This project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme, H2020 SU-FCT-2019, under grant agreement no 883341.

Global Response Against Child Exploitation

Instrument: Research and Innovation Action proposal

Thematic Priority: FCT-02-2019

Quality Assurance Guidelines

Deliverable number	D1.2	
Version:	1.0	
Delivery date:	June 2020	
Dissemination level:	PU	
Classification level:	Non classified	
Status	FINAL	
Nature:	Report	
Main author(s):	Anastasios Dimou, Athanasios Psaltis	CERTH
Contributor(s):	Juan Arraiza	VICOM

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Author(s)	Change(s)
0.1	26/06/2020	Anastasios Dimou (CERTH) Juan Arraiza (VICOM)	TOC and first draft
0.2	17/07/2020	Anastasios Dimou (CERTH)	2nd draft
0.3	11/08/2020	Anastasios Dimou, Athanasios Psaltis (CERTH)	Integrating comments from Juan Arraiza (VICOM)
0.4	10/09/2020	Anastasios Dimou, Athanasios Psaltis (CERTH)	Reviewers for deliverables, integrating comments from Juan Arraiza (VICOM)
1.0	28/09/2020	Juan Arraiza (VICOM)	Minor changes

DISCLAIMER

Table of Contents

1.Overview

This document addresses the Quality Management Plan. The aim of this deliverable is to describe the mechanisms that will be used throughout the project to ensure the quality level of the project deliverables and the project outcomes. It will serve as a guide to the project coordinator, to ensure that quality reviews will occur at appropriate points throughout the project. It will also serve as a reference for all project partners, to understand their responsibilities, regarding the project deliverables and outcomes.

It encompasses a detailed guide to the GRACE partners and thereby enables effective cooperation within the consortium and accurate project documentation. Moreover, the document outlines the success criteria for each deliverable, defines the structure of each deliverable, describes the quality review techniques and it also defines configuration management procedures and change control.

Of particular importance is Section 2.4.1 which explains how to prepare a Deliverable Development Plan and the quality control procedures that are active to ensure that released documents have gone through an appropriate level of assessment. To ensure the quality of the project product, each project deliverable or public document must pass a quality assurance and assessment procedure defined in Section 2.5.3.

A separate section of the document is devoted to risk management of the project: It includes management procedures that will be applied to either avoid the potential risk or minimize and mitigate its negative impacts. In general, this document should be used as a reference by the project coordinator and all project partners.

A reference on what the project will do to get the ethical approvals is described in section 3.

This document will not cover the procedures regarding classified information.

2.Quality Management Plan

2.1. Quality Management

Quality management is an aspect of project management that normally differentiates three different aspects:

- Quality Planning: This is basically the identification of quality goals, and identification of the metrics that will be used to control the quality.
- Quality Control: This determines how and when quality checks and controls will take place to collect data related to the quality metrics identified, and who will perform these checks.
- Quality Assurance: This basically determines who/how/when will monitor if the quality goals that have been set are being met or not and to seek for continuous improvement.

2.1.1. Quality Planning

Quality planning in this project is reflected in this document as it specifies quality policies on the topics that have been identified as most important for this project, namely Communication, Reporting, Documents, Deliverables, and Dissemination. In this document, for each of the aforementioned topics, quality goals are set and the process to control and assure that those goals are met are defined.

As there is always a need to find the appropriate balance between cost and benefit, in this project the quality goals (and therefore the metrics associated to them) have been identified taking into account among other things risks and expected benefits.

The goals and associated metrics that have been chosen for the topics listed before are:

- Communication (COMM),
    - Goal1: Having efficient and well managed project meetings.
        - Metric(s):
            - COMM-G1-M1: all formal meetings should have an agenda prepared and distributed with sufficient time in advance so that all invited people know what the goal of the meeting is, what the expected output of the meeting is (e.g. decision, plan, information exchange), what is expected from them and so that they can be able to prepare the meeting appropriately.
            - COMM-G1-M2: all formal meetings should have the minutes prepared and submitted within 24 labour hours, using the approved template for minutes, and uploaded to the collaboration tool.
    - Goal2: Establishing and maintaining good communications with other related projects
        - Metric(s):
            - COMM-G2-M1: Number of related projects contacted.
            - COMM-G2-M2: Frequency of the coordination meetings between GRACE and other related projects.

