



Deliverable title:	Quality assurance Plan
Deliverable ID:	D 1.5
Document version:	1.0
Partner responsible:	IMAT
Due date:	31/01/2024
Status:	Final





D1.5

Document Control Sheet

Deliverable number	D1.5
Deliverable name	Quality assurance Plan
Dissemination Level	PU
Call	HORIZON-CL5-2022-D6-01
Topic	HORIZON-CL5-2022-D6-01-08-Safer navigation and tackling containership fires
Consortium Coordinator	IMAT
Partner responsible for the deliverable	IMAT
Edition	1.0

Authors of the document

Appointed reviewers of the document - Representatives of beneficiaries involved in the project			
Name/Beneficiary	Position/Title within the project	within the	Date
Valentina Lasco/IMAT	OVERHEAT Project Management and Leader Support	and WP1	15/03/2024

Reviewers of the document

Appointed reviewers of the document - Representatives of beneficiaries involved in the project			
Name/Beneficiary	Position/Title within the project	within the	Date
Marco Pasciuto/IMAT	OVERHEAT Project Manager and WP1 Leader		15/01/2024



D1.5

Valentina Lasco/IMAT	OVERHEAT Management and Leader Support	Project and WP1	15/01/2024
Valentina Lasco/IMAT Marco Pasciuto/IMAT	OVERHEAT Management and Leader	Project and WP1	22/01/2024
Vittorio Sangermano /ISSNOVA Raffaella Russo/ISSNOVA	OVERHEAT Management and	Project and WP9 leader	20/02/2024
Massimo Capozza/PeopleTrust Dominic Kudlacek	WP4 Leader WP2 Leader		11/03/2024
Marco Pasciuto/IMAT	OVERHEAT Management and Leader	Project and WP1	15/03/2024

Responsible for the document approval

List of people approving the document - Representatives of beneficiaries involved in the project		
Name/Beneficiary	Position/Title within the project	Date
Marco Pasciuto/IMAT	OVERHEAT Project Manager and WP1 Leader	15/03/2024
Vittorio Sangermano/ISSNOVA	ISSNOVA PoC	15/03/2024
Bartosz Dziugiel/ILOT	ILOT PoC	15/03/2024
Holger Kramer/ISL	ISL PoC	15/03/2024
Fabienne Vallee/ Brest Port	Brest Port PoC	15/03/2024
Rafael Company/VPF	VPF PoC	15/03/2024
Stefano Ricci/DITS	DITS PoC	15/03/2024
Théo Delferriere/CIRCOE	CIRCOE PoC	15/03/2024



D1.5

Diego Cioce/AKKODIS	AKKODIS PoC	15/03/2024
Pedro Merino-Laso/ENSM	ENSM PoC	15/03/2024
Massimiliano Siliberti/GTS	GTS PoC	15/03/2024
Gunnar Tietze/SeaTopic	SeaTopic PoC	15/03/2024
Massimo Capozza/PeopleTrust	PeopleTrust PoC	15/03/2024
Dominic Kudlacek/ISaSS	ISaSS PoC	15/03/2024
Francesco Russo/TopView	TopView PoC	15/03/2024
José Miguel Basset Blesa/VFF	VFF PoC	15/03/2024
Simone Panfiglio/Caronte	Caronte PoC	15/03/2024

OVERHEAT is a Horizon Europe project supported by the European Union under grant agreement no. 101076633. The information contained in this document is a property of the OVERHEAT consortium and it shall not be reproduced, disclosed, modified or communicated to any third party without the prior written consent of the consortium.

Views and opinions expressed in the document are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or REA. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for the



D1.5

ABSTRACT

The deliverable scope is to ensure that high quality of OVERHEAT project is maintained all along the project development. The deliverable provides a view about the involvement of each actor and provide an overview about their responsibilities. The deliverable also provides a detailed description of deliverables review. In particular, the deliverable defines a quality assurance procedure in which it is described how to maintain the quality of the issued documents. In addition, a definition of the submission schedule is provided by taking into account the entire review process of the deliverables. Then, a method regarding the review process is provided in order to maintain high standards for all the OVERHEAT deliverables.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	5
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	6
LIST OF FIGURES	7
LIST OF TABLES	7
ACRONYMS	8
INTRODUCTION	9
SECTION 1 - WORK PROGRESS VERIFICATION.....	10
SECTION 2 - DELIVERABLES’ REVIEW	11
Section 2.1 Quality Assurance Procedure.....	11
Section 2.2 – Milestones.....	12
Section 2.3 – Schedule.....	12
Section 2.3 – Revision methods.....	13
Section 2.4 – Delay	14
CONCLUSIONS	14
REFERENCES	15



D1.5

LIST OF FIGURES

Non è stata trovata alcuna voce dell'indice delle figure.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 - Review lifecycle.....	12
---------------------------------	----



D1.5

ACRONYMS

Acronym	Definition
CA	Consortium Agreement
DMP	Data Management Plan
EB	Executive Board
EBMs	Executive Board Meetings
EC	European Commission
GA	General Assembly
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
PCC	Project Coordination Committee
QAP	Quality Assurance Plan
RMP	Risk Management Plan
SSB	Stakeholder Support Board
ToCs	Table of Contents
WPs	Work Packages



