

SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
PRIORITY 1.6. Sustainable Development, Global Change
and Ecosystem
1.6.2: Sustainable Surface Transport



506716

IN-SAFETY Quality Assurance Strategy

Deliverable No. (use the number indicated on technical annex)		D7.1	
Workpackage No.	WP7	Workpackage Title	Project Management
Activity No.	A7.3	Activity Title	Quality Control
Authors (per company, if more than one company provide it together)		G.Yiannis (NTUA), E. Bekiaris (CERTH/HIT), E. Gaitanidou (CERTH/HIT), I. Spyropoulou (NTUA).	
Status (F: final; D: draft; RD: revised draft):		D	
File Name:		IN-SAFETY Deliverable 7.1.doc	
Project start date and duration		01 February 2005, 36 Months	

List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
PAR	Project Partner or Participant.
PC	Project Coordinator.
PQCB	Project Quality Control Board.
QAM	Quality Assurance Manager.
Quality Plan	A document setting out the general quality policies, procedures and practices of the Project.

Table of contents

LIST OF TABLES	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1 PURPOSE.....	6
1.2 SCOPE OF THE QUALITY PLAN	6
1.3 PROCEDURE DESCRIPTION	6
1.4 QUALITY WITHIN THE PROJECT	6
2. QUALITY SYSTEM REVIEW	7
3. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGER.....	8
4. PROJECT QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (PQCB)	8
5. DOCUMENT AND DATA CONTROL	10
5.1 DOCUMENT CODING	10
5.2 DOCUMENT REFERENCING AND TEMPLATE	10
5.3 DELIVERABLES LAYOUT	10
5.4 DATA COMMUNICATION PROTOCOLS	11
6. DISSEMINATION EVENT SCHEDULING AND REPORTING	11
7. INTERNAL COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES	12
8. DELIVERABLES PEER REVIEW AND CONTROL OF NON- CONFORMING DELIVERABLES.....	13
9. REPORTING AND MONITORING	14
ANNEX 1: INTERNAL REPORTS TEMPLATE AND CODIFICATION.....	15
ANNEX 2: DELIVERABLES TEMPLATE.....	18
ANNEX 3: DISSEMINATION EVENTS REPORTING FORMS.....	26
ANNEX 4: PQCB MEMBERS LIST	31
ANNEX 5: DELIVERABLES REVIEWERS LIST	37
ANNEX 6: PLANNED PROJECT COMMUNICATIONS	41
ANNEX 7: PEER REVIEW REPORT TEMPLATE.....	43
ANNEX 8: QUARTERLY REPORT TEMPLATE.....	48

List of Tables

Table 1: Document coding system	10
Table 2: Deliverables reviewers	38
Table 3: Number of Deliverables to be reviewed per partner	39

Executive Summary

This document provides the quality assurance strategy to be followed in the framework of the IN-SAFETY project, so as to guarantee that the outcomes of the project meet its objectives and are of high quality, as well as the requested forms to be completed, and templates for documents.

In the Annex 9 (MS Excel file), a linear distribution of MMs for each partner is given, per WP and tasks.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

The Quality Plan is the document setting out the quality assurance procedures for the IN-SAFETY 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 Description of Work. Once accepted by the Consortium, this Quality Plan becomes an official project document, which should govern all partners' and consortium's actions. It has been written in accordance to ISO 9000 guidelines.

1.2 Scope of the Quality Plan

This Quality Plan is to be used by:

- All Consortium Partners, responsible for preparing and amending deliverables,
- Quality Experts, responsible for reviewing completed quality plans and sign-off,
- Any responsible person of a Consortium Partner for approving works to be done by third parties, in order to complete deliverables.

1.3 Procedure Description

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

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

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

1.4 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 Plan includes explanation, necessary to show how quality requirements for activities are met. A list of such activities is given below:

- Responsibilities of the Quality Assurance Manager,
- Quality system review,
- Document and data control,
- Project Quality Control Board,
- Internal Communication Strategies,
- Deliverables Peer Review And Control Of Non-Conforming Deliverables,

- Control Of Quality Records,
- Project Reporting And Monitoring.

2. Quality System Review

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

- the results from project audits,
- the results from internal audits,
- the official project Deliverables (Reports and Prototypes),
- the corrective action requests from all the above,
- the preventive actions on all the above,
- any project prototype deficiencies and subsystems/parts problems,
- project participants staff training and adequacy for the tasks undertaken,
- level of used resources per category and adequacy of spent resources for the particular task.

The outcomes from the above shall be discussed at Steering Group meetings, and their results shall be minuted and include:

- Satisfaction with the audits, corrective actions and the results of complaints,
- Dissatisfaction and requirements for further auditing or more corrective actions,
- Satisfaction with the corrective actions taken by the relevant partner(s).