- Goal3: Setting up and maintaining efficient and easy-to-use collaboration tools
  - Metric(s):
    - COMM-G3-M1: To have private collaboration tools set up and ready to be used before M3 (as defined in DoA).
    - COMM-G3-M2: Number of complaints from team members with regard to the appropriateness of the collaboration tools.

- Reporting (REP),
  - Goal1: Meeting EC related reporting requirements on time and with no issues.
    - Metric(s):
      - REP-G1-M1: Number of issues that have been identified related to reporting to the EC
  - Goal2: Meeting internal reporting policy (see section 2.2.5) on time and with no issues.
    - Metric(s):
      - REP-G2-M1: Number of issues that have been identified related to internal reporting

- Documents (DOC),
  - Goal1: To follow agreed upon standards for formats and tools to be used in document editing and exchange as described in section 2.3.
    - Metric(s):
      - DOC-G1-M1: 6 monthly audit of a sample of the documents generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan as described in section 2.3 (prior to the Management Board meeting in which quality assurance will take place).

- Deliverables (DEL),
  - Goal1: to assure that the deliverables produced in the project are of high quality and that they have followed the deliverables preparation policy as described in section 2.4.
    - Metric(s):
      - DEL-G1-M1: 6 monthly audit of a sample of the deliverables generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan as described in section 2.4 (before the Management Board in which quality assurance will take place).

- Dissemination (DISS).
  - Goal1: To have the project website up and running before M3 and updated on a regular basis.
    - Metric(s):
      - DISS-G1-M1: To have the public website up and running before M3 (as described in the DoA)
      - DISS-G1-M2: Audits every 3 months to check that the public website is updated with the relevant information.

- Goal2: To organise at least two end-user workshops (as defined in the DoA) to successfully engage end-users.
  - Metric(s):
    - DISS-G2-M1: workshop minutes and conclusions reports.

2.1.2. Quality Control

The Project Management Team of the project will be responsible to put in place and run the quality control mechanisms needed for the project.

The quality control mechanisms that will be put in place are as follows:

- Communication (COMM),
  - Goal1: Having efficient and well managed project meetings.
    - Metric(s):
      - COMM-G1-M1: all formal meetings should have an agenda prepared and distributed with sufficient time in advance so that all invited people know what the goal of the meeting is, what is expected from them and so that they can be able to prepare the meeting appropriately.
        - Quality control mechanism: 6 monthly audits run by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator.
      - COMM-G1-M2: all formal meetings should have the minutes prepared and submitted within 24 labour hours, using the approved template for minutes, and uploaded to the collaboration tool.
        - Quality control mechanism: 6 monthly audits run by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator.
  - Goal2: Establishing and maintaining good communications with other related projects
    - Metric(s):
      - COMM-G2-M1: Number of related projects contacted.
        - Quality control mechanism: Verification of the existence of minutes or formal documents that reflect the contacts that have taken place.
      - COMM-G2-M2: Frequency of the coordination meetings between GRACE and other related projects.
        - Quality control mechanism: Verification of the existence of minutes or formal documents that reflect the contacts that have taken place.
  - Goal3: Setting up and maintaining efficient and easy-to-use collaboration tools
    - Metric(s):
      - COMM-G3-M1: To have private collaboration tools set up and ready to be used before M3 (as defined in DoA).

        - Quality control mechanism: Email from the Project Coordinator announcing the opening of the collaboration tools to all team members.
    - COMM-G3-M2: Number of complaints from team members with regard to the appropriateness of the collaboration tools.
        - Quality control mechanism: Emails or notes in meeting minutes reflecting those complaints.

- Reporting (REP),
    - Goal1: Meeting EC related reporting requirements in time and with no issues.
        - Metric(s):
            - REP-G1-M1: Number of issues related to reporting to the EC
                - Quality control mechanism: Emails with the submission of the reports and/or with issues raised by the EC.
    - Goal2: Meeting internal reporting policy (see section 2.2.5) in time and with no issues.
        - Metric(s):
            - REP-G2-M1: Number of issues related to internal reporting
                - Quality control mechanism: Emails or notes in meeting minutes reflecting those issues.

