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# Executive Summary

In the scope of the FoodQA project and to what is foreseen in the Grant Agreement, the consortium decided that it is to the benefit of the satisfaction of its quality objectives to prepare a Project Quality Plan.

The objective of this Quality Plan is to ensure the production of concrete and high–quality results in line with the project objectives.

In this context, the main purpose of the Quality Plan is to facilitate the project’s management and guide all partners on the evaluation and quality issues, by establishing a coherent set of guidelines by which all aspects of the project are managed and measured. It will be the use of these guidelines that will ensure better collaboration among the consortium members, individuals and groups, and will also ensure that the entire consortium is responsible for and engaged in the work that is produced by the project.

# Introduction

The purpose of this section is to give a brief description of the project, including the rationale, objectives and expectations.

## FoodQA Project description

FoodQA addresses one of the national priorities in Jordan in providing safe food and food quality. Thus, it responds to the need for a professional and well-designed courses and facilities able to offer answers and provide solutions in the interdisciplinary approach of food industry and business. This will integrate knowledge and expertise in academia on one hand and in industry on the other hand. Currently, Jordan regulatory bodies hold massive responsibilities in these fields, but still the lack of integration in between different regulatory and legislative bodies resulted in difficulties in decision making. The initiation of the FoodQA will help in bridging the gap between all of the Jordanian governmental authorities and the industrial community. With the creation of interface Centres for food safety and food quality in Jordan FoodQA intends to support the organisation and structure of the interfaces between Academia and Industry; making available to the food sector technical and scientific services that can contribute to the development of the industry and to strength its competitiveness in the direction of a future integration in the European Union in particularly in the area of food safety and quality.

## The FoodQA Partnership

The FoodQA Project involves 13 organizations from 6 countries. The project is being carried out by the partners:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| P1 | Jordan University of Science and Technology (JUST) | Jordan | P1 -JUST (JO) |
| P2 | The University of Jordan (UJ) | Jordan | P2 -UJ (JO) |
| P3 | Mutah University (MU) | Jordan | P3 -MU (JO) |
| P4 | Al Balqa’ Applied university (BAU) | Jordan | P4 -BAU (JO) |
| P5 | MONOJO | Jordan | P5 -MONOJO (JO) |
| P6 | Jordan Food and Drug Administration (JFDA) | Jordan | P6 -JFDA (JO) |
| P7 | Hochschule für Technik, Wirtschaft und Kultur Leipzig HTWK Leipzig (HTWK) | Germany | P7 -HTWK (GE) |
| P8 | University of Teramo (UNiTE) | Italy | P8 -UNiTE (IT) |
| P9 | University of Split (UNIST) | Croatia | P9 -UNIST (HR) |
| P10 | Jerash University (JU) | Jordan | P10 -JU (JO) |
| P11 | Agricultural University of Athens (AUA) | Greece | P11 -AUA (GR) |
| P12 | Paulo & Beatriz – Consultores Associados, Lda (P&B) | Portugal | P12 -P&B (PT) |
| P13 | Creative Thinking Development (CRE.THI.DEV) | Greece | P13 -CRE.THI.DEV (GR) |

## FoodQA Project aims and objectives

The FoodQA project aims at reinforcing and structuring a Jordanian network for promoting entrepreneurship and innovation in the food area, while improving the flow of knowledge and cooperation between HEI and industry. To achieve this ambitious goal, the consortium identified a set of activities to be carried out through the creation of the FoodQA centres. These activities will lead to key changes in teaching and learning approaches and will build strong & durable bridges between academia and industry.

The FoodQA project will notably allow:

* To specify the needs in food companies in order to better shape training courses and encourage close interactions of authorities with the concerned companies. The short-term objective is to define roadmaps to guide future innovations of food businesses, and to allow ideas to better fit industrial constraints and address current market needs. The long-term objective is to offer mentoring services to all partners and to give help to companies interested in developing new technologies and products.
* To develop a more professional and complete approach that will federate experts of several disciplines to support the best projects and allow their transfer within a food company partner of the project or in HEIs’ incubators. The new training model will be disseminated and promoted through this project network and during related competitions after the end of the project.
* To analyse and address the skills and needs of food companies in order to propose new training sessions (some in common with students) thus enhancing and normalizing interactions.
* To put together revised and new training courses for all stakeholders. The FoodQA ambition is to ensure the training of number of staff on project management and thus to organize 30 hours/year of teaching on innovation processes and management in industries in each HEI. Legislative authorities will provide the legal advices and solutions for the obstacles.

