




## SAFE STRIP

# SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications

Grant Agreement Number: 723211

### D8.2: SAFE STRIP Quality Assurance Plan

<b>Work package</b>	WP8: Project Management
<b>Activity</b>	A8.3: Quality Assurance
<b>Deliverable</b>	D8.1: SAFE STRIP Quality Assurance Plan
<b>Authors</b>	N. Bakalos (ICCS) M. Gkemou (CERTH/HIT)
<b>Status</b>	Final (F)
<b>Version</b>	2.0
<b>Dissemination Level</b>	Public (PU)
<b>Document date</b>	15/09/2017
<b>Delivery due date</b>	19/09/2017
<b>Actual delivery date</b>	18/09/2017
<b>Internal Reviewers</b>	Not applicable
<b>External Reviewers</b>	Not applicable
	<i>This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no 723211. Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no 723211.</i>

## Document Control Sheet

Version history table			
Version	Date	Modification reason	Modifier
0.1	15.06.17	First complete version of Deliverable & suggested peer review allocation plan	N. Bakalos, ICCS M.Gkemou, CERTH/HIT
0.2	23.06.17	Peer review allocation plan confirmed	All Partners
1.0	29.06.17	Editing and Final release – 1 <sup>st</sup> submission	F. Fischer, ERTICO
1.1	14/09/2017	Revisions upon PO requests	M.Gkemou, CERTH/HIT
2.0	15/09/2017	Revised submitted version	F. Fischer, ERTICO

### Legal Disclaimer

This document reflects only the views of the author(s). Neither the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) nor the European Commission is in any way responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. The information in this document is provided “as is”, and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The above referenced consortium members shall have no liability for damages of any kind including without limitation direct, special, indirect, or consequential damages that may result from the use of these materials subject to any liability which is mandatory due to applicable law. © 2017 by SAFE STRIP Consortium.

# Table of Contents

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>ABBREVIATION LIST</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT.....	6
1.2 INTENDED AUDIENCE.....	6
1.3 INTERRELATIONS .....	6
<b>2 SAFE STRIP QUALITY CONTROL BOARD</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3 SAFE STRIP QUALITY MANAGEMENT PROCESSES AND PRINCIPLES</b> .....	<b>8</b>
3.1 PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION.....	8
3.2 QUALITY WITHIN THE PROJECT .....	8
<b>4 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGER</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>5 QUALITY SYSTEM REVIEW</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>6 MAIN PERFORMANCE PROCESSES</b> .....	<b>10</b>
6.1 INTRODUCTION.....	10
6.2 PROCESS FOR INITIATION / PLANNING OF WPS AND TASKS .....	10
6.3 PROCESS FOR WPS AND TASKS PERFORMANCE.....	10
6.4 PROCESS FOR MEETINGS ORGANISATION .....	10
6.5 PROCESS FOR PROJECT REPORTING.....	11
6.6 COMMUNICATION TOOLS AND PROCEDURES .....	11
<b>7 SUPPORTING PROCESSES</b> .....	<b>12</b>
7.1 DELIVERABLES PRODUCTION, PEER REVIEW AND SUBMISSION .....	12
7.1.1 <i>Peer Review</i> .....	12
7.1.2 <i>Process</i> .....	13
7.2 DOCUMENT NAMING CONVENTION.....	14
7.3 DOCUMENTS LAYOUT .....	15
7.4 CORRECTIVE AND PREVENTIVE ACTIONS .....	16
<b>8 COMMON SOFTWARE AND TOOLS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>9 CONCLUSIONS</b> .....	<b>16</b>
<b>REFERENCES</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>ANNEX 1: DELIVERABLES REVIEW PLAN</b> .....	<b>18</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: PEER REVIEW REPORT TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: DELIVERABLE TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>27</b>
<b>ANNEX 4: PLANNED COMMUNICATIONS FOR PROJECT REPORTING</b> .....	<b>35</b>
<b>ANNEX 5: INTERNAL REPORTS TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>37</b>
<b>ANNEX 6: PROJECT MEETINGS PRESENTATION TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>41</b>
<b>ANNEX 7: PROJECT EVENTS PRESENTATION TEMPLATE</b> .....	<b>43</b>
<b>ANNEX 8: PROJECT MEETINGS' AGENDA</b> .....	<b>44</b>

<b>ANNEX 9: PROJECT MEETING MINUTES.....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>ANNEX 10: REQUEST FOR CORRECTIVE ACTION .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>ANNEX 11: DECISION ON CORRECTIVE ACTION REQUEST.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>ANNEX 12: PROJECT MEETINGS SCHEDULE .....</b>	<b>55</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1: SAFE STRIP deliverable reviewers.....	18
Table 2: SAFE STRIP total reviews per beneficiary. ....	20
Table 3: SAFE STRIP Project Periodic Meetings.....	55
Table 4: SAFE STRIP Distribution of Agenda timetable.....	55
Table 5: Addition of items in the agenda timetable.....	56

## List of Figures

Figure 1: SAFE STRIP project governance and management structure.....	6
Figure 2: Slide Cover Screenshot.....	41
Figure 3: Activity Presentation Cover Screenshot.....	41
Figure 4: Activity Overview presentation Screenshot.....	42
Figure 5: Activity analysis screenshot.....	42
Figure 6: Project event slide cover screenshot.....	43
Figure 7: Project event slide screenshot.....	43

## Abbreviation List

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Definition</b>
A	Activity
DoA	Description of Action
EC	European Commission
PC	Project Coordinator
PMT	Project Management Team
PSC	Project Steering Committee
QAM	Quality Assurance Manager
QCB	Quality Control Board
SAB	Scientific Advisory Board
TM	Technical & Innovation Manager
WP	WorkPackage

## Executive Summary

This Deliverable, entitled “SAFE STRIP Quality Assurance Plan”, defines the procedures to be applied in SAFE STRIP project in order to guarantee high quality of project results and smooth monitoring and control of internal project processes and concerns all SAFE STRIP project beneficiaries that will act as work producers, followers and/or reviewers.

The objectives of the quality system are defined, together with a detailed presentation of the responsibilities of the Quality Manager and the Project Quality Control Group. The main performance and supporting processes to be followed (i.e. for initialisation/planning of WPs and tasks, for WPs and tasks performance, for project’s meetings organisation, for internal and official reporting, reviewing and monitoring the project’s work as well as details regarding quarterly technical and financial reports and data communication protocols) are part of this document.

Processes are also defined for requesting corrective actions and handling these requests. Finally, templates which correspond to the key types of documents that are foreseen to be circulated in SAFE STRIP project are provided as Annexes of this Deliverable. The provisional meetings’ schedule as well as the project reporting communication schedule are also annexed to this document.