D1.5

INTRODUCTION

The Quality assurance process is ensured by using internal sources (i.e. partners, WP leaders, Project Coordination Committee (PCC), Executive Board (EB)) and from external sources (e.g. participants of project events, Stakeholder Support Board (SSB) and other stakeholders). Such information will enable a more complete overview of project activities, outputs and achieved results. OVERHEAT can count on a multi-disciplinary consortium team offering a high-variety of expertise and local experience, which is necessary to address specific challenges. The monitoring of the project progresses together with the quality assessment activities are managed by the Coordinator, the PCC and EB and involves the following main procedures such as (i) Verification of successful accomplishment of project scientific and technical activities; (ii) Organization of internal quality assurance through adequate review mechanisms for reports and deliverables; (iii) Protection and management of Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) of the project results through the Consortium Agreement. This document serves two purposes: (i) establishing a framework for the PCC and the EB to effectively carry out quality assessment of the produced results, and (ii) being a handbook for every member of the project consortium to conduct their project activities at high-quality levels.



D1.5

SECTION 1 - Work Progress Verification

The project coordinator and PCC are responsible for the project quality management. In particular, the PCC will ensure that the project activities necessary during the project lifespan are effective and efficient with respect to the OVERHEAT objectives. The PCC comprises: The Coordinator (Chairperson), and two members of ISSNOVA (as shown in D1.1). The PCC will manage both scientific and financial aspects. The PCC will build project resilience by maintaining the project documentation and overseeing any resource changes should they become necessary. The PCC will have monthly meetings to ensure that work is in accordance with the Consortium Agreement (CA), paying attention to: (i) Main constant communication between the consortium and the EC for all contractual and formal reporting matters; (ii) Coordination and progress monitoring of all project activities; (iii) Organisation (and chairing) of Executive Board Meetings (EBM) and General Assembly (GA) meetings to discuss progress within and across the WPs and the need for any corrective measures. (iv) Monitoring and managing risks to the project and providing early warning of these where necessary, together with D1.4 Risk Management Plan (RMP). Thus, PCC will be in charge of organizing EBMs, and the EB is intended as the is the executive body where the progress of the project is monitored takes also decisions. The EB will evaluate in their meetings the critical risks for the OVERHEAT activities. The EB will discuss and propose solutions in case of: (i) Foreseeable difficulties in a WP to achieve objectives or deliverables (ii) Need for harmonisation of activities between and across WPs (iii) Obstacles and barriers causing delays in progress, in particular if this is likely to affect other WPs that need the output of another WP as a starting point (iv) Weak performance or malfunctioning of a partner. To ensure a regular monitoring of the project's tasks, WP leaders are asked to report on the progress of their WP monthly. For this purpose, WP leaders should collect the views of the task leaders and try to present information regarding:

- 1.1. On-going activities;
- 1.2. Short overview of the activities undertaken during that month period;
- 1.3. Issues/delays with the activities.

In case there are issues, the WP leader should also identify other tasks that can be impacted, and specify a plan to minimise the risks. To ensure that overall quality of the project, when an activity, a task or a deliverable is delayed or when there are deviations from the GA, the PCC should be informed and a valid justification should be provided. The WP leaders together with the coordinator are then responsible to identify the other tasks that can be impacted, and identify a plan to minimize the risks. Then, the EB and the PCC will decide on corrective measures to improve the quality of results, and if necessary, to reallocate this responsibility to another partner. The coordinator, in consultation with the EB, will be ultimately responsible for reporting to the EC and for coordinating mitigating actions, when necessary. In case of conflict and dispute among the team members, the conflict resolution will follow the procedure described in the CA. To facilitate the project progress monitoring, the OVERHEAT sharepoint has been created and made accessible to the consortium.



D1.5

This sharepoint provides information and standard templates for internal communication on deliverables, milestones status, minute of the meetings, etc.

SECTION 2 - Deliverables' review

Deliverables should be set by considering their purpose, as stated in the Grant Agreement and defining the best way to convey the information addressing the work performed in the task(s). All the deliverables will undergo a Check, Review, Approve and Verify process. This process ensures that no deliverable goes unchecked, being subject to peer reviewing and final approval by the PCC. The deliverables should be designed from the beginning to be clear about the objective, and then be very concise about which content to include. Very long deliverables should be avoided as they should be to the point, focused and easy to review for the reviewer and read for the final user. However, the right size for a given deliverable depends largely on the topic, the objective, etc.

The focus of the deliverable must be clear and concise. Avoid repeating content from other documents (always use references for that) and synthesize, summarize and always get to the point. The following elements are to be included in a deliverable: Executive Summary, an Introduction section outlining clearly the purpose and scope, the main achievements of the activities performed and a Conclusion.

Section 2.1 Quality Assurance Procedure

Partners in charge of the deliverables are responsible for the arrangements and logistics for the quality assurance process and its supervision (contacting reviewers, deadlines, etc.). An excel file, available in the OVERHEAT SharePoint, will be used to track the writing and reviewing process of the pending deliverables (and in general the file will provide an overall view of the project). Progress of the writing of the deliverable will be included as well so to be able to plan the reviewing process on-time.

