



DELIVERABLE

Project title: ElderHop

Project reference number: AAL-2010-3-037

D1.2 – Quality management plan

Revision: 0.2

Main Authors:

Barnabás Málnay (Mobility and Multimedia Nonprofit Ltd.)
Alexandra Horváth (Mobility and Multimedia Nonprofit Ltd.)
Gabriella Kiss (Mobility and Multimedia Nonprofit Ltd.)

Date: [31/07/2012]
Dissemination Level: Restricted

REVISION HISTORY

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
0.1	15/07/2012	A. Horváth G. Kiss	MMO	The first draft of the deliverable
0.2	31/07/2012	B. Málnay	MMO	Approved document

Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DELIVERABLE	4
1.2 STRUCTURE OF THE DELIVERABLE	4
2. OBJECTIVES	5
2.1 PURPOSE.....	5
2.2 SCOPE OF THE QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN	5
2.3 PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION	5
2.4 QUALITY WITHIN THE PROJECT	5
2.5 RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE COORDINATOR	6
2.6 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSORTIUM MEMBERS IN THE PROJECT	6
2.7 CORRECTIVE AND PREVENTIVE ACTIONS.....	9
2.8 DATA COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS	9
2.9 DELIVERABLES	10
2.10 DELIVERABLE REVIEW	11
1. ANNEXES	13
1.1 ANNEX 1.....	13
1.2 ANNEX 2.....	14
1.3 ANNEX 3.....	15

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Scope and objectives of the deliverable

The quality management plan of ElderHop project was created with the aim to provide a methodology to ensure the excellent implementation of tasks undertaken into the original project proposal and accepted by AAL CMU.

1.2 Structure of the deliverable

[The report is structured in 3 chapters.

Chapter 2 is a collection of used principles and methodology for ensuring the implementation of ElderHop project's tasks in high quality.

Chapter 3 contains the suggested templates to be used (Annexes).

2. OBJECTIVES

2.1 Purpose

The Quality Management Plan is the document setting out the quality assurance procedures for the ElderHop project. Its aim is to assure that the results and deliverables of the project are of high quality and meet the specifications set in the project's Description of Work. After acceptance of the document by the consortium, this Quality Management Plan becomes an official project document, which should govern all partners' and consortium's actions.

2.2 Scope of the Quality Management Plan

This Quality Management Plan is to be used by:

- all consortium members, responsible for preparing and amending deliverables;
- any responsible person of a project partner for approving works to be done by third parties, in order to complete deliverables.

2.3 Procedure description

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

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

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

2.4 Quality within the Project

This section specifies the activities to be implemented, including their sequence, in order to ensure that the project and its deliverables conform to the project requirements. Those responsible for ensuring that the required activities are carried out are identified within the subsequent chapters of this document. The Quality Management Plan includes explanation, necessary to show how quality requirements for activities are met. A list of such activities is given below:

- Quality system review
- Document and data control

- Internal Communication Strategies
- Prototypes Identification And Traceability
- Inspection and Testing Of Project Prototypes and their Parts
- Deliverables Review and Control Of Non-Conforming Deliverables
- Corrective and Preventive Actions,
- Project reporting and auditing

2.5 Responsibilities of the coordinator

The current Quality Management Plan is applicable to all the activities, which are related to the project. Hence, compliance of its execution with the Quality Management Plan is mandatory for all involved.

The project manager is the person who has the authority to manage and perform all quality work. This is documented in the present manual and is meant to encompass the following aspects:

- initiate action to prevent the occurrence of any non-conformity,
- identify and record any relevant problem,
- initiate, recommend and/or provide solutions through the reporting system,
- verify the implementation of solutions,
- monitor and control further processing, delivery or installation of any preferred solution to ensure that any reported non-conformance has been corrected.

This Quality Management Plan is compiled and documented by the project coordinator. The project coordinator after approval by the Project Management Team (PMT) will forward the final Quality Management Plan to the AAL CMU (at the time of ElderHop project's mid-term review).

All subsequent changes / revisions should also be approved / authorised by the PMT.

