



**Deliverable 5.2** 

# **Quality and Contingency Plan**

## **Responsible Unit: CNR** Contributors: All Partners

The project PETAL is cofunded by the Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL-2016) and the following National Authorities and R&D programs in Italy, Portugal, Austria and Romania.











1



## **Document Technical Details:**

Document Number	D5.2
Document Title	Quality and Contingency Plan
Status	Draft
Work Package	WP5
Deliverable Type	Report
Contractual Date of delivery	31/03/2018
Responsible Unit	CNR
Contributors	All Partners
Keywords List	Quality, Risks
Dissemination Level	Public













## **Table of Contents**

1	INTRODU	ICTION	4
2	PROJECT	MANAGEMENT AND ORGANIZATION	5
2.1	2.1.1 Pr 2.1.2 St 2.1.3 St 2.1.4 Qu 2.1.5 W 2.1.6 Ta	ational structure	5 6 7 7 8 8
3	PROCEDU	IRES FOR COMMUNICATION	3
3.1 3.2 3.3	Respons 3.2.1 Ag 3.2.2 M Commur 3.3.1 M 3.3.2 Te 3.3.3 Sl	Meetings       13         sibilities of organizer and participants       14         genda       1         linutes and Summaries       1         nication Channels and Collaborative tools       15         lailing-list       1         eleconferencing       1         hared repository       1         roject website       1	4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
4	PROJECT	QUALITY PLAN	7
4.1 4.2 4.3 4.4 4.5	Quality o Deliveral Scientifio	tion	7 7 3
5	SIGNIFIC	CANT RISKS AND ASSOCIATED CONTINGENCY PLAN	0
BIE	BLIOGRAPH	ΗΥ2	2
GLC	DSSARY		3
API	PENDIX A .		3
		ask Leaders23 uthors and Internal Reviewers24	







AAL

PROGRAMME

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

This document summarizes deliverable D5.2 of the PETAL project, a Collaborative Project supported by the Active and Assisted Living Programme under Call 2014.

The overall objective of AAL is to enhance the quality of life of older adults while strengthening the industrial base in Europe through the use of ICT.

Full information on PETAL project is available online at <a href="http://www.aal-petal.eu/">http://www.aal-petal.eu/</a>.

The main objective of D5.2 is to make the collaboration among PETAL partners easier and to ensure both efficient management and high quality of the PETAL project.

The document defines a set of rules and procedures that allow the partners to organise their cooperative work efficiently. Moreover it provides guidelines and principles that ensure a high scientific and organizational quality of the PETAL project throughout its lifetime.

Some sections are derived from the Description of Work ([1]) and the Consortium Agreement ([2]), while other parts have been created specifically for this document.

A basic assumption in the project is that everyone in the project reads, understands and agrees with the procedures described. This document includes:

- An overview of the project plan and a description of the management structure.
- A description of the procedures for sharing information and documents among partner.
- The Quality Plan and identification of the KPIs.
- The Risk Analysis and mitigation measures.

🕼 Ministere della Salute

The project PETAL is cofunded by the Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL-2016) and the following National Authorities and R&D programs in Italy, Spain, Austria and Romania.

Ministero dell'Istruzione, 11 Nationale - Lille Provi FCT BINGE DIA CIENCIA CONTRACTOR DIA CONTRACTOR DI

4



## 2 Project Management and Organization

#### 2.1 Organisational structure

The project is built around a team of researchers, developers, designers, and users, drawn from a number of centers/organizations/companies in various European countries. Most of them have previous experience with EU R&D projects. The structure and procedures of project management activities are designed to:

- Provide coherence in distributed project work coordinating and integrating the various project tasks.
- Provide the administrative support and appropriate quality control procedures.
- Guarantee the communication flow and the exchange of experiences between the partners, facilitating effective feedback for early containment of potential problems.
- Function as the intermediary between the project partners and the AAL Association.

The project management framework is based on the following main principles:

- The establishment of a cooperative and collaborative project environment.
- The identification of precise responsibilities and tasks for each partner.
- The utilization of unambiguous information channels, effective control mechanisms and flexible organizational structures.

In the following paragraphs the principal entities involved in Project Management and respective responsibilities will be described in detail.