Quality planning is an integral part of management planning. As a pre-requisite to its preparation, the Quality Assurance Manager has reviewed all requirements in order to determine the necessary procedures needed to guarantee the high quality of project results and the proper monitoring of project processes, which are described in the present deliverable. The objective of this work is to demonstrate and provide the Consortium with the assurance that:

- the contract requirements and conditions have been reviewed;
- effective quality planning has taken place;
- the quality system is appropriate.

The Consortium quality policy has been defined as follows:

- to implement and maintain a quality system according to ISO 9001:2015;
- to identify for all involved their responsibilities regarding quality;
- to ensure that all Deliverables and other tangible outcomes comply with the contract;
- to ensure that all processes relevant to the project are organised and monitored with a high level of effectiveness and quality.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the document

The Quality Assurance plan is the document setting out the quality assurance procedures for the SAFE STRIP project. Its aim is to assure that the tangible outcomes of the project are of high quality and delivered according to the time schedule and the specifications set in the project Description of Action. This Quality Assessment plan will constitute an official project document that will govern all partners' and consortium's actions. It has been written in accordance to ISO 9001:2015 guidelines.

## 1.2 Intended audience

This Quality Assurance Plan is to be used by all SAFE STRIP Consortium Partners, responsible for preparing (acting as Authors) or reviewing Deliverables (acting as Reviewers). In addition, being a public document, may serve as a guide for the preparation of corresponding quality assurance plans of respective research initiatives.

## 1.3 Interrelations

The present manual is applicable and cross-cutting to all project activities. Hence, compliance with the manual is mandatory for all Consortium Partners and during the conduct of all activities.

# 2 SAFE STRIP Quality Control Board

The SAFE STRIP management structure is presented below.



Figure 1: SAFE STRIP project governance and management structure.

As seen in the figure above, in order to address quality assurance, SAFE STRIP has assembled a **Quality Control Board (QCB)** as a horizontal management element that oversees the project's outcomes. The QCB is responsible for compiling, co-ordinating - in collaboration with the Management team (which is part of its synthesis) - and supervising the implementation of the SAFE STRIP workplan. The QCB consists of the following members:

- The **Quality Manager**: The position is held by **Prof. Emeritus Protonotarios (ICCS)**, who has significant experience in European project' coordination and quality assessment. *Prof. Protonotarios has had a long and interesting career both in the USA and Greece, as a professor of Electrical Engineering. In the USA where he got his PhD degree, he worked first as a member of the technical staff at Bell Laboratories in New Jersey and later as a professor at Columbia University in New York, until 1973. In Greece he served as a professor of telecommunications at the National Technical University of Athens and was the director of the*

*corresponding laboratory for more than 30 years. He also served as Vice Rector for Academic Affairs at NTUA for three years. As the Dean of the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering he renovated the whole program of studies. He inaugurated the MBA Program Engineering Economic Systems which he directed for ten years. He also plays an active part in the rapid development of research in NTUA and was a founding member of the ICCS group. He is the author or co-author of 200 journal papers, published mostly in the IEEE Journals and International Conferences on Telecommunications and Circuit Theory, some of which he organised and chaired. He has also been the Executive Director of the National Research Council in Greece. He has been awarded many prizes, rewards and distinctions for academic achievements. In his life, he considers as his biggest achievement helping young talented people to achieve eminence and recognition. He has supervised more than 80 Ph.D. theses and more than 600 Diploma and MSc theses. He now serves as a Research Consultant and Project Manager in ICCS. He participated and led hundreds of Telecommunications and Electrical Engineering Research Projects. Lately, he has been interested in networked media research area and advanced Internet applications.*

- The **Coordinator, Francois Fischer** (ERTICO) – his CV can be seen in D8.1 (SAFE STRIP Project Presentation).
- The **Technical & Innovation Manager, Maria Gkemou** (CERTH/HIT) – her CV can be seen in D8.1.
- The **Quality experts** assigned by each Consortium Partner for the peer review of project Deliverables. For each project Deliverable, 2 representatives from Consortium Members are assigned, not involved in the production of the Deliverable under review (and not even coming from the same entity), acting as internal inspectors. Allocation of peer reviews has been done (and approved by all Consortium members) according to which are the most appropriate Partners (technically wise) with the deliverable under peer review. **Annex 1** includes the list of the Consortium members who are responsible to review each Project Deliverable (in addition to the QAM and the external expert who are obliged to review all the Deliverables).
- An **expert external** to the project that was set (in the DoA) to be nominated by the Quality Manager and its main role will be to peer review the project Deliverables. ICCS nominated for this position **prof. George Dimitrakopoulos**. *Prof. George Dimitrakopoulos (male) has received his bachelor degree in Electrical and Computer Engineering in 2002 and his Ph.D. in 2007, from the National Technical University of Athens, and the University of Piraeus, respectively. Since November 2015 he is a senior consultant and project manager at Intrasoft International S.A. Since 2009 he is also with the Harokopio University of Athens (HUA), department of Informatics and Telematics, where he is now an assistant professor. From 2002 till 2009 he was an adjunct lecturer and senior research engineer at the University of Piraeus, department of Digital Systems. He is the author of about 100 publications in international journals and conferences, whereas he has been involved in numerous internationally funded R&D projects. His research interests include the design and development of safety and emergency management algorithms for vehicular communication, as well as the design and development of strategies for the optimization of wireless networks based on cognitive networking principles.*

Members of the Scientific Advisory Board will be considered as potential additional reviewers of some Deliverables, especially those ones that are related to key implementation and demonstration results of the project (and will be produced in the third year of the project).

## **3 SAFE STRIP Quality Management Processes and Principles**

### **3.1 Procedure Description**

Quality planning is an integral part of management planning. As a pre-requisite to its preparation, the Quality Manager has reviewed all requirements in order to determine the necessary activities that need to be planned. This Quality Plan has been prepared early in the project in order to demonstrate and provide the Consortium with the assurance that:

- a) the contract requirements and conditions have been reviewed;
- b) effective quality planning has taken place;
- c) the quality system is appropriate.

The Consortium quality policy is as follows:

- To implement and maintain a quality system according to ISO 9001:2015.
- To identify for all involved their responsibilities regarding quality.
- To ensure that all Deliverables and other tangible outcomes comply with the contract.

To ensure relevance of the quality plan during the project lifespan, the Quality Manager will conduct quality reviews, throughout the duration of the contract and when contractual changes occur. The Quality Manager shall ensure that the quality plan is available to all concerned and that its requirements are met.

### **3.2 Quality within the Project**

The quality assurance activities to be implemented in order to ensure that the project and its outcomes conform to the project requirements are the ones listed below. The responsible Partners for ensuring that the required activities are carried out are identified within the subsequent chapters of this document.

