PLUG-N-HARVEST

Plug-n-play passive and active multi-modal energy Harvesting systems, circular economy by design, with high replicability for Self-sufficient Districts & Near-Zero Buildings

768735, H2020-EEB-2017

Deliverable D7.2.1:

Quality Assessment Plan

Deliverable Version:	D7.2.1, v.1.0
Document Identifier:	d7.2.1_quality_ assessment_plan_v1.0
Preparation Date:	March 14, 2018
Document Status:	Final
Author(s):	Iakovos Michailidis, Christos Ravanis, Kyriaki Alexandridou, Elias Kosmatopoulos
Dissemination Level:	PU - Public

Project funded by the European Union in the H2020 Framework Programme

H2020-EEB-07-2017 - Integration of energy harvesting at building and district level

Deliverable SUMMARY SHEET

Deliverable Details	
Type of Document:	Deliverable
Document Reference #:	D7.2.1
Title:	Quality Assessment Plan
Version Number:	1.0
Preparation Date:	March 14, 2018
Delivery Date:	February 28, 2018
Author(s):	Iakovos Michailidis, Christos Ravanis, Kyriaki Alexandridou, Elias Kosmatopoulos
Document Identifier:	d7.2.1_quality_ assessment_plan_v1.0
Document Status:	Final
Dissemination Level:	PU - Public

Project Details	
Project Acronym:	PLUG-N-HARVEST
Project Title:	Plug-n-play passive and active multi-modal energy Harvesting systems, circular economy by design, with high replicability for Self-sufficient Districts & Near-Zero Buildings
Project Number:	768735
Call Identifier:	H2020-EEB-2017
Call Theme:	**Integration of energy harvesting at building and district level**
Project Coordinator:	Centre for Research and Technology Hellas (CERTH)
Participating Partners:	CERTH – Centre for Research and Technology Hellas – Greece RWTH – RWTH Aachen University – Germany CU - Cardiff University – United Kingdom ALUMIL – Alumil Aluminium Industry S.A. – Greece AIGUASOL – Sistems Avancats d' Energia Solar Termica SCCL – Spain ODINS – Odin Solutions S.L – Spain SIE – Siemens SLR – Romania ETRA – Etra Investigacion y Desarrollo S.A. – Spain ET – Energy Transitions Limited – United Kingdom EIG – Eco Intelligent Growth – Spain

	AHC – Agencia de l'Habitatge de Catalunya – Spain RWM – Region of Western Macedonia – Greece CCC – County Council of the City and County of Cardiff – United Kingdom
Instrument:	
Contract Start Date:	September 1, 2017
Duration:	51 Months

Deliverable D7.2.1: Short Description

The purpose of the Quality Assessment Plan (QAP) is to describe the actions and measures that will be taken by the Consortium, in order to ensure the high-quality level of the project outcomes and its full conformance with its contractual requirements

Keywords: Quality Assessment Plan, Quality Plan, Project Management, Deliverable 7.2, PLUG-N-HARVEST

Deliverable D7.2.1: Revision History

Version:	Date:	Status:	Comments
0.1	22/02/2018	Draft	Structure by Iakovos Michailidis, Christos Ravanis, Kyriaki Alexandridou, Elias Kosmatopoulos
0.2	07/03/2018	Draft	Inputs by EIG
0.3	12/03/2018	Draft	Inputs by AIGUASOL
0.4	13/03/2018	Draft	Inputs by RWTH
1.0	14/03/2018	Final	Final version by Iakovos Michailidis, Christos Ravanis, Kyriaki Alexandridou, Elias Kosmatopoulos

Copyright notices

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of ABREBIATIONS

Abbreviation	Definition
ABDE	Adaptable/Dynamic Building Envelopes
ADO	Administration Office
CCBE	Conventional Controllable Building Elements
DoA	Description of Action
EAB	Ethical Advisory Board
ERA	European Research Area
EU	European Union
FTP	File Transfer Protocol
ICT	Information & Communication Technologies
IMCS	Intelligent Management and Control System
IPR	Intellectual Property Rights
OEMS	Optimal Energy Management System
PB	Plenary Board
PM	Person-Month
QAM	Quality Assurance Manager
QCB	Quality Control Board
QMR	Quarterly Management Report
QAP	Quality Assessment Plan
SIM	Scientific and Innovation Manager
SAB	Scientific Advisory Board
SC	Steering Committee
SIB	Scientific Innovation Board
STREP	Specific Targeted Research Project
SVN	Subversion
WP	Work Package