#### 2.1.1 Project Coordinator

The Project Coordinator (PC) for PETAL is Fabio Paternò from CNR. He will be supported by a Deputy Coordinator (DC), Carmen Santoro from CNR. The Project Coordinator is responsible for the overall management of the project. Additionally, he has to ensure a smooth, timely and effective overall progress/development of the project and provide an interface between the project and the outside world, in particular with the AAL Association and the Lead NFB (National Funding Body). The coordinator executes the project under the control of the Steering Committee, which will be chaired by him, and shall perform all tasks assigned to him as described in the Grant Agreement(s) and the Consortium Agreement.

In particular, the Project Coordinator shall be responsible for:

- Monitoring compliance by the Parties with their obligations.
- Keeping the address list of Members and other contact persons updated and available.
- Collecting, reviewing and submitting information on the progress of the Project and reports and other deliverables (including financial statements and related certification) to the AALA CMU.
- Preparing the meetings, proposing decisions and preparing the agenda of Steering Committee meetings, chairing the meetings, preparing the minutes of the meetings and monitoring the implementation of decisions taken at meetings.
- Transmitting promptly documents and information connected with the Project to the AALA CMU and NFBs.





#### 2.1.2 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee (SC) is the decision-making body of the Consortium. It consists of one representative for each PETAL Partner, identified during the Kick-off meeting as reported in in Table 1.

Participant no.	Participant organisation name	Participant short name	Representatives	Country
1 (Coordinator)	Coordinator)Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche2Apollis - Istituto di ricerca sociale e demoscopia s.n.c.3Bartenbach GmbH		Fabio Paternò / Carmen Santoro	Italy
2			Hermann Atz	Italy
3			Lisa-Marie Neier	Austria
4	Fondazione Santa Lucia	FSL	Nerisa Banaj	Italy
5	5 Fundația Ana Aslan International		Mircea Marzan	Romania
6 Ideable Solutions, SL		IDE	Iñaki Bartolome	Spain

The Steering Committee has the final responsibility for the technical, financial, administrative, exploitation and dissemination aspects of PETAL.

The following decisions shall be taken by the Steering Committee:

- Content, finances and intellectual property rights:
  - Proposals for changes to the Description of Work (DoW) to be agreed by the Lead NFB
  - Changes to the Consortium Plan (Including the Consortium Budget)
  - Withdrawals from Attachment 1 (Background included)
  - Additions to Attachment 2 (Background excluded)
  - Addition to Attachment 4 (List to Third Parties)
- Evolution of the Consortium:





- Entry of a new Party to the Consortium and approval of the settlement on the conditions of the accession of such a new Party
- Withdrawal of a Party from the Consortium and the approval of the settlement on the conditions of the withdrawal
- Declaration of a Party to be a Defaulting Party
- Remedies to be performed by a Defaulting Party
- Termination of a Defaulting Party's participation in the Consortium and measures relating thereto
- Proposal to the involved NFBs for a change of the Coordinator
- Proposal to the involved NFBs for suspension of all or part of the Project
- Proposal to the involved NFBs for termination of the Project and the Consortium Agreement

The PETAL Consortium Agreement defines the procedures for decision making in SC and the respective voting rule. As a general approach, regular and extraordinary meetings of the SC shall constitute a quorum if a minimum of 2/3 of all parties are present or duly represented by proxy. Decisions are made by relative majority of all attendees of the meeting.

The Steering Committee will confront possible conflicts within the consortium by means of a conciliatory discussion and a consensual resolution. If necessary, advice will be sought from representatives of the Stakeholder Advisory Board.

#### 2.1.3 Stakeholder Advisory Board

The Stakeholder Advisory Board (SAB) will be composed of representatives from relevant stakeholders involved in the pilot sites (users, relatives, caregivers, institutions, insurance companies, and relevant business units of industrial/research organizations).

#### 2.1.4 Quality Assurance Manager

PETAL Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) is Giulio Galesi from CNR. The Quality Assurance Manager has been appointed during the kick-off meeting and will be responsible for ensuring:

- The quality of and the compliance to the procedures agreed by the Management Board.
- The quality of the intermediate and final deliverables.
- The quality of final results.

The Quality Assurance Manager will select peer reviewers, in agreement with work package leaders and the Steering Committee for the revision of key deliverables.