# Aims and Objectives of the Quality Plan

This document is for internal use by the project team and will act as a guide for the internal quality management of the Project.

The main purpose of this Project Quality Plan is to describe the Quality Management procedures that the project team will follow in order to ensure, monitor and control the quality of all processes and deliverables produced during the FoodQA project lifecycle. In particular:

* To clearly define the content, format, review and approval process of the project deliverables;
* To define the responsibilities of the project partners regarding those deliverables.
* To identify all the different tools and means to be applied throughout the project duration
* To provide guidelines for adequate implementation and thereby assure that certain quality standards in the performance of our tasks are fulfilled.
* To define the quality requirements that must be obtained throughout the project lifecycle, those that the deliverables, actions and results must conform to.

# Project Management Structure/Responsibilities

## Organizational Structure/Roles

The management structure in the FOODQA project reflects the consortium’s determination to maintain focused goals and balanced activities among its members. The objective of the management procedures will be to optimize resources in terms of budgetary, strategic and technical efficiency.

The structure of the project management will consist of:

* **The Project Coordinator (PC) –** The Coordinator of the FoodQA Project (JUST-P1) is responsible for the overall operation of the project and its smooth running, financial and administrative management including the preparation of budget and reports, timeliness and accomplishment. The PC will supervise and coordinate all activities, ensuring that all partners are working towards the same objectives; contractually, technically and administratively. The PC will ensure that all partners’ contributions meet the Work Plan expectations.

The coordinator’s main responsibilities are the following:

* + To ensure the effective flow of information between partners,
  + To manage the project’s decision-making process,
  + To ensure the implementation of the agreed action plan to the agreed standards and deadlines,
  + To assure the project’s deliverables quality and of the processes leading to them,
  + To coordinate the technical/support activities for the Work Packages,
  + To serve as the only representative of the Consortium to the European Commission (EC),
  + To define and identify the project deliverables for the Commission from the inputs received by participants
  + To perform evaluation of the project activities and report on project progress to the National Agency and the EC,
  + To act as the Financial Officer within the Consortium and manage the preparation of financial statements for the EC.
* **The Project Steering Committee (StC) -** The StC, chaired by the PC, will be composed by one representative of each partner and will supervise the implementation of the whole programme.

The StC is the project operational decision-making and arbitration body, which will implement the provisions of the Grant Agreement and shall decide on the following matters:

* + strategic orientation of the project;
  + identification of the Foreground that could be the subject matter of protection and consequential decisions on dissemination and exploitation activities;
  + allocation of the co-ownership shares over Foreground obtained by several participants; acquisition of rights from third parties, if applicable;
  + take all decisions required for the successful progress of the project;
  + implement the scientific decisions and orientations, taken by the coordinator, by redefining the work plan and schedule and/or re-defining partner roles, contributions and budgets;
  + elaborate progress reports on the state of advancement of each work package; monitor any significant difference between planned and actual advancement of participants’ work, particularly with respect of project results and deliverables;
  + in case of default by a contractor, to propose to the Steering Committee to review participants roles and budget as well as any new entity to replace the defaulting contractor.

* **The Quality Committee and the Quality Manager -** In order to achieve the quality objectives of the project, a Quality Committee (QC), was formed during the kick-off meeting, and was composed of representatives from the partners:
  + P13-CRE.THI.DEV
  + P1-JUST
  + P4-BAU
  + P7-HTWK
  + P11-AUA

CRE.THI.DEV (P13) will also chair the QC as the Quality Manager (QM). The duty of the QC is to monitor and evaluate the progress of the project and to ensure that all its activities are carried out properly according to European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance and ensuring proper execution of the project to achieve its objective. The QC will design a proper evaluation process and be responsible for creating a set of indicators.