- Responsibilities of the Quality Assurance Manager
- Quality system review and control of quality records
- Main performance processes, including:
  - Process for initiation/planning of WPs and tasks
  - Process for WPs and tasks performance
  - Process for meetings organisation
  - Process for project reporting (internal and to the EC; interim and final)
  - Communication tools and procedures
- Supporting processes, including:
  - Deliverables production, peer review and submission processes
  - Document naming contention and layout
  - Corrective and preventive actions
  - Project reporting and monitoring in general

## **4 Responsibilities of the Quality Assurance Manager**

The Quality Assurance Manager (Prof. Emmanuel Protonotarios - ICCS) is the person who has the authority to manage all quality processes taking place in the project. This encompasses the following aspects:

- a. Quality control of all tangible outcomes of the project (i.e. Deliverables, public reports, scheduled demonstrations), according to specifications and time schedule



defined in the DoA. In addition, management of all the relevant quality processes in this context (i.e. peer review of Deliverables);

- b. Initiation of action to prevent the occurrence of any non-conformity to quality control processes;
- c. Early recognition of non-conformity, recommendation of solutions, monitoring until problems' resolution and verification of solutions' implementation;

Nevertheless, decision making and conflict resolution processes as described in D8.1 are valid.

## 5 Quality System Review

The Quality System is to be reviewed within the Project Steering Committee meetings. In subsequent reviews the following will be taken into account:

- the results from project audits;
- the results from internal audits;
- the official project Deliverables (reports and prototypes);
- the corrective action requests;
- the preventive actions taken/proposed;
- any project prototype deficiencies and subsystems/parts problems;
- project participants staff training and adequacy for the tasks undertaken;
- level of used resources per category and adequacy of spent resources for the particular task/activity.

Decisions on the above shall be discussed at Project Steering Committee meetings will be minuted and will encompass:

- Level of satisfaction with the audits, corrective actions and the results of complaints;
- Requirements for further auditing or more corrective actions;

An agenda of such a meeting may include indicatively the following topics:

1. Results of Internal Audits
2. Corrective actions requests received
3. Equipment deficiencies
4. Defects in prototypes / deliverables
5. Complaints
6. Results of external audits
7. Supplier problems
8. Health and Safety
9. Training including needs and resources
10. Preventive actions
11. Review of quality policy and objectives
12. Introduction of new quality plans

Records to be kept are the minutes of the meeting which are to record those attending and the summary of the points raised/resolved. The records are to be produced and archived by the Quality Assurance Manager.

## 6 Main performance processes

### 6.1 Introduction

The SAFE STRIP project is divided in 9 Workpackages (WP). Each WP has a WP leader and a planned start and end date. Each WP is divided into Activities. Each activity has an Activity leader and a planned start and end date as well. The above are defined in the SAFE STRIP "Description of Action".

### 6.2 Process for initiation / planning of WPs and tasks

1. WP leaders request Activity leaders to initiate task.
2. Activity leaders come back with working document/detailed plans.

### 6.3 Process for WPs and tasks performance

1. Each partner responsible for performing part of a task prepares an internal report with the results obtained as soon as the task finishes. This internal report is sent to WP partners.
2. WP partners send comments, if any, on this report within 5 days. The author revises the report and submits the final one to the WP leader with copy to all partners.
3. If one or more activities result into a Deliverable, the Deliverable main author synthesises the tasks internal reports into the expected Deliverable.
4. The Deliverable main author submits the Deliverable for peer review with a notification to the Quality Assurance Manager, the respective WP leader and the Technical & Innovation Manager.
5. The Quality Assurance Manager follows the process as defined in section 7.1.
6. The Deliverable Author sends the Deliverable for submission, after conforming to the Peer Review process outcomes, with notification to the Quality Assurance Manager, the respective WP leader, the Technical & Innovation Manager and the Coordinator.
7. The Coordinator submits the Deliverable to the European Commission, with notification to the Author, the Quality Manager and the Technical & Innovation Manager.
8. As soon as all Deliverables in a WP are submitted to the European Commission through the Coordinator (after having been peer reviewed), the WP is terminated.

### 6.4 Process for meetings organisation

1. The Project Management Team (PMT) meetings (physical or not) are initiated by the project Coordinator.
2. The Workpackage (WP) meetings (physical or not) are initiated by the respective WP leaders with notification to the Technical and Innovation Manager.
3. The Steering Committee meetings are initiated either by the Coordinator or the Technical Innovation Manager, upon a request of a member or not.
4. Extraordinary technical meetings/workshops are initiated by the Technical and Innovation Manager, upon a Consortium member request or not.
5. The project meetings overall schedule and organisation is presented in **Annex 12**.
6. Before each scheduled meeting (of any type), the initiator prepares a draft agenda (using the format of **Annex 8**) and sends it to expected participants for revision and finalisation.
7. During the meeting, the initiator/chair of the meeting (of any type) is responsible for keeping minutes, which are following the template of **Annex 9**. Minutes are sent within 7 calendar days after the meeting end and comments from participants are accepted within 14 calendar days.

8. The meeting initiator/chair sends the final revised meeting minutes to the whole Consortium within another 2 calendar days.

## **6.5 Process for project reporting**

The table shown in **Annex 4** includes the provisional processes to be followed for the interim and final documentation of the project; internal and to the EC.

## **6.6 Communication tools and procedures**

As explained in D8.1 (section 3.2.2: Communication Tools and Procedures), SAFE STRIP will use ProjectPlace for internal communication and data management. Deliverables peer review process will be supported through the *Documents* section of ProjectPlace (see more in section 7.1).

Meetings will be organised through the respective section of ProjectPlace and the same is valid for internal communication, that is supported by *Conversations* functionality of ProjectPlace. In specific, in SAFE STRIP, this functionality will be given priority in comparison to other conventional methods (i.e. e-mails), in order to avoid an excessive use of email that would result in an actual loss of information, and to keep track of communication (that is supported through ProjectPlace).

ERTICO has setup all the groups that reflect the consortium and project bodies in ProjectPlace, to allow the project members to keep communication as targeted and relevant as possible:

- Partner Board
- Steering Committee
- Project Management Team (corresponding to WP8)
- WP Leaders
- WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6, WP7 and WP9
- Pilot Site Leaders
- One group for each Activity according to the DoA

ProjectPlace will also be used to send emails to a dedicated group, as for instance to person belonging to a WP or an Activity.

In addition, a specific section in ProjectPlace has been reserved to serve as a repository for the documentation to be accessible by the Project Officer and the Scientific Advisory Board solely.

As such, all project documentation will be stored in the corresponding ProjectPlace folder (there is one dedicated for each WP and Activity) following the versioning system that is supported therein and a respective notification will be sent again through ProjectPlace from the respective Partner.

Each partner will be responsible for hosting code developed for the project in specific repositories (e.g. gitlab, github, other git clients). Access to this code to other project partners will be specified and clarified between the partners and the WP leader or the PMT in case code sharing is extended between multiple WPs.

ProjectPlace Posts (or e-mails) headings in SAFE STRIP will follow the convention below:

- “SAFE STRIP - PMT – title of message”: for posts/e-mails concerning only the PMT.
- “SAFE STRIP – All – title of message”: for posts/e-mails concerning all project participants.
- “SAFE STRIP – PSC – title of message”: for posts/e-mails concerning only the Project Steering Committee.
- “SAFE STRIP – WPx – title of message”: for posts/e-mails concerning specific WPs.