- Documents (DOC),
    - Goal1: To follow agreed standards for formats and tools to be used in document editing and exchange as described in section 2.3.
        - Metric(s):
            - DOC-G1-M1: 6 monthly audit of a sample of the documents generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan as described in section 2.3 (before the Management Board in which quality assurance will take place).
                - Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.

- Deliverables (DEL),
    - Goal1: to assure that the deliverables produced in the project are of high quality and that they have followed the deliverables preparation policy as described in section 2.4.
        - Metric(s):
            - DEL-G1-M1: 6 monthly audit of a sample of the deliverables generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan as described in section 2.4 (before the Management Board in which quality assurance will take place).
                - Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.

- Dissemination (DISS).

- Goal1: To have the project's website up and running before M3 and updated on a regular basis.
  - Metric(s):
    - DISS-G1-M1: To have the public website up and running before M3 (as described in the DoA)
      - Quality control mechanism: Email from the Project Coordinator to the Project Officer announcing the existence of the project website.
    - DISS-G1-M2: Audits every 3 months to check that the public website is updated with the relevant information.
      - Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.
- Goal2: To organise at least two end-user workshops (as defined in the DoA) to successfully engage end-users.
  - Metric(s):
    - DISS-G2-M1: workshop minutes and conclusions reports
      - Quality control mechanism: Verification that workshop minutes and conclusion reports are generated and uploaded to the collaboration tool.

A Quality Control audit report will be prepared by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator before GRACE Management Board meetings (where quality assurance will take place). A Quality Control audit report template has been prepared for this purpose.

2.1.3. Quality Assurance

In order to assure that quality goals are met and that a continuous improvement philosophy is followed the project Management Board will meet and include in their meetings a session to review quality control outputs and to assess whether quality goals are being met or not and whether mitigation or contingency plans need to be put in place to tackle some quality aspects.

GRACE Quality Manager – Mr Anastasios Dimou (from CERTH), will be responsible for preparing and chairing the Management Board session related to Quality Assurance.

2.2. Deliverables

Each deliverable has a Deliverable Leader who will coordinate the production of the document, interacting as necessary with the beneficiaries involved. Before starting on the production of a deliverable, the Deliverable

Leader will define the document structure and the contributions expected from each beneficiary. This is done in a document named the DDP (Deliverable Development Plan) and will propose the calendar for the meetings (teleconferences) that may be necessary.

Upon receiving the inputs from different contributors for the deliverable, the Deliverable Leader will merge them into a single document. This first draft will then be circulated and asked for comments. Each beneficiary will check its consistency with the plans and give their feedback and approval. This iterative procedure will continue until all involved beneficiaries give approval. The Deliverable Leader will then prepare the final draft of the deliverable (version 1.0).

The final draft will then be sent to the Work Package Leader, to the Project Coordinator, and to the Quality Manager. The deliverable will then undergo a Quality review process detailed in Section 2.4.2 below. Once the Work Package Leader, Project Coordinator and Quality Manager have agreed on the Deliverable, the Project Coordinator will send the requested number of copies to the European Commission.

2.2.1. Deliverable Development Plan (DDP)

The DDP is issued by the Deliverable Leader in order to clarify the main objectives of the Deliverable and to assign specific tasks to the different contributors. Its purpose is to provide a detailed plan on how the Deliverable will be completed successfully and on time. The DDP must sketch the structure of the future Deliverable, and therefore must contain a clear indication of:

1. Person responsible for the deliverable
2. Persons in charge of each section/task
3. A timetable for the deliverable development, setting deadlines for:
    a. Submission of contributions
    b. Production of first draft (version 0.1)
    c. Internal review (beneficiaries' comments)
    d. Productions of further draft versions (versions 0.x)
    e. Production of first complete version (version 1.0)
    f. Delivery to the Project Coordinator and Work Package Leader

At least twelve weeks before the deliverable's deadline the Deliverable Leader will distribute the DDP. The Deliverable Leader can request the guidance of the Quality Manager for producing the DDP. Once the DDP is complete, it is sent to the Project Coordinator, the Quality Manager, and to all beneficiaries who are assigned with responsibilities in the DDP.

