DRIVE2 THE FUTURE

Needs, wants and behaviour of "Drivers" and automated vehicles users today and into the future

Contract No: 815001

D9.2: Quality Assurance Plan

Version 1.0

Work package	WP9
Activity	A9.3 Quality and Ethics Board
Deliverable	**D9.2 Quality Assurance Plan**
Authors	Mary Panou (CERTH/HIT)
Status	Final
Version	1.0
Dissemination Level	Public
Document date	05/07/2019
Delivery due date	31/06/2019
Actual delivery date	05/07/2019
Reviewers	Evangelia Gaitanidou (CERTH/HIT)

Version History

Document history			
Version	**Date**	**Modified by**	**Comments**
0.1	25/05/2019	Mary Panou	First Draft
0.2	20/06/2019	Mary Panou	Second Draft with Deliverables allocation
0.3	01/07/2019	Mary Panou	Final Draft with reviewers per partner
0.4	03/07/2019	Evangelia Gaitanidou	Review
1.0	05/07/2019	Mary Panou	Final

Legal Disclaimer

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Abbreviations List

Abbreviation	Definition
AD	Autonomous Driving
AV	Autonomous Vehicles
DoA	Description of Action
EB	Ethics Board
MaaS	Mobility as a Service
PB	Partner Board
PiB	Pilot Board
PMT	Project Management Team
PQH	Project Quality Handbook
PS	Pilot Site
QB	Quality Board
QCB	Quality Control Board
QRT	Quality Review Team
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

This Deliverable, entitled "Quality Assurance Plan" consists the Project Quality Handbook (PQH) and provides a detailed description of management and quality assurance strategy to be followed in the framework of the project, so as to guarantee that its outcomes meet the planned objectives, reaching high quality.

The main governing body of Drive2theFuture is the Project Management Team. This is in charge for supervising the project progress and deciding upon all relevant technical and administrative issues. The day to day monitoring of the Project evolvement is running by the Coordinator. The Partner Board consists of one representative from each partner. This performs, plans and reviews project work. The WP leaders are responsible for the smooth work progress in the WP. The WP leaders will report to the Coordinator and (if needed) the Quality manager.

Templates which correspond to all the key documents that are foreseen to be circulated in the framework of Drive2theFuture project are presented, addressing both internal communication and official documentation towards the EC. The proposed management and quality scheme is flexible and well-defined, thus allowing for an effective and robust project monitoring and handling of any problems that may arise.

1. Introduction

This Deliverable entitled "Quality Assurance Plan" consists the Project Quality Handbook (PQH) and defines the quality review procedure to be followed in the project. Rules and procedures for project processes, like initiation of WPs, WP performance, organisation of meetings, reporting and monitoring, communication within the project, etc. are being thoroughly described. The reference and structure of key project documents are defined. Moreover, the current Deliverable includes the templates for official Drive2theFuture documents that should be used by the Consortium.

The Consortium quality policy has been defined as follows:

- To identify responsibilities regarding quality for all involved parties.
- To ensure that all Deliverables comply with the contract.
- To ensure that all processes relevant to the project are organised and monitored with a high level of effectiveness and quality.

The Project Quality Handbook (PQH) includes explanation, necessary to show how quality requirements for activities are met. A list of such activities is given below:

- Responsibilities of the Quality Manager
- Quality system review
- Document and data control
- Project Quality Management Panel
- Internal Communication Strategies
- Deliverables peer review and control of non-conforming Deliverables,
- Corrective and preventive actions,
- Control of quality records
- Internal quality audits
- Project reporting and monitoring

The present Handbook is applicable to all the activities, which are related to Drive2theFuture project. Hence, compliance with the Handbook is mandatory for all Partners involved and all project activities.

1.1. Purpose of the Document

Deliverable D9.2 includes a short presentation of the Drive2theFuture project goals, approach and intended outcomes and addresses the project's quality organisation through the Quality Assurance Plan. The Quality Assurance Plan sets out the quality assurance procedures for the Drive2theFuture project. Its aim is to assure that the tangible outcomes of the project are of high quality and delivered according to the time schedule and the specifications set in the project Description of Action. This Quality Assurance plan will constitute an official project document that will govern all partners' and consortium's actions. It has been written in accordance to ISO 9001:2015 guidelines.

The purpose of the Project Quality Handbook (PQH) 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.

This Project Quality Handbook (PQH) is to be used by:

- All Consortium Beneficiaries, responsible for preparing, or contributing and amending Deliverables.
- Any responsible person of a Consortium Beneficiary for approving work to be done by third parties, in order to complete Deliverables.
- The external Quality Expert, responsible for reviewing the project key Deliverables.

The scope of the PQH is to:

1. Provide to all concerned a guide for the actions required by each one involved.
2. Exhibit the performance of the Project's quality plan with the contractual requirements.
3. Decide which internal members of the Quality Management Team will review which Deliverables.