* **The Scientific Committee (SC),** iscomposed by the Leaders and Co-leaders of Scientific work packages; it will supervise all scientific activities, managing the actions of all partners, deciding appropriate strategies, monitoring the achievement of final results. The SC will plan the scientific activities through a specific plan and timetable, scheduling tasks and roles for the preparation and carry out of the scientific contents. SC will be also responsible for the training on research methodology. The members of the SC are representatives of the following partners:
  + P1 -JUST (JO)
  + P2 -UJ (JO)
  + P3 -MU (JO)
  + P4 -BAU (JO)
  + P6 -JFDA (JO)
  + P8 -UNiTE (IT)
  + P9 -UNIST (HR)
  + P10 -JU (JO)
  + P11 -AUA (GR)
  + P12 -P&B (PT)
  + P13 -CRE.THI.DEV
* The **Training and Technical Committee (TTG)** will be composed by representatives of all partners; it will be responsible for the preparation and carrying out of the training activities and will report its progress also to the coordinator. It will ensure an adequate balance between scientific, technological and transversal training through internal evaluation of training contents and guaranty its adequation to trainer, industrial and trainee needs.
* The **Industrial Committee** (national industrial representatives of all participant countries) will ensure that the skills requirements for the Trainers and students are defined on the basis of a consistent understanding of the industrial needs of food companies, to enhance the relevance of this Knowledge Alliance. It will also produce recommendations to guide the HEIs of the consortium and their students to i) create and develop innovative skills in food industry that will challenge the trainees ability ; ii) participate in designing of industrial materials that is required and highly demanded through the food industry ; iii) work together for the maintain of FoodQA project and centres by helping to define a robust exploitation strategy; iv) help in the spreading of the FoodQA initiative during and after the project through the industrial network and their own professional networks.
* **A Dissemination Committee** will ensure communication and dissemination activities.
* **The Work Package Leader (WPL) -** For each deliverable, one or more partners are defined as Work Package Leader/s (WPL), as more than one partner, depending on their role in the project, can be involved in the implementation of each Work Package and its subtasks. Each WPL will be responsible for the detailed co-ordination and reporting of the specific Work Package. If needed, meetings of the partners involved in the Work Package will be organized and chaired by the WPL. For each deliverable, within the Work Package, the WPL will assign direct responsibility either to himself or to an associate individual. The Work Package Leader is, in the first instance, the person who will be contacted by the PC as part of the monitoring of progress towards completion of the deliverables and of the assigned Work Package.

A partnership agreement (PA) explaining the terms, conditions, right, and duties of each partner will be signed between the PC and each partner representative. This agreement will be the reference in case of conflict; in case of conflicts, the coordinator will make decisions after discussing the matter with all partners. If the conflict is of strategic importance for the successful completion of the project it will be brought to the StC which will take the final decision after voting, with the vote of the coordinator counting double if necessary for achieving majority. In all cases, the PA will be the reference.

# Project Work Packages and Subtasks

The duration of the project is 36 months (15/10/2016 – 14/10/2019) and is comprised of 7 Work Packages. Each Work Package may contain one or more subtasks and these are described in the following table:

