

# HACID - Deliverable

# Quality Assessment Report

## Year 1

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No. 101070588. UK Research and Innovation (UKRI) funds the Nesta and Met Office contributions to the HACID project.

<b>Deliverable number:</b>	D1.6
<b>Due date:</b>	31.08.2023
<b>Nature<sup>1</sup>:</b>	Report
<b>Dissemination Level<sup>2</sup>:</b>	Public
<b>Work Package:</b>	WP1
<b>Lead Beneficiary:</b>	CNR
<b>Contributing Beneficiaries:</b>	MPG, HDX, Nesta, MET Office

---

<sup>1</sup> The following codes are admitted:

- R: Document, report (excluding the periodic and final reports)
- DEM: Demonstrator, pilot, prototype, plan designs
- DEC: Websites, patents filing, press & media actions, videos, etc.
- DATA: Data sets, microdata, etc.
- DMP: Data management plan
- ETHICS: Deliverables related to ethics issues.
- SECURITY: Deliverables related to security issues
- OTHER: Software, technical diagram, algorithms, models, etc.

<sup>2</sup> The following codes are admitted:

- PU – Public, fully open, e.g. web (Deliverables flagged as public will be automatically published in CORDIS project's page)
- SEN – Sensitive, limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement
- Classified R-UE/EU-R – EU RESTRICTED under the Commission Decision No2015/444
- Classified C-UE/EU-C – EU CONFIDENTIAL under the Commission Decision No2015/444
- Classified S-UE/EU-S – EU SECRET under the Commission Decision No2015/444

# Document History

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Partner</b>
V1	30/08/2023	Draft created	Vito Trianni	CNR
V2	31/08/2023	Final Version	Vito Trianno	CNR

# Table of content

<b>Document History</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Table of content</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Findings, Recommendation and Remediation Actions</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Conclusions</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>5</b>

# 1. Introduction

This document reports on the quality assessment processes and outcomes conducted during the first year of the HACID project, i.e., from September the 1st, 2022 to August the 31st, 2023. The quality control processes have been defined in the Quality Management Plan (QMP, Deliverable D1.5). In particular, Section 5 in the QMP provided indications on the procedure to perform general quality control activities and produce quality records:

*Project quality reviews will be performed every four months in order to verify that all project plans and processes have been created and are executed as planned. A Quality Review Checklist will be used to assess the project's compliance with the planned activities (and related outputs) in domains such as scope, time, costs, quality, communications, risks. The findings, recommendations and remediation/improvement actions will be consolidated in the annual Quality Review Report. Every time the Quality Control step is executed, the effectiveness of previous cycle recommendations and remediation/improvement actions should be assessed.*

In order to collect information about the project's compliance with the planned activities, we prepared a quality review checklist following a template for project management from PM<sup>2</sup> Project Management Methodology ([https://pm2.europa.eu/index\\_en](https://pm2.europa.eu/index_en)), but revisited it to collect information for each Work Package (WP).

The process starts with each WP leader reporting on the quality of the processes for each WP. Following their input, the checklist is reviewed by the Project Coordinator and a series of finding, recommendations and remediation actions is made. In the following period, the recommendations and remediation action needs to be implemented, and the results tracked. During the first year, the quality review process has been executed once at the end of Month 12. The results are summarised in [Section 2](#), and the whole quality report is attached to this document. In the second and third year, the planned period of four months will be enforced.

## 2. Findings, Recommendation and Remediation Actions

Generally speaking, the project is on track with the activities and the quality score resulted in an overall score of 91% quality compliance. All WPs have a satisfactory score, and do not present significant deviations from the project plans.

A cross-WP analysis has led to identify the following findings, and to determine associated recommendation and remediation actions.

### 1. Scope

- *Finding:* Few changes in scope have been made, but these are not fully documented. While there is awareness within the consortium about the changes made, short descriptions can help track the actions.
- *Impact:* In the long run, missing documentation can lead to diverging knowledge within the consortium.

- *Recommendation and Remediation Actions*: Centralise tracking of changes in a project-wide repository, with an online worksheet in which tasks are described and changes are tracked.
- 2. Schedule:**
- *Finding*: Issues with keeping up with the planned schedule are recognised project-wide, mostly due to a slower pace of activities at the beginning of the project (partly due to delays in setting up the consortium agreement).
  - *Impact*: Cumulated delays could hamper project completion within the planned time frame. Difficulties in synchronising WPs.
  - *Recommendation and Remediation Actions*: While mitigation actions have been included thanks to careful planning, it is necessary to raise awareness about the cumulated delays. It is necessary to centralise an infrastructure for detailed task planning (currently available only down to task level), keeping it aligned with the resources used internally by each partner.
- 3. Communication:**
- *Finding*: Communication among partners is not always effective. While there are regular meetings both at project level and at single WP level, it happens that follow-up interactions require much more effort than expected.
  - *Impact*: The lack of coordination due to inefficient communication is sometimes related to diverging expectations. In the long run, it can result in frustration and lack of motivation.
  - *Recommendation and Remediation Actions*: Raise awareness about the situation and solve diverging expectations. Proceed through bilateral meetings and follow-up in the GA. Closely monitor the most critical communication paths.

### 3. Conclusions

The first-year quality assessment exercise revealed the need for actions to improve the overall quality score, which is however very high at the moment. Follow-up actions are recommended and will contribute to even higher quality scores for the second and third year.

## Annexes

In the following pages, the Quality Report is provided.