Excel file with reviewers by the PCC team is already available in the OVERHEAT SharePoint which describe each reviewer per deliverable.

Reviewers' comments and contributions should be done in track change mode combined with specific text comments aligned with the specific section.

Reviewers' comments should be addressed before the deliverable can be considered final. Thus, the author(s) of the deliverable should send the reviewed/revised document to the reviewers for a final acceptance of the document. With the approval of the reviewer(s), the WP leader will check that the content of the deliverable is in line with the GA.

The PCC will perform a last round of proof-reading. The PCC is responsible to oversee the application of quality assurance standards to deliverables against pre-defined quality standards, layout and structure. The PCC will submit the final document to the EC services.



D1.5

Section 2.2 – Milestones

Milestone reports produced during the project will be reviewed by the PCC. Revision will be conducted according to the methods above described. Revision will take place ensuring that the content produced meets the quality specifications. PCC comments should be addressed before the milestone report can be considered final. Thus, the author(s) of the report should send the reviewed/revised document for a final acceptance of the document. The PCC will proceed to the delivery of the report to the EC services.

Section 2.3 – Schedule

When the deliverable preparation starts, the deliverable responsible partner has already received indications about the appointed reviewers. The WP Leader will be informed about the Table of Contents (ToCs) of the deliverable. The partner responsible and WP leader will agree about the ToC. In case the deliverable is a milestone report, then the revision will be conducted in accordance with the PCC. Each deliverable needs a period of revision and in particular:

- Within 8 weeks before the submission deadline, the deliverable contents are agreed by the involved partners (i.e. partner responsible, WP leader and contributors).
- Within 5 weeks before the due date, the deliverable should be ready for the internal revision and send to the appointed reviewers.
- Within 3 weeks before the due date the appointed reviewers will send the comments to the deliverable to the responsible partner who will integrate them.
- Within 2 weeks, before the final submission the deliverable should be ready for the final revision by the PCC team.
- if no major issue is detected by the PCC, the deliverable will be submitted to EC the portal within the submission deadline.

The process of revision will be tracked through the OVERHEAT SharePoint. The schedules for the review process are provided in Table below. However, the timing of specific review stages can be adapted if previously agreed between the PCC, the WP leader, the deliverable leader and the corresponding reviewers.

Table 1 - Review lifecycle

Review Process	Time	Involved partner
ToCs definition	Within 1 month to the start of the task activities	WP leader Task leader Deliverable leader
Final version of the deliverable for internal review	Within 5 weeks before the due date, the deliverable should be	Task leader Deliverable leader



D1.5

	ready for the final revision by the appointed reviewers.	Partners involved in the task WP leader Appointed reviewers
Commented deliverable ready for the comments' integration	Within 3 weeks before the due date the appointed reviewers will send the comments to the deliverable to the responsible partner who will integrate them.	Appointed reviewers Deliverable responsible
Final version sent to the PCC	Within 2 weeks before the due date, the deliverable should be ready for the final revision by the PCC team.	Deliverable responsible PCC team
Comments	Within 1 week before the due date, the PCC the document is sent to the deliverable leader for final changes if some issues are detected	PCC team Deliverable responsible
Submission	Within the due date, the PCC team submit the deliverable to the EC.	PCC team

However, it is a responsibility of the deliverable leader to make sure that the document is ready for the review process by the corresponding date and, therefore, the writing phase should be planned accordingly. The deliverable leader should also take into consideration any internal rule regarding quality assurance adopted by the contributing parties, so as to avoid delays.

Section 2.3 – Revision methods

When working with Word documents, reviewers' comments and contributions should be done using "track change" mode combined with specific text comments aligned with the specific section. Reviews based on a pdf document, are not acceptable, because they do not allow for easy modification of the text. It is also possible, when the comments are of a general nature to submit an accompanying text document (as a separate word or pdf file). The reviewers are invited to give detailed and constructive comments (with references, whenever possible) that will help the authors to improve the deliverable.



D1.5

Section 2.4 – Delay

In the case where, the reviewer is not able to meet the deadline, the PCC should be informed as soon as possible in order to inform to the OVERHEAT project officer about the delay.

The EU project officer can reject the request for the deliverable delay. As such, it is important that partners detect possible slowdown in advance and inform the PCC.

CONCLUSIONS

This document summarizes the procedures to ensure a successful collaborative work within the OVERHEAT project, describes relevant roles and tasks, as well as instruments available to conduct and report the work undertaken within the project at the highest possible quality level. The document is aligned with the D1.4 Risk Management Plan in order to ensure that all the risks are mitigated, and high quality is given since the start to the OVERHEAT project.



D1.5

REFERENCES

1. OVERHEAT Grant Agreement GAP-10107663
2. OVERHEAT Consortium Agreement Version 1.0
3. OVERHEAT D1.1 Project Management Plan Version 1.0
4. OVERHEAT D1.5 Quality Assurance Plan Version 1.0



**Funded by
the European Union**

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement Project No: 101076633. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.