# Report on Quality Management

## Deliverable no. 3.1
## Report, version 2.0

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: | **Report on Quality Management** |
| Creator: | **UNS/SC/QMA** |
| Date: | **19-06-2011** |
| Subject: | All deliverables submitted until this date |
| Type | Internal report |
| Description | First Report on Quality Management |
| Contributor(s) | Steering Committee Members |
| Status | Final version 2.0 |

## 1 - Introduction

According to the Quality Management Plan, the objective of this document is to report about the quality management procedures and results followed in carrying out project activities during the first 8 months of the project (October 2010 – May 2011).

For the seek of clarity we are providing here the report only for those deliverables which have been already finalised during the concerned period, at least in their pilot versions.

The eLEANOR Quality Management tasks have been performed by UNS, as project coordinator and WP responsible, with the contribution of the Steering Committee members and the partner responsible for each specific deliverable, with the aim to monitor how and if the quality procedures are respected and to evaluate the project outcomes. In addition, external reviews by an External Evaluator, appointed by the coordinator with the approval of the SC, were performed for specific deliverables.

## 2 – Results of the reviewing procedure

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 1 "Project Handbook"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| CO | Draft versions provided by UNS | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 6 "Questionnaire on vocational training needs (Matrix)"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions agreed during project meetings | Review by e-mail consultations and during meetings | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 7 "Report on vocational training needs for Water Industry"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by SUEZ | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert (Annex 1).

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 10 "Metadata for Training Modules" (former "Metadata for Course description")*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert (Annex I).

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 11 "Training Modules Catalogue" (former "Course Catalogue")*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review through tests | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final pilot version was approved following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert. Users also were involved in the review of this deliverable, letting know any occurred fail to the project coordinator.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 12 "Templates for Good Practices"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 13 "Good Practices Catalogue"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final pilot version was approved following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 18 "Dissemination Plan"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 19 "Project Web Site (www.e-leanor.eu)"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by UNS | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final pilot version was approved following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 20.1 "Project Leaflet"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 20.2 "Project Poster"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review was needed for this document.

### *Internal review of Deliverable no. 21.1 "eLEANOR Newsletter"*

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC | Draft versions provided by GISIG | Review by e-mail consultations | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Final version was approved and made available on the project document server following the completion of the above procedure.
An external review was performed for this deliverable, as detailed in the enclosed report by the appointed External Expert.

***Internal review of Deliverable no. 22.1 "First Eleanor Dissemination Workshop (Nice, France, 17th – 18th February 2011)"***

| Performed by | Input | Method | Quality Criteria | Output |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SC, U | Workshop programme and produced material | Review of workshop proceedings, collection of comments from the participants | Considered as accomplished | Statements of proposed improvements |

Event approved following the completion of the above procedure.
No external review / a review by attendants through evaluation questionnaires was needed for this deliverable (see enclosure).

# ANNEX I
# External Expert Revision

# 1. Introduction

The object of this document is to give a quality revision onto Deliverables susceptible of external revision.

As an external Quality Advisor, I was in charge of the checking of all Deliverables given by the Project Coordinator and evaluate them under the Quality Management Plan criteria and personal experience in quality matters.

The following paragraph, thus, is a collection of the feedbacks given to the Project Coordinator for Deliverables' approval.

## 2 Quality Management Advices

### *2.1 Deliverable 7: "Report on vocational training needs for Water Industry"*

The deliverable accomplishes all quality presentation criteria. The report is well designed and organised. It follows quality standards criteria for reports (including Metadata, Table of contents, Numeration and use of Corporate Design)

Regarding the content of this report, proposed objectives have been achieved and results are clearly presented as a list of JP and BP well described. The matrix helps in the achievement of this task, giving a smart résumé of all jobs and business processes covered in the Deliverable.

The Report on vocational training need for the water industry complies with the European and International Standards.

This Deliverable is considered as approved from a quality point of view.

### *2.2 Deliverable 10 "Metadata for Training Modules*

This form has achieved the goal of structuring its metadata. This is a key issue for most of the form, and especially for this one, whose prime objective is feeding a Catalogue later on.

The layout is simple and easy to understand, so it will be more attractive and easy for stakeholders to fill it in.

The number and kind of information requested as well as the consistency of the solicited information accomplish all European standards.

For achieving better and more complete results, it is advised to have a multilingual version of this form.

Regarding all filled forms obtained so far, the content of their metadata, the completeness and appropriateness of contents provided in all of them are satisfactory according to general quality criteria.

Form shows clarity of learning outcomes and objectives, as well as the fulfill clearness of conditions for delivery and of prerequisites for accessing to it.

This Deliverable is considered as approved from a quality point of view.

### *2.3 Deliverable 11 "Training Modules Catalogue"*

The Catalogue has been tested and evaluated under the fixed criteria.

It shows a wide usability and accessibility, besides of its clarity and availability of documentation and instructions.

It contains a map of knowledge that makes it utilisation rather easy and instinctive for users.

The catalogue achieves with what was expected in the project's objectives and it is a good tool for training searches and proposers of training modules. Therefore, this Deliverables is considered as approved.

### *2.4 Deliverable 13 "Good Practices Catalogue*

After giving several feedbacks to the project coordinator in order to seek for the accessibility of the Good Practices Catalogue and to report some bugs found, the Catalogue is working well and providing all expected functionalities.

The catalogue achieves successfully with the Deliverable and project's objectives, providing a wide range of documentation.

This Deliverable is considered as approved from a quality point of view.

### *2.5 Deliverable 19 "Project Web Site (www.e-leanor.eu)"*

The project website has achieved a good quality standard. It is attractive, usable and accessible for professional public. It contains well structured information and graphics.

Contents are well managed, giving sufficient information to site's visitors.

Project website accomplished all quality criteria and therefore is considered as approved.

### *2.6 Deliverable 21.1 "eLEANOR Newsletters"*

Newsletters are attractive and well presented. According to the project rules, they are well provided with the chosen design.

The content is accessible for targeted public and moreover well structured. The content reflects project's present activities and objectives.

This Deliverable is considered as approved from a quality point of view.