



Internal Monitoring Report

Project Acronym:	WBCInno
Project full title:	Modernization of WBC universities through strengthening of structures and services for knowledge transfer, research and innovation
Project No:	530213-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-RS-TEMPUS-JPHES
Funding Scheme:	TEMPUS
Coordinator:	UKG – University of Kragujevac
Project start date:	October 15, 2012
Project duration:	36 months

Abstract	This report gives an overview on the implemented quality management within the project WBCInno by project partners and its compliance with the defined Quality management procedures (Quality Control Manual). It specifically elaborates whether the processes for planning and executing the project activities are respected in order to ensure the highest possible quality and outputs.
----------	--

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title of Document:	Internal Monitoring Report
Work Package:	WP5 Quality Plan
Last version date:	05/10/2015
Status :	First Draft
Document Version:	v.01
File Name	Internal monitoring report_v01.docx
Number of Pages	
Dissemination Level	Internal (Institutional) - RESTRICTED

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Responsible Partner
v.01	05/10/2015	Creation of document	ZSI (Ines Marinkovic)
v.02	31.01.2016	Revision	BIC (Vojislav Veljkovic)

TABLE OF CONTENT

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET	2
VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY	2
TABLE OF CONTENT	3
1. Internal monitoring	4
1.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy.....	4
1.2. Quality responsibilities	5
1.2.1. Task Leader (main author of the deliverable).....	5
1.2.2. Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors.....	6
1.2.3. WP Leader.....	6
1.2.4. Quality Assurance Project Team (QAPT).....	6
1.2.5. Project Coordinator.....	7
1.2.6. Steering Committee (SC).....	7
1.3. Common templates and formats	7
1.4. Quality feedback by the target groups.....	7
1.5. Project Risk Management.....	8
1.5.1. Practical approach of risk identification	9
1.5.2. Risks / Uncertainties Monitoring procedure.....	9

1. Internal monitoring

According to the Quality Assurance Manual prepared in the first months of the WBCInno project, internal monitoring was carried out by all partners, including self-evaluation by using the LFM, Workplan, budget and cash flow tables, SC meetings, monitoring visits of the QAPT and questionnaires / satisfaction surveys of target groups. The following templates were prepared additionally to QA Manual in order to support the implementation of the project:

- Annex A Quality Assurance Check List for deliverables / activities
- Annex B Word Template for project document deliverables
- Annex C PowerPoint Template for project presentations
- Annex D Attendance Sheet Template for different meetings / events
- Annex E Word Template for Minutes of different meetings / events
- Annex F Participant Feedback Form Template for different meetings / events
- Annex G External Monitoring Report
- Annex H Event Report Template for different meetings / events
- Annex I Risk Management: Monitoring Sheet
- Annex J Excel Template for monitoring deliverables and reviews

Furthermore, both - the WBCInno internal platform (<https://wbcinno.datastation.com>) and WBCInno external platform (<http://www.wbc-inno.kg.ac.rs/>) were used for monitoring of project activities. The internal platform was also used to monitor partners' technical and financial reporting.

The internal monitoring report at hand provides more in detail information and assessment of activities implemented to assure smooth project execution.

1.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy

For the development of the **University Innovation Platform**, development strategies, methodologies for innovation management, training programmes and publications, four-stage control procedures were applied: from team member to WP leader, then to the coordinator and after that to the SC for final approval .

The Quality Assurance in WBCInno included four levels of quality control (1) Deliverable authors, Task-, and WP-leaders, (2) Deliverable reviewers, (3) Coordinator level, and (4) Steering Committee level and final approval:

1. Deliverable authors, task and WP leaders:

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project were a joint responsibility of the associated Task Leader and his/her team, further partners involved in the activity and of the corresponding WP leader, guaranteeing the quality and timeliness of the deliverable as identified in Application Form and WP action plans (modified and agreed by the SC on six-month basis). "Final draft deliverable" was then presented to the QAPT (i.e. the deliverable reviewers).