## 7 Supporting processes

### 7.1 Deliverables production, peer review and submission

#### 7.1.1 Peer Review

Each project’s Deliverable is reviewed by 4 reviewers as follows:

- The Quality Assurance Manager (QAM)
- 2 representatives of Consortium Members, not involved in the production of the Deliverable under review, acting as internal inspectors, according to the plan provided in **Annex 1**.
- The external expert nominated by ICCS, namely Prof. George Dimitrakopoulos.

In special occasions, additional reviews (i.e. from a beneficiary the expertise of whom will be considered valuable or from a SAB member) may also be considered. Also, the Technical and Innovation Manager will closely monitor the overall process and give directions/propose corrective actions if needed.

All peer reviewers have to review each Deliverable (they are assigned with) with respect to the following matters as stated below, concluding, finally, whether the Deliverable is accepted or not.

#### General comments

- Deliverable contents thoroughness
- Innovation level
- Correspondence to project and programme objectives

#### Specific comments

- Relevance
- Response to user needs/requirements/specifications
- Methodological framework soundness
- Quality of achievements
- Quality of presentation of achievements
- Deliverable layout, format, syntax, spelling, etc.

The final rating of the Deliverable draft will be marked as:

- Fully accepted
- Accepted with reservation
- Rejected unless modified as suggested
- Rejected

Each reviewer will include his/her comments in a Deliverable **Peer Review Report (Annex 2)**. The Quality Assurance Manager will be responsible for critically synthesizing the individual peer review reports (using the same template as in Annex 2).

SAFE STRIP Consortium has to reach a common understanding that the Deliverables are the tangible outcomes of the project and, as such, they have to be of the highest quality possible. This is upon the responsibility of the Quality Assurance Manager and the Project Management Team to convey this message to all beneficiaries and assure that this will be indeed the case in the project duration. The quality processes defined in this document is a control measure towards the achievement of this goal. In this context, Deliverable Author(s) but also peer reviewers have to respect some basic rules and avoid frequent mistakes, as listed in section 7.3.

### 7.1.2 Process

1. The Deliverable main Author issues the *Purpose* and the *Intended Audience* of the Deliverables and uploads them in the respective Deliverable folder of the ProjectPlace, **6 months before the final deadline** of the Deliverable, notifying the PMT.
2. The Deliverable Main Author issues the provisional ToC of the Deliverable and uploads in the same folder of the ProjectPlace, **4 months before the final deadline**, notifying the Technical and Innovation Manager.
3. As soon as the ToC is agreed, the Deliverable main Author shares responsibilities among participants/Co-Authors and monitors progress of contributions along with the respective Activity and WP leaders, with a notification to the Technical and Innovation Manager.
4. The Deliverable Main Author, in agreement and collaboration with the other Co-Authors, iteratively and progressively updates purpose, audience and ToC as well as content.
5. **2 months before the final deadline of the Deliverable**, a complete draft is sent out by the Deliverable main Author for internal (to the WP) comments and revision with a notification to the Technical and Innovation Manager.
6. The Deliverable responsible informs the PMT and the QAM about the expected delivery date of the Deliverable for review, **15 calendar days** before the expected delivery date for peer review.
7. Immediately after that, the QAM informs (confirms in reality as the plan is already set in Annex 1) the reviewers about the expected delivery date, so that they can make the necessary schedule. Until the delivery of the Deliverable, the QAM checks that the reviewers have responded and accepted the timing.
8. The Deliverable main Author submits the final draft of the Deliverable in the ProjectPlace with a notification to the WP leader, PMT and the QAM. This is happening maximum **three (3) weeks before** its expected official publication.
9. The QAM notifies the corresponding peer reviewers immediately through the ProjectPlace.
10. The peer reviewers within five (5) working days do study and revise the Deliverable and prepare the «Peer Review Report» (**Annex 2**), which they upload in the ProjectPlace, sending a notification to the QAM. If the reviewers are delayed in sending the report, the QAM sends them weekly reminders. If after three weeks time, there is only one review report received, then the QAM proceeds with this report only.
11. The QAM makes a synthesis of the individual reports and integrates his own comments into the consolidated «Peer Review Report» (using the same template of

Annex 2). The consolidated «Peer Review Report» is uploaded in the ProjectPlace with a notification to the Deliverable Main Author, the PMT and the corresponding WP leader.

12. The Deliverable author revises the Deliverable, as required, and submits the final one in the ProjectPlace with a notification to the QAM, the PMT and the respective WP leader. S/he also uploads the consolidated «Peer Review Report» completed with the Authors' response. Within this, proper explanation should be given about each action taken as a result of the comments in the Consolidated Peer Review Report. Similarly, justification should be given for any type of non-conformity to the peer review comments.
13. The Coordinator submits the final Deliverable and the consolidated «Peer Review Report» with the response of the Deliverable's Author(s) to the European Commission with notification to the Authors, the QAM and the Technical & Innovation Manager. The final file is stored in the respective folder of the ProjectPlace.
14. In case the Commission requests a revision of the submitted Deliverable, the internal review will be only repeated if the changes to the Deliverable are significant. The PMT will decide if the revised Deliverable has to be reviewed again.

As it is obvious from the above sequence, the key communication means to be used for the Deliverables production and peer review up to their submission will be the ProjectPlace account set for SAFE STRIP.

## 7.2 Document naming convention

The objective of the naming convention is to simplify and to make the identification of a document produced by the project self-explanatory. This naming convention is applicable to the official documents defined in the Grant Agreement and in the DoA (Deliverables, Periodic and Final reports to the European Commission), as well as to internal documentation of the project (i.e. that one related to project meetings, internal reports, etc.). The document naming convention is formed by the following elements, separated by “-”:

- The project's name, “SAFE STRIP”
- The document type:
  - “D” for deliverable, together with its ID number (e.g. D1.5) followed by a official name as mentioned in the DoA (i.e. “-SAFE STRIP Quality Assurance Plan”)
  - “Periodic report” for interim reports to the European Commission, followed by the reference period (i.e. – [May 2017 – July 2017])
  - “Final report” for the final report to the European Commission
  - “Agenda” and the meeting name followed by “meeting”
  - “Minutes” and the meeting name followed by “meeting”
  - “IR” for the internal reports, with a coded name referring to the objective of the report (i.e. “\_Specs”) and the respective task in the context of which it has been produced (i.e. A1.2).
  - “PR” for the peer review reports of Deliverables, follows by the ID of the Deliverable (i.e. \_D1.5)
- The document's version, starting with “-v” followed by the documents preparation stage:
  - Initial draft version numbering starts with 0. (zero dot) followed a sequential number starting with 1. (i.e. v0.1, v0.2, etc.).