2.2.2. Deliverable Quality Process

The main technique that will be used for the document revision process is Peer Review. The Peer Review technique requires project team members to review each other's work. This technique is known to increase the level of quality of deliverables. It will also enable quality issues to be identified earlier in the project execution phase, and therefore increase the likelihood of quality issues being solved earlier.

In those cases, where all consortium members are involved in the deliverable creation process, a third person will be responsible for developing the review.

Peer Review policy description:

1. A list of peer reviewers for each deliverable will be created. Work Package Leaders, in coordination with the Quality Manager, will assign a reviewer for the deliverables within their work packages.
2. Reviewers will document the results of each peer using the Deliverable Review Form
3. Deliverable responsible partners will integrate the suggested quality improvements in the deliverable final versions.

The table below shows the names of all deliverable owners and reviewers.

No.	Deliverable name	Lead Part.	Reviewer	Diss. Level
D1.1	Project Management Plan	VICOM	PMT	CO
D1.2	Quality Management guidelines	CERTH	PMT	PU
D1.3	Ethical and legal guidelines for the project and data management and protection plan	CRI	CENTRIC, NICC	CO
D1.4	SELP guidelines for GRACE	CRI	NICC, EUROPOL	PU
D1.5	GRACE sub-committees and Advisory Board's plan and establishment	EUROPOL	VICOM, CENTRIC	PU
D1.6	Innovation Management strategy, guidelines and tools	VICOM	ENG, CERTH	PU
D2.1	Use Cases, Process and Data Flows Refinement v1	EUROPOL	CRI, VICOM	CO
D2.2	Use Cases, Process and Data Flows Refinement v2	EUROPOL	CRI, VICOM	CO
D2.3	Use Cases, Process and Data Flows Refinement v3	EUROPOL	CRI, VICOM	CO
D2.4	User requirements v1	EUROPOL	NICC, ZITIS	CO
D2.5	User requirements v2	EUROPOL	NICC, ZITIS	CO
D2.6	User requirements v3	EUROPOL	NICC, ZITIS	CO
D2.7	Standardised Taxonomy and Information Exchange Formats v1	EUROPOL	ENG, DNA	CO
D2.8	Standardised Taxonomy and Information Exchange Formats v2	EUROPOL	ENG, DNA	CO
D2.9	Standardised Taxonomy and Information Exchange Formats v3	EUROPOL	ENG, DNA	CO
D2.10	Technical Specifications and Architecture v1	EUROPOL	ENG, INOV	CO
D2.11	Technical Specifications and Architecture v2	EUROPOL	ENG, INOV	CO
D2.12	Technical Specifications and Architecture v3	EUROPOL	ENG, INOV	CO
D2.13	Technical Specifications and Architecture v4	EUROPOL	ENG, INOV	CO
D2.14	Security and auditing mechanisms report v1	EUROPOL	SYN, ULE	CO
D2.15	Security and auditing mechanisms report v2	EUROPOL	SYN, ULE	CO
D2.16	Security and auditing mechanisms report v3	EUROPOL	SYN, ULE	CO
D2.17	Security and auditing mechanisms report v4	EUROPOL	SYN, ULE	CO
D3.1	Data acquisition module v1	EUROPOL	CERTH, ZITIS	CO
D3.2	Data acquisition module v2	EUROPOL	CERTH, ZITIS	CO
D3.3	Data acquisition module v3	EUROPOL	CERTH, ZITIS	CO
D3.4	Data pre-processing module v1	INOV	EUROPOL, CYP	CO
D3.5	Data pre-processing module v2	INOV	EUROPOL, CYP	CO
D3.6	Data pre-processing module v3	INOV	EUROPOL, CYP	CO