1 Quality Assessment Plan

1.1 Quality Control of the Project

Quality planning and control is an integral part of the success of a project. The purpose of the Quality Assessment Plan (QAP) is to describe the actions and measures that will be taken by the Consortium, in order to ensure the high-quality level of the project outcomes and its full conformance with its contractual requirements. Based on the QAP, the QCB will ensure that:

- the contract requirements and conditions have been reviewed
- effective quality planning has taken place
- the quality system is appropriate.

The QCB ensures that the QAP is available to all concerned and that its requirements are met.

This section specifies the activities to be implemented, including their sequence, in order to ensure that the project and its deliverables conform to its requirements. Those responsible for ensuring that the required activities are carried out, and the resources, which are crucial for their successful completion are identified within the subsequent chapters of this document. The QAP includes explanations, necessary to show how quality requirements for activities are met.

1.2 Quality System Review

The Quality system is reviewed within PB meetings. In such reviews, the following issues will be taken into account:

- the results from project audits
- the results from internal audits
- the official project Deliverables
- the corrective action requests from all the above
- the preventive actions on all the above
- any project prototype deficiencies and subsystems/parts problems
- project participants staff training and adequacy for the tasks undertaken
- the level of used resources per category and adequacy of spent resources for the particular task

The outcomes from the above shall be discussed at PB meetings, and their results shall be noted and include:

- Satisfaction with the audits, corrective actions and the results of complaints
- Dissatisfaction and requirements for further auditing or more corrective actions
- Satisfaction with the corrective actions taken by the relevant partner(s).

An agenda of such a meeting may include some of the following topics:

1. Results of Internal Audits
2. Corrective actions requests received
3. Equipment deficiencies
4. Defects in prototypes/deliverables
5. Complaints
6. Results of external audits
7. Supplier problems

8. Health and Safety
9. Training including needs and resources
10. Preventive actions
11. Review of quality policy and objectives
12. Introduction of new quality plans
13. Date of next meeting

Records to be kept, are the minutes of the meeting which are to record those attending and the summary of the points raised/resolved. The records are to be produced and archived by an appointed QCB member.

1.3 Quality Control Board

The Quality control of activities and deliverables are of main importance for the PLUG-N-HARVEST project. A Quality Assessment Plan (QAP) will be issued in accordance to the ISO – 9001 early in the project, which will consist of the following chapters:

1. Requirements of the project
2. Organizational structure of the project
3. Co-ordination between the members as well as the aforementioned structured management levels of the consortium
4. General measures and actions taken
5. Planning and control
6. Control of the quality of the deliverables
7. Quality control of the project
8. Files and archives
9. List of quality forms to be used

The purpose of the QAP is to describe the actions and measures that will be taken by the Consortium, in order to ensure the quality of the project and its full conformance with its contractual requirements. The main goals of the QAP will be the following:

1. Provide to all concerned a guide for the actions required by each one involved
2. Exhibit the performance of the project's QAP in accordance to the contractual requirements
3. Decide which internal members of the Quality Board (see below) will review which deliverables

The QAP is applicable to all the project's activities, and strict compliance with it is mandatory for all involved. The QAP will be documented and authorized by the QCB, which after its authorization will submit it to the Consortium Plenary Board for approval. All subsequent changes will be approved by the QCB and submitted to the PB for approval. The description of the quality system will focus on the prevention of deviations during each task of the project.

The QCB will be responsible for the co-ordination and supervision, regarding the implementation of the measures for the quality assurance. Also, it will be responsible for the project's quality assurance matters. In accordance with the contractual agreements, the project's quality management plan will be prepared, defining organizational structure, flow of the quality system and the quality management procedures to be applied. The Quality Board will consist of the following permanent members:

- The Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM)
- The Quality Assurance Manager (QAM)

- A Users Representative
- A person in charge of Standards with high expertise in the specific domains that the project targets.

A preliminary list of the project QCB members is indicated in the following Table.