- Version for submission to the European Commission (if it is an official report) is v1.0. v
- Any requested revisions after submission get subsequent versioning v1.1, v1.2, etc.
- The new submitted version (if applicable) corresponds to v2.0.
- See versioning pattern in Annex 3.

As seen in Annex 2, a series of Deliverables (i.e. the managerial Deliverables including D8.1 and D8.2) are excluded from peer review. The names of the internal and external reviewers are noted in the cover page of the Deliverable.

### 7.3 Documents layout

The templates to be used for Deliverables and other types of reports that are going to be produced in the project are provided as Annexes of the current document. In specific, the template to be followed by all Partners for the production of a Deliverable is provided in Annex 3. All sections therein have to be addressed in each case by the Author(s), apart from some specific occasions that some of them are not applicable (i.e. the Annexes).

Deliverables should follow the rules and avoid some frequent mistakes, as listed below:

- Deliverables should have the quality of a book.
- Deliverables should include all the outcomes of all associated tasks to them. It is upon the responsibility of the Main Author (as assigned in the DoA) to collect from other beneficiaries their input, evaluate their quality and, if needed, ask for revised versions and critically synthesize them in order to reach the expected goal.
- There is no rule in size of Deliverables; still, excessive verbalism should be avoided. Analytical information that go in depth in one topic should be put in an Annex and only a summary of them should be included in the main body text.
- UK English is the official language of the European Union and, as such, the working language of the Deliverables.
- The standard format to be followed is the one provided in Annex 3.
- The standard font to be used is Times New Roman 12, justified centre.
- Header and footer and headings should follow the pattern of the current Deliverable.
- Acknowledgement to the EC should be included in the cover page, as in the current Deliverable and as follows:



*This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no 723211.*

- Frequent mistakes that will be avoided in SAFE STRIP are as follows:
  - Start with content without purpose nor initial ToC.
  - Executive summary looking like introduction or conclusion.
  - Purpose looking like introduction.
  - Conclusion looking like Executive Summary.
  - No logic in the document structure – no methodological sequence - no relevance to the project.
  - Not reflecting a global vision but aggregating different visions from different beneficiaries, without logic.
  - Copy / paste – plagiarism - poor English - wrong usage of style.

All official Consortium documents in the previous section, except from the Deliverables, are cumulatively characterised hereafter as Project **Internal Reports (IR)** and follow the template of **Annex 5**. Whenever applicable, they follow the same rules as defined above for the Deliverables.

Project meeting agendas follow the template of **Annex 8**. Project meeting and project events presentations follow the templates of **Annex 6** and **Annex 7** respectively. Minimum font size should be 18pt in all cases, so that they are readable and they should follow the basic accessibility principles. Project meeting minutes follow the template of **Annex 9**.

## 7.4 Corrective and preventive actions

The formal description of the procedure is given below.

1. The PMT identifies need for corrective actions (i.e. could be originated from a beneficiary/PSC request).
2. The Coordinator notifies the WP leader. The relevant request is documented in the appropriate form of **Annex 10**.
3. The WP leader discusses the issue with the Activity leader and comes up with the proposed solution. The proposal on corrective action is also using **Annex 10** form.
4. The solution is forwarded to the PSC via the Coordinator.
5. The PSC decides on the matter. The decision shall be documented according to the template of **Annex 11**. The Coordinator sends this to all involved and checks that the actions decided are implemented.

## 8 Common software and tools

The main software standards have been defined as follows for the project:

- Operating Systems: Windows 7, 8, 10, Mac OS X 10.10 or later, Linux stable distros
- MS Office 2007 or later for
  - Textual Deliverable (MS-Word)
  - Textual Deliverable support, cost statements (MS-EXCEL)
  - Transparencies, Slides, Posters (MS-POWERPOINT)
- All operating systems and tools compliant with the aforementioned

## 9 Conclusions

The current document constitutes the Quality Assurance Manual of the project that defines all the internal quality processes of the project that will take place, upon specific principles and rules, in order to high quality of project results and easy monitoring of project process. In the context of them, all associated responsibilities and schedules have been defined. In this sense, this document should serve as a reference document for all Partners and all activities of the project.

Whereas the key principles and rules are not subject to change, slight changes may occur with regard to assigned responsibilities (or even schedules) as described herein that will be acknowledged to all project Consortium, after approval by the Quality Assurance Manager and the Project Management Team before application.

This document should be seen as a complementary document to D8.1: “SAFE STRIP Project Presentation”.



## References

1. Fischer, F., Gkemou, M., Deliverable 8.1: SAFE STRIP Project Presentation, SAFE STRIP (SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications) project, G.A. 723211, [www.safestrip.eu](http://www.safestrip.eu)
2. SAFE STRIP Grant Agreement, 723211, H2020-MG-2016-2017/H2020-MG-2016-Two-Stages, Research & Innovation Action, Innovation and Networks Executive Agency, European Commission.

## Annex 1: Deliverables review plan

Table 1: SAFE STRIP deliverable reviewers.

Del. (No)	Deliverable name	WP number	Author	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery month	1 <sup>st</sup> Reviewer	2 <sup>nd</sup> Reviewer
D1.1	Benchmarking database	WP1	ICCS	OTHER	PU	M3 <sup>1</sup>	CERTH/ITI	UPAT
D1.2	SAFE STRIP Use Cases and application scenarios	WP1	CERTH/IT	R	PU	M6	SWARCO	FhG/IAO
D2.1	System architecture, sensor specifications, fabrication, maintenance, installation and security requirements and Risk Assessment	WP2	CERTH/ITI	R	CO	M18	CRF	SWARCO
D2.2	SAFE STRIP initial Data Management Plan	WP2	CERTH/ITI	ORDP	PU	M6	ERTICO	ICCS
D2.3	SAFE STRIP final Data Management Plan	WP2	CERTH/ITI	ORDP	PU	M29	ERTICO	ICCS
D3.1	Micro & nano sensors, QR algorithms, power supply units	WP3	CEA	R	CO	M18	CERTH/ITI	ICCS
D3.2	Smart miniaturised SAFE STRIP integrated platform	WP3	CTI	R	CO	M25	UNITN	CNR
D4.1	Friction data fusion modules, benchmarking and algorithms optimisation	WP4	CONTI	R	CO	M24	CERTH/ITI	CRF
D4.2	Final Cooperative safety function	WP4	UNITN	R	CO	M33	CERTH/IT	RELAB
D4.3	Final Predictive road maintenance	WP4	UPAT	R	CO	M33	ATTD	SWARCO
D4.4	Final Rail crossing, work zones and other intermodal nodes safety/support functions	WP4	UNITN	R	CO	M33	UPAT	RELAB