This deliverable addresses the "Drive2theFuture Quality Assurance Plan" that defines the procedures to be applied in Drive2theFuture project in order to guarantee high quality of project results and smooth monitoring and control of internal project processes and concerns all Drive2theFuture project beneficiaries that will act as work producers, followers and/or reviewers.

Quality planning is an integral part of management planning. As a pre-requisite to its preparation, the Quality Assurance Manager has reviewed all requirements in order to determine the necessary procedures needed to guarantee the high quality of project results and the proper monitoring of project processes, which are described in the present deliverable. The objective of this work is to demonstrate and provide the Consortium with the assurance that:

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

The Consortium quality policy has been defined as follows:

- to implement and maintain a quality system according to ISO 9001:2015;
- to identify for all involved their responsibilities regarding quality;
- to ensure that all Deliverables and other tangible outcomes comply with the contract;
- to ensure that all processes relevant to the project are organised and monitored with a high level of effectiveness and quality.

The project will employ the following main mechanisms:

- The **Project Quality Handbook** will define the rules and basic support for the co-operation between the partners and establish procedures for documentation, quality control, management decision schemes and control procedures. The Handbook will be released on Month 2 and is subject to Project Management Team (PMT) approval.
- **Review of deliverables**. The Quality Manager will appoint Consortium internal reviewers for all deliverables, ensuring that there is no conflict among authors-reviewers. In addition to final release reviews, the project will carry out intermediate reviews of structure and completeness in advance of final delivery. More details are explained in the following sections.
- **Feedback from meetings and annual Commission Technical Reviews**. Project management will foster an attitude where review outcome is treated as part of the Project's Quality Handbook rather than as an adversarial assessment. The Quality Manager is responsible for ensuring that recommendations are considered and actions decided upon.

The current Project Quality Handbook is applicable to all the activities, which are related to the project. Hence, compliance of its execution with the PQH is mandatory for all involved.

1.2. Intended audience

The dissemination level of D9.2 is **public**. Although it is primarily intended to be an internal guideline for the appropriate management of the specific project, it may serve as a reference guide for other European research projects management. In particular, the Quality Assurance Plan is to be used by all Drive2theFuture Consortium Partners, responsible for preparing (acting as Authors) or reviewing Deliverables (acting as Reviewers).

1.3. Interrelations

The present manual is applicable and cross-cutting to all project activities. Hence, compliance with the manual is mandatory for all Consortium Partners and during the conduct of all activities.

2. Drive2theFuture Quality Assessment

This section specifies first of all the responsibilities of the Quality Manager and then the activities to be implemented, including their sequence, in order to ensure that the project and its Deliverables conform to the project requirements. Those responsible for ensuring that the required activities are carried out have been identified within the previous chapter of this document.

2.1. Drive2theFuture Quality Control Board (QCB) & Ethics Board (EB)

With the view to addressing quality assurance, Drive2theFuture has assembled a **Quality Control Board** (QCB) as a horizontal management element that oversees the project's outcomes. The QCB is responsible for compiling, coordinating and supervising the implementation of the project's work plan, with the support and collaboration of the Management team. The following members are part of the QCB:

2.1.1.   Project Coordinator

The role of the Project Coordinator operates at strategic level as well, in so far as it is concerned with the development and recommendation of strategies and the overseeing and coordination of implementation plans for all project activities. The main tasks of the Coordinator are the day to day running of the Project, the management of the Consortium regarding the administrative issues and the compilation of progress reports (financial part). Also, the gathering of audit certificates and cost statements and their delivery to EC is to be carried out. The responsibilities are not only limited to the timely notification of the partners and the collection of their input to the above reports, but also the continuous support to them, in administrative and financial issues. The preparation of major project meetings (agendas and minutes) and the representation of the Consortium to the EC are also included in this activity.

Furthermore, the Coordinator is asked to deal with the following issues:

- Financial, contract and Consortium Agreement administration.
- Interfacing with the EC on all consortium matters, including reporting (technical and financial).
- Inclusion of new partners, products, technologies and markets.
- Recommendations regarding development of new strategies for market, product, technologies and resources.
- Recommendations regarding Knowledge management including generation, dissemination, exploitation, etc.
- Chairing the Partner Board and the Steering Committee, and acting upon decisions of these bodies.
- Overseeing technical and quality standards and directions of the project, with the Technical & Quality Managers.
- Each of the Project Coordinator and Technical & Innovation Manager shall report to and be accountable to the GA.
- Collection and dissemination of the EU financial contribution and preparation of the project financial statements.
- Preparation of the Annual Financial statements and financial reports to be submitted to the EC.
- Responsibility for the logistics with regard to the execution of the project.
- Overview of the work performed across all project's activities and final approval of them.
- Responsibility for the submission of the foreseen work (Deliverables) to the EC within the time frame, as defined in the approved Description of Action.