2.6 Roles and Responsibilities of the consortium members in the project

Role	Project partner	Responsibility	Task
Project coordinator	MMO	Submit the annual progress and financial report and the midterm review (reports) to the AAL CMU	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collect the necessary data and information from the WP leaders for the preparation of reports; ▪ prepare the reports from the information sent by WP leaders; ▪ The WP leaders shall send the following information: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ starting from what was reported in the previous annual project report ○ detailed description of the performed work, person months, planned and actual budget

			<p>reason of the differences from the planned budget and planned description of work of the project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> project coordinator sends the reports to the consortium members; consortium members have 10 days to send comments on this report; if consortium members agree with the report, Coordinator will send it to the AAL CMU (at mid-term review or final review of ElderHop project); if any consortium members have remarks, the coordinator shall initiate a conciliation in order to approve the report as soon as possible; if no remarks within the timeframe the report shall be deemed accepted; edit the accepted reports on the internal project website (on Basecamp).
		Responsible for the development of the consortium agreement (CA)	The creation of CA was finalized before the official start of the project. All partners' representatives signed the final version of CA by 5 July, 2011.
		Preparation and organization of project meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> conciliate on the date of the project meetings with the project partners; prepare and send the agenda of the project meetings and determine the timeframe within the project partners can add any items to the agenda modify the agenda and/ or add new items to it according to the request of the consortium members; chair the meeting; prepare the minutes and send to the consortium partners for review; determine the timeframe within the project partners can send any remarks on the minutes; if the consortium members agree with the draft of the minutes, it shall be deemed accepted; if any consortium members have remarks, the coordinator shall initiate a conciliation in order to approve the minutes as soon as possible; if no remarks within the timeframe the minutes shall be deemed accepted; edit the accepted minutes on the internal project website (Basecamp);

		Monitor the implementation of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ collect the information in order to follow up of the execution of the project; ▪ prepare the annual progress report and send it to the consortium partners for review; ▪ if the consortium members agree with the draft of the annual, it shall be deemed accepted; ▪ if any consortium members have remarks, the coordinator shall initiate a conciliation in order to approve the annual report as soon as possible; ▪ if no remarks within the timeframe the annual report shall be deemed accepted; ▪ edit the accepted annual on the internal project website (Basecamp); ▪ shall notify the consortium members in written any delay on the project; the delay and its reason shall be notified to the NCP and AAL CMU; The consortium members shall endeavour to make everything to reduce any adverse effect of the delay.
		Responsible for the communication between the AAL CMU and the consortium partners and/or between the consortium partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ transmit any request of the AAL CMU to the consortium partners; ▪ send for review the annual report to the consortium partner; ▪ responsible for the up-to-date information of the project website; ▪ responsible for the management of the online project management platform; ▪ responsible for the approval of any publication related to the project by the consortium members.
		Follow up of the payment by the national and international authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ every 6 months the consortium members shall send information on the payment by the national authorities; ▪ if there is delay and delay has adverse effect on the execution of the project the coordinator shall inform AAL CMU and shall request help to speed up the payment by the national authorities.

WP leaders	CURE KIBU IntegraSys COOS MMO	Responsible for the execution of the relevant WP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ communicate with the partners involved in the corresponding WP; ▪ call meeting/ conference call within his/her WP; ▪ follow up the implementation of his/her WPs; ▪ indicate immediately for the coordinator if there is a delay in his/her WP; ▪ responsible for the progress report of his/ her WP;
Partners	All	Submit the progress and financial report to the national authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ all partners shall submit the progress and financial report in due time to their national authority; ▪ all partners shall prepare the reports according to theirs national laws and financial and management rules; ▪ shall inform the coordinator if there is a delay on the payment or approval of the progress report by the national authorities, especially if it has hamper the due implementation of theirs tasks.

2.7 Corrective and preventive actions

If project coordinator and /or any WP leaders notify delay and/or any circumstances, which have negative effect on the execution of the project, they shall approve corrective actions:

- Coordinator identifies needs for corrective actions (e.g. by proposals from partners).
- Coordinator notifies WP leader.
- WP leaders discuss the issue with the task leader and come up with the proposed solution. The relevant request is documented on the appropriate form of Annex 1 (or in an email with the same content). There, also a proposal on corrective action is being done.
- The solution is forwarded to the PMT via the project manager.
- The PMT decides on the matter. The decision shall be documented. The project coordinator sends this to all involved and checks that the actions are implemented.

2.8 Data Communication protocols

Files are to be VIRUS checked before issue and to be screened on receipt. If a VIRUS is found then action is to be implemented to purge both the system infected and to notify the sender to prevent a reoccurrence.

If acknowledgement is requested, an explicit request will be included by the sender at the end of the message (E-mail, fax, etc.), stating "PLEASE ACKNOWLEDGE". Then, the recipient is required to send a message acknowledgement within the next two (2) working days.