The Quality Assurance Manager will supervise the integration of peer reviewers' comments into the results of the project. She will closely cooperate with the Project Coordinator.

Quality assurance procedures will be included in the Project Quality Plan section of this document.





#### 2.1.5 Work Package Leaders

Work package leaders will act as the main interface between a work package and the rest of the project. Thus, they will be responsible for: defining the overall technical approach and strategy of the WP, technical coordination and overseeing the progress of the different tasks within the WP, organizing cross work package coordination meetings at their discretion and enforcing deadlines to ensure smooth achievement of the project objectives.

#### 2.1.6 Task Leaders

Task leaders will lead the technical work for a task within a WP ensuring that it is done in accordance with the overall technical strategy and deadlines defined and agreed with the Work Package leader. Task leaders will report periodically to their respective work package leader on an informal basis.

#### 2.2 Overview of the Work plan

The activities in PETAL are broken down into three technical work packages, and two support work packages as detailed in the following. The project Gantt is reported in **Error! Reference source not found.**1.

**WP1 (End Users Participation)** is aimed to gather end user requirements from both the users with dementia and caregivers perspective. It will also address the first prototypes evaluations in terms of usability and accessibility.

**WP2 (Market Analysis and Exploitation)** is devoted to address relevant stakeholders (e.g. informal and formal caregivers) and also the scientific community, which will be both informed about the results of our project. Particular emphasis will be put in this WP on analysing and planning how to commercially exploit the results of PETAL, also through the development of an initial market analysis (to estimate the economic potential of the PETAL system) and then through building an appropriate business plan that will be refined during the project also taking into account the feedback gathered from the field tests.

In **WP3 (Technology & Product Design)**, the design, development and integration of the various platform subsystems (e.g. Monitoring and Behaviour Analysis, Lighting system) will be carried out. The initial architectural specifications will be drawn in order to meet the gathered end user requirements. The platform resulting from the integration of the developed modules will be evaluated in real contexts of use in WP4. In **WP4 (Demonstrator and Field Trials)**, the platform developed in WP3 will be tested by validating its use in real contexts. We plan to carry out trials in the home of 16 people (distributed in four different areas) suffering from mild cognitive impairment. We plan two cycles of trials: this will allow to assess the added value of the proposed solution with respect to the state of technique, and to quantify its benefits from the economic point of view.

The main goal of **WP5 (Management)** is to ensure an efficient coordination of the project activities according to the approved plans and a consistent high quality of the work to be performed. It aims to ensure the compliance of the project activities with the plans previously agreed, and thus the high quality of the work. This will be mainly done by managing the coordination of the other WP activities and by ensuring the timely delivery of the planned documents, prototypes, trials.





Regarding the flow between WPs, WP2 will provide input and influence the work of the core technical WP1 and WP3. The applications and the technological platform developed in the project will be verified in WP3. WP4 will focus on exploitation and dissemination, i.e. addressing the interactions with the external world, communicating the results achieved in the other workpackages. Finally, WP5 will address the project management, as well as the relationship between the project and the AAL Association. The deliverables and milestones are reported in Table 2 and Table **3** respectively.

We plan to have two iterations in the PETAL development. Since applications are based on the platform, their development will start later than the platform development. In the 1st year we will therefore put less emphasis on evaluation, as there will be little ready to evaluate.











## **Quality and Contingency Plan**

Workpackage	Task	М1	М2	мз	M4	M5	М6	M7	M8	М9	M10	M11	M12	M13	M14	M15	M16	M17	M18	M19	/20 N	121	V122 N	23 N	124 N	125 N	126 1	W27	M28 I	M29	M30	VI31	M32 M	33 M	134 N	M35 I	M36
	T1.1 Early stage dementia users requirements																																				
WP1 End Users Participation	T1.2 Care givers requirements																																				
	T1.3 Usability and Accessibility evaluation (Laboratory Evaluation)																																				
	T2.1 Information campaign for stakeholders																																				
WP2 Dissemination & Exploitation	T2.2 Addressing scientific community																																				
Exploitation	T2.3 Market analysis and Business Plan																																				
	T3.1 Architecture specification																																				
WP3	T3.2 Monitoring Behaviour																																				
Technology & Product Design	T3.3 Personalizable Lighting System																																				
	T3.4 Platform integration																																				
	T4.1 Demonstrator Development																																				
WP4 Demonstrator	T4.2 FieldTrial Preparation																																				
Development and Field Trials	T4.3 FieldTrials																																				
	T4.4 Effectiveness and Performance Evaluation of Field Trials																																				
WP5	T5.1 Management																																				
Management	T5.2 Reporting and monitoring																																				