Table 1. Preliminary list of the project QCB members

Partner	Quality Peer Reviewer	Telephone Number / Fax Number	E-mail Address
CERTH	Dimosthenis Ioannidis	+30 2311 257750	djoannid@iti.gr
RWTH	Rita Streblow	+49 241 80 49767	rstreblow@eonerc.rwth-aachen.de
CU	Hu Du	+44 29208 75589	duh4@cardiff.ac.uk
ALUMIL	Alexios Matakos	+30 23130 11059	a.matakos@alumil.com
AIGUASOL	Toni Herena	+34 933 424 755	toni.herena@aiguasol.coop
ODINS	Rafael Marin	+34 868 123395	rmarin@odins.es
SIE	Septimiu Nechifor	+40 268 400-171	septimiu.nechifor@siemens.com
ETRA	Álvaro Nofuentes	+34 9631 34082	anofuentes.etraid@grupoetra.com
ET	John Blower	+44 7719006912	johnblower@energytransitions.uk
EIG	Maria Colantoni	+34 934 199080	m.colantoni@ecointelligentgrowth.net
AHC	Anna Mestre	+34 932 287327	annamestre@gencat.cat
RWM	Paraskevi Christopoulou	+30 24610 52726	p.christopoulou@pdm.gov.gr
CCC	Gareth Harcombe	+029 20873478	gharcombe@cardiff.gov.uk

In addition to the above members other internal members will be appointed from the QCB for the purpose of reviewing specific deliverables and reports. These are senior researchers of the project partners with extensive expertise on the subject of the specific deliverable, excluding of course its authors. Moreover, members of the different forums of the project will be used as reviewers especially for the public deliverables.

In reviewing the Deliverables, the following procedure will be adhered in general:

1. The Deliverable will be reviewed by the QB as defined for the specific case (consisting of the internal experts, users' representative, the expert of Standards and the Quality Manager). The defined period for the whole review procedure is two weeks at maximum.

2. In parallel to the QCB, the Project Coordinator (PC) will review the Deliverable to judge the degree to which the objectives are met and whether the Deliverable meets in general the standards to be expected.
3. The responsible author(s) and the respective task leader(s) will be sent the consolidated peer review form including all comments of all reviewers appointed and the ones coming from the Project Coordinator (PC), in order to be able to proceed with the relevant amendments.
4. The responsible author(s) will revise the Deliverable upon the comments included in the consolidated peer review and will send the revised Deliverable together with their answers to the comments received justifying also the degree of their compliance to them (in the context of a specific form) to the instantiated QB, the Project Coordinator (PC) and the responsible task leader.

1.4 Deliverables Peer Review and Control

Each deliverable is assigned a "Deliverable Responsible Partner", who is typically the WP or the Task Leader associated with the deliverable. Table 3 lists all the Responsible Partners for each PLUG-N-HARVEST deliverable. The deliverable responsible partner decides on the list of contributors (authors) of the deliverable, who typically come from the partners involved in the work reported on the specific deliverable.

The assigned peer reviewers for each deliverable are listed in GRANT AGREEMENT, whereas the peer review report template is also provided**.**

Each deliverable will be evaluated according to the following criteria:

- **General criteria**
  1. Deliverable contents thoroughness
  2. Innovation level
  3. Correspondence to project and programme objectives
- **Specific criteria**
  1. Relevance
  2. Response to user needs (if applicable)
  3. Methodological framework soundness
  4. Quality of achievements
  5. Quality of presentation of achievements
  6. In case of a document: deliverable layout, format, spelling, etc.
  7. In case of a prototype: deliverable functionality according to the specifications

The ***final rating of a deliverable***, which will be given by the QCB, is in the following scale: *Fully accepted*, *Accepted with minor comments*, *Rejected unless modified properly*, *Rejected.* Each deliverable is evaluated according to the following schedule:

Table 2. Deliverable evaluation schedule

Deadline	Action
> 15 days before	Deliverable responsible partner and deliverable contributors prepare first draft
15 days before	Deliverable responsible partner sends first draft to the peer Reviewers
10 days before	Reviewers send comments to Deliverable responsible partner, the associated QCB members and the Project Coordinator (PC)

7 days before	The deliverable responsible partner incorporates the Reviewers' comments and sends the revised version, along with a list of actions describing how he addressed the comments, to the associated QCB members and the Project Coordinator (PC)
4 days before	The associated QCB members control the quality of the deliverable and if needed ask the deliverable responsible partner for further modifications
2 days before	The associated QCB members send their final rating to the Project Coordinator (PC)
Due Date	Deliverable submission

In case the Commission requests a revision of the submitted Deliverable, the internal review will be only repeated if the changes to the Deliverable are significant.