2. Deliverable reviewers (QAPT and Advisory Team):

The 2nd level of control was elaborated by at least two assigned reviewers of the QAPT who are not leaders of Task/WP within which the deliverable is produced. The reviewers had 5 working days to respond by sending comments using the template for the quality assurance check list

(Annex A). The deliverable authors had 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer comments or send their written objections. In this case the reviewers had another 5 days to send back their final comments.

In case profound disagreements between reviewers and Task leaders arose, the 3rd level control of the deliverables allowed the coordinator to have a final say – while he may also involve the rest of the consortium if deemed necessary.

3. Coordinator level:

The 3rd level control was carried out by the Coordinator. If a draft deliverable has not passed the 2nd level control and there are disagreements between the deliverable authors and the reviewers, the Coordinator takes the necessary corrective actions in order to come up with acceptable deliverables. If necessary the Coordinator may involve the rest of the consortium. A draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control was checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it was forwarded to the Steering Committee for formal approval.

4. Steering Committee level and final approval:

The 4th level control was elaborated at the Steering Committee level. The Steering Committee is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the approval of major deliverables.

It was possible to include a deliverable in the project reports even if its formal approval is still pending, if it has passed the 2nd and 3rd level of control without profound disagreements as then no major alterations were expected.

All partners also establish internal quality control mechanisms, i.e. the site manager always checks the output of his co-workers before sending documents to the WBCInno team or before uploading them on the project communication tools.

These four stages of the Quality control in WBCInno project have been respected throughout the project. No major alterations to deliverables were made. However, where necessary, on the second control level assigned reviewers commented on the quality of the deliverables. Internal quality control was established within all partner institutions. Random check of the pre adopted (draft) documents on the Innovation platform by the WP and Task leaders show that all partners followed the procedures set in the quality manual. Furthermore, the final versions of the documents / deliverables were adopted at the Steering committee level with the consent of all project partners.

1.2. Quality responsibilities

Different roles were identified with reference to the development of the project activities and in particular the project quality assurance procedures. Different responsibilities were associated with the different roles and are listed below.

1.2.1. *Task Leader (main author of the deliverable)*

- Is responsible for coordinating the development of the deliverable(s) according to the deliverable template.
- Is responsible for assigning parts of the work leading to the deliverable to the other partners involved in the activity.
- Is responsible for coordinating the work of the other partners involved in the task, providing guidance when necessary.

- Is responsible for aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the task, in order to produce the deliverable.
- Is responsible for the submission of the draft deliverable via WBCInno platform to the WP leader (1st level control), the QAPT (2nd level control) and the coordinator (3rd level control).
- Is responsible for implementing the suggestions of the QAPT team, assigning certain amendments to the other partners contributing to the task as appropriate.
- Is responsible for sending the amended draft deliverable.
- Reports to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.
- Cooperates with the WP Leader and the other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in conformity with other activities and that any cross-task inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the Steering Committee as recorded in the respective minutes).

1.2.2. *Other partners involved in the activity, co-authors*

- Are responsible for the production of their part in the deliverable according to the Task Leader's instructions.
- Make sure that their written contributions comply with the Deliverables' Document Template so that to ensure that the Task Leader will be able to put all contributions together in the desirable format.
- Are responsible for providing to the Task Leader all the complementary information regarding their work (i.e. references, bibliography, methodologies used, contact details of people interviewed etc.)
- Are responsible to implement amendments to their contribution as a result of the amendments requested by the QAPT team, after consulting with the Task Leader.

1.2.3. *WP Leader*

- Is responsible for preparing and updating of WP Action plan, making sure that all activities are in the time frame defined
- Is responsible for coordinating the Work Package and ensuring that all the activities are contributing to the WP's objectives.
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders and the coordinator in ensuring that all of the contributing partners are smoothly cooperating with a view to accomplish the WP's objectives and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the project description.
- Sends alerts in time to remind about submission deadlines and the procedures to be followed and provides input and suggestions to the Task Leaders of the WP during the development of the relevant deliverables.
- Provides to the Task Leaders comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables (1st level control).
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders in ensuring the implementation of the suggestions of the QAPT team (2nd and 3rd level control).
- Verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations.