- Taking of corrective actions for the mitigation of Partners' or outcomes not compliance to the contractual agreement.
- Transmission of any documents and information connected with the project between the Parties concerned.
- Establishment of detailed management and technical work plans for the project in cooperation with the Technical & Innovation Manager.
- Day to day running of the project.
- Networking management (i.e. cooperation with other projects).
- Preparation and post-processing of project reviews.
- Responsibility for the all administrative issues of the project not mentioned above.

The project Co-ordinator is **Ms Evangelia Gaitanidou** (CERTH/HIT). She is a Civil Engineer, MSc Transportation Systems and works as Senior Researcher in CERTH/HIT. She has participated on administration and technical level in more than 15 research projects and authored over 30 publications in refereed journals, books, and conferences. In CERTH/HIT she is the Head of the Road Safety and Security Lab.

The **Technical & Innovation Manager:** Dr Evangelos Bekiaris (CERTH/HIT). He is the Director of CERTH/HIT, PhD Mechanical Engineer of the National Technical University of Athens, former Research Director (Grade A Researcher) and former Head of the sector "Driver & Vehicle". He has participated in over 100 research projects up to date, in 36 of which has led all the research consortium

2.1.2. *Project Quality and Ethics Manager*

The role of the Quality Manager is to assist the Project Coordinator in the development and maintenance of the PQH, and shall oversee that project execution takes place in accordance with this plan. She/he will also put in evidence important deviations in terms of quality, timing and resources spent. To this end, the project will employ the following mechanisms:

- The **PQH** will define the rules and basic support for the co-operation between the partners and establish procedures for documentation, quality control, management decision schemes and control procedures. The Handbook will be released on Month 2 and is subject to Project Coordination Committee ( ) approval.
- **Review of deliverables**. The Quality Manager will appoint Consortium internal reviewers for all deliverables, ensuring that there is no conflict among authors-reviewers. In addition to final release reviews, the project will carry out intermediate reviews of structure and completeness in advance of final delivery. More details are reported in the following sections.
- **Feedback from meetings and annual Commission Technical Reviews**. Project management will foster an attitude where review outcome is treated as part of the PQH rather than as an adversarial assessment. The Quality Manager is responsible for ensuring that recommendations are considered and actions decided upon.
- The **Ethics and Privacy Protection Manual** will define the guiding principles and the main procedures regarding privacy, data protection, security, legal issues and ethical challenges, in consultation with the project's Ethics Board and the local ethics committees at each pilot site.

The current PQH is applicable to all the activities, which are related to the project. Hence, compliance of its execution with the PQH is mandatory for all involved.

The Quality Management is undertaken by **Dr. Maria Panou** of CERTH. Dr. Maria Panou is a Principal Researcher and Head of Department 'Vehicle & Driver – Transport Safety – Accessibility' at the Hellenic Institute of Transport of the Centre for Research and Technology Hellas. She has a wide experience in research projects as Coordinator/technical manager and is acting as expert of research proposals evaluation for various entities, including the European Commission.

2.1.3. Quality Review Team

A Quality Review Team (QRT) is established with the task to assure the consistency of all project Deliverables with their respective objectives and the satisfaction of high quality standards. This goal will be reached by using a relevant 'Quality improvement Report template', issued in **ANNEX B** (to be filled by the QRT members), where suggestions and instructions for necessary changes/additions/deletions of the contents of the Deliverable will be reported. Deliverables consistency will also be checked against the Description of Action, the relevant milestones, the H2020 program objectives, the current state of the art and the Drive2theFuture PQH.

As mentioned in the DoA, the QRT will consist of the following parties:

- the Quality Manager (CERTH),
- the Coordinator (CERTH),
- 1 person from the Consortium (who is not related to the Deliverable work).
- If needed and upon decision of the Project Coordinator and the Quality Manager, an external expert will be assigned in cases where extra expertise will be considered that is needed. This expert will be widely recognised for his/her experience in a field related to Drive2theFuture.

In **ANNEX A**, the Deliverables assigned to be reviewed by each Consortium partner are specified. It is not necessary that the Consortium reviewer is not a person working in the project (i.e. it can be an employee/colleague who is working in Drive2theFuture), but it is mandatory that the assigned reviewer has not be involved in the Deliverable preparation, in order to ensure a neutral feedback.

2.1.4. Procedure Description

PQH planning is an integral part of management planning. As a pre-requisite to its preparation, the Quality Manager has reviewed all requirements in order to determine the necessary activities that need to be planned. This PQH is being prepared early in the project in order to be applied even to the first project outcomes. It assures that:

4. The contract requirements and conditions have been reviewed.
5. Effective quality planning has taken place.
6. The quality system is appropriate.

To ensure use of the PQH, the Quality Manager should conduct quality reviews, throughout the duration of the contract, and when contractual changes occur. The Quality Manager shall ensure that the quality plan is available to all concerned and that its requirements are continuously met.

The Consortium quality policy is as follows:

- To implement and maintain a quality system inspired to ISO 9001.
- To identify for all involved partners their responsibilities regarding quality.
- To ensure that all Deliverables comply with the contract, keeping a high quality status.