|  |
| --- |
| **WP1: PREPARATION – Development of training materials**  **Work Package Leader: P12 - P&B** |
| 1.1 Definition and validation of the book in e-form |
| 1.2 Definition and validation of structure of the videos |
| 1.3 Definition and validation of posters |
| 1.4 Production of e-book |
| 1.5 Production of videos |
| 1.6 Production of posters |
| 1.7 Validation of training materials |
| **WP2: DEVELOPMENT - Development of training courses**  **Work Package Leader: P8 - UNITE** |
| 2.1 Definitions of the educational dossiers and contents for the 8 training courses |
| 2.2 Developments of the 8 in-room training courses |
| 2.3 Validation of .material for the training courses |
| 2.4 Detailed definition of the model of e-learning courses |
| 2.5 Definition and validation of content of the 2 e-learning courses |
| 2.6 Development of the 2 e-learning courses |
| 2.7 Validation of the 2 e-learning courses |
| 2.8 Installations of the e-library and e-learning facilities |
| **WP3: DEVELOPMENT – Training of Academia and Industry**  **Work Package Leader: P5 - MONOJO** |
| 3.1 Preparation and organisation of the seminars |
| 3.2 Realisation of the seminars |
| 3.3 Preparation and organisation of the training courses |
| 3.4 Realisation of the training courses |
| **WP4: DEVELOPMENT – Pilot of implementation of food safety and quality management systems**  **Work Package Leader: P1 - JUST** |
| 4.1 Preparation of food safety and quality management systems |
| 4.2 Implementation of food safety and quality management systems |
| 4.3 Conduction of independent audits |
| 4.4 Establishment of possible correction action |
| **WP5: DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION – Dissemination**  **Work Package Leader: P7 - HTWK** |
| 5.1 Detailed definition of the structure of contents and requirements of the web portal. |
| 5.2 Development/validation of the architecture of the web-portal |
| 5.3 Development and validation of the web-portal |
| 5.4 Gathering information |
| 5.5 Project newsletter |
| 5.6 Definition of the academia-industry council |
| 5.7 Invitations to representatives for the council |
| 5.8 Council meeting |
| 5.9 Definition or the model of Associated of the FoodQA Centres |
| **WP6: QUALITY PLAN**  **Work Package Leader: P13 – CRE.THI.DEV** |
| 6.1 Establish the Quality committee |
| 6.2 Develop a monitoring, evaluation, and quality plan |
| 6.3 Write progress reports that elaborate the progress of the project and address it to the project coordinator |
| 6.4 Hire External Monitor |
| **WP7: MANAGEMENT – Management and Operational Structure**  **Work Package Leader: P1 - JUST** |
| 7.1 Kick-off meetings and Establishment of management and operational structures |
| 7.2 Establishment of Technical Committee (TC) |
| 7.3 Establishment of Training and Technical Group (TTG) |
| 7.4 Hiring External Auditors |
| 7.5 Financial and administrative Management |
| 7.6 Reports |
| 7.7 Consortium Meetings |

# Project Quality Assurance

The project quality is assured through the monitoring and evaluation of the quality of the project deliverables and of the processes that are used to develop the project activities and its deliverables.

## Quality of the project processes

The quality of the key project processes will be monitored and assessed through internal self-evaluation of the consortium by the project partners, according to table 1 below.

The evaluation is done by each partner, who must answer questions on a questionnaire with an assessment of the performance of the consortium and of the current state of the partnership. This internal evaluation will be performed 3 times during the lifecycle of the project, at the end of year one, year two and at the end of the project. The QM will evaluate the results and develop a progress report.

The QM will collect all the answers from the partners and integrate them into a report which will reflect the views of the consortium on its progress.

**The project evaluation is considered approved if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator**

In case the QM, upon processing the results finds that one or more are below the expected performance, notifies the PC in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

Table 1. Process Quality

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project process** | **Quality indicator / criteria** | **Quality control activity** | **Frequency / Date of evaluation** |
| *Project management and internal communication* | *Efficient follow-up of the project progress and adequacy of the internal communication process* | *Evaluation of project management quality by the participants of the project (****Internal evaluation******questionnaire****)* | *Every 18 months* |
| *Effective time management* | *Evaluation of progress through the* ***Progress Reports*** | *Every six months* |

## Quality of project deliverables

The deliverables of the FOODQA project are classified into tangible ones (document based), such as:

* printed and/or electronic publications,
* manuals,
* reports,
* methodologies,
* guidelines,
* plans,
* minutes,
* handbooks,
* promotional material

As well as intangible deliverables in the form of:

* meetings (partnership, stakeholders’ or other),
* organized events (such as multiplier events, trainings, conferences, etc.),
* established social media presence,
* developed and launched electronic platforms for training, communication, dissemination, file-sharing,
* competitions, challenges, etc.

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to the project objectives, timely delivery according to the time-schedule agreed in the project Work Plan and adequacy according to the quality criteria set out in Table 2, in conjunction with the information and indicators contained in the Logical Framework Matrix.

The key deliverables of the FOODQA project as identified in the Table 2, consisting of the results of the Work Packages, will be monitored according to the associated monitoring actions and assessed according to the quality indicators that are proposed.

It must be noted that the Table 2 includes only the outcomes for the FoodQA project that are considered key for the effective evaluation of quality of the project results. Therefore, some outcomes of Work Package subtasks are not included in the Table. However, in the regular quality reports that will be produced in the lifetime of the project, all aspects of the project will be evaluated, against the expressed goals and objectives of the project, as these have been expressed in the Application Form and the Grant Agreement.