1.2.4. *Quality Assurance Project Team (QAPT)*

- Is coordinated by the QAPT manager, as agreed by the Steering Committee at the Kick-off meeting.

- Is responsible for the Quality Assurance exercise of deliverables.
- Receives each draft deliverable from the Task Leader and provides feedback using the Quality Assurance Check List.
- Sends the Quality Assurance Check List to the Task Leader and the Coordinator.
- Verifies the satisfactory implementation of the recommendations included in the Quality Assurance Check List, in co-operation with the WP Leader.
- Cooperates with the Project Coordinator on general issues related to the level of quality of the project's deliverables as appropriate.

1.2.5. *Project Coordinator*

- Cooperates with the QAPT and the Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables.
- Accepts the deliverable or provides final comments to the Task Leaders and WP Leaders (3rd level control).
- Cooperates with the WP Leaders in order to ensure that all WPs are progressing in conformity with each other and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description.
- Informs the QAPT, the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related WorkPlan or any implicit changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables.
- Officially submits all approved deliverables after their approval (4th level control).

1.2.6. *Steering Committee (SC)*

- Officially approves and finally accepts the deliverables for their submission.

ZSI, as WP5 Leader, is responsible for the elaboration of the Quality Control and Monitoring Manual along with the Project Coordinator and QAPT team as well as for its application in the different project activities.

1.3. Common templates and formats

All document based deliverables had been drafted based on a common MS Word format. This format was adopted by the SC in order to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as ensuring that a minimum amount of information appears consistently in all documents produced by the project. This was not relevant to deliverables that by their nature need to have a different format (i.e. project brochures, newsletters).

The document template was given in Annex B of QCM manual as a separate document which and was also available on the WBCInno platform.

All presentations were based on a common MS PowerPoint template. The template was provided in Annex C as a separate document which is also available on the WBCInno platform.

For the professional execution of meetings also some other templates have been developed to record the attendance and minutes of the meeting (provided in Annex D and Annex E as separate documents for download).

1.4. Quality feedback by the target groups

The satisfaction of stakeholders, beneficiaries and end users was investigated, taking into account a variety of information from different sources using visits, interviews, questionnaires to target groups and consultation with the project beneficiaries.

In order to allow the impact assessment of the project activities, a template for feedback for different meetings / events had been developed and adapted to the specific needs with main features remaining. This form was provided in Annex F as a separate document which was also available on the WBCInno platform.

Furthermore, a specific event report template has been developed which is to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all WBCInno events (open door events, workshops, info days etc. – except SC meetings). Furthermore, this template was used to inform colleagues and partners about other events attended (promoting WBCInno). This form was provided in Annex H as a separate document which was also available for download from the WBCInno platform.

1.5. Project Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment was carried and reviewed out during the Steering Committee meetings (Risk brainstorming) which lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the WorkPlan based on a sound process.

The risk management strategy addressed issues that could potentially endanger the achievement of the overall goal of the project and its objectives considering potential financial risks (overspending and underspending), timing (postponing and preponing of activities / deliverables), performance risks (project management), and sustainability of the project developments. The main aim was to provide a sound assessment, to anticipate challenges in a systematic way and to minimize the potentially negative overall impact.

The identification and assessment of new risks was a joint responsibility of all project partners who had to communicate them to the Coordinator and the rest of the partnership, eventually suggesting also possible interventions and solutions, as soon as they got aware of those risks. In particular, partners could have applied preventive actions (avoiding that the risk occurs) and corrective actions (decreasing the severity and impact), specifying also the resources that would be needed.

The Steering Committee had a possibility to react in several ways, ranging from the simple acceptance of the situation in the case of negligible risks, to the enforcement of a mitigation plan including alternatives, workarounds and the proposed corrective actions that will make the risk consequences acceptable for the consortium.

Also the external reviewer was involved in the risk management, to assess if there is a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators and if there is a risk that project partners will not be able to spend all the money according to the Partner budget table.