<sup>1</sup> M=Month

Del. (No)	Deliverable name	WP number	Author	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery month	1 <sup>st</sup> Reviewer	2 <sup>nd</sup> Reviewer
D4.5	Final report on merging/intersection support	WP4	UNITN	R	CO	M33	PIAGGIO	VCDA
D4.6	Personalised VMS/VDS's toll collection and Traffic Centre information – final report	WP4	CERTH/UNIT	R	CO	M33	FhG	UNITN
D4.7	Final report on Advanced Driver & Rider Assistance Systems adaptation	WP4	CRF	R	CO	M33	CONTI	VCDA
D4.8	Final Autonomous vehicles functions	WP4	VCDA	R	CO	M33	CONTI	CRF
D4.9	Final supportive Added Value Services	WP4	RELAB	R	CO	M33	UNITN	CERTH/UNIT
D5.1	SAFE STRIP decision making algorithms and module and HMI strategy & elements	WP5	CERTH/UNIT	R	CO	M26	PIAGGIO	UPAT
D5.2	Final Infrastructure integration	WP5	SWARCO	R	CO	M33	CTI	CERTH/ITI
D5.3	Final Car and PTW Demonstrators	WP5	CRF	R	CO	M33	UNITN	ERTICO
D5.4	Test sites set-up, experimental technical validation plan and results	WP5	CRF	R	CO	M12	CERTH/UNIT	CEA
D5.5	Updated experimental technical validation plan and results – final report	WP5	CRF	R	CO	M24	CERTH/UNIT	CEA
D6.1	Initial report on Pilot framework and plans	WP6	CERTH/UNIT	R	PU	M18	CIDAUT	A22

Del. (No)	Deliverable name	WP number	Author	Type	Dissemination level	Delivery month	1 <sup>st</sup> Reviewer	2 <sup>nd</sup> Reviewer
D6.2	Final report on Pilot framework and plans	WP6	CERTH/HIT	R	PU	M28	CIDAUT	ATTD
D6.3	Pilot results consolidation & Impact analysis	WP6	CIDAUT	R	PU	M36	UPAT	CEA
D7.1	Project logo, leaflets and posters	WP7	ERTICO	R	PU	M2	Not applicable	
D7.2	Initial dissemination plan	WP7	ERTICO	R	PU	M6	CNR	CIDAUT
D7.3	Updated dissemination plan and dissemination activities	WP7	ERTICO	R	PU	M18	CERTH/HIT	CTI
D7.4	Final report on dissemination activities	WP7	ERTICO	R	PU	M30	CTI	FhG/IAO
D7.5	Market Analysis	WP7	RELAB	R	CO	M12	RELAB	CNR
D7.6	Project Video	WP7	ERTICO	DEC	PU	M30	Not applicable	
D7.7	Application guidelines and standardisation recommendations	WP7	FhG/IAO	R	PU	M36	ERTICO	A22
D7.8	Initial Exploitation plans	WP7	SWARCO	R	CO	M6	RELAB	CONTI
D7.9	Interim Exploitation plans update	WP7	SWARCO	R	CO	M18	PIAGGIO	VCDA
D7.10	Business cases and Exploitation plans	WP7	SWARCO	R	CO	M36	RELAB	ERTICO
D8.1	SAFE STRIP Project Presentation	WP8	ERTICO	R	PU	M1	Not applicable	
D8.2	SAFE STRIP Quality Assurance Plan	WP8	ICCS	R	PU	M2	Not applicable	
D8.3	Project Final Report	WP8	ERTICO	R	PU	M36	Not applicable	
D9.1	H – Requirements No. 1	WP9	ERTICO	ETHICS	CO	M6	Not applicable	
D9.2	PQRD – Requirements No. 2	WP9	ERTICO	ETHICS	CO	M6	Not applicable	

The total number of reviews per SAFE STRIP Partner is shown in the following table:

Table 2: SAFE STRIP total reviews per beneficiary.

Beneficiary	Number of Peer Reviews
<b>ERTICO</b>	5
<b>CERTH/HIT</b>	5

<b>Beneficiary</b>	<b>Number of Peer Reviews</b>
<b>CERTH/ITI</b>	4
<b>UNITN</b>	4
<b>RELAB</b>	4
<b>CNR</b>	3
<b>FHG/IAO</b>	3
<b>CEA</b>	3
<b>PIAGGIO</b>	3
<b>UPAT</b>	3
<b>VCDA</b>	3
<b>SWARCO</b>	3
<b>CRF</b>	3
<b>ATTD</b>	2
<b>CIDAUT</b>	3
<b>CTI</b>	3
<b>ICCS</b>	3
<b>CONTI</b>	3
<b>A22</b>	2

## **Annex 2: Peer Review report template**

# SAFE STRIP

## SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications



Grant Agreement Number: 723211

### Consolidated Peer Review Report

Deliverable No.		Deliverable Title	
Deliverable Authors			
Quality Assurance Manager		<b>E.N. Protonotarios (ICCS)</b>	
Workpackage No.	<b>WPy</b>	Workpackage Title	
Activity No.	<b>Ak.z</b>	Activity Title	
Date of Review:			
File Name:			

## REVIEWERS

George Dimitrakopoulos (External expert)

Prof. Emmanuel Protonotarios (Quality Assurance Manager) – ICCS

Mr/Ms Y (Quality expert) – Company name

Mr/Ms Y (Quality expert) – Company name

## OVERALL PEER REVIEW RESULT

Deliverable is:

<input type="checkbox"/> Fully accepted	<input type="checkbox"/> Accepted with reservation	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejected unless modified as suggested	<input type="checkbox"/> Fully rejected
---	--	--	---

Please provide an overall rating of this deliverable in a scale from 1 (very poor) to 10 (excellent): \_\_\_\_\_

## SUMMARY OF SUGGESTED ACTIONS TO AUTHOR(S)

(Please note that they will be transmitted to the Author(s) and the European Commission)

1. The following changes should be implemented: .....
2. Specify missing chapters / subjects: .....
3. Required changes on deliverable essence and contents: .....
4. Further relevant required improvements: .....



## COMMENTS OF PEER REVIEWERS

<p><b>General comment</b> <i>Referring to any issue not covered by the particular topics below.</i></p>
<p><b>Specific comments</b></p>
<p><b>Topic A: Relevance.</b> Please answer the question: "Is this Deliverable relevant to SAFE STRIP and to the particular Activities / WP it covers?"</p> <p><i>Reviewer comment</i></p> <p><i>Author response</i></p>
<p><b>Topic B: Response to user needs/requirements/specifications (if applicable)</b> Please examine the correlation of this Deliverable with the relevant user needs/requirements/specifications identified in SAFE STRIP, if relevant. "Does the Deliverable cover the prioritised User Needs or is it technology-driven?"</p> <p><i>Reviewer comment</i></p> <p><i>Author response</i></p>
<p><b>Topic C: Methodological framework soundness</b> Please comment on the soundness of the methodology followed and how it is explained. "Are the results arbitrary or based upon a clear methodology, involving user tests, expert opinions, etc.?"</p> <p><i>Reviewer comment</i></p> <p><i>Author response</i></p>
<p><b>Topic D: Quality of achievements</b> Please comment on the essence of the results. "Are they of high value? Are they what one should expect?"</p> <p><i>Reviewer comment</i></p> <p><i>Author response</i></p>
<p><b>Topic E: Quality of presentation of achievements</b> Please comment on the results presentation. "Are the results adequately explained and commented or just listed? Is there a clear and established link between methodology and results?"</p> <p><i>Reviewer comment</i></p>