Table 1 - PETAL Gantt





Del. no.	Deliverable name	WP no.	Nature/	Dissemin	Deliver
			type of	ation	у
			deliver	level	date
			able	(Public	(projec
				or	t
				restricte d)	month)
D1.1a	Early Stage Dementia Users Analysis	1	R	Public	M5
D1.2a	Care Givers Users Analysis	1	R	Public	M5
D1.3a	Usability and Accessibility Eval. Report	1	R	Public	M12
D1.1b	Early Stage Dementia Users Analysis	1	R	Public	M15
D1.2b	Care Givers Users Analysis	1	R	Public	M15
D1.3b	Usability and Accessibility Eval. Report	1	R	Public	M24
D2.1	Project Web Site (M1)	2	0	Public	M1
D2.2a	Dissemination plan	2	R	Public	M12
D2.3a	Market analysis preliminary business			Restrict	
DEISU	plan	2	R	ed	M12
D2.4	Exploitation plan	2	R	Public	M18
D2.2b	Dissemination plan	2	R	Public	M24
D2.3b	Market analysis preliminary business	2	R	Restrict	M24
	plan	Z	ĸ	ed	1124
D2.5	Final business plan/business model	2	R	Restrict	M36
			ĸ	ed	1130
D3.1	Architecture Specification	3	R	Public	M12
D3.2a	Monitoring and Behaviour Analysis	3	R	Public	M12
D3.3a	Personalizable Lighting System	3	R	Public	M12
D3.4a	Integrated Platform	3	Р	Public	M24
D3.2b	Monitoring and Behaviour Analysis	3	R	Public	M24
D3.3b	Personalizable Lighting System	3	R	Public	M24
D3.4b	Integrated Platform	3	Р	Public	M31
D4.1a	Demonstrator and Field Trial	4	Р	Public	M12
	Preparation:				
D4.2a	Field Trial Plan	4	R	Public	M12
D4.3a	Field Trial Report	4	R	Public	M16
D4.4a	Field Trial Effectiveness and Perfor. Eval.	4	R	Public	M19
D4.2b	Field Trial Plan	4	R	Public	M23
D4.1b	Demonstrator and Field Trial Prototype	4	Р	Public	M24
D4.3b	Field Trial Report	4	R	Public	M28
D4.4b	Field Trial Effectiveness and Perfor. Eval.	4	R	Public	M31
D5.1	Consortium agreement	5	0	Restrict ed	M1

Table 2 Deliverables overview list











## **Quality and Contingency Plan**

PETAL

D5.2	Quality and Contingency Plan	5	R	Public	M6
D5.3	First annual progress and financial report	5	R	Restrict ed	M12
D5.4	Mid-term review report	5	R	Public	M18
D5.5	Second progress and financial report	5	R	Restrict ed	M24
D5.6	Final project report	5	R	Restrict ed	M36

Table 3 - Milestones overview list

No.	Milestone name	WP involved	Expected date (project month)	Means of verification
1	User Requirements	WP1	M5	D1.1; D1.2
2	Technological components defined	WP3	M12	D3.1, D3.2a; D3.3a
3	Preliminary business plan completed	WP2	M24	D2.3b
4	Field trials finished	WP4	M28	D4.3b
5	Final business plan ready-made	WP2	M36	D2.5









#### **Procedures for Communication** 3

To avoid misunderstandings and delays as well as to ensure a high quality of deliverables, a number of communication and reporting principles are laid down as follows:

- The PC, DC and SC are responsible for timely and transparent information on any decisions • taken by them or the commission.
- The procedures for planning and conducting meetings, for internal communications and for reporting are described in section 3.1.
- The communication channels including mailing lists, project external web site, shared repository and responsibilities are detailed in section 3.3.

#### 3.1 Project Meetings

Throughout the project several meetings will be held. These will differ in type, scope, participation, and frequency.