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of utmost importance. There are several possible risks connected: 1) the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan; 2) the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality; 3) an underspending during the project implementation (also causing a shift in the headings' ratio), meaning that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables, yet the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated; etc.

The project partners all had to ensure that they allocated the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

1.5.1. *Practical approach of risk identification*

The first step in project risk management is to identify the risks that are present in a project. The risks should furthermore be identified as early as possible in order to deal with them properly and to think about corrective and/or preventive actions.

In order to identify and monitor the risks within WBCInno project, a monitoring sheet for risks has been developed including the information on corrective and/or preventive actions (Annex I).

1.5.2. *Risks / Uncertainties Monitoring procedure*

- WP leaders (or Task leaders) **identify possible risks/uncertainties** in their WP and fill in the template (Annex I).
- The **risks monitoring templates (Annex I) are communicated** to QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (ZSI) + Project coordinator (UKG)
- QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (ZSI) + Project Coordinator (UKG) **register, analyses and priorities risks/uncertainties**
- QAPT Team + WP5 Leader (ZSI) + Project Coordinator (UKG) **plans and implements risk responses.**

Steering Committee meetings had a risk brainstorming sessions basing on the Annex I template. After each Steering Committee meeting this template was updated by QAPT Team.

Number of project		530213-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-RS-TEMPUS-JPHES	
Visit completed by		Signature	
1. Project partner information			
1.1. Name			
2. Visit information			
2.1. Location of visit (country, street, number)			
2.2. Date of visit			
2.3. Contact person	Name	Position	
3. Summary of progress to date			
3.1.	Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule		
3.2.	Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix		
3.3.	Is there a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators? (if yes, please describe what corrective actions can be taken)		
3.4.	Is there a risk that the Project partner will not be able to spent the all the money according to the Partner budget table?		

4. Description and status of the activities within project workplan			
<p>Generally, is the project proceeding in accordance with the workplan? Specifically, which activities have not taken place which should have according to the workplan? What is the level of risk of the project not being completed on time or to the intended standard?</p>			
5. Progress against indicators			
<i>Outputs/ outcomes</i>	<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Achieved to date</i>	<i>Plan to achieve indicator</i>
DEV1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV2	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV3	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV4	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
QPLN1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DISS1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
EXP1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
MNGT1	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
	2.		
	3.		
6. Finance			
<p>6.1. Is the Project partner obtaining all necessary supporting documentation and storing this properly? If not, what action will the Project partner take to rectify the solution?</p>			
<p>6.2. Is the Project partner experiencing any problems in terms of cash flow? This includes any problems caused by delays with payment from the UKG?</p>			
<p>6.3. Are any underspends or overspends anticipated? For overspends, what is the solution to</p>			

keep within Partner budget table? For underspends, are there proposals for how this can be used?

6.4. Other

7. Main problems encountered and recommendations

<i>Related to</i>	<i>Description of problem</i>	<i>Project partner Solution/s and/or recommendation/s</i>
Procurement/installation		
Development of strategic documents		
Implementation of strategies		
Delivery of trainings and services		
Marketing/public relations		
Technical and financial reporting		
Relations with Project coordinator, PST and QAPT team		
Other		

Report received by the Project partner

I confirm that I have received and read the monitoring report

Name		Date	
Scheduled date of next visit			
Personnel to be present from the Project partner			
1.			
2.			
3.			

Conclusion:

After performing internal monitoring of documents produced within the WPs, we can draw a conclusion that all project partners used the guidelines and templates provided in the **“Quality control and monitoring manual”**, thus ensuring the high quality project performance. Furthermore, it can be concluded that all WP leaders and task leaders applied their internal monitoring procedures.

All presentations of the deliverable by associated task leader and his/her team, further partners involved in the activity and of the corresponding WP leader (in accordance with **Annex J to QCM Plan_INTERNAL_List of deliverables_reviews**) are adopted by the Project Steering Committee while Final documents / deliverables can be found on project web site www.wbc-inno.kg.ac.rs under Project results and on Datastation platform which was used a project coordination tool.