*Author response*

**Topic F: Deliverable Layout / Spelling / Syntax/ Format**

**Please comment on the Deliverables layout. "Does it include all necessary Chapters, is it readable, in comprehensive language, etc.?"**

*Reviewer comment*

*Author response*

## **Annex 3: Deliverable template**




## SAFE STRIP

# SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications

Grant Agreement Number: 723211

### DX.X: Deliverable Name

<b>Work package</b>	WPx: Title
<b>Activity</b>	ActivityX.X: Title
<b>Deliverable</b>	DX.X Deliverable Name
<b>Authors</b>	
<b>Status</b>	Choose an item.
<b>Version</b>	X.X
<b>Dissemination Level</b>	Choose an item.
<b>Document date</b>	00/00/2017
<b>Delivery due date</b>	00/00/2017
<b>Actual delivery date</b>	00/00/2017
<b>Internal Reviewers</b>	
<b>External Reviewers</b>	
	<i>This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no 723211.</i>

## Document Control Sheet

Version history table			
Version	Date	Modification reason	Modifier
0.1	00/00/2017		
0.2	00/00/2017		
0.3	00/00/2017		
0.4	00/00/2017		
0.5	00/00/2017		
0.6	00/00/2017		<i>Delete unused lines</i>
1.0	00/00/2017		<i>Submitted version</i>
1.1	00/00/2017		<i>Revisions after submission</i>
1.2	00/00/2017		
2.0	00/00/2017		<i>Revised submitted (if applicable)</i>

### Legal Disclaimer

This document reflects only the views of the author(s). Neither the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) nor the European Commission is in any way responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. The information in this document is provided “as is”, and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The above referenced consortium members shall have no liability for damages of any kind including without limitation direct, special, indirect, or consequential damages that may result from the use of these materials subject to any liability which is mandatory due to applicable law. © 2017 by SAFE STRIP Consortium.

## Table of Contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	30
LIST OF TABLES.....	30
LIST OF FIGURES.....	30
ABBREVIATION LIST .....	31
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	32
<b>1 INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>32</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF THE DOCUMENT .....	32
1.2 INTENDED AUDIENCE.....	32
1.3 INTERRELATIONS (OPTIONAL) .....	32
<b>2 HEADING 1.....</b>	<b>33</b>
2.1 HEADING 2 .....	33
2.1.1 Heading 3.....	33
2.1.1.1 Heading 4 .....	33
2.2 HEADING 2 .....	33
2.2.1 Heading 3.....	33
2.3 HEADING 2 .....	33
<b>3 HEADING 1.....</b>	<b>34</b>
3.1 HEADING 2 .....	34
3.1.1 Heading 3.....	34
3.1.2 Heading 3.....	34
3.1.2.1 Heading 4 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2 HEADING 2 .....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.2.1 Heading 3.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.2.2 Heading 3.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3 HEADING 2 .....	ERROR! BOOKMARK NOT DEFINED.
3.3.1 Heading 3.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.3.1.1 Heading 4 .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>4 CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>34</b>
REFERENCES.....	34

## List of Tables

Table 1: .....	33
Table 2: .....	33

## List of Figures

Figure 1: .....	33
Figure 2: .....	33
Figure 3: .....	34

## Abbreviation List

Abbreviation	Definition

## Executive Summary

Text

### 1 Introduction

#### 1.1 Purpose of the Document

Text

#### 1.2 Intended audience

Text

#### 1.3 Interrelations (Optional)

Text



## **2 Heading 1**

*Methodology Chapter should follow here, when applicable.*

### **2.1 Heading 2**

Text

Figure 2:

#### **2.1.1 Heading 3**

Text

##### **2.1.1.1 Heading 4**

Text

### **2.2 Heading 2**

#### **2.2.1 Heading 3**

Text

Table 3:

### **2.3 Heading 2**

Text

Figure 3:

Table 4:

## **3 Heading 1**

### **3.1 Heading 2**

Text

#### **3.1.1 Heading 3**

Text

Figure 4:

#### **3.1.2 Heading 3**

Text

## **4 Conclusions**

## **References**

## **Annexes**

*If applicable, numbered and optional.*

## Annex 4: Planned communications for project reporting

	Start Time	Steps	Timing per step	Way	Format	Content	Length
<b>Internal interim report (three monthly)</b>	Once every 3 months (2 weeks after the start of next month)	PAR to WP leader (PAR contribution)	½ week	E-mail; ProjectPlace	Specific template	Provisional Chapters: 1. Progress of the work / explain deviation 2. Outlook for the next period 3. Planned resource / used resources for the period / explain deviation (every second report – on 6 month basis) - Justify resources with details about Deliverable / task contributions & Costs 4. Risks/issues	1-2 pages per Partner upon specific structure to be provided by the PC.
		WP leader to PC	½ week				
		PC to PSC & TM (global draft)	½ week				
		PSC & TM to PC (draft reviewed)	½ week				
		PC to TM, PSC & EC (final version)	½ week				
<b>Official Report to the EC (interim &amp; final)</b>	Twice in the project (M18 & M36)	PAR to WP leader (PAR contribution)	1 week	E-mail; ProjectPlace	Specific template; build upon quarterly interim reports	Provisional contents: 1. Explanation of the work carried out by the beneficiaries; 2. Overview of the progress towards the objectives of the action, including milestones and Deliverables identified in DoA. 3. Explanations justifying the differences between work expected to be carried out in accordance with DoA and that actually carried out. 4. Exploitation and dissemination of the results and an updated 'plan for the exploitation and dissemination of the results'. 5. Communication activities. 6. Summary for publication by the Agency. 7. Answers to the 'questionnaire', covering issues related to the action implementation and the economic and societal impact.	Contribution upon specific structure to be provided by the PC.
		WP leader to PC	1 week				
		PC to PSC & TM (global draft)	2 weeks				
		PSC & TM to PC (draft reviewed)	2 weeks				
		PC to TM, PSC & EC (final version)	1-2 weeks				
		Should be sent from the PC to the EC within 60 days					

	Start Time	Steps	Timing per step	Way	Format	Content	Length
<b>Financial statements and other reports</b>	Twice a year, upon request from the PMT	PAR to PC (draft)	1 week	fax (draft)	Form C	Summary of PAR Cost Statements	As indicated by EC rules
		PC to PAR (draft reviewed)		By courier (final)			
		PAR to PC					
		PC to EC					
		QAM to PAR and PC				Comments on spent resources and warnings, if appropriate	