The participants in the meetings should in general be a representation of all project members, selected based on subject matter discussed or other relevant criteria. When appropriate, small meetings will be chosen rather than large ones. All partners are required to attend plenary meetings. Every meeting should be documented by minutes summarising results and a list of further actions. Particular attention must be given to the follow-up of the meeting: send the minutes quickly, check commitment on decisions and actions with absent Partners, check that decisions are respected and actions executed.

PETAL project foresees different types of meetings both at operational level and at more general, strategy oriented-ones. These are summarized in Table 4.

Meeting	Frequency	Description	Туре
Plenary Meetings	Three times per year	Organized by the PC. Will cover issues such as technical aspects, WPs implementation, work plan modifications, control of the research activities conducted within the project. Invitations can be open to external observers if desired.	Face to Face
Steering Committee Meetings	Three times per year	Organized by the PC preferably within a plenary meeting. Will cover issues such as amendments to the work plan, commission corrective actions, strategy for conducting the project	Face to Face or by Teleconference
Project Mid Term Review	At project Mid- term	To verify the ongoing state of the work. The AALA CMU, the	Face to Face

Table 4 - PETAL meetings











Meeting		NCP's and project consortium will be represented.	
WP Meetings	Once a month or whenever needed		by
Issue-driven meetings	Whenever needed	Organized by PC or WP Leaders to address specific and unforeseen issues that emerge from ongoing project activities or from other meeting outcomes	Teleconference

#### 3.2 Responsibilities of organizer and participants

Meeting organizers are responsible for logistics: providing an adequate venue (or technical means for on-line meetings), giving indications to the attendees for joining the meeting (e.g. travel information, accommodation suggestions, indications to reach the venue), supplying meeting materials (e.g. agenda, slides, or other documents). They are also responsible for communication: announcing meeting, inviting partners, collecting materials, producing final minutes and summaries.

Partners participating in the meetings are responsible for providing, upon request, all information needed to the organizers, and to positively collaborate both in the organization and conducting the meetings. All Members should be present or represented at the meetings and shall participate in a cooperative manner in the meetings.

#### 3.2.1 Agenda

Each meeting must have an agenda. The agenda should be distributed in advance, to inform the participants about the topics to be discussed and to give them the possibility to suggest changes to the agenda, which must then be redistributed. The agenda lists the topics which are planned for discussion. It is an instrument to assist the facilitator in monitoring the meeting. Secretarial work is also minimised by a well-structured agenda. Each agenda contains some standard subjects with the following structure:

- type of meeting
- list of participants
- place
- date
- hours (beginning of work, breaks, closing)
- list and explanation of topics to be addressed





#### 3.2.2 Minutes and Summaries

Meeting organizers are responsible for drafting the minutes of the meetings (or for appointing someone to the task) and sharing them as soon as possible and no later than 10 working days after the meeting. Draft minutes should be circulated as soon as possible, and will be subject to approval by all partners, according to the deadlines and rules defined on a case-by-case basis. All minutes of periodic meetings will have the same structure and should contain the following information:

- meeting date
- location
- author
- participants
- objective of the meeting (brief)
- actual agenda
- list of documents distributed during the meeting with reference to the author (if appropriate)
- summary of discussion (if relevant)
- decisions
- open issues
- summary of the action list (if appropriate)
- place and date of the next meeting (if appropriate)

#### 3.3 Communication Channels and Collaborative tools

#### 3.3.1 Mailing-list

The main communication channel for the project members will be email.

Given the size of the project, a single general mailing list (<u>petal@isti.cnr.it</u>) including all the PETAL contacts has been created, and is maintained by CNR.

If additional mailing lists will be needed to address different audiences in PETAL for a better organization of the project communication (for example at WP or Task level), they will be created on demand.

#### 3.3.2 Teleconferencing

Teleconferencing is a powerful tool for organizing and conducting short meetings. This can be organized with short notice, participants only need a plain telephone or an internet connection set to participate and do not need to spend time and resources travelling.

The teleconferences will be set up through web conference tools (like Skype or GoToMeeting), or phone bridge.

#### 3.3.3 Shared repository

PROGRAMME

In order to share information and files among Partners, a shared repository on Dropbox has been set-up and maintained by CNR.