2.9 Deliverables

Deliverables of the project is determined by the following table. The table determines the deadline, the type and the dissemination level of the deliverables as well. One of the he most crucial points is the dissemination level, since there will be developed restricted information during the projects and disclosure thereof could have adversely effect on the IPR issue or commercial interests of the consortium partner. Therefore it is especially important that all consortium partners have exact knowledge which information, data and/ or documents are especially confidential.

Del. no.	Deliverable name	from WP no.	Nature/type of deliverable	Dissemination level (Public or restricted)	Delivery date (project month)
D1.1	Project management platform	WP1	software	restricted	M2
D1.2	Quality management plan	WP1	document	public	M3
D1.3	Risk management plan	WP1	document	public	M4
D1.4	Annual project reports	WP1	document	public	M6, M18
D1.5	Final project report	WP1	document	public	M24
D2.1	User requirements report	WP2	document	public / restricted	M3
D2.2	Functional requirements document	WP2	document	restricted	M5
D2.3	Non-Functional requirements report	WP2	document	restricted	M7
D2.4	System architecture	WP2	document+software	restricted	M7
D3.1	Development Environment and Testing Machines report	WP3	document	public / restricted	M9
D3.2	Server components and middleware development	WP3	document	restricted	M13
D3.3	Mobile and Web/TV components development	WP3	document+software	restricted	M14
D3.4	Component interfaces	WP3	document+software	public / restricted	M14
D4.1	Verification and validation of ElderHop components/modules	WP4	document	public/restricted	M15
D4.2	Integration and evaluation of the preliminary prototype	WP4	document+software	restricted	M19
D4.3	Integration and verification of the final prototype	WP4	document+software	restricted	M20
D4.4	Integration and evaluation of the final prototype - System global Tests	WP4	document+software	restricted	M24
D5.1	Field trial manual report	WP5	document	public	M12
D5.2	Field trial interim reports	WP5	document	restricted	M16,M18,M20,M22
D5.3	Field trial summary report	WP5	document	public	M24
D5.4	Benefit delivery summary report for key performance indicators	WP5	document	public	M24
D6.1	Functional market analysis report	WP6	document	public	M3
D6.2	Market segmentation report	WP6	document	public / restricted	M16
D6.3	Business model	WP6	document	restricted	M21
D6.4	Exploitation plan	WP6	document	restricted	M24
D6.5	Report on dissemination activities	WP6	document	public	M6, M18, M24

The other most crucial point is the execution of the deliverables in due time. Therefore the deliverable review is an important issue during the implementation of the project.

2.10 Deliverable review

Each deliverable is reviewed by the PMT. All member of PMT after having studied the Deliverable under consideration, must evaluate it with respect to the following matters, as stated below and must conclude 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
- Methodological framework soundness
- Quality of achievements
- Quality of presentation of achievements
- Deliverable layout, format, spelling, etc.

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

- Fully accepted
- Accepted with reservation
- Rejected unless modified properly
- Rejected

Deliverable template is to be found in **Annex 2.**

Process

1. The deliverable responsible informs the project manager about the expected delivery date of the deliverable for review, 15 days before the expected delivery date.
2. Immediately after that, the project manager informs the member of PMT about the expected delivery date, so that they can plan their time. Until the delivery of the deliverable, the project coordinator checks that the PMT members have responded and accepted the timing.
3. The project manager forwards immediately the deliverable to the member of PMT. The project manager puts in copy to this mail, a technical contact person per partner.
4. The PMT members within five (5) working days do study and revise the deliverable and prepare the feedback, which they send to the project coordinator. If the PMT members are delayed in sending the report, one reminder shall be sent by the project coordinator. If within 5 days after the reminder there is only one review report received, the coordinator endeavour to pressure on the consortium members.

5. The project coordinator upon receiving the above reports, makes a synthesis. The above integrated feedbacks are sent by the project coordinator to the PMT.
6. The deliverable author revises the deliverable, as required, and submits the final one to the project coordinator. The deliverable author has to send back a document entitled "Summary of main feedback and actions taken". In this, proper explanation should be given about each action taken as a result of the comments in the Integrated Peer Review Report. The relevant form is to be found in **Annex**
7. The Coordinator submits the final deliverable in word and acrobat format and the integrated feedbacks.
8. In case the AAL CMU 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.

1. ANNEXES

1.1 Annex 1

Suggested templates for corrective measures:

Deficiency details	Inspected by: Partner representatives:
Reason	
Corrective action	Name: Implementation date:
Follow up and close out	Name: Date:

1.2 Annex 2

See in separate document

1.3 Annex 3

Summary of main feedback and actions taken on deliverable review report

Topic	Particular comment	Actions to meet the comment	Reason of non-conformity