### Internal review/evaluation process for document deliverables

Tangible or document deliverables undergo an internal review process of evaluation by nominated reviewer(s), internal or external. In all cases, the reviewer(s) is/are person(s) not directly associated with the work carried out for the relevant task of the Work Package in question. The deliverables for which a internal review is required, as well as the reviewer(s) nominated for each deliverable are shown in Table 2.

The review process is schematically shown below:

When a deliverable is finished, the author sends the “draft version” of the relevant document to the WPL for an initial evaluation. The WPL examines the deliverable for its compliance with the ***Document Template*** and the general objectives of the project. After the document is approved by the WPL, it is sent to the reviewer(s) who check(s) it for its completeness, clarity and comprehensiveness, using the ***Deliverable Evaluation*** document which is placed in the Quality Management Dropbox folder.

The reviewer(s) must verify whether the deliverable satisfies the requirements, description, or objective, identify problems and/or deviations from requirements and suggest improvements to author.

Internal review evaluations should include the following information:

* General comments:
  + - Thoroughness of contents
    - Correspondence to project objectives
* Specific comments:
  + - Relevance
    - Format (layout, spelling, etc.)
* Suggested actions:
  + - Changes that should be implemented
    - Missing information
    - Further improvements

The reviewer(s) send(s) the evaluation to the WPL and the author who is then responsible for amending the document according to the review results, if needed. The time for this amendment is set according to the time schedule already agreed upon by the partners. Once the document is amended (if needed) its revised version is sent by the WPL to all members of the consortium. The document that is finally approved takes the status of “final version/version 1” and is included by the PC in the formal Workplan and/or progress report of the project.

Depending on the deliverable, other means of evaluation may be used (such as minutes of meetings, contracts, etc), according to Table 2.

### Meeting and event evaluations

Meeting and event evaluations will be done by all participants. At the end of each meeting and event organized by and/or for the partnership, a relevant questionnairewill be completed by the participants**.** Standard questionnaires will be used, one for partner meetings (***Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire)*** and one for events (***Event Evaluation Questionnaire)*.**

The partnership meeting questionnaires will be delivered using an online digital survey tool that allows respondents to remain anonymous in order to collect quantitative and qualitative data.

The event evaluations will be done on the spot using hardcopies of the standard document.

A 5-point Likert scale will be used wherever possible. A summary of the data collected, including suggestions for changes and improvements will be compiled after each meeting or event.

**The meeting/event is considered approved if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.**

### Training evaluations

Evaluations for deliverables like training courses, seminars, practical training, etc shall be done by the trainees/participants, using the appropriate questionnaire ***Training Evaluation Questionnaire*** as shown in Table 2. The evaluations will be done on the spot, after the end of the traininings/seminars, using hardcopies of the standard document.

A 5-point Likert scale will be used wherever possible. A summary of the data collected, including suggestions for changes and improvements will be compiled after each meeting or event.

**The training is considered approved if the percentage of agreement is more than 70% of weighted answers with score ≥ 3. Scores less than this will require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.**

### Other intangible deliverables

Other project deliverables, such as the e-library and the FoodQA web portal, will be evaluated according to the criteria that are set in table 2, with a focus on the overall quality of the deliverable and the usability and the added value to the final users.