**PAR: Partner**

**PC: Project Coordinator**

**TM: Technical & Innovation Manager**

**PMT: Project Management Team**

**PSC: Project Steering Committee**

**QAM: Quality Assurance Manager**

## **Annex 5: Internal reports template**




## SAFE STRIP

# SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications

Grant Agreement Number: 723211

Internal Report: "Title of the report"

<b>Work package</b>	WPx: Title
<b>Activity</b>	ActivityX.X: Title
<b>Internal Report</b>	Internal Report name
<b>Authors</b>	
<b>Status</b>	Choose an item.
<b>Version</b>	X.X
<b>Document date</b>	00/00/2017
	<i>This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement no 723211.</i>

## Document Control Sheet

Version history table			
Version	Date	Modification reason	Modifier

## Excerpt

### Legal Disclaimer

This document reflects only the views of the author(s). Neither the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) nor the European Commission is in any way responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains. The information in this document is provided “as is”, and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The above referenced consortium members shall have no liability for damages of any kind including without limitation direct, special, indirect, or consequential damages that may result from the use of these materials subject to any liability which is mandatory due to applicable law. © 2017 by SAFE STRIP Consortium.

### Table of Contents

### List of Tables

### List of Figures

### Abbreviation list

(separate page)

## **1. Introduction**

(starting from new page, after Executive Summary, encompassing the following subsections)

### **1.1 Purpose of the document**

### **1.2 Intended audience**

### **1.3 Interrelations (optional)**

## **2. Methodology**

(when applicable)

## **3. Chapters**

(reaching up to fourth level of sub-heading maximum)

## **4. Conclusions**

(encompassing future steps)

## **References**

## **Annexes**

(numbered and optional)



## Annex 6: Project meetings presentation template



Figure 5: Slide Cover Screenshot.



Figure 6: Activity Presentation Cover Screenshot.

Activity X.Y – title 

<b>Partners</b>	<b>leader, partners</b>
<b>Start-end</b>	<b>Mx – My</b>
<b>Objective</b>	<b>short.</b>
<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Dx.y – title (Mxx)</b>
<b>Inputs</b>	
<b>Outputs</b>	

 4

Figure 7: Activity Overview presentation Screenshot.



- Activity x.y – title 
- Progress towards objective
    - What was carried out
  - Results
    - Actual outcomes ( deliverables, components, events, publications ...)
  - Scope for the next period
    - Objective for the next Quarter
  - Issues / Risks
    - Issues and Risk
      - Situation with existing risks
      - New risks issues
  - Use as much slides as necessary but keep the text short and meaningful
-  5

Figure 8: Activity analysis screenshot.

## Annex 7: Project events presentation template

**Project Events Presentation Template**  
presented by,  
**SAFE STRIP Consortium**

**SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive Applications**

**H2020 Project ID: 723211**

ERTICO, C2A, Fraunhofer, PIAGGIO GROUP, cidaut, Valeo, A2Z, Autostrada del Brennero SpA, Brennerautobahn AG, Continental, etc.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 723211

Figure 9: Project event slide cover screenshot.

**Title**

Subtitle

**Text**

SAFE STRIP  
SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive Applications  
2nd Review Meeting, Brussels

2

Figure 10: Project event slide screenshot.

## **Annex 8: Project meetings' agenda**



**SAFE STRIP**

**SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive applications**

**Grant Agreement Number: 723211**

## **Meeting Agenda**

**Meeting Date**  
**Meeting address**

## Day 1 - Date

Topic	Presenter(s)	Time
Slot Title and description		
Slot		
Slot		
Slot		
Slot		

## Day 2 – Date

Topic	Presenter(s)	Time
Slot Title and description		
Slot		
Slot		
Slot		
Slot		

## Notes

## Contacts

## Logistic Information

Venue, Directions, nearby hotel

## **Annex 9: Project meeting minutes**



**SAFE STRIP**

**SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications**

**Grant Agreement Number: 723211**

## **Meeting Minutes**

**Meeting ID**  
**Meeting Date**



## Meeting agenda

## List of Participants

No	Name/Surname	Partner

## Minutes – Day 1

## Minutes – Day 2

## List of Actions

Action	Date	Who	Status

## Annex 10: Request for Corrective Action



**SAFE STRIP**

**SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive aPplications**

**Grant Agreement Number: 723211**

### **Request for Corrective Action**

<b>WP:</b>	<b>Activity:</b>
<b>Requesting Participant:</b>	
<b>Number of request:</b>	

<b>No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Reasoning</b>	<b>Proposal for remedy</b>	<b>Deadline for remedy implementation</b>

<b>No</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Reasoning</b>	<b>Proposal for remedy</b>	<b>Deadline for remedy implementation</b>

## Annex 11: Decision on Corrective Action request



**SAFE STRIP**

**SAFE and green Sensor Technologies for self-explaining and forgiving Road Interactive applications**

**Grant Agreement Number: 723211**

### **Decision for Corrective Action**

<b>CORRECTIVE ACTION DECISION</b>	<b>Number:</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Date:</b>
SECTION 1: Description of issue	
Relevant WP / Activity: .....	

SECTION 2: Reasoning / Cause

SECTION 3: Immediate corrective action to be taken

To be implemented by ..... Date .....

SECTION 4: Follow Up Action and Effectiveness Monitor

List of Changes to be made:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 8.

The Corrective/Preventive Action has been completed and has/has not effectively cured the problem.

Further action has been requested on Corrective Action Request No.....

## Annex 12: Project meetings schedule

Project meetings shall be organised by the responsible party. The provisional schedule of project meetings are as follows:

Table 5: SAFE STRIP Project Periodic Meetings.

Body	Ordinary meeting
PB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least 3 face to face meetings on annual basis.</li> <li>▪ Telcos upon request of the PMT.</li> </ul>
SC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least twice per Year:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Every 2 meetings alongside with the Partner Board meetings</li> <li>▪ Telcos upon request of the PMT.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
PMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ At least every 3 months:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Alongside with the Partner Board and the Steering Committee meetings</li> <li>▪ Biweekly telcos.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
WP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Biweekly telcos (as soon as the WP starts).</li> </ul>

Notice for each meeting shall adhere to the following timeline

	Ordinary meeting	Extraordinary
PB	45 calendar days	15 calendar days
PSC	14 calendar days	7 calendar days
PMT	14 calendar days	7 calendar days

While notice of the agenda items shall adhere to the following:

Table 6: SAFE STRIP Distribution of Agenda timetable.

	Ordinary meeting	Extraordinary
PB	21 calendar days	10 calendar days
PSC	7 calendar days	7 calendar days
PMT	7 calendar days	7 calendar days

Table 7: Addition of items in the agenda timetable.

	<b>Ordinary meeting</b>	<b>Extraordinary</b>
<b>PB</b>	14 calendar days	7 calendar days
<b>PSC</b>	2 calendar days	2 calendar days
<b>PMT</b>	2 calendar days	2 calendar days