The Deliverable Responsible and the authors of a Deliverable make every possible effort to confront with the quality criteria as well as with the comments of the peer Reviewers, the QCB members, and/or the Project Coordinator (PC).

1.5 Quality Control of Deliverables and Documentation

This section provides information about the document types of the project, their templates, the naming and coding of the project's deliverables, and the scheduling and reporting of the project's dissemination events.

All current document templates can be found in GRANT AGREEMENT[1] of this deliverable. As the project evolves, however, modifications to the current templates and/or new templates may be required. For this reason, ***the most updated versions of all document templates will be always stored in the SCIEBO tool.***

1.5.1 Document types

The types of documents produced within PLUG-N-HARVEST are as follows:

- **Deliverable**, which describes the work done within a WP and/or task.
- **Technical Report,** which is a scientific paper, submitted for publication, or is in press, or has already published, and which is uploaded in the PLUG-N-HARVEST web site.
- **Review Report**, which is filled in by a deliverable reviewer as measure to evaluate the quality of the work done.
- **Meeting Program,** used to communicate the schedule of a project's event or meeting. In many cases, it can be just an e-mail to the project mailing list.
- **Meeting Agenda**, used to communicate the purpose and items to be discussed in a physical or virtual meeting. In many cases, it can be just an e-mail to the project mailing list.
- **Meeting minutes**, which summarize the topics dealt during the meeting as well as the actions agreed.
- **Conference Call minutes**, which summarizes the topics dealt during a conference call as well as the actions agreed. In many cases, it can be just an e-mail to the project mailing list.

- **Presentation**, which is a document used to expound topics related to the project, both internally (Consortium meetings, a partner's vision/contribution, etc.) and externally (conferences, dissemination events, meetings, annual review meetings, etc.).
- **Financial Report**, which is filled in by the partners to state their costs.
- **Management Report**, which is filled in by the partners to report on managerial issues, cost statements and justifications, as well as on planned and actual manpower spent within a certain reporting period.
- **Activity/Progress Report,** which is filled in by partners to collectively report on the Scientific & Technological work performed within a certain reporting period.

1.5.2 Document formats and templates

All document templates will be located at the SCIEBO tool and can be downloaded from there for use by the partners. The format of a document depends on its type and its use, which can be either ***internal*** to the consortium or ***external*** (including the EC).

The following table shows the allowable format of documents per type and use,

Table 3. Allowable format of documents per type and use

Document Type	Allowable Format for Internal Use	Allowable Format for External Use
Deliverable	doc, tex	PDF
Technical Report	PDF	PDF
Review Report	doc	PDF
Meeting Program	doc, txt	PDF
Meeting Agenda	doc, txt	PDF
Meeting minutes	doc	PDF
Conference Call minutes	doc, txt	PDF
Presentation	ppt, tex	PDF
Financial Report	doc, xls	PDF
Management Report	doc	PDF
Activity Report	doc, tex	PDF

where "**tex**" stands for LaTeX format, "**doc**" stands for MS-Word or equivalent compliant format, "**txt**" stands for plain text format, "**ppt**" stands for MS PowerPoint presentation or

equivalent compliant format, "**xls**" stands for MS-Excel or equivalent compliant format, and "**PDF**" stands for the well-known portable document format.

1.5.3 Document naming and coding

For facilitating common browsing and storage in different platforms and OS's, no spaces should be used in the document names, and instead the underscore character "_" should be used.

All project document names must start with the prefix

"P-n-H"

In order to facilitate quick identification and indexing. In particular, the following conventions are mandatory for certain types of documents. Names of deliverable documents should follow the convention

"P-n-H_Dw.n[.m]_zzz_vX.Y._[LB,T,DL,Md].ext"

where

- "*Dw.n[.m]*" is the deliverable number
  - "*w*" is the WP number
  - "*n*" is the numbering within the specific WP
  - *"[.m]"* (if exists) is the sub-numbering within the specific WP
- "zzz" is the deliverable name
- "*vX.Y*" is the version number
  - "*X*" is the version
  - "*Y*" is the sub-version
- "LB" is the lead beneficiary
- "T" is the deliverable type
- "DL" is the dissemination level
- "Md" is the due date in months
- "*.ext*" is the file extension pertaining to the format used