Table 2. Activities monitoring and evaluation

| **Activity** | **Deliverable** | **Type of deliverable** | **Method of Evaluation** | **Quality indicator/criteria** | **Frequency /dates of evaluation** | **Reviewer(s)** | **Review using** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***WP1: PREPARATION – Development of training materials***  ***Work Package Leader: P12 - P&B*** | | | | | | |  |
| *1.1 Definition and validation of the book in e-form* | E-book structure | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *E-book structure for each topic* | *After development* | *All TTG partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.2 Definition and validation of structure of the videos* | Video scripts | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Video scripts for each topic* | *After development* | *All TTG partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.3 Definition and validation of posters* | Poster structure | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Poster structure for each topic* | *After development* | *All TTG partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.4 Production of e-book* | E-book (1) | *Document* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* * *see WP1.7* | * *1 x E-book* * *E-book content approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | * *All TTG partners* * *Academia –industry council* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.5 Production of videos* | Videos (5) | *Videos* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* * *see WP1.7* | * *5 x Videos* * *Videos content approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | * *All TTG partners* * *Academia –industry council* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.6 Production of posters* | Posters (8) | *Document* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* * *see WP1.7* | * *8 x Posters* * *Posters content approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | * *All TTG partners* * *Academia –industry council* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *1.7 Validation of training materials* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| ***WP2: DEVELOPMENT - Development of training courses***  ***Work Package Leader: P8 - UNITE*** | | | | | | |  |
| *2.1 Definitions of the educational dossiers and contents for the 8 training courses* | Dossier structure | *Document* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* * *see WP2.3* | *Dossier structure for each topic for 8 x Training courses* | *After development* | *All TTG partners*  *Academia –industry council*  *Trainees through the pilot training* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *2.2 Development of the 8 in-room training courses* | Material for training courses (8) | *Document* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* * *see WP2.3* | * *Material for 8 x Training courses* * *Training material content approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | * *All TTG partners* * *Academia –industry council* * *Trainees through the pilot training* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *2.3 Validation of material for the training courses* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *2.4 Detailed definition of the model of e-learning courses* | Model of e-learning | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | * *1 x model* * *Content approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | *All TTG partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *2.5 Definition and validation of content of the e-learning courses* | Material for e-learning training (3) | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | * *Material for 3 x e-learning courses* * *E-learning contents approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | *All TTG partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *2.6 Development of the e-learning courses* | e-learning courses development (3) |  | * *External validation* * *Acc.to WP2.7* | * *3 x e-learning courses* * *E-learning contents approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | * *Academia –industry council* * *Trainees through the pilot training* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *2.7 Validation of the e-learning courses* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *2.8 Installations of the e-library and e-learning facilities* | E-library & e-learning infrastructure  (E-learning platform will be a part of the website development) | *Equipment* | *Internal evaluation* | * *5 x Servers installed in all Universities/FoodQA centres* * *Items received match the description in the Application Form and fulfil the project objectives* | *After the installation* | *JUST* | ***List of equipment/ Shipment bulletin/ Purchase proofs*** |
| ***WP3: DEVELOPMENT – Training of Academia and Industry***  ***Work Package Leader: P5 - MONOJO*** | | | | | | |  |
| *3.1 Preparation and organisation of the seminars* | Seminars (5) | *Training* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *3.2 Realisation of the seminars (in Jordan, Germany, Croatia, Greece, and Italy)* | Seminars (5) | *Training* | *External Evaluation by the trainees* | * *5 x Half-day Seminars* * *Positive feedback (Satisfaction>70% for answers ≥3)* | *After training* | *Trainees/ Participants* | ***TEF -Training evaluation questionnaire*** |
| *3.2 Preparation and organisation of the training courses* | Training courses (10) | *Training* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *3.4 Realisation of the training courses (in Jordan, Germany, Croatia, Greece, and Italy)* | Training courses (10) | *Training* | *External Evaluation by the trainees* | * *10 x training courses* * *Positive feedback (Satisfaction>70% for answers ≥3)* | *After training* | *Trainees/ Participants* | ***TEF -Training evaluation questionnaire*** |