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

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

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

This Quality Plan is compiled and documented by the Quality Assurance Manager and is authorised by the Steering Group.

3. Responsibilities of the Quality Assurance Manager

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

The Consortium quality policy is as follows:

- To implement and maintain a quality system according to ISO 9001,
- to identify for all involved their responsibilities regarding quality,
- to ensure that all deliverables comply with the contract.

The Quality Assurance Manager (NTUA) is responsible for the administration of the Quality Plan, and has the authority to identify problems during internal audits. In such cases, the Project Coordinator and the Steering Group are responsible, with the agreement of the Steering Group for initiating actions, resulting in complete solutions to them. All problems are raised within the meetings, and the minutes should also record the agreed solution and the time bound action to be taken. There is a requirement to provide evidence that the problem has been cured. All involved in providing the Consortium with services are to be qualified (i.e. have relevant academic studies, relevant professional experience) in the area they are to work within, inspect or verify.

The Quality Manager (Dr. G. Yannis of NTUA) 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:

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

All the above responsibilities and authorities will be exercised through the Project Coordinator and the Steering Group.

4. Project Quality Control Board (PQCB)

The PROJECT QUALITY CONTROL BOARD (PQCB), in general will be responsible, for:

- assuring the conformity of all deliverables, with the initial criteria defined for them and guaranteeing that the deliverables are in accordance with the specifications in the IN-SAFETY Description of Work,
- consulting the Work Package Leaders, on the expected technical characteristics of the deliverables.

Thus, the main Tasks of this board are:

- Overview of the technical reports produced

- Quality control of all deliverables submitted
- Guidance (upon request) to the WP Leaders on the expected characteristics and contents of the relevant Deliverables

Its main objective is to ensure that:

- All the outputs are consistent, with their contractual requirements
- All the project reports / documents do have the highest quality, regarding their overview / context

The Quality Assurance Manager, as chairman of the Project Quality Control Board (PQCB), will report every six (6) months to the Project Co-ordinator and through him to the Steering Group.

The PQCB consists of:

- The QAM (chair).
- 1 representative (high level personnel) from each Consortium Member, not involved in production of the deliverable under review, acting as internal inspectors, which are the most relevant (technically wise) with the deliverable under consideration / examination.
- Two external members, one appointed by CERTH/HIT and another by TUDelft.

A full list of the internal members of the PQCB follows in **Annex 4**, whereas **Annex 5** includes the list of the PQCB members who are responsible to review each Project Deliverable (in addition to the QAM who is supposed to review all of the Deliverables).

5. Document and data control

The Quality Assurance Manager is responsible for ensuring that all documents are controlled effectively. The system contains two levels of documentation under the control of the Quality Assurance Manager in association with the Quality Peer Reviewers.

- Level 1:** The control of document referencing
Level 2: The control of formal deliverables overall quality

5.1 Document coding

There will be a unique project document coding system, as indicated below:

Table 1: Document coding system

Document Code	Document Type	Type of Forms to be used
D	Deliverable	Deliverable Template, Peer Review Report, Summary of main Feedback and Actions taken, Non Conforming Report, Corrective Actions Request
TP	Technical Paper	Internal Report Template
PR	Workpackages Plans and Progress Reports	Internal Report Template
M	Minutes, Action Lists, Decision Lists	Internal Report Template
C	Correspondence between Partners	Internal Report Template
L	Legal documents	Internal Report Template
COM	Commercial documents	Internal Report Template
GI	Documents of general interest	Internal Report Template
OTH	Other subjects	Internal Report Template

All official Consortium documents in the above table, except from the Deliverables, are cumulatively characterised hereafter as Project **Internal Reports (IR)**.

5.2 Document referencing and template

There is a unique document-referencing scheme. This is not applicable however for informal data and views exchange between Partners. It is only valid for official Consortium documents, falling in one of the above categories of the previous section.

Still, if a Participant selects not to classify one of his communications, he may not raise claims later, if another Participant has not considered it.

The project internal documents template and referencing scheme follows in **Annex 1**. Note, that official Deliverables have a different template and referencing scheme, which is presented in the following section.

5.3 Deliverables layout

Official Project Deliverables should have a first page template as in **Annex 2**. They should also use the page layout (headers / footers) suggested in the same Annex.

Furthermore, they should abide to the following rules:

- Have a list of abbreviations used within the Deliverable
- Have a table of contents
- Have a list of Figures (including the ones of the Annexes)
- Have a list of Tables (including the ones of the Annexes)
- Start with an one-page Executive Summary
- End the main part with a Conclusions section of around 1 page
- Include a References section after the Conclusions section
- Include all detailed technical and other information in Annexes

5.4 Data Communication protocols

All documents and computer data files sent either on floppy disk or by e-Mail 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 re-occurrence.