The project PETAL is cofunded by the Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL-2016) and the following National Authorities and R&D programs in Italy, Spain, Austria and Romania.

ic Ill Pin



#### 3.3.4 Project website

The project external web site has been published and is maintained by CNR HIIS Laboratory: www.aal-petal.eu.

The project website contains updated information on project status and other relevant news and upcoming activities.











## 4 Project Quality Plan

#### 4.1 Introduction

The project quality plan is developed and maintained during the whole project duration from M1 to M36. This document is the current version of the project quality plan. It is meant to be a living document that is updated regularly during the whole project duration but at least once in each reporting period.

Over time, experiences in conducting the PETAL project will prompt changes to the project quality plan. The project quality is maintained by the QAM, in close cooperation with PC and DC, based on the input and feedback that is received from all consortium members on a regular basis.

#### 4.2 Quality of Project Progress

Work Package Leaders are responsible for the progression of their respective Work Package and they report directly to the Steering Committee. Furthermore, the Consortium will use typical measures such as milestones within the project plan for monitoring the progress of activities. All along the project activities, each member of the Consortium will be responsible for informing the Steering Committee and the relevant Work Package leaders about any contingencies that might have negative or indeed positive impacts on the progress of the project.

Standard and commonly available project management software tools will be used to assist project management tasks. Together with the use of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), the

monitoring of project progress will be done internally using the following metrics:

- Timely completion of the milestones and deliverables.
- Appropriate use of the resources according to the work plan.
- Prompt reaction from the EC, from relevant scientific communities, from industry and interest from other European organizations involved.

#### 4.3 Deliverable Quality

Each deliverable is responsible for a specific subject and aspect of the PETAL project and each deliverable is associated to a specific Task in a given WP. WP Leaders and Deliverable Leaders should produce the document and co-ordinate the activities of the partners involved. Deliverable Leaders are the Task Leaders in the Task that the Deliverable is associated to. In the case of a Deliverable associated to more than one task, the Deliverable Leader will be properly selected among the Task Leaders and the WP Leader. PM is responsible for monitoring and facilitating the process as well as for controlling the quality of the final document. All

documents must follow a delivery process in order to assure their consistency and their quality and to minimize the risk that deliverables will be rejected at project reviews. All the deliverables will pass through two

processes:

- a scientific internal review
- a formal quality check





Each Deliverable's leader has to identify two peer reviewers who have not been involved in its creation. The reviewers could be either be part of the project, or someone from the outside, as appropriate. This scientific review will check that:

- the Deliverable covers the objectives stated in the Technical Annex
- the quality of the work described in the document is good and is in accordance with what is expected

The Coordinator and Quality Assurance Manager will be responsible of the formal quality check of the deliverables under the following points of view:

- the quality of the document is good (errors, organization of topics, readability, illustrations)
- the Deliverable is complete (there are no missing parts, non-existing references, topics not covered, arguments not properly explained)
- the Deliverable is clear and suitable to its potential readers (it is possible to find in it complete and clear answers to the questions raised by the stated objectives, in a form that can be useful for the Users of the work and/or for the continuation of the work)
- the Deliverable conforms to the quality standards stated in this document

#### 4.4 Scientific and Technical Quality

The following measures are in place to ensure high quality of the scientific results and the project deliverables:

- Task Leaders are experienced researchers and normally at least at the post-doctoral or senior engineering level. All Work Package Leaders are senior researchers with a strong scientific track record in the field of their work package and ample organisational experience.
- Each scientific deliverable is reviewed internally before its release as described in previous section. Scientific deliverables in text form are expected to be of a quality that allows peer-reviewed, international publication. Such publication is explicitly encouraged. Checklists for task leaders, authors and internal reviewers have been established to ensure a high quality standard and timely delivery of the reports. The checklists are included in Appendix A.
- The PC and the DC monitor the active work tasks and ensure that the evaluation criteria laid down in the DoW are addressed in the deliverables.
- The WPLs organize "tracks" relating to their work package during the annual project meetings with presentations on the scientific progress. These are followed by critical discussions in which all project members participate.
- User interfaces will be designed according to guidelines for accessibility and usability, and end users will assess the mock-ups created through focus groups and user tests.
- All field work will be based on appropriate ethical guidelines. Ethical issues will be a permanent agenda point in consortium meetings.





