, replication plans and technical definitions of the Follower cities interventions	3	EIRA	R	PU	M24		MOV	COLAS

D3.7	The ELABORATOR framework of principles and mechanisms to operationalize multistakeholder governance in LLs	3	LIU	R	PU	M28		LUND	SENS
D4.1	Mobility intervention data framework	4	UCPH	R	PU	M18		IAAC	UBRIS
D4.2	Intervention shared data platform	4	SENS	OTHER	PU	M30		VTT	IAAC
D4.3	Machine-learning based analytic and prediction models	4	UBRIS	OTHER	PU	M39		ICCS	LIU
D4.4	Data visualisation tool	4	IAAC	OTHER	PU	M39		UCPH	SENS
D5.1	Lighthouse cities implementation initial report	5	VTT	R	PU	M21		FBH	SBA
D5.2	Lighthouse cities implementation final report	5	VTT	R	PU	M36		THIN	ISSY
D5.3	Demo methodology and activities at Lighthouse cities	5	MCRIT	R	PU	M39		AMAT	URAD
D5.4	Lighthouse cities interventions validation	5	ICCS	R	PU	M39		ETRIK	URB
D6.1	Follower cities initial implementation report	6	FPZ	R	PU	M24		LIBER	SPLIT
D6.2	Knowledge exchange and initial lessons learnt report	6	THIN	R	PU	M30		CDM	LUND
D6.3	Follower cities final implementation report	6	CVUT	R	PU	M36		COLAS	CPHK
D6.4	Demo methodology and activities at Follower cities	6	ICCS	R	PU	M39		AVLL	IOAN
D6.5	Knowledge exchange and final lessons learnt report	6	THIN	R	PU	M39		CIRCE	LIBER
D6.6	Follower cities interventions validation	6	CVUT	R	PU	M39		AVLL	ISSY
D7.1	Environmental, social and safety evaluation and impact assessment	7	IRAP	R	PU	M42		AYZG	FPZ
D8.1	Brand identity and guidelines	8	POLIS	DEC	PU	M3		ICCS	URAD
D.8.2	Dissemination and communication strategy, plan and tools – version I	8	POLIS	R	PU	M6		URAD	AVLL
D8.3	Handbook of ELABORATOR FAIR data	8	POLIS	R	PU	M18		ININ	UBRIS
D8.4	Dissemination and communication strategy, plan and tools – version II	8	POLIS	R	PU	M24		FPZ	IFPEN
D8.5	Exploitation plan	8	MCRIT	R	SEN	M24		UCPH	VTT
D8.6	Report on the dissemination activities	8	POLIS	R	PU	M42		UBRIS	URB
D8.7	Report on liaison activities and international cooperation	8	POLIS	R	PU	M42		LIU	CDM
D8.8	Exploitation report	8	MCRIT	R	SEN	M42		COLAS	IFPEN
D8.9	EU policies and regulations recommendations	8	EIRA	R	PU	M42		THIN	IRAP

5.5 Quality metrics register

Table 11 Quality metrics register

QMe ID	Related WPs	Type	Quality metric	Performance measure	Acceptance criteria
QMe1	All	Governance	Deliverable is submitted to the PC at least 5 working days before the deadline for submitting the deliverable to the EC	QMe1 = (deadline-5) – PC submission date	QMe1 >= 0
QMe2	All	Governance	Respect of the deadline for submitting the deliverable to the EC	QMe2 = deadline – EC submission date	QMe2 >= 0
QMe3	WP2 - WP6	Technical dissemination	Number of scientific publications	QMe3 = number of papers in peer-reviewed scientific journals and international conferences	1st year: QMe3 > 5 2nd year: QMe3 > 5 3rd year: QMe3 > 5 4th year: QMe3 > 5
QMe4	All	Dissemination	Number of non-scientific publications	QMe4 = number of non- scientific publications	1st year: QMe4 > 1 2nd year: QMe4 > 2 3rd year: QMe4 > 2 4th year: QMe4 > 3
QMe5	All	Dissemination	Number of project-related presentations	QMe5 = number of presentations	1st year: QMe5 > 5 2nd year: QMe5 > 10 3rd year: QMe5 > 15 4th year: QMe5 > 10
QMe6	All	Dissemination	Popularity of public events	QMe6 = total number of participants / number of events	1st year: - 2nd year: QMe6 > 70 3rd year: QMe6 > 100 4th year: QMe6 > 200
QMe7	All	Dissemination	Number of trade shows	QMe7 = number of ELABORATOR-related exhibition stands	QMe7 > 1 (annually)

QMe8	WP8	Dissemination	Website popularity	QMe8 = number of visits per month	1st year: QMe8 > 200 2nd year: QMe8 > 250 3rd year: QMe8 > 300 4th year: QMe8 > 400
QMe9	WP8	Dissemination	Social networks impact	QMe9 = number of messages with the #ELABORATOR hashtag	1st year: QMe9 >= 75 2nd year: QMe9 >= 125 3rd year: QMe9 >= 150 4th year: QMe9 >= 150
QMe10	WP8	Dissemination	Engagement to the project via professional social network	QMe10 = number of followers of ELABORATOR group in LinkedIn	1st year: QMe10 >= 150 2nd year: QMe10 >= 200 3rd year: QMe10 >= 250 4th year: QMe10 >= 250
QMe11	WP8	Dissemination	Leaflets dissemination activity	QMe11 = number of technical leaflets published and distributed (project brochure, etc.)	1st year: QMe11 >= 100 2nd year: QMe11 >= 100 3rd year: QMe11 >= 100 4th year: QMe11 >= 100
QMe12	WP8	Dissemination	Videos dissemination activity	QMe12 = number of project videos produced	1st year: QMe12 > 1 2nd year: QMe12 > 2 3rd year: QMe12 > 6 4th year: QMe12 > 3
QMe13	WP8	Dissemination	Webinars	QMe13 = number of webinars per year	1st year: QMe13 >= 2 2nd year: QMe13 >= 3 3rd year: QMe13 >= 4 4th year: QMe13 >= 3
QMe14	WP8	Dissemination	Participation in webinars	QMe14 =number of participants in each webinar	1st year: QMe14 >= 50 2nd year: QMe14 >= 75 3rd year: QMe14 >= 75 4th year: QMe14 >= 75