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 dates.

Every Internal Report or Deliverable should be uploaded to the project ftp site by the author who should also inform the rest of the partners (by e-mail, fax, etc.) that the specific file has been uploaded. The Deliverables that are characterised as “Public”, after being finalised, should be uploaded to the project web site by the partner responsible for dissemination actions (ICCS).

6. Dissemination Event scheduling and reporting

The following are considered dissemination events:

- Publications in Scientific, Technical or Commercial Journals
- Presentations in Conferences
- Exhibition stands and demos
- Participation in non-project workshops, forums and/or events

The Project Coordinator and the Quality Assurance Manager should be informed about the participation of any Participant in such an event through the completion of the appropriate form (from Forms A to D) from **Annex 3**. They are responsible for approving or not the participation in such an event, after having received comments from the rest partners in the Consortium.

For any scientific journal publication, the following procedure will be followed:

- ➔ Completion of appropriate form (from Forms A to D) from Annex 3 and submission of it to the whole Consortium through E-mail.
- ➔ Written acceptance should be sent to the requesting Participant within 5 working days from receipt from both the Coordinator and the QAM. Else, it is supposed to be positive.
- ➔ The draft paper is then circulated to all project participants before submission. All participants may object to the publication of confidential data or to non-inclusion of their name, if their work is also included. Comments are to be sent to the publishing Partner with copies to the Project Coordinator and the QAM. Then the author should restructure the draft paper accordingly. In case of conflict, it is the task of the Project Coordinator and the QAM together to take the final decision.
- ➔ After paper acceptance, the revised relevant Form from Annex 3 will be sent to the Project Coordinator and the QAM, together with a copy of the final paper.
- ➔ After the dissemination event takes place, a final version of the relevant Form from Annex C will be sent again to the Project Coordinator and the QAM for their archives.

The participation in exhibitions through a stand and the presentation of demos of the project results also require prior agreement of the whole project Consortium.

The above rules will be applied and checked by the QAM in order to:

- Avoid repetition of publication of the same work
- Avoid publication of restrictive and/or commercial in confidence data
- Avoid misunderstandings between Participants and publication of one's work without proper referencing
- Secure optimum use of dissemination resources of the project
- Guarantee proper archiving of all dissemination material

7. Internal communication strategies

The table shown in **Annex 6** includes all the main internal communication strategies between Partners regarding the documents circulation. These documents are:

- Three monthly progress report;
- Technical deliverables;
- Peer review for deliverable quality check;
- Project slides;
- Prototypes;
- Formal Cost assessment Forms.
- Internal Cost assessment Forms.

The main software standards has been defined as follows:

- Operative System: Windows 98/2000/XP
- MS Word 2000/2003: textual deliverable;
- MS Excel 2000/2003: textual deliverable support, cost statement, ...
- MS PowerPoint 2000/2003: transparencies, slides, posters, ...
- MS Project 1998/2000: for scheduling purposes.

8. Deliverables peer review and control of non-conforming deliverables

Each deliverable will be reviewed by:

- The QAM.
- 2 members of the PQCB, acting as internal inspectors, which will be the most relevant (technically wise) with the deliverable under consideration / examination.
- One external expert.

All responsible PQCB members 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.

Assessment of key points of Deliverable

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 relevant comments will be included in a Deliverable **Peer Review Report**, as indicated in **Annex 7**.

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

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

The deliverable under consideration / examination, will be forwarded, through the QAM in parallel to the Sub-Project and Work Package Leader and to the responsible members of the Project Quality Control Board (PQCB). The deliverable will be in its draft version, and will be received three (3) weeks before its official publication. The members of the PQCB are presented in **Annex 4**, while the responsables per deliverables are included in **Annex 5**.

The members of the PQCB, namely the two Consortium representatives (internal inspectors) and the external inspector, within five (5) working days, do study and revise the deliverable and prepare the «Peer Review Report», which are all collected by the Quality Assurance Manager (QAM).

The QAM upon receiving the above report and integrating his/her own «Peer Review Report», compiles a list with all the approved deviations that have to be repaired. Furthermore, if needed, he compiles a «Corrective Actions List», along with the person responsible for carrying this action and the required date to be done, always up to five (5) working days. The above list is also forwarded through the QAM to the corresponding Sub-Project and Work Package Leaders, for their information, and at the end all corrections should be incorporated immediately within the specific deliverable by the deliverable author.