No.	Deliverable name	Lead Part.	Reviewer	Diss. Level
D3.7	Data loading and mapping module v1	INOV	CENTRIC, BFP	CO
D3.8	Data loading and mapping module v2	INOV	CENTRIC, BFP	CO
D3.9	Data loading and mapping module v3	INOV	CENTRIC, BFP	CO
D3.10	Content management and digital evidence tamper detection module v1	NICC	CRI, AGS	CO
D3.11	Content management and digital evidence tamper detection module v2	NICC	CRI, AGS	CO
D3.12	Content management and digital evidence tamper detection module v3	NICC	CRI, AGS	CO
D4.1	Modules for Visual Information Processing v1	VICOM	SYN, WEBIQ	CO
D4.2	Modules for Visual Information Processing v2	VICOM	SYN, WEBIQ	CO
D4.3	Modules for Visual Information Processing v3	VICOM	SYN, WEBIQ	CO
D4.4	Modules for Audio Information Processing v1	ULE	VICOM, PJ	CO
D4.5	Modules for Audio Information Processing v2	ULE	VICOM, PJ	CO
D4.6	Modules for Audio Information Processing v3	ULE	VICOM, PJ	CO
D4.7	Modules for Unstructured Text Processing v1	ULE	ENG, L3CE	CO
D4.8	Modules for Unstructured Text Processing v2	ULE	ENG, L3CE	CO
D4.9	Modules for Unstructured Text Processing v3	ULE	ENG, L3CE	CO
D4.10	Digital evidence tamper detection module v1	VICOM	CERTH, IGPR	CO
D4.11	Digital evidence tamper detection module v2	VICOM	CERTH, IGPR	CO
D4.12	Digital evidence tamper detection module v3	VICOM	CERTH, IGPR	CO
D5.1	Report on Federated Learning infrastructure and processes	VICOM	CERTH, EUROPOL	CO
D5.2	Federated data annotation tools	SYN	CENTRIC, VICOM	CO
D5.3	Report on Federated Learning strategies	CERTH	VICOM, ENG	PU
D5.4	Secure data exchange mechanism	SYN	CERTH, CRI	CO
D5.5	Federated Learning system analysis	CERTH	WEBIQ, AGS	CO
D6.1	Module(s) to perform cross-matching and entity mapping between referrals	EUROPOL	ENG, VICOM	CO
D6.2	Module(s) to perform content analysis and classification	ULE	CERTH, CNP	CO
D6.3	Module(s) to perform content-based geo-location	CERTH	INOV, DCJP	CO
D6.4	Module(s) to perform analysis of knowledge graphs for evidence data fusion	ENG	SYN, DNA	CO
D6.5	Module(s) to perform prioritisation on OSP referral data	CENTRIC	EUROPOL, CERTH	CO
D6.6	Module(s) for predictive analysis of short and long-term trends in CSEM	CENTRIC	CRI, KGP	CO
D7.1	Orchestration Framework v1	ENG	VICOM, EUROPOL	CO
D7.2	Orchestration Framework v2	ENG	VICOM, EUROPOL	CO
D7.3	GRACE System v1	NICC	ENG, CERTH	CO
D7.4	GRACE System v2	NICC	ENG, CERTH	CO
D7.5	GRACE System v3	NICC	ENG, CERTH	CO
D7.6	GRACE Collaborative applications v1	ENG	CENTRIC, NICC	CO
D7.7	GRACE Collaborative applications v2	ENG	CENTRIC, NICC	CO
D7.8	GRACE Collaborative applications v3	ENG	CENTRIC, NICC	CO
D7.9	Technical validation report v1	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO
D7.10	Technical validation report v2	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO

No.	Deliverable name	Lead Part.	Reviewer	Diss. Level
D7.11	Technical validation report v3	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO
D7.12	Technical validation report v4	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO
D7.13	Technical validation report v5	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO
D7.14	Technical validation report v6	SYN	EUROPOL, EUC	CO
D8.1	Pilots scenario definition v1	EUROPOL	CERTH, BFP	CO
D8.2	Pilots scenario definition v2	EUROPOL	CERTH, BFP	CO
D8.3	Pilots scenario definition v3	EUROPOL	CERTH, BFP	CO
D8.4	Pilots preparation plan v1	CERTH	VICOM, IGPR	CO
D8.5	Pilots preparation plan v2	CERTH	VICOM, IGPR	CO
D8.6	Pilots preparation plan v3	CERTH	VICOM, IGPR	CO
D8.7	Report on pilots' execution v1	EUROPOL	CENTRIC, CNP	CO
D8.8	Report on pilots' execution v2	EUROPOL	CENTRIC, CNP	CO
D8.9	Report on pilots' execution v3	EUROPOL	CENTRIC, CNP	CO
D8.10	Report on pilots' evaluation & assessment v1	EUROPOL	INOV, ~~DNA~~	CO
D8.11	Report on pilots' evaluation & assessment v2	EUROPOL	INOV, DNA	CO
D8.12	Report on pilots' evaluation & assessment v3	EUROPOL	INOV, DNA	CO
D9.1	Ethical report v1	CRI	NICC, L3CE	PU
D9.2	Ethical report v2	CRI	NICC, L3CE	PU
D9.3	Legal report v1	CRI	EUROPOL, PJ	PU
D9.4	Legal report v2	CRI	EUROPOL, PJ	PU
D9.5	Overall legal and ethical framework v1	CRI	NICC, DCJP	PU
D9.6	Overall legal and ethical framework v2	CRI	NICC, DCJP	PU
D9.7	Architecture for technical safeguards – "security and privacy by design" v1	CRI	SYN, EUC	PU
D9.8	Architecture for technical safeguards – "security and privacy by design" v2	CRI	SYN, EUC	PU
D9.9	Review Mechanism and Procedure	EUC	ENG, CRI	PU
D10.1	GRACE communication, visibility and dissemination plan	CENTRIC	ENG, CNP	CO
D10.2	GRACE website, social media presence and dissemination materials	CENTRIC	CERTH, AGS	PU
D10.3	GRACE exploitation plan and business models v1	VICOM	CENTRIC, EUROPOL	CO
D10.4	GRACE exploitation plan and business models v2	VICOM	CENTRIC, EUROPOL	CO
D10.5	Development of GRACE training packages for EUROPOL and MS LEAs	EUC	VICOM, CYP	CO
D10.6	Stakeholder and policy recommendations for addressing online CSEM v1	EUROPOL	CRI, AGS	PU
D10.7	Stakeholder and policy recommendations for addressing online CSEM v2	EUROPOL	CRI, AGS	PU
D10.8	Best Practices on Victim support for LEA first responders v1	EUROPOL	NICC, BFP	PU
D10.9	Best Practices on Victim support for LEA first responders v2	EUROPOL	NICC, BFP	PU
D11.1	POPD – Requirement No. 2	VICOM	EUROPOL, INOV	CO

*Table 1 – **Deliverable Owners and Reviewers***

Once each deliverable has a clear owner for content preparation as well as the reviewers identified, the review

process timeline will be as follows:

1. At least six weeks before the deliverable's deadline the owner of that deliverable will distribute a draft of the document with the proposed sections, requested contributions from other partners.
    a. NOTE: **for deliverables included in the Limited Dissemination List**, the Security Advisory Board (SAB) has also to be informed(grace_sab@vicomtech.org). The SAB members are not requested to provide feedback at this stage, but they are informed so that if they have any comment or question, they have the opportunity to share it with the deliverable owner. This applies to the first version of a document (v1). When the same document has different versions (and therefore different deliverables), for the second version (v2) and onwards the SAB does not have to be informed. All deliverables in the Limited Dissemination List must use PGP encryption to handle the information during the whole deliverable preparation phase. Only persons with the *need-to-know* should have access to the information related to these deliverables.
2. All contributors (including the owner of the deliverable) will prepare the content and pass it to the deliverable owner, who will consolidate, review and harmonise if needed.
3. At least four weeks before the deliverable's deadline the owner of the deliverable will distribute the first draft of the deliverable to the peer reviewers.
4. At least two weeks before the deliverable's deadline peer reviewers will review and provide feedback to the deliverable owner. Feedback will be provided using the Deliverable Review Form.
    a. NOTE: **for deliverables included in the Limited Dissemination List**, the SAB will also be informed (grace_sab@vicomtech.org), and it will be requested to provide an assessment about the sensitivity of the information. The SAB will have one week to respond to the deliverable owner with this assessment and, if applicable, specific requirements about removal or considerations about the whole or parts of the deliverable.
5. At least one week before the deliverable's deadline the deliverable owner (with the assistance of other contributors as needed) will update the deliverable taking into account the reviewers' feedback AND the deliverable owner will distribute the final version of the document to the Quality Manager and to the Project Coordinator.
    a. NOTE: **for deliverables included in the Limited Dissemination List**, if the SAB has made requests to the owner to make any changes to the deliverable, then the owner will also have to send to the SAB (grace_sab@vicomtech.org) this version of the deliverable so that the SAB members can check that its requests have been appropriately treated.
6. At least one day before the deliverable's deadline the Quality Manager and to the Project Coordinator will provide their comments/feedback.
7. The day before the deliverable's deadline the owner will make whatever final modifications might be needed (if any) considering the feedback provided by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator.
8. The day of the deliverable's deadline, the Project Coordinator will submit to the Project Officer the final version of the deliverable.