PROGRAMME

#### 4.5 Key Performance Indicators

The following Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) measures have been identified as suitable ones for measuring the progress and success of the PETAL Project:

- Scientific excellence of the project's research activities:
  - Number of published works by Consortium partners;
  - $\circ$   $\;$  Number of presentations given by Consortium partners in external events.
- Level of integration among partners:
  - Number of joint publications;
  - Number of visits to other partners and number of remote meetings involving multiple partners for carrying out joint work.
- Level of visibility of the initiative at the European and global level:
  - Average monthly hits on the project Web site;
  - o Total number of documents downloaded from the project Web site;
  - Number of articles in blogs/magazines/news/radio.
- Commercial exploitation of the project:

🕼 Ministero della Salute –

- $\circ$  Positive evaluation of the applications developed during the field trials.
- Number of marketing presentations given by project partners to representatives of different groups of interest.

The project PETAL is cofunded by the Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL-2016) and the following National Authorities and R&D programs in Italy, Spain, Austria and Romania.

Ministero dell'Istruzione,

FCT Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia bm V fiscoti



## 5 Significant risks and associated contingency plan

Risk assessment will be extended to all main Tasks in the project. Due to the nature of the research and innovation, some risks may be high as chosen concepts may not perform as expected. This extends to areas such as dependencies on other technologies and acceptability of solutions. However, non-technical risks inherent to cooperative Research and Innovation projects also exist, including those related with partnership, market, privacy rules, regulation and legal issues. Risks also exist in areas such as IP, relations in the partnership, cost monitoring, timing and competition. In the project these risks will be monitored and actions will be taken in order to develop appropriate strategies to minimize any impact on eventual exploitation of the results.

Risk management is coordinated through WP5 and involves all project partners. The risk management process is iterated regularly during the project, and will be a fixed item on the agenda of each project meeting to ensure that:

- Identified risks are continuously monitored until judged acceptable;
- Regular evaluation is performed to identify new sources of risks;
- Regular update of the Risk Status Report are made, including risk mitigation actions;
- Risk mitigation actions are performed and monitored.

The following table presents an overview of the preliminary identified high-level risks and the envisioned risk contingency plans for the project.

Risk	WP	Likelihood	Impact
<ul> <li>R1 - A number of project management risks exist, related to for example:</li> <li>Lack of communication;</li> <li>Late production of deliverables;</li> <li>Unclear project expectations and goals set the project on a wrong direction: deviation from original project objectives;</li> <li>A partner violates IP rights;</li> <li>A partner withdraws due to changed priorities, bankruptcy or other reasons;</li> <li>Unacceptably low performance of individual partners;</li> <li>Slow or inadequate mobilisation of consortium.</li> </ul>	5	Unlikely	Serious





#### Risk

WP Likelihood

Impact

A strong management by the project coordinator will ensure effective cooperation through good communication. Periodic reviews of the advance will be performed. Proactive management will ensure timeliness. Partners are experienced in the domain considered and have produced a realistic development timeline. Deliverable templates will be set-up at project kick-off. Application of good practices for task documentation (continuous documentation during task execution). Clear identification of deliverable responsible (task leader). The objectives of the project are clear for all partners, and will be further detailed in the agreements and internal project communication. There is a clear understanding between the partners about IP rights, and this will be formalized in the agreements. All of the partners are committed to the direction of the project and are financially healthy and stable. All partners have longstanding experience in working in projects that deal with development of technology in an international framework. Clear identification of points of contacts for all partners who are responsible for initiating the project (already performed) supports this assessment.

R2 – Risks around business expectations and exploitation potential:	2	Possible	Harmful
<ul> <li>The project lacks exploitation strategy;</li> <li>Not meeting the end users' expectations;</li> </ul>			
• Competing solutions appear before the end of the project.			

Strong requirements definition work will be developed as well as validation tasks. The consortium includes partners that have significant experience in meeting end users' expectations in innovative processes. They will drive the project where possible, will be demanding towards technology developers and will be vigilant towards stated requirements. Focus on end users' expectations will be regularly discussed during the project, and will be a significant topic at the kick-off meeting of the project. Furthermore, partners will continuously interact during the project with end users and will monitor progress (and direction) of the project with respect to the signals received from end users.