The relevant Partner (the main author of the deliverable), after making the modifications suggested by the peer reviewers, has to send back the peer review report, where the "Author response" fields under each question are completed. If needed, the author sends also 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 Overall Peer Review Report.

9. Reporting and monitoring

All participants are requested to send, in addition to all formal work and cost reports, mentioned in the Description of Work, a brief progress and cost report to the QAM and the Coordinator, every 3 months. The relevant templates are included in **Annex 8**.

These will be used by the QAM to produce the following warning milestones. Also, when other key issues / problems are found, they will be evaluated and may cause alarm warnings by the QAM.

Warning alarm may be raised if any of the following deviations is found out for any of the partners or the project deliverables:

1. **BUDGET-RELATED:** +- 10% for the first 6 months, +-15% for the first year, +-20% for the second year, +-20% for the third year and fourth year. This is valid for each partner and for each cost category.
2. **TIME-RELATED TO SUBMISSION OF DELIVERABLE:** if 1 month before its issue date no draft is available, or 15 days after, no deliverable is provided. This is valid for each deliverable.

The deviation monitoring related to budget and timescale will be reviewed every 3 months.

Annex 1: Internal Reports Template and Codification

**SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
PRIORITY 1.6. Sustainable Development, Global Change
and Ecosystem
1.6.2: Sustainable Surface Transport**



506716

Title (no more than 2 lines)

Authors (per company, if more than one companies provide it together)

Summary (no more than 5 lines)

Status: (F: final, D: draft, RD: revised draft)

Distribution: (AP: all Partners, Specific Partners' names if only to some, C: Co-ordinator only)

Document ID (see attached page)

Internal Reports Codification (Document ID)

- First letters: IN-SAFETY
- Dash
- Next three / four digits: Abbreviated name of the Partner
- Dash
- Next digits: "WP" and number of relevant WP
- Dash
- Next digits : "R" and number of report of this partners in this WP
- Dash
- Next digits : "V" and number of revision of this report
- Dash
- Optional Optional description of the content (no more than one or two words)

i.e. :

IN-SAFETY-HIT-WP1_R3_V2_title.DOC : second revision of third report of HIT relevant to WP1

Annex 2: Deliverables Template

**SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
 PRIORITY 1.6. Sustainable Development, Global Change and Ecosystem
 1.6.2: Sustainable Surface Transport**



506716

Deliverable Title			
--------------------------	--	--	--

Deliverable No. (use the number indicated on technical annex)		DX.Y	
Workpackage No.	WPX	Workpackage Title	
Activity No.	AX.Y	Activity Title	
Authors (per company, if more than one company provide it together)			
Status (F: final; D: draft; RD: revised draft):			
File Name:		IN-SAFETY Deliverable X.Y.doc	
Project start date and duration		01 February 2005, 36 Months	

List of abbreviations

Table of contents

List of Figures

(If there is a need for such)

List of Tables

(If there is a need for such)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(Text, no more than 1 page)

Introduction

Chapters

Conclusions

References

Annexe/s

Annex 3: Dissemination Events Reporting Forms

A/ Publication in Magazine Form

Partner ID ¹ :	
Title:	
Authors:	
Abstract (4 lines):	
Name of Magazine (full Title):	
Magazine Abbreviation (if any):	
Type of Magazine:	<input type="checkbox"/> Scientific <input type="checkbox"/> Professional <input type="checkbox"/> Special ² <input type="checkbox"/> Informational <input type="checkbox"/> Newspaper
Level of Magazine:	<input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> Multinational <input type="checkbox"/> National
Month/Year of publication ³ :	
No. of publication Volume ⁴ :	
Editor:	
Pages ⁵ :	
Language of paper ⁶ :	
Status of publication:	<input type="checkbox"/> Published <input type="checkbox"/> Accepted <input type="checkbox"/> Pending (decision expected by)
Special comments:	

¹ i.e. SWOV

² i.e. from automotive association

³ i.e. October 2005

⁴ i.e. No 12 of 2005

⁵ i.e. pp. 86-92

⁶ i.e. English, German, etc.