2.2.3. Incidents in the delivery process

Several incidents can occur during the delivery process:

- The author foresees a delay in the delivery (the risk should have been detected before and remedy actions should already have been taken):
    - As soon as the author detects the potential delay, he/she must immediately make known such incident to the Work Package Leader, Project Coordinator and Quality Manager.
    - In any case, the delay must be made known well in advance. As a general rule, a delay of N days must be made known at least 2xN days before the due date.
    - Recovery actions must be defined and agreed with the Work Package Leader and the Project Coordinator in order to reduce the impact of the delay as much as possible. The Quality Manager should be informed about the recovery action.
- The Project Coordinator does not accept a delay due to lack of quality or due to other reasons:
    - As a first action, the author must immediately agree with the PC and the WPL on a recovery plan. The reviewers may be consulted on this recovery plan.
    - The Work Package Leader or the Project Coordinator may call a meeting of the Project Coordination Committee in order to explain the problem and take the corresponding actions.
    - The Project Coordinator will inform the Project Officer about the problem and the corrective measures.

In the end, all project deliverables will be subject to acceptance by the following parties, in the order indicated:

1. Scientific-Technical and/or Management Representative of the partner responsible for the Deliverable
2. Work Package Leader (WPL)
3. Technical Manager (TM)
4. Project Coordinator (PC)
5. Project Management Team (PMT)
6. Project Reviewers
7. European Commission (EC)

2.2.4. Deliverable Quality Checklist

The reviewers will use the Deliverable Review Form (template provided) which includes a checklist of items. These are shown in the following table.

Check Point	Yes/No	Observations
Does the deliverable include an initial overview or executive summary section that is self-explanatory and easy to understand by all readers with a maximum length of 2 pages? Does this initial section describe what the reader will find in the rest of the document?		
Does the deliverable include a final conclusions section which lists the most remarkable things included in the document?		

Check Point	Yes/No	Observations
Does the deliverable mention explicitly when it includes content copy-pasted from other documents? *(Note: when the copy-pasted content is lengthy it is highly recommended to include just a summary of it on the document and then a reference to the original document)*		
Does the document cover the objectives and task description stated in the DoA taking also into consideration the overall project vision?		
Is the Executive Summary in publishable form?		
Are the structure and appearance (layout, images, etc.) compliant with the Quality Plan?		

*Table 2 – **List of check points***

3.Conclusion

Quality Management Plan describes the main quality processes and the standards that will be applied in the GRACE project. Procedures and rules included in this document are to be followed by all partners, which will result in a quality management process that ensures high quality standards. In addition to the Quality Management aspects, one chapter is dedicated to Risk Management.

All in all, it encompasses a detailed guide to the GRACE partners and thereby it is expected to enable and promote effective cooperation within the consortium and accurate project documentation. Finally, it outlines the success criteria for each deliverable, defines the structure of each deliverable, describes the quality review techniques, and also defines configuration management procedures and change control.

The Quality Assurance Guidelines have been developed under Task 1.2 of Work Package 1.

This document will not cover the procedures regarding classified information.

ANNEX I. Deliverable Development Plan (DDP)

This project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme, H2020 SU-FCT-2019, under grant agreement no 883341.

Global Response Against Child Exploitation

Instrument: Research and Innovation Action proposal

Thematic Priority: FCT-02-2019

[Dx.x] Deliverable Development Plan (DDP)

Deliverable number	
Deliverable title	
Deliverable Version	x.x
Deliverable Leader	[Organization]

Reviewers

Version	Date	Author	Modifications
0.1			
0.2			
0.3			
1.0			

DISCLAIMER

Table of Contents

1.Aim

The aim of this document is to define the responsibilities and timetable to produce Dx.x.

2.Description

Dx.x is the outcome of Task x.x. They are described in the DoA as follows.