If alternative solutions appear it will likely be positive for the acceptance of the selfmanagement solution that is developed in this project, instead of negative.

R3 – Difficulties in getting input or feedback from the project stakeholders (patients and the patient organisations).	14	Unlikely	Harmful
--	----	----------	---------

Given the participation of end-user organisations in this project, and considering the proven track record of the partners in the project in healthcare related innovations, this risk is considered small. However, managing this potential risk will be one of focus areas during the first phase of the project.

The project PETAL is cofunded by the Active and Assisted Living Programme (AAL-2016) and the following National Authorities and R&D programs in Italy, Spain, Austria and Romania.

Q Ministero dell'Istruzione,

E. Ill Pin

🙀 Ministero della Salute

PROGRAMME

FCT binder a tenologia bin to the fischi



Risk	WP	Likelihood	Impact
<ul> <li>R4 - Patients abandon the trials. Possible reasons can be:</li> <li>Permanent hospitalization of the patient due to a severe issue or a quick decline;</li> <li>The informal caregivers lose the trust on the system and demand the patient withdrawal;</li> <li>Explicit withdrawal of the patient who does not want to cooperate anymore.</li> </ul>	4	Possible	Serious

A waiting list for the enrollment in the trial will be filled, and only a limited number of patients from the list will be initially involved in the trial. However, the remaining patients will keep in the waiting list. In case of withdrawal of one or more participants, the first patient(s) in the waiting list will be contacted for enrollment in the trial. The equipment will be moved from the house of the withdrawed patient to the house of the new participant.

<ul> <li>R5 - Chosen technology does not perform as expected. Some examples:</li> <li>The maturity level of the technology is not as far advanced as expected;</li> </ul>	3	Possible	Harmful
• The partners cannot agree on the details of the overall technical architecture.			

The maturity level of the applied technology can lead to time consumption in the related developing tasks and delays in the tasks on the critical path (milestone deadlines). To cope with this challenge, first, the progress will be continuously supervised in the regular project meetings and teleconferences, and resources reallocated between partners as necessary. Second, the requirements will be defined and subsequently elaborated to detect possible technological constraints early in time. This processing can be iterated making the specification process lean. Third, the applicability of the result from the business added-value viewpoint will be highlighted.

## **Bibliography**

[2]

- [1] PETAL DoW
  - PETAL Consortium Agreement





## Glossary

AALA CMU DC KPI	Active Assisted Living Association Central Management Unit Deputy Coordinator Key Performance Indicator
NCP	National Contact Person
NFB PC	National Funding Body
QAM	Project Coordinator Quality Assurance Manager
sc	Steering Committee
TL WP	Task Leader Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader

## **Appendix A**

#### **Checklist for Task Leaders**

The following list shall help task leaders to prepare the deliverables. The task leader should also read the checklist for the internal reviewers.

Description	Weeks before delivery	Explanation
Assignment internal reviewers	10 - 8	Each deliverable has to be reviewed by 2 project members not involved in its creation.
Creation	8	Setup skeleton of deliverable in the repository.
Contact coordinator & WP leader	8	Inform the coordinator & WP leader who the internal reviewers are and where to find the deliverable skeleton.
Send deliverable to internal reviewers, WP leader & coordinator	5	
Incorporate feedback from internal reviewers	3	
Send final version to coordinator & WP leader	1	









#### **Checklist for Authors and Internal Reviewers**

When preparing/reviewing a PETAL deliverable, please make sure that the following issues are addressed in addition to the quality criteria you apply for conference or journal papers.

Does the deliverable address explicitly and in sufficient depth the objectives as described in the "Description of Work"? If there are deviations, are they sufficiently motivated and explained?
Does the deliverable point out and explain the importance of the work for the project? Is the work put into relation with the overall goals?
Is related work cited and discussed sufficiently?
If the results of the deliverable were gained in a collaboration among different PETAL sites, please point out what the benefits were.
Are items referred to in other/later deliverables (e.g., requirements) traceable (e.g., by a numbering schema)?
Is the deliverable consistent with previous deliverables?
Is everything spell-checked?
Please add a glossary of acronyms and main terms.
When sending feedback to the task leader, please include the WP leader and coordinator in the cc.