B/ Presentation in Conference Form

Partner ID ⁷ :	
Title:	
Authors:	
Abstract (4 lines):	
Name of Conference (full Title):	
Conference Abbreviation (if any):	
Type of Conference:	<input type="checkbox"/> with paper selection <input type="checkbox"/> without paper selection
Level of Conference:	<input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> European <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Day(s)/Month/Year of publication ⁸ :	
Type of Article:	<input type="checkbox"/> Full Paper <input type="checkbox"/> Poster <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Conference Proceedings:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Form of Conference Proceedings:	<input type="checkbox"/> Book <input type="checkbox"/> CD <input type="checkbox"/> Book & CD <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Editor of Proceedings:	
Volume of Proceedings ⁹	
Pages ¹⁰ :	
Language of Proceedings:	
Special Comments:	

⁷ i.e. TUDELFT

⁸ i.e. 17-21.11.05

⁹ if more than one, i.e. Vol. 2

¹⁰ i.e. pp.122-124

C/ Exhibition Stand/Demo Form

Partner ID ¹¹ :	
Full Name of Exhibition:	
Exhibition Abbreviation (if any):	
Exhibition Location (Town/Country) ¹² :	
Exhibition date (Day(s)/Month/Year) ¹³ :	
Exhibition organiser:	
Level of Exhibition:	<input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> European <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Type of stand:	<input type="checkbox"/> IN SAFETY <input type="checkbox"/> Company's <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Approx. stand dimensions in m ² (only for IN-SAFETY):	
Type of demo ¹⁴ :	
Approx. number of visitors (if known):	
Number of persons wishing to test IN-SAFETY:	
Number of persons wishing to acquire IN-SAFETY results:	
Special Comments:	

¹¹ i.e. IIID

¹² i.e. Stuttgart/Germany

¹³ i.e. 17-21 June 2005

¹⁴ i.e. prototype, simulation, posters, etc.

D/ Event/Workshop Form

Partner ID ¹⁵ :	
Full Name of Event:	
Event Abbreviation (if any):	
Theme of the Event:	
Event Location:	
Event date (Day(s)/Month/Year):	
Event Organiser:	
Type of Event:	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation <input type="checkbox"/> Workshop <input type="checkbox"/> Press Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Level of Event:	<input type="checkbox"/> International <input type="checkbox"/> European <input type="checkbox"/> Multinational <input type="checkbox"/> National <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Approx. Number of Participants:	
What was shown/discussed at the event? ¹⁶	
IN-SAFETY was:	<input type="checkbox"/> Only theme of the event <input type="checkbox"/> main theme of the event <input type="checkbox"/> one of the themes of the event
Type of Participants:	<input type="checkbox"/> Authorities <input type="checkbox"/> Users <input type="checkbox"/> Manufacturers <input type="checkbox"/> Press/Media <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify)
Special Comments:	

¹⁵ i.e. _BAsT

¹⁶ bullet points, attach programme if necessary

Annex 4: PQCB members list

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Position in the Company	Postal Address	Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-mail Address
Centre for Research and Technology Hellas / Hellenic Institute of Transport	Dr. G. Aifadopoulou	Principal Researcher	6th km. Charilaou-Thermi Road, 57001 Themi, Greece	+30-2310-498451	+30-2310-498269	gea@certh.gr
Kuratorium für Schutz und Sicherheit	Klaus Machata	Traffic Engineer/Senior Researcher	A-1031 Wien, Oelzeltgasse 3	+43 - 1 - 71770-214	+43 - 1 - 71770-7	klaus.machata@kfv.at
Vrije Universiteit Brussels	Dr. Wim Vanden Panhuyzen	Professor	Department of Business Economics and Strategic Management Vrije Universiteit Brussel Pleinlaan 2 1050 Brussels Belgium	+3226292131	+3226292060	<u>Wim.Van.den.Panhuyzen@vub.ac.be</u>
Centrum Dopravního Vyzkumu	Doc. Ing. arch. Karel Schmeidler, CSc	Head of Social and Human Aspects of Transport Section	Lvšeňská 33a Brno 636 00	00420 543 215 050 / 124	00420 543 211 215	schmeidler@cdv.cz
Bundesanstalt für Strassenwesen	Marco Schmidt Roland Schindhelm		BAST - Bundesanstalt für Strassenwesen Bruederstr. 53, 51427 Bergisch Gladbach	+49 - (0)2204 - 43 569. +49 - (0)2204 - 43 643	+49 - (0)2204 - 43 680	schmidtm@bast.de schindhelm@bast.de