| ***WP4: DEVELOPMENT – Pilot of implementation of food safety and quality management systems***  ***Work Package Leader: P1 - JUST*** | | | | | | |  |
| *4.1 Preparation of food safety and quality management systems* | Criteria for the selection of companies | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Deliverable* ***content*** *approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | *All Jordanian partners* | ***DEF –Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *4.2 Implementation of food safety and quality management systems (pilot)* | Successful implementation of the Food Safety & QM systems in the 8 companies  (via WP4.3Conduction of independent audits & WP4.4Establishment of possible correction action) | *Training Report* | *Internal evaluation* | * *1 Year of pilot implementation for 8 companies* * *Successful implementation of the Food Safety & QM systems in the 8 companies= 8 positive audits carried out in 8 companies* * *8 x correction action plans implemented by companies* | *After the conclusion of the implementation of the Food Safety & QM systems* | *Selected Partners (to be specified)* | ***Audit reports+ TRQMS*** *-****Training Report for the Evaluation of the effectiveness of the training for Food Safety & QM systems*** |
| *4.3 Conduction of independent audits* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *4.4 establishment of possible correction action* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| ***WP5: DISSEMINATION & EXPLOITATION – Dissemination***  ***Work Package Leader: P7 - HTWK*** | | | | | | |  |
| *5.1 Detailed definition of the structure of contents and requirements of the web portal.* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *5.2 Development/validation of the architecture of the web-portal* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *5.4 Gathering information* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *5.3 Development and validation of the Web -portal* | Web-portal | *Website* | * *Internal evaluation validation* * *External validation* | *Positive feedback (Satisfaction>70% for answers ≥3)* | *After development* | *Internal evaluation validation by JUST & selected partners*  *External validation by AIC* | ***WPEF-Web Portal Evaluation Form*** |
| *5.5 Project newsletter information and news linked to the project* | Newsletters | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | * *Deliverable* ***content*** *approved by reviewer(s)* * *Accordance to Dissemination Plan* | *After development, before distribution* | *All partners* | ***DEF-Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *5.6 Definition of the academia-industry council* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *5.7 Invitations to representatives for the council* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *5.6, 5.7, 5.8 Academia-Industry Council meeting* | *Academia-Industry Council meetings* | *Meeting* | *Meeting evaluation* | *Positive feedback (Satisfaction>70% for answers ≥3)* | *After the meeting* | *All participants in the AIC* | ***MEF-Meeting Evaluation Form*** |
| *5.9 Definition or the model for the Associations of the FoodQA Centres* | Model for the Associations | *Document* | * *Internal evaluation* * *External validation* | *Deliverable* ***content*** *approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | *All*  *Members of the AIC* | ***DEF-Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| ***WP6: QUALITY PLAN***  ***Work Package Leader: P13 – CRE.THI.DEV*** | | | | | | |  |
| *6.1 Establish the Quality committee* | Kickoff meeting minutes |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***Kickoff meeting minutes*** |
| *6.2 Develop a monitoring, evaluation, and quality plan* | Quality plan | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Deliverable* ***content*** *approved by reviewer(s)* | *After development* | *Members of the Quality Committee* | ***DEF-Deliverable Evaluation Form*** |
| *6.3 Write progress reports that elaborate the progress of the project* | Progress reports (6)  Evaluation reports (2) | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | * *6 x progress reports* * *2 x Quality Evaluation reports* | *Every 6 months for the progress*  *Evaluation at midterm and at the end* | *Members of the Quality Committee* | ***Progress Reports***  ***Evaluation Reports*** |
| *6.4 Hire External Monitor* | External Quality Audit |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***External Monitor Report*** |
| ***WP7: MANAGEMENT – Management and Operational Structure*** | | | | | | |  |
| *7.1 Establishment of management and operational structures* | Project Meeting Minutes | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***Kickoff meeting minutes*** |
| *7.2 Establishment of Technical Committee (TC)* | Project Meeting Minutes | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***Kickoff meeting minutes*** |
| *7.3 Establishment of Training and Technical Group (TTG)* | Project Meeting Minutes | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***Kickoff meeting minutes*** |
| *7.4 Hiring External Auditors* | External Financial Audit | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***External Auditor Report*** |
| *7.5 Financial and administrative Management* |  |  | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***N/A*** |
| *7.6 Reports* | Reports | *Document* | *Internal evaluation* | *Accomplishment of task* | *At the next progress report* | *QM* | ***Reports*** |
| *7.7 Consortium Meetings* | Project Meetings | *Meeting* | *Internal evaluation* | *Positive feedback (Satisfaction>70% for answers ≥3)* | *After each meeting* | *All participants* | ***MEF-Meeting Evaluation Form*** |

