Grant agreement no. 675451

CompBioMed

Research and Innovation Action

H2020-EINFRA-2015-1

Topic: Centres of Excellence for Computing Applications

D1.2 Quality Assurance Plan

Work Package: 1

Due date of deliverable: Month 03

Actual submission date: 30 / November / 2016

Start date of project: October, 01 2016   Duration: 36 months

Lead beneficiary for this deliverable: *CBK*
Contributors: *UCL, Sheffield*

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the H2020 Programme (2014-2020)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	YES
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CI	Classified, as referred to in Commission Decision 2001/844/EC	

Disclaimer

The content of this deliverable does not reflect the official opinion of the European Union. Responsibility for the information and views expressed herein lies entirely with the author(s).

Table of Contents

1   Version Log

Version	Date	Released by	Nature of Change
V1.0	30/11/2016	Hugh Martin	First Draft

2   Contributors

Name	Institution	Role
Hugh Martin	CBK Sci Con	Author
Alberto Marzo	Sheffield	Editor
Pragna Kiri	UCL	Editor

3   Definition and Acronyms

Acronyms	Definitions
DoA	Description of the Action
EB	Executive Board
QAP	Quality Assurance Plan
QA	Quality Assurance
WP	Work Package

4   Introduction

This document outlines the Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) that will be used in the CompBioMed project. It describes:

- the objectives of the plan;
- the tasks in the Description of the Action (DoA) that it relates to;
- a description of this deliverable
- a detailed description of the plan itself;
- a description of the QAP for software deliverables
- the procedures which are applied for publications of the CompBioMed project
- an analysis of the risks associated with the QAP.

5   Objectives

The Quality Assurance Plan is linked to the following objectives of WP1:

- To ensure the timely and high quality achievement of the project results and deliverables through administrative coordination
- To ensure the quality control of the project results and deliverables and the risk management of the project as a whole

D1.2 is part of WP1 Management, which oversees the overall technical, financial and administrative management of the consortium and the project's activities. The activities in this work package include all activities necessary to successfully manage and run the consortium.

6   Related tasks

D1.2 directly relates to Task1.5: Project Quality Control. According to this task the project management will manage and support the quality control and timely delivery of project reports and deliverables. Amongst others, this includes:
- the setting up and maintenance of an internal quality assurance plan to monitor all deliverables before finalising them;
- monitoring of all project activities and ensuring that they lead to the required deliverables and are in line with the project programme;
- assuring that necessary actions are undertaken in case of delays or underachievement, and if required execute the appropriate contingency plan, to minimise any delays and their impact on dependent work packages.

7   Description of the Deliverable

The QAP will be set up and maintained to monitor all deliverables before finalising them. The deliverable also contains a risk analysis and contingency planning related to Quality Assurance and deliverables.

8 Quality Assurance Plan for Project Deliverables (which are not software)

1. The first step in the QAP is the check by the Corresponding Deliverable Editor of the quality of the content of the deliverable. The Deliverable Editor is appointed by the lead beneficiary of that deliverable. The Deliverable Editor will check the following points:
   - The deliverable covers the stated objectives;
   - The quality of the work described in the deliverable is of high standard and is in accord with what is expected;
   - The quality of the writing of the document is of high standard with respect to style, errors and organisation; readability; and illustrations. This is described in the Project Handbook.
   - The deliverable is complete, i.e. there are no missing parts, missing references, missing explanations of concepts;
   - The deliverable is clearly written and understandable by its potential readers.

2. The Deliverable should be written in Word unless otherwise agreed with the consortium. The deliverable editor must provide the consortium with a version which is readable for all and use the provided deliverable template. The format for the title should be as follows:
   D[WP#].[D#]_[Short Title]_[lead partner].[version#]_[YYYYMMDD].[extension]
   This is an example:
   D1.2_QualityAssurancePlan_CBK_v1.0_20161130

3. Next, to ensure that these standards of quality are achieved, each deliverable will be submitted for project-internal peer review 4 weeks before the delivery date of the deliverable. The peer reviewers will be at least 2 members of the consortium, who have not been directly involved in the work described in the deliverable. They will be selected by the Project Coordinator and Project Manager at least 5 weeks before the delivery date. They will read the submitted deliverable and suggest changes where necessary. During the review, the deliverable draft should also be accessible by all project members through the intranet.

4. The assessments of the peer reviewers are sent by email to the Deliverable Editor 2 weeks before the delivery date of the deliverable. The Deliverable Editor has one week for the revision of the deliverable.

5. The Deliverable Editor will send the revised version of the deliverable to the Reviewers to check whether the comments have been adequately addressed if possible within two days. The reviewer's comments and recommendations will be sent to the Project Manager and the Executive Board (EB) few days before the delivery date. The EB leader will ensure that the Deliverable Editor takes into account the suggestions of the reviewers in preparing the final document.

6. The Deliverable Editor will send the final version of the deliverable to the Project Manager at least 48 hours before the delivery date.

9 QA Plan for Software Deliverables

A similar procedure will be applied in the case of internally reviewing software deliverables. However, a user not familiar with the software should be able to install and run it, guided by appropriate documentation. The main functionality of the software and its integration with other CompBioMed or external components should be checked by running basic tests. Reviewers of such releases should be given at least one more week than the regular deliverable release schedule.

10 Risk Analysis and Contingency Planning

The following risks associated with the QAP can be identified:

a) Deliverable is not submitted to a project-internal peer review one month before the delivery date of the deliverable.

Probability	Medium
Impact	Minor
Risk assessment	Medium
Mitigation	Deliverable Editor to update WP leader and Coordinator about the progress of the deliverable. PM will start reminding Deliverable Editors 2 months before the delivery date of the

b) Peer reviewers do not complete their review of the deliverable within one week

Probability	Medium
Impact	Minor
Risk assessment	Minor
Mitigation	Project Coordinator to ensure timely appointment of reviewers. Project Manager to remind reviewers one week before submission that deliverable is due for submission, and to monitor the progress of the review.

c) Major problems with the deliverable are discovered by the peer reviewers

Probability	Small
Impact	Medium
Risk assessment	Minor-Medium
Mitigation	Progress of the deliverables will be checked regularly internally within the work packages through intra-WP meetings and teleconferences, and through the WP leader teleconferences.

11 Conclusions

This deliverable has outlined the QAP of the CompBioMed project. The QAP will be set up and maintained to monitor all deliverables before finalising them. It is part of the management infrastructure of the project that allows the Project Support Unit to monitor and operate the day-to-day project activities efficiently. It is linked to Task 1.2 of the project: Quality control and work plan monitoring. It has outlined the five different steps of the actual QAP, and the additional objective of the QAP for software deliverables. We have described the three most common risks associated with the QAP, how probable they are to occur; the impact if they were to occur; the assessment of the risk; and ways to mitigate the risk.