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Position in the Company	Postal Address	Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-mail Address
PTV Planung und Verkehr	Thomas Benz	Project Manager	Stumpfstrasse 1 , 76131 Karlsruhe , Germany	+49 7 21 96 51- 336	+49 7 21 96 51- 693	Thomas.Benz@ptv.de
Technische Universitaet Darmstadt	Dr.-Ing. Stefan Böhm	Principal Researcher	Petersenstrasse 29 64287 Darmstadt	+49-6151-162686	+49-6151-164093	sboehm@verkehr.tu-darmstadt.de
University of Stuttgart	Manfred Dangelmaier	Director	Fraunhofer IAO Nobelstraße 12 70569 Stuttgart Germany	+49-711-970-2107	+49-711-970-2299	manfred.dangelmaier@iao.fraunhofer.de
Valeo Switches and Detection Systems	Ing. Bernd Giesecke	Product Line Director Vision Systems	Laiernstrasse 12, 74321 Bietigheim-Bissingen, GERMANY	+49 7142 916-1208	+49 7142 916-4208	bernd.giesecke@valeo.com;
ATTIKES DIADROMES S.A.	Fanis Papadimitriou	Head of Traffic Operations	41.9 km of Attiki Odos GR 19002 PEANIA, ATTIKI	+30-210-6682180	+30-210-6634248	fpapadim@attikesdiadromes.gr
Institute of Communications and Computer Systems	Prof. Nicolaos Uzunoglou	Senior Researcher	9, Iroon Politechniou str., GR 157 73, Athens- Greece	+30 210 7721663	+30 210 7723557	nuzu@cc.ece.ntua.gr
National Technical University of Athens	Dr. Matthew Karlaftis	Lecturer	School of Civil Engineering, Department of Transportation Planning &Engineering, 5, Iroon Politechniou St., 15773 Zografou, Athens, Greece	+30-210-7721280	+30-210-7722404	mgk@central.ntua.gr
The Institute for Transport Sciences Ltd.	Dr. Imre Büki	Senior researcher	Institute for Transport Sciences, KTI, H-1518, Budapest, P.O.B.107, Hungary.	tel.: +36-1-371-5715	+36-1-205-5932	buki@kti.hu

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Position in the Company	Postal Address	Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-mail Address
5T S.c.r.l.	Dr. Ing. Paolo Cassinelli	Responsible of 5T system operation	C.so Bramante 66/a 10126 Turin Italy	+39-0115764545	+39-015764536	Cassinelli.p@gtt.to.it
Centro Studi sui Sistemi di Trasporto	Silvana Toffolo	Project manager	Corso Re Umberto 30 10128 Torino Italy	+39 0115513831	+39 0115513821	silvana.toffolo@csst.it
CRF Societa' Consortile per Azioni	Ing. Carlo Liberto	Researcher	Centro Ricerche Fiat Strada Torino 50, 10043 Orbassano (TO), ITALY	+39 011.90.83104	+39 011.90.83083	Carlo.Libero@crf.it
Mizar MediaService srl	Prof. Vito Mauro	President	Via Vincenzo Monti, 48 - 10126 Turin (Italy)	+39.011.6500411	+39.011.6500444	vito.mauro@torino.miz.it
Navigation Technologies B.V.	Jean François Gaillet					jean-francois.gaillet@navteq.com
Radboud University Nijmegen	Dr. Rob van der Heijden	Professor	Radboud University Nijmegen P.O. Box 9108 6500 HK Nijmegen The Netherlands	+31.24.361.2104 (Secr. +31.24.361.2099)	+31.24.361.1841	r.vanderheijden@fm.ru.nl
SWOV Institute for Road safety Research	Mr. Peter Wouters,	Senior researcher	SWOV Institute for Road Safety Research P.O. Box 1090 2260 BB Leidschendam The Netherlands	+31 70 3173398	+31 70 320 12 61	peter.wouters@swov.nl
Delft University of Technology	Johan den Hartog	Senior lecturer (for social skills, drama and communication studies)	Delft University of Technology - Faculty TBM Work and Organisational Psychology Jaffalaan 5, room a0.300	+31 15 278 4913	+31 15 278 2950	j.denhartog@tbm.tudelft.nl

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Position in the Company	Postal Address	Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-mail Address
			2628 BX DELFT			
Transport- økonomisk institutt	Rune Elvik	Chief Research Political Scientist	Transportøkonomisk institutt (Institute of Transport Economics), PO Box 6110 Etterstad, NO-0602 Oslo	+47 22 57 38 10	+47 22 57 02 90	re@toi.no
Swedish National Road and Transport Research Institute	Prof. Liisa Hakamies- Blomqvist	Research Director	SE-581 95 Linköping, Sweden	: +46 13 20 41 24	+46 13 14 14 36	Liisa Hakamies- Blomqvist@vti.se
International Institute for Information Design	Veronika Schreyer	Board Member	Westbahnstrasse 56- 58/2/10, 1070 Wien, Austria	+43 (0)1 526 47 25	+43 (0)1 526 47 25	veronika.schreyer@iiid.net
International Information Centre for Terminology	Dr. Gabriele Sauberer	Deputy Director of Infoterm, Project Manager and Senior Researcher	Aichholzgasse 6/12, 1120 Vienna, Austria	+43 1 817 4499 +43(0)664 344 6180	: +43 1 817 4499-44	gsauberer@infoterm.org
Danish Road Directorate						
Ole Sondergaard ApS	Ole Sondergaard	Manager	Sct. Annagade 71B DK-3000 Helsingør Denmark	+45 49 21 28 78	+45 49 21 25 69	osgrafik@mail.dk
Bureau Mijksenaar b.v.						
Prof. Dr. Heiner Erke Consultant Applied Psychology						