The Quality system is to be reviewed by the Project Quality Review Team. In subsequent reviews the following will be taken into account:

- The results from project audits.
- The results from internal audits.
- The official project Deliverables (Reports and Prototypes).
- The corrective action requests from all the above.
- The preventive actions on all the above.
- Any project prototype deficiencies and subsystems/parts problems.
- Level of used resources per category and adequacy of spent resources for the particular task.

The outcomes from the above shall be discussed at Project Board meetings, and their results shall be documented 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).

In such cases of problems (negative results from audits), the Project Coordinator and the Quality Manager are responsible for initiating actions, resulting in complete solutions to them. All problems are raised within the meetings, and the minutes should also record the agreed solution and the time bound action to be taken. There is a requirement to provide evidence that the problem has been cured. All involved in providing the Consortium with services are to be qualified (i.e. have relevant academic studies, relevant professional experience) in the area they are to work within, inspect or verify.

The following actions are to be carried out:

- Initiate action to prevent the occurrence of any non-conformity.
- Identify and record any relevant problem.
- Initiate, recommend and/or provide solutions through the reporting system.
- Verify the implementation of solutions.
- Monitor and control further processing, delivery or installation of any preferred solution to ensure that any reported non-conformance has been corrected.

The **Quality Manager** (CERTH/HIT) is responsible for the administration and definition of a detailed quality control strategy (included in the present document) for the project and production of the relevant Project Quality Handbook (PQH) with all the relevant instructions and rules. She has the authority to identify problems during quality reviews and propose mitigation actions. Furthermore, the Quality Manager has the authority to update the PQH within the project life, if necessary.

2.1.5. *Deliverables review procedure*

In general, the following reviewing procedure is planned for the project Deliverables:

- The Deliverable will be prepared by the responsible author(s), minimum 2 weeks before its submission deadline, to give time for the quality review procedure.
- It will then be reviewed by the QRT, within a time period of 6 working days at maximum.
- The Quality Manager will prepare a consolidated 'Quality Improvement Report' (consisting of the individual reviewers' input and her own comments), within 3 days upon receipt of the reviewers' input and she will send it to the main author and the Coordinator.
- The Deliverable author(s) will revise the Deliverable and will send the revised version along with their replies to the reviewers' comments in the 'Quality improvement Report', within 5 days after receiving the Report. Both documents will be sent to the Project Coordinator and the Quality Manager.
- The Coordinator will then submit the Deliverable to the EC; while the 'Quality Improvement Report' will be available upon request by the EC.

In case the EC requests a revision of the submitted Deliverable, the internal review will be only repeated if the changes to the Deliverable are significant. The Coordinator and the Quality Manager will decide if the revised Deliverable has to be reviewed again. The same rule applies for Deliverables that are planned to be revised and re-submitted.

2.2. Quality Improvement Report

All reviewers after having studied the Deliverable under consideration, must evaluate it with respect to the following matters, as stated below and must conclude whether the Deliverable is accepted or not. Whenever changes or comments are introduced to the Deliverable itself, the 'track changes' option should always be used.

2.2.1.   Assessment parameters

The Quality improvement template is divided in two parts: 'General comments' and 'Specific comments'. The issues that the reviewers have to provide their comments are given below:

A. General comments
- Deliverable contents thoroughness.
- Innovation level.
- Correspondence to project and programme objectives.

B. Specific comments
- Relevance.
- Response to user needs.
- Methodological framework soundness.
- Quality of achievements.
- Quality of presentation of achievements.
- Deliverable layout, format, spelling, etc.

The final rating of the Deliverable draft will be marked as:

- Fully accepted.
- Accepted with minor corrections, as suggested by the quality reviewers.
- Rejected unless major corrections are applied, as suggested by the quality reviewers.

The relevant comments will be included in a Deliverable Quality Improvement Report, as indicated in **ANNEX B**. Reviewers should pay attention to express their opinion in a formal and mild way, as these reviews will be transmitted to the authors and to the European Commission.

2.3. Corrective and preventive actions

The issues below are *related to general performance of a Partner* and the quality of his/her 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 and the Quality Manager 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 Form of **ANNEX D**).

The formal description of the procedure is given below.

- The Coordinator identifies needs for corrective actions (e.g. by proposals from partners).
- The Coordinator notifies the WP leader.
- WP leader discusses the issue with the Activity leader and comes up with the proposed solution. The relevant request is documented on the appropriate form of **ANNEX C**. There, also a proposal on corrective action is being done.
- The solution is forwarded to the Coordinator and the Quality Manager via the WP leader.
- The Coordinator and the Quality Manager decide on the matter. The decision shall be documented according to the template of **ANNEX D**. The Coordinator sends this to all involved and checks that the actions are implemented.

2.4. 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
- The Quality Manager

All the findings of the Internal Audit will be documented in the Internal Audit Report (included in **ANNEX E**) by the Quality Manager. Then, she will issue corrective actions, which again will be documented by her 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 Quality Manager will be responsible for the implementation of this procedure. In all other cases, the progress of the project will be monitored by her 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

3. Project performance processes

3.1. Introduction

The Drive2theFuture project is divided in 10 Workpackages (WP). Each WP has a WP leader and a planned start and end date. Each WP is divided into Activities. Each Activity has an activity leader and a planned start and end date. In each Workpackage, the Workpackage leader co-ordinates the activities, by communicating with the corresponding task leaders. The activities' leaders report to the Workpackage leader and the Project Coordinator.

The above are defined in the Drive2theFuture "Description of Action".

3.2. Process for WPs and tasks initiation and performance

The process for initiating and planning WPs and activities is the following:

1. WP leaders request Activity leaders to initiate task.
2. Activity leaders come back with working document/detailed plans.

Upon initiation, the work will be carried out with the following steps:

1. Each Beneficiary responsible for performing an activity or part of an activity performs the planned work (presented in advance during meetings and agreed among the Consortium).
2. Each Beneficiary responsible for performing an activity or part of an activity prepares an Internal Report with the results obtained, as soon as the task finishes. This Internal Report is sent to WP partners.
3. WP Beneficiaries (and other partners wishing to do so) send comments, if any, on this report within 5 days. The author revises the report and submits the final one to the WP leader and the Coordinator with copy to all partners.
4. If one or more Activities result into a Deliverable, the Deliverable main author synthesises the activities internal reports into the expected Deliverable.
5. The Deliverable main author submits the Deliverable for quality review.
6. As soon as all Deliverables in a WP are submitted to the European Commission through the Coordinator (after having passed the quality review procedure), the WP is terminated, unless it is stated in the DoA that the Deliverable has to be updated on specific project months.

3.3. Process for meetings organisations

The Partner Board (all the Consortium), will need to meet (at least) 2 times annually, in order to discuss and review the project progress, and take important decisions for the project continuation. In these regular meetings, all partners have to present the work performed for the activities of their responsibilities. Important issues related to IPR, new partners inclusion or exclusion and key persons substitution (i.e. Coordinator, Quality Manager, etc.) will be decided unanimously (except from the Partner affected) in the PMT and the

decision will have to be accepted by the majority rule. In case of equal rates, the Coordinator holds double rate. The project Coordinator will take the day to day decisions.

At least 1 person per partner is required to attend the regular meetings. Each partner is allowed to miss only up to 2 meetings during the project life. Although each partner has a specific part of Drive2theFuture work to carry out, for maximum knowledge transfer within the project, all Partners are expected to appoint time to read the other Deliverables and thus be prepared and informed at the meetings, in order that all partners can be involved in relevant discussions and help the progress of the project with their opinion and suggestions. In addition to regular meetings, special technical meetings may need to be arranged (upon decision of the Coordinator), with specific partners only. The Third Parties/Subcontractors (if any) will be called in Plenary and Technical meetings, by the relevant Partner (with Coordinator's permission) or by the Coordinator.

The Plenary meetings agendas and minutes will be prepared by the Coordinator. The agendas must pay special attention to Deliverables and milestones. The responsible partners for presenting should be indicated. Also, the meeting location should be on it. The agendas must be available at least 3 weeks before the meeting date. The minutes must be prepared within 3 weeks after the meeting, giving the partners some time (~ 1 week) to provide comments, before their finalisation. The minutes should include the main discussion items per session/presentation of the meeting, as well as decisions taken, along with a list of actions for the forthcoming period, with clear responsibilities per action and specific deadlines. The final minutes are considered as part of the Partners agreement for the next work steps. Minutes of the technical meetings will be prepared by the leading partner (the partner that initiated the meeting or that is the main responsible for the issue discussed at the meeting) and will be circulated to all Partners.

Summarising, the process for meetings organisation and recording, is given below:

7. The first meeting of the Partner Board is called and hosted by the Coordinator.
8. During the first meeting of the PB, the first year's meetings and meeting hosts are planned and agreed.
9. Three weeks before each scheduled Plenary Meeting, the Coordinator prepares a draft agenda and send it to the expected participants.
10. Recipients should send comments on the agenda within 5 working days.
11. The agenda author (Coordinator) updates the agenda and sends final version at least 5 working days before the meeting.
12. During the meeting, the Coordinator is responsible for keeping minutes, which must be sent to the expected participants.
13. Recipients should send comments on the minutes within 7 working days.
14. The Coordinator sends the final revised meeting minutes to the whole Consortium within another 5 working days.
15. At the last meeting of each year, the meetings dates and places of the next year will be arranged.

More details on the organisation of all meetings' categories can be found in D9.1, thus not repeated here.

3.4. Communication within the project

Detailed communication rules have been defined for Drive2theFuture regarding all kinds of internal and external to the Consortium communication. These are described thoroughly in D9.1, thus not repeated here.

In addition to the D9.1 rules, it is mandatory that all emails referring to the project shall start their subject line with [Drive2theFuture].

3.5. Decisions and rules

The decisions regarding the project will be taken by common agreement of all partners present in the regular meetings. In case of disagreement, the majority rule will be applied. In case of equality in votes, the Coordinator's vote will be the decisive one. If amendments to the terms of the contract, or to the costs or time schedules under the contract, or to procedures for publication and press releases, will be needed, the decision shall be taken commonly by all the Partners of Drive2theFuture.

3.6. Reporting and monitoring

Officially reporting to EC is done on Months 18 (Mid Term report) and 36 (Final report). The reporting to EC will include all the technical and administrative information, quality assessment report, in detail. The final ratification of all progress will be undertaken by the Technical & Innovation Manager and the Coordinator.

Interim Periodic Project Reports (PPR) describing the status of the technical work and the costs spent will have to be submitted from the Drive2theFuture Consortium to the Coordinator on 6-monthly basis, in order to keep track of the progress and identify any problems in time. As such, the project progress will be monitored and reported periodically through internal Reports on a six-monthly basis. . The reporting has to be done no later than the 20th day of the following month (e.g. by 20th of November for reporting the 1st six month period May 2019-October 2019) and it should reflect effort actually worked in the period in question.

All participants will be requested to send, in addition to all formal work and cost reports mentioned in the Description of Action, a brief technical progress and cost report to the Coordinator (CERTH/HIT), when it is asked. In this way each partner declares the resources used for the respective time period and deliverables produced. Each WP leader checks if this is compatible with the effort and resources planned per partner involved in the project activities under control for each six month period.

Interim reports will depict deviations from planned project milestones including delays or early finishes and their implications on the overall progress; then, the corrective actions that are necessary for implementation will be considered and taken as appropriate.

The Project Management Team will be responsible of analysing all the gathered inputs and consolidate the figures in order to obtain the overall use of resources per WP. These reports will allow to monitor the progress of the project and the performance of each partner. The report will be evaluated and further discussed, if necessary, during the next planned project meeting.

3.6.1.   Reporting Description

All Progress Reports and Financial Statements, internal and official will be done according to EC template of Reporting.

3.6.1.1.   Technical reporting

For the Technical part of the Reports, WP leaders are responsible for reporting to the Coordinator on activities and general progress per WP with respect to the work plan, following the specific template that will be provided in advance. The WP leaders submit the WP report to the Coordinator, who then compiles all gathered WP activity reports into the general project report.

The formal description of the procedure is given below.

1. The Coordinator initiates the reporting process, by sending out a request to WP leaders for the Periodic or Annual Report and time plan, followed by a specific template.

2. Each Drive2theFuture partner provides the requested input by filling in the respective fields of the report, reporting the work performed in each WP/activity, for the specific time period covered in the report.

3. Each WP Leader gathers the relevant items of the specific WP, from the full reports of the Contractors that participate in the respective WP and makes a consolidated report, respectively adapted, so as to include the work performed in the respective WP by all participating Contractors.

4. WP leaders send the files to the Coordinator.

5. The Coordinator formulates the report for the total project, following the template launched from the EC, respectively adapted so as to include the work performed in all WPs by all Beneficiary Contractors, and submits it to the EC.

3.6.1.2. *Financial reporting*

For the financial statement reports, each partner is responsible for reporting to the Coordinator on person months and eligible costs per Work package in parallel to the technical reporting. The Coordinator then compiles all gathered activity reports into the general project activity report.

The formal description of the procedure is given below:

1. The Coordinator initiates the reporting process by sending out a request to the Drive2theFuture Consortium for administrative reporting, together with a time plan and a template.
2. Partners fill in the info required for the report for all WPs they participate in, for the reporting period covered in the report. They should act as follows:

    a. Reporting Costs in € and Person months per WP.

    b. All budget numbers shall be full project budgets.

    c. Starting from what was reported in the last report.

3. The Coordinator gathers all reported financial info per Contractor and compiles the respective report for the whole project for the EC, following the template launched from the EC especially adapted, so as to include the financial info of all Contractors and all running WPs in the reporting period.
4. The Coordinator is responsible for the final ratification of the integrated report, before she sends it to the EC.

In the end of the procedure, the Coordinator merges technical and financial data (if needed).

3.7. Dissemination Event scheduling and reporting

All guidelines and details for all dissemination activities will be described in the context of A8.1 "Dissemination plans and actions". The forms used to track the Dissemination actions of Drive2theFuture are provided in **ANNEX G**.

4. Documents referencing and structure

The Quality Manager is responsible for ensuring that all documents are controlled effectively. The system contains two levels of documentation under the control of the Quality Manager in association with the members of the QRT.

Level 1: The control of document referencing.

Level 2: The control of document structure.

4.1. Document referencing

There will be a unique project document template system, as indicated below:

D9.2: Quality Assurance Plan

Table 1: Documents template list.

Document Type	Template to be used
Deliverable	Deliverable Template, Peer Review Report Template, Non-Conforming Report Template, Corrective Actions Request Template
Deliverable Quality Improvement Report	Deliverable Quality Improvement Report template
Internal Report	Internal Report Template
Work packages Plans	Internal Report Template
Correspondence between Beneficiaries (if not by email)	Internal Report Template
Legal documents	Internal Report Template
Commercial documents	Internal Report Template
Documents of general interest	Internal Report Template
Corrective Action request	Request for Corrective Actions Template
Decision on Corrective Action request	Decision on Corrective Actions Request Template
Internal Audits, Inspections	Internal Audit Report Template
Periodic/Annual Reports	EC template for Periodic Report and Annual Report (to be sent to the Consortium by the Coordinator prior to the reporting deadline)
Other subjects	Internal Report Template

There is a unique document referencing scheme. This is not applicable however for informal data and views exchange between Beneficiaries. It is only valid for official Consortium documents, falling in one of the above categories of the previous section.

The project Internal Reports, Deliverables and Quality Improvement Reports referencing scheme follows below.

Table 3: Referencing scheme.

First digits :	" Drive2theFuture "
Underscore	_
Next digits :	Short name of the Partner
Underscore	_
Next digits:	Type of document: for Internal Technical Reports: "IR" & no. of Internal Reports produced by the specific partner; for Deliverables: "Dx.y" (indicating the number of the Deliverable, taken from the DoA); for Quality Improvement Report: "QIR_Dx.y"
Underscore	_
Next digits (only in case of use of the Internal Report – IR template)	Type of document: Ax.y (meaning that the document focuses on Activity …)
Underscore	_
Next digits (optional) :	Short explanatory title for the document, e.g. 'Use cases'
Final digits :	"V" & number of revision of this specific report

Examples:

"Drive2theFuture _CERTH _D9.2_ Quality Assurance Plan_ V1.doc" means first draft version of the D9.2, produced by CERTH, on Project Quality Assurance Plan.

"Drive2theFuture _IRU-IR2_A4.2_plans_v2.doc" means an Internal Report written by IRU, which is the 2nd IR prepared by this partner, on A1.1 management and it is the 2nd version.

4.2. Documents structure

A. Internal Reports
In case of Internal Reports, the following structure should be respected:

- Include the Cover page of **ANNEX F.**
- Include Table of Contents.
- Continue with an Introduction with the aim of this report.
- Separate contents in numbered Chapters and sub-chapters.
- The template of **ANNEX F** should be used.

B. Deliverables

Official Project Deliverables should have a first page template as in **ANNEX H**. They should also use the page layout (headers / footers) suggested in the same Annex. The standard font to be used is Calibri 11, justified.

Furthermore, they should abide to the following structure:

- Include the cover page of **ANNEX H**, followed by a version history table on the next page.
- Have a list of abbreviations used within the Deliverable.
- Have a table of contents.
- Have a list of figures (including the ones of the Annexes).
- Have a list of tables (including the ones of the Annexes).
- Include half to one-page Executive Summary.
- Start with an Introduction.
- Separate contents in numbered Chapters and sub-chapters.
- End the main part with a Conclusions section of around 1 page.
- Include a References section after the Conclusions section.
- Include all detailed technical and other information in Annexes.
- Headers/footers should be in accordance to the template of **ANNEX H**.
- Language should be English (UK).
- Same fonts should be used all over the text.
- The document should have been spell-checked.

5. Conclusion

The rules that apply to the project and the responsibilities per contractor cover all the areas needed for the effective project execution. However, the present Quality Handbook can be updated, if during the project life certain needs for changes and/or additions may arise. This is a task that will be undertaken by the Quality Manager, in agreement with the rest PMT members.

The project Management and the high expertise of the Coordinating team and the rest of the Consortium in EC research projects, guarantee the proper monitoring, coordination and smooth execution of the work.

Annex A: Deliverables internal quality reviewers list

The following table shows the Internal reviewer of each Deliverable from the Consortium part. The proposed distribution of reviews takes into account the expertise of each partners (as much as possible) and also tries to keep a balance among the partners, so that all have finally to review about the same number of Deliverables.

There are 45 Deliverables planned to be delivered, with several of them scheduled to be updated in pre-defined dates. In addition there are 14 revised versions to be delivered.

Table 2 Drive2theFuture Deliverables and reviewers' assignment

Del. #	Deliverable Title	WP	Short name of lead participant	Type	Dissemination Level	First Internal reviewer	Second Internal reviewer
D1.1	User clusters, opinion, research hypotheses and use cases towards future AV acceptance	WP1	AIT	Report	Public	UITP	PIAGGIO
D1.2	Acceptance Risk Assessment	WP1	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	CTL	DBL
D1.3	Revision of D1.2 Acceptance Risk Assessment	WP1	CERTH/HT	Report	Public	CTL	DBL
D2.1	AV acceptance simulation platform and tools	WP2	NTUA	Other	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	FZI	TUM
D2.2	Sentiment analysis on social media	WP2	INFILI	Other	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	VUB	WL
D2.3	AV drivers behavioural models	WP2	TOI	Demonstrator	Public	VTI	INFILI
D2.4	Revision of D2.1 AV acceptance simulation platform and tools	WP2	NTUA	Other	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	FZI	TUM
D2.5	1st revision of D2.2 Sentiment analysis on social media	WP2	INFILI	Report	Public	CERTH/HIT	EURNEX
D2.6	2nd revision of D2.2 Sentiment analysis on social media	WP2	INFILI	Report	Public	CERTH/HIT	EURNEX
D2.7	3rd revision of D2.2 Sentiment analysis on social media	WP2	INFILI	Report	Public	CERTH/HIT	EURNEX

D9.2: Quality Assurance Plan

Del. #	Deliverable Title	WP	Short name of lead participant	Type	Dissemination Level	First Internal reviewer	Second Internal reviewer
D2.8	Revision of D2.3 AV drivers behavioural models	WP2	TOI	Demon strator	Public	VTI	INFILI
D3.1	Affective, persuasive, trusted mand personalised HMI for AV functions	WP3	FhG/IAO	Report	Public	DBL	PIAGGIO
D3.2	HMI development toolkit for AVs	WP3	FhG/IAO	Demon strator	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	PIAGGIO	FZI
D4.1	Novel training tools and scenarios	WP4	VTI	Other	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	VUB	ACASA
D4.2	AV training programs	WP4	IRU	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	WEGEMT	IAM
D4.3	Training certification requirements, acceptance creation measures and impact to employment	WP4	IRU	Report	Public	VIAS	VUB
D5.1	Pilot Plans	WP5	VTI	Report	Public	IFSTTAR	TOI
D5.2	Pilots results consolidation	WP5	DEUSTO	Report	Public	VIAS	FhG/IAO
D5.3	1st Revision of D5.1 Pilot Plans	WP5	VTI	Report	Public	IFSTTAR	TOI
D5.4	2nd Revision of D5.1 Pilot Plans	WP5	VTI	Report	Public	IFSTTAR	TOI
D6.1	Impact assessment framework, project KPIs and their prioritisation	WP6	CTL	Report	Public	AIT	VED
D6.2	Business models and best practices of correlation of automation to MaaS	WP6	SWM	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	ACASA	HUMANIST

Del. #	Deliverable Title	WP	Short name of lead participant	Type	Dissemination Level	First Internal reviewer	Second Internal reviewer
D6.3	Impact assessment of project results	WP6	CTL	Report	Public	CERTH/HIT	VED
D6.4	ESoP on HMI for AVs	WP6	HUMANIST	Report	Public	WL	TUB
D7.1	Ethical, sociocultural, gender, safety, security and legal issues	WP7	TOI	Report	Public	CTL	UITP
D8.1	Project Dissemination material	WP8	ACASA	Websites, patents filling, etc.	Public	HUMANIST	IAM
D8.2	Dissemination Plan, User Forum and events	WP8	ACASA	Report	Public	HUMANIST	PZM
D8.3	Business Models Suite	WP8	SWM	Report	Public	VED	UITP
D8.4	Exploitation plans	WP8	IAM	Report	Public	IRU	SWM
D8.5	Guidelines and policy recommendations	WP8	UITP	Report	Public	ACASA	IRU
D8.6	Automation User Acceptance creation path roadmap	WP8	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	IRU	WEGEMT
D8.7	1st revision of D8.2 Dissemination plan, User Forum and events	WP8	ACASA	Report	Public	FIA	PZM
D8.8	2nd revision of D8.2 Dissemination plan, User Forum and event	WP8	ACASA	Report	Public	FIA	PZM
D8.9	Revision of D8.4 Exploitation Plans	WP8	IAM	Report	Public	FIA	SWM
D9.1	Drive2theFuture Project Presentation	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	-	-
D9.2	Drive2theFuture Quality Assurance Plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	-	-
D9.3	Project Management Plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	-	-
D9.4	Data management plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot	Public	DEUSTO	NTUA

Del. #	Deliverable Title	WP	Short name of lead participant	Type	Dissemination Level	First Internal reviewer	Second Internal reviewer
D9.5	Project Final Report –including the meetings outcomes of Drive2theFuture Advisory Board	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	NTUA	VTI
D9.6	Report on Concertation and clustering actions in Europe and beyond	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Public	TUM	WEGEMT
D9.7	Revision of D9.4 Data Management Plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	ORDP: Open Research Data Pilot		DEUSTO	NTUA
D9.8	1st revision of D9.3 Project Management Plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	AIT	FhG/IAO
D9.9	2nd revision of D9.3 Project Management Plan	WP9	CERTH/HIT	Report	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	AIT	FhG/IAO
D10.1	NEC - Requirement No. 3	WP10	