### Reports

Every 6 months, a progress evaluation will be carried out, in order to ascertain the progress of the project outcomes. The results will be forwarded to the Project Coordinator for review.

At midterm, a Quality Report will be developed, based on the results of the scheduled investigations and evaluations, as pointed out in Table 2, with the responsibility of the Quality Manager. The Quality Report will be the basis for any corrective or adaptive measures, should there be a need. The Quality Report will be submitted to the partnership for approval.

## Monitoring

To effectively monitor the performance of the project deliverables and work packages, a form will be used, the Work Packages Monitoring Form. The form will be maintained, in an excel spreadsheet, by the Project Coordinator.

## Document Control

### Document Storage and Accessibility

All documents are to be stored in a shared workspace for visibility and use for all partners when needed.

Documents are to be stored in specific folders, accessible to all partners, categorised according to the denomination of the Work Package from which they originated. This means that there will be a folder for each Work Package.

Regarding project management activities (WP7), Quality (WP6) and Dissemination (WP5), the dedicated folders with the following recommended structure and contents:

* WP7-Management
  + Application Form
  + Management plan (detailed workplan)
  + Budget – Financial area (project budget, timesheet templates, report templates, etc)
  + Communication (contact list)
  + Meetings (meeting agendas, minutes, presentations)
    - Kickoff meeting
    - 2nd meeting
    - 3rd meeting
    - ….
  + Reports
* WP6-Quality management & evaluation
  + Quality  plan
  + Evaluation reports
* WP5-Dissemination
  + Dissemination plan
  + Newsletters

Project Work Packages will be stored in the relevant folders in the shared and will include the deliverables, subtask results etc. The Work Package folders will be named after their respective titles:

### Document Format

All documents essential to the progress of the project must be named using their title, version number, status (draft or final) and the relevant code of the deliverable.

Example: FOODQA-QualityPlan-v01-draft

If there are several editions of a document (eg a newsletter), a reference number at the end of the title is necessary (R1-R2-etc).

Example: FOODQA-Newsletter-R1-v01-draft

In communication, the documents can simply be referred to with their title and their sequential reference number (if any), for example “Quality Plan” or “Newsletter R3”.

All documents produced for the project will be saved in MS Word, MS Excel or MS PowerPoint compatible file types. **The document Template and the Sheet Template provided will be the base for all produced documents for the deliverables of the FoodQA project** and will be available to all partners, posted as a separate document in the Quality Management folder in Dropbox.

Templates of the documents to be used for the internal evaluation of deliverables, meeting evaluations, event evaluations shall also be placed in the Quality Management Dropbox folder and are listed in the Annex of this document.

Final versions of documents should be marked as final and uploaded to Dropbox in read-only format.

Documents or other material that is addressed to the public (informative material, brochures, leaflets, posters, presentations, DVDs etc) must bear appropriate logos and disclaimers, according to EC projects visual identity requirements.

The documents that fall under these rules include all products of the project, such as deliverables, progress reports, minutes, Quality plan, management plans, etc.

All produced documents will be assigned a distribution/access level: Partnership (Confidential), Public, or restricted to certain recipients.

## Communication

Communication between the members of the consortium, between the PC and the National Agency and between the PC and the European Commission is very crucial for the successful implementation of FOODQA project.

Day by day communication is conducted by e-mail, telephone conversations and skype meetings when deemed necessary. For the avoidance of any confusion, special attention is paid to the clear drafting of the subject of the e-mail.

In general, all information relevant to the project is sent to the PC, who then forwards it to the partners involved in the specific action(s).

Direct partner/partner communications flows will be set up in those cases where an increase in efficiency can be achieved.

External communication with the National Agency for ERASMUS+ and with the European Commission is the responsibility of the PC. This communication takes place mainly by e-mail, telephone conversations and face-to-face discussions when it is needed.

### Meetings

Meetings are important to ensure the progress of and to maintain the technical and social relationships among the partners in the project.

Decisions in partner meetings will be made based on simple majority should consensus not be reached. If the distribution of votes is even, the PC vote decides.

### Exchange of Documents, Correspondence

All documents and computer data files should be exchanged as much as possible via the Dropbox workspace. Partners should notify via e-mail when a file has been added or changed.

# Attached Documents

The following documents (forms and templates to be used for the purposes of quality of the project) are an integral part of the Quality Plan:

1. PEF - Internal Project Evaluation Form

2. MEF - Meeting Evaluation Form

3. EEF - Event Evaluation Form

4. TEF -Training Evaluation Form

5. DEF - Deliverable Evaluation Form

6. TRQMS-Training Report (for the Evaluation of the effectiveness of the training for Food Safety & QM systems)

7. WPEF-Web Portal Evaluation Form

8. Document Template

9. Sheet Template

10. Work package monitoring form.