For instance, the name of (the final version of) deliverable D6.2.1 sent to SCIEBO is

P-n-H_D6.2.1_Project_Website_&_Social_Media_v1.0_[CERTH,R+DEC,PU,M3].pdf

The name of the PLUG-N-HARVEST Technical Reports will follow the convention

"P-n-H_TR_ddd.pdf"

where "*ddd*" is a three-digit decimal number that will be assigned automatically to a new Technical Report by the related submission service of the PLUG-N-HARVEST web site.

1.5.4 Dissemination

Dissemination activities include:

- Publications in scientific and technical journals or magazines
- Publications in the printed or electronic press and media (including TV and Radio), as well as on commercial journals or magazines
- Presentations in conferences and publications in conference proceedings
- Exhibition stands and demos
- Participation in non-project workshops, forums and/or events

The Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM) and the QCB should be informed ***as early as possible*** about the participation of any Partner member in any dissemination activity through the completion of an appropriate form that will be available at the SCIEBO tool. The Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM) and the QCB are responsible for approving or not the participation in the specific dissemination activity.

Especially for scientific publications, the following procedure applies:

1. An email regarding the planned publication along with its abstract (or a draft of the publication) is sent to the QCB and the Project Coordinator (PC) 30 days before the submission deadline. The Coordinator informs the consortium about the planned publication.
2. The final version of the publication is stored as a Technical Report on the SCIEBO tool and resides there for inspection by the rest of the partners. If within 15 calendar days, no objection is raised by any partner to QCB or the Project Coordinator (PC), then the publication is allowed and the Technical Report is made public.
3. A special provision is made in case of a submission to a conference publication: since there may be not enough time between the preparation of the final version and the required 15 days for final approval by the rest of the consortium, Step 2 is followed for the submitted to the conference version of the publication, provided that the submitted version is stored as a Technical Report on SCIEBO tool at most 1 day after the conference submission deadline. If there is a major and justified objection by any partner, then the publication is withdrawn from the conference.

A partner may object to a planned publication by another partner on serious and justified grounds that have to do with confidentially of data and/or for not inclusion of the objecting partner members in the authorship of the publication if their work is included in the publication. The QCB is responsible for resolving any objection raised by any partner.

In any dissemination activity, the following quote should be included:

The Plug-n-Harvest project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 768735

Participation to dissemination activities/events requiring attendance (e.g., conferences, concentration events, workshops, seminars, etc.) is governed by the following rules:

- A partner should make his application as early as possible and not less than four weeks in advance of the event. The application shall be submitted to the QCB.
- The application should be accompanied by a copy of the event program together with a rationale describing the event and explaining the relevance of attendance to the objectives of the Project.
- The application must provide a clear breakdown of the attendance cost explaining the proposed claim for the EC contribution.
- Within two weeks after the event, the partner must provide to QCB a concise written report (1-2 pages) about the event. If possible, the report should be accompanied by the event's proceedings (or at least a suitable extract of it).

Notes: (a) preference will be given to those presenting papers to a conference; (b) the cost and frequency of the conference attendance should always be minimised and kept in proportion to the size and resources of the Project.

The above rules will be applied and checked by the QCB in order to:

- Avoid repetition of publication of the same work

- Avoid publication of restrictive and/or commercial in confidence data
- Avoid misunderstandings between Partners and publication of one's work without proper referencing
- Secure optimum use of dissemination resources of the project
- Guarantee proper archiving of all dissemination material

1.6 Internal Quality Audits

In special cases, when a problem of paramount importance comes up, an Internal Audit Procedure will be carried out by the corresponding group. This will be done on the corresponding site, where the problem has appeared. All personnel listed below will have to travel to the corresponding site:

- The Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM)
- The Quality Assurance Manager

All the findings of the Internal Audit will be documented in the Internal Audit Report (included in the GRANT AGREEMENT[1] document) by the Quality Assurance Manager. Then, he will issue corrective actions, which again will be documented by him in the corresponding form, in order to make all the discrepancies obsolete, within the appropriate time period. Follow up actions will be arranged, so as to ensure the effectiveness of the corrective actions. The results of the Internal Quality Audits will be distributed to all Partners, related to the specific WP.