2.1 Deliverable Description

2.2 Task Description

[Include PM's per partner]

3.Objectives

[Deliverable leader describes what are the objectives, how they will be met, and how success will be measured].

4.Responsibilities

[Short description of responsibilities]

Section	Section title	Responsibility
1	Executive summary	Name (Organization)
2	Introduction	Name (Organization)
…	…	….

Table 2 - Responsibilities

5.Development Timetable

Action	Due Date	Leader
Production of first draft	99/99/9999	Name (Organization)
….		
Final submission	99/99/9999	

Table 2 – Timetable

6.Relevant Information from other Work Packages and Tasks

[References or material from other deliverables]

7.Additional tasks for partners involved in Task x.x

[Tasks which are not explicitly described in the DoA but are needed in order to complete the deliverable]

8.Suggestions and Guidelines

[Overall suggestions on how to successfully complete the deliverable, what could go wrong, risks, and how to handle such cases]

ANNEX II. Deliverable Review form

This project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme, H2020 SU-FCT-2019, under grant agreement no 883341.

Global Response Against Child Exploitation

Instrument: Research and Innovation Action proposal

Thematic Priority: FCT-02-2019

[Dx.x] Deliverable Review form

Deliverable number	
Deliverable title	
Classification level:	
Final Review Date	

Reviewers

Version	Date of Review	Reviewer	Summary of Review
0.1			
0.2			
0.3			
1.0			

DISCLAIMER

Table of Contents

A. Check Points

Each question is first answered with a single Yes or No, and then clarifying comments are provided.

1. Does the deliverable include an initial overview or executive summary section that is self-explanatory and easy to understand by all readers with a maximum length of 2 pages? Does this initial section describe what the reader will find in the rest of the document? **Comments:**
2. Is the Overview or Executive Summary in publishable form? **Comments:**
3. Does the deliverable include a final conclusions section which lists the most remarkable things included in the document? **Comments:**

4. Does the document cover the objectives and task description stated in the DoW, taking also into consideration the overall project vision? **Comments:**
5. Are the structure and appearance (layout, images, etc.) compliant with the Quality Plan? **Comments:**
6. Does the deliverable mention explicitly when it includes content copy-pasted from other documents? ***(Note: when the copy-pasted content is lengthy it is highly recommended to include just a summary of it on the document and then a reference to the original document)*** **Comments:**

B. Suggested Corrections

Section	Page	Error	Suggested Correction

C. Further Comments

D. Conclusion

ANNEX III. Deliverable Template

This project that has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 - Research and Innovation Framework Programme, H2020 SU-FCT-2019, under grant agreement no 883341.

Global Response Against Child Exploitation

Instrument: Research and Innovation Action proposal

Thematic Priority: FCT-02-2019

Dx.x. ..(Deliverable title)

Deliverable number		
Version:		
Delivery date:		
Dissemination level:		
Classification level:		
Status		
Nature:		
Main author(s):	(Name)	(Institution)
Contributor(s):		

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Author(s)	Change(s)
0.1			
0.2			
0.3			
1.0			

DISCLAIMER

Every effort has been made to ensure that all statements and information contained herein are accurate; however, the Partners accept no liability for any error or omission in the same.

This document reflects only the view of its authors and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of Contents

Annexes

Tables

Figures

1. Overview

The DoW describes this deliverable as:

Dx.x) Xxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxx. [month xx]

The aim of this document is to ….

This document includes the following sections:

- Section XXXXX: In this section ….
- Section YYYYY: In this section …..

3.1. [2nd Level Header]

Xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx

3.1.1. [3rd Level Header]

Xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxxxx

3.1.2. [4rth Level Header]

Xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx

Title1	Title2	Title3	Title3	Title4	Title5

Table 3 - [description]

Figure 1 – example of a figure

2. [Section Title]

Xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx

3. [Section … Title]

Xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx

4. Conclusion

In this document we have described….

Section XXXX has shown how….

Section YYYY ….

Finaly it is worth highlighting …

ANNEX IV. GLOSSARY AND ACRONYMS

Xxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx xxxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xxxxxx

Term	Definition / Description

Table 4 - Glossary and Acronyms

ANNEX V. REFERENCES

The table below shows the most significant references used and/or cited to prepare this document:

Reference	Source