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Position in the Company	Postal Address	Telephone Number	Fax Number	E-mail Address
De Montfort University	Professor Stephen Brown	Professor of Knowledge Media	De Montfort University Faculty of Art & Design Portland Building The Gateway Leicester LE1 9BH	0116 257 7173	0116 250 6101	sbrown@dmu.ac.uk

External Reviewers:

1. (to be appointed by CERTH)
2. (to be appointed by TUDelft)

Annex 5: Deliverables reviewers list

Table 2: Deliverables reviewers

No	Deliverable name	WP no.	Issued by	Delivery date ¹⁷ (proj. month)	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
1	D1.1 Implementation scenarios and concepts towards forgiving roads	1	TU Delft	M18	RU	MMS
2	D2.1 Implementation scenarios and concepts towards self-explaining roads	2	VUB	M18	CDV	PTV
3	D2.2 Intelligent Agents for driver information personalisation	2	HIT	M20	ICCS	USTUTT
4	D2.3 Proposal on unified pictograms, keywords, bilingual verbal messages and typefaces for VMSes in the TERN	2	IIID	M24	KuSS	CSST
5	D3.1 Improved micro and macro simulator models	3	PTV	M26	Infoterm	SWOV
6	D3.2 Road Risk Analysis tools	3	TUDarm	M26	NTUA	OS
7	D3.3 Road Operators training schemes and tools	3	KuSS	M26	5T	ATTDIA
8	D3.4 Overview of resulting tools, guidelines and instruments	3	SWOV	M28	PTV	TUDarm
9	D4.1 Pilot plans	4	ICCS	M12	VTI	ATTDIA
10	D4.2 Pilot results consolidation	4	VTI	M32	CSST	CRF
11	D5.1 Best practice guide on road signing	5	USTUTT	M34	BASt	CDV
12	D5.2 CBA/CEA on project proposed implementation scenarios and developed tools	5	TOI	M34	VUB	HIT
13	D5.3 Implementation scenaria and further research priorities	5	VUB/CDV	M35	KuSS	BASt
14	D5.4 Policy recommendations	5	BASt	M36	5T	IIID
15	D6.1 Project dissemination material	6	ICCS	M4	USTUTT	TU Delft
16	D6.2 Project web site	6	ICCS	M6	KTI	TOI
17	D6.3 Final exploitation plans, Dissemination activities report and TIP	6	ATTDIA / ICCS	M36	NavTeQ	MMS

¹⁷ Month in which the deliverables will be available. Month 1 marking the start of the project, and all delivery dates being relative to this start date.

No	Deliverable name	WP no.	Issued by	Delivery date ¹⁷ (proj. month)	Reviewer 1	Reviewer 2
18	D7.1 Project Quality Manual	7	NTUA	M3	TU Delft	HIT
19	D7.2 Project mid-term report	7	HIT / TU Delft	M18	NTUA	VSDS
20	D7.3 Project final report	7	HIT / TU Delft	M36	SWOV	DMU

Thus, each partner will have to review the following number of deliverables:

Table 3: Number of Deliverables to be reviewed per partner

Participant name	No of Deliverables
CERTH/HIT	2
KuSS	2
VUB	1
CDV	2
BASt	2
PTV	2
TUDarm	1
USTUTT	2
VSDS	1
ATTDIA	2
ICCS	1
NTUA	2
KTI	1
5T	2
CSST	2
CRF	1
MMS	2
NAVTEQ	1
RU	1
SWOV	2
TUDELFT	2
TOI	1
VTI	1