The QAM will be responsible for the implementation of this procedure. In all other cases, the progress of the project will be monitored by him through contacts (mainly by e-mail) with all the partners involved. All day to day and trivial barriers of the project have to be dealt with in this way.

The progress of the project will be monitored by the Project Coordinator (PC) and the QCB through contacts (mainly by email and/or by teleconferencing facilities) with all the partners involved. All day to day and trivial barriers of the project have to be dealt with in this way.

In exceptional cases, when a problem of paramount importance comes up with a certain partner, an Internal Audit Procedure will be carried out by a specific project group. This group consists of:

- The Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM)
- The Leader of the WP or Task within which the problem occurred
- A member of QCB (not belonging to the certain partner site)
- Optionally, 1-2 other consortium members, which will be the most relevant (technically-wise) for the problem under inspection. Their participation will be decided by the QCB or by the Project Coordinator (PC) and Scientific Innovation Manager (SIM) and will depend on the nature of the problem.

In a first attempt, the Internal Audit Procedure will be carried out remotely through a suitable teleconferencing facility. If the problem cannot be resolved in this way, then the aforementioned project group has to travel to the corresponding site in which the problem appeared.

All the findings of the Internal Audit will be documented in an Internal Audit Report by the QCB member. Then, he will issue corrective actions, which again will be documented by him in the corresponding form, in order to make all the discrepancies obsolete, within the appropriate time period. Follow up actions will be arranged, in order to ensure the effectiveness of the corrective actions. The results of the Internal Quality Audits will be distributed to all Partners, related to the specific WP. The QCB member will be responsible for the implementation of this procedure.

1.7 Project Reporting and Monitoring

Concerning Quality Management Scheme, Quarterly Management Reports (QMRs) that have been included in the DoA, will be delivered on a 3-month-basis, and in which all partners will contribute by reporting their technical and financial progress in the project.

Every partner should provide the following information for the particular 3monthly reporting period (Quarterly Management Report):

1. Per each WP and/or Task:
   - Objectives of the WP/Task within the reporting period
   - Status and progress towards the WP/Task Objectives
   - Deviations from the DoA and Corrective Actions
   - Plan for next reporting period (regarding the WP/Task)
2. Dissemination & Exploitation activities for the reporting and the next reporting period
3. Project Meetings
4. Cooperation with other partners
5. Cooperation with other projects
6. Deviations from planned deliverables and milestones
7. Planned and actual person months per WP and per Task

The Project Coordinator (PC) will provide a specific template to the partners in order to fill in the aforementioned information.

The QMR will be used to depict deviations from planned milestones including delays or early finishes and their implications on the overall progress will be evaluated. Then, the corrective actions that are necessary for implementation will be considered and taken as appropriate, and will be communicated to the SC so that these corrective actions are carried out in a timely manner in order to achieve optimal performance.

Warning alarms will be raised in case of significant deviations in the planned work and budget spending. The deviation monitoring will be reviewed every six months.

1.8 Corrective and Preventive Actions

The issues below are ***related to general performance of a Partner*** and the quality of his work outcome and ***not to Project Deliverables***, for which the particular procedure of the previous Section is to be followed. Any participant may raise such an issue on the work of another participant or external suppliers work.

The Project Coordinator (PC) and the Quality Assurance Manager (QAM) are responsible for resolving matters of complaint under this procedure, within their own areas of responsibility. All complaints are to be investigated and corrective action agreed. Corrective and possible preventative actions are recorded and all involved are informed of the action taken, (according to the GRANT AGREEMENT Form).

The formal description of the procedure is given below:

1. The Project Coordinator (PC) identifies needs for corrective actions (e.g. by proposals from partners).
2. The Project Coordinator (PC) notifies the WP leader.
3. WP leader discusses the issue with the Task leader and comes up with the proposed solution. The relevant request is documented on the GRANT AGREEMENT[1]. There, also a proposal on corrective action is being done.
4. The solution is forwarded to the Project Coordinator (PC) via the WP leader.

5. The Project Coordinator (PC) decide on the matter. The decision shall be documented according to the template of GRANT AGREEMENT[1]. The Project Coordinator (PC) sends this to all involved parties and checks that the actions are implemented.

2 References

[1] THE PLUG-N-HARVEST GRANT AGREEMENT