Participant name	No of Deliverables
IID	1
INFOTERM	1
OS	1
BM	0
HE	0
DMU	1

Annex 6: Planned project communications

	Start Time	Steps	Timing per step	Way	Format	Content	Length	
Progress Report (three monthly)	Once every 3 months (2 weeks after the start of next month)	PAR to PC (PAR contribution)	½ week	E-mail through the Project Management Portal	Informal text + Progress Report file included (see Annex ID)	Technical overview, management and coordination aspects	1-2 pages, as required	
		PC to PAR (global draft)	½ week					
		PAR to PC (draft reviewed)	½ week					
		PC to PAR (final version)	½ week					
Technical Deliverables	4 weeks before deliverable deadline	Deliverable responsible to PC and QAM (draft version)		E-mail through the Project Management Portal	Informal text + Technical Deliverables file included	1. Executive summary	• ½ or 1 page	
		QAM to reviewers				2. Content	• As required	
		Reviewers to QAM (peer review reports)	10 working days			3. Conclusions	• ½ or 1 page	
		QAM to PC and deliverable responsible (synthesised peer review report)		5 working days	E-mail through the Project Management Portal	Informal text + Technical Deliverables file included	4. Annexes	• As required
		Deliverable responsible to PC and QAM (final version)		5 working days	E-mail through the Project Management Portal			
		PC to CEC (if required) and PAR (final version)		e-mail /courier (final version)				
Financial statements and other reports	Every 15 January	PAR to PC (draft)	1 week	fax (draft)	Form C	Summary of PAR Cost Statement (express cost in national currency and in EURO)	As indicated by CEC rules	
		PC to PAR (draft reviewed)		By courier (final)				
		PAR to PC						
		PC to CEC						
		QAM to PAR and PC						Comments on spent resources and warnings, if appropriate

PAR: Partner

PC: Project Coordinator

QAM: Quality Assurance Manager

Annex 7: Peer Review Report template

**SIXTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME
 PRIORITY 1.6. Sustainable Development, Global
 Change and Ecosystem
 1.6.2: Sustainable Surface Transport**



506716

Peer Review Report

Deliverable No.	DX.X	Deliverable Title	
Deliverable Authors			
Quality Manager Name and Company			
Workpackage No.	WPX	Workpackage Title	
Activity No.	AX	Activity Title	
Date of Review Document			
File Name:		IN-SAFETY Peer Review Report DX_X.doc	

PROCEDURES USED FOR PEER REVIEW

The **IN-SAFETY** Consortium uses the **Peer Review** process for its internal quality assurance for deliverables to assure consistency and high standard for documented project results.

The Peer Review is processed individually by selected reviewers. The allocated time for the review is about two weeks. The author of the document has the final responsibility to collect the comments and suggestions from the Peer Reviewers and decide what changes to the document and actions are to be undertaken.

Reviewers:

Dr. George Yannis (Quality Assurance Manager) – NTUA

Mr/Ms Y (Quality expert) – Company name

Mr/Ms Y (Quality expert) – Company name

Mr/Ms Y (External expert) – Company name

Overall Peer Review Result:

Deliverable is:

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

Please give an overall rating of this deliverable in a scale from (1: very poor to 5: very good) :

Suggested actions:

1. The following changes should be implemented

2. Specify missing chapters / subjects

3. Required changes on deliverable essence and contents

4. Further relevant required improvements

COMMENTS OF PEER REVIEWERS

Comments of Mr/Ms X
General comment These refer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverable contents thoroughness• Innovation level• Correspondence to project and programme objectives
Specific comments
Topic A: Relevance <i>Reviewer comment</i> <i>Author response</i>
Topic B: Response to user needs <i>Reviewer comment</i> <i>Author response</i>
Topic C: Methodological framework soundness <i>Reviewer comment</i> <i>Author response</i>
Topic D: Quality of achievements <i>Reviewer comment</i> <i>Author response</i>
Topic E: Quality of presentation of achievements <i>Reviewer comment</i>

Author response

Topic F: Deliverable Layout / Spelling / Format

Reviewer comment

Author response

Annex 8: Quarterly Report Template

THREE- MONTHLY INTERNAL TECHNICAL REPORT PER PARTNER

Partner: xxx

Period:

Date:

Contribution requested per Partner as follows:

1. Critical overview of technical progress made and results concerning partner's work in the tasks / WPs in which he participated.
2. Achievements per Task / WP you participated.
3. Problems per Task / WP.
4. Comparison of technical progress against planned.
5. Corrective actions taken.
6. Reference Deliverables, their status and critical assess their delay.
7. Planned activities for the next reporting period.
8. Exploitation aspects:
 - Discussion of practical applications of project results
 - Patentable results, including a list of patents applied for
 - Publications and conference presentations resulting from the project
 - Demonstrations given
 - Contacts with potential users and their reactions
 - Other aspects of results dissemination
 - Significant market input
 - Significant scientific input from elsewhere
9. Annex

If appropriate, an annex may be used to submit any significant document or publication that does not form part of a deliverable.

THREE- MONTHLY INTERNAL COST REPORT PER PARTNER

Partner: XXX
Period:
Date:

1. Resources (personmonths spent per WP)

Partner Code	WP 1	WP 2	WP 3	WP 4	WP 5	WP 6	WP 7	Total

2. Costs / Expenditures

Cumulative cost per Partner (Euros)						
Partner Code	Equipment	Third party	Travel	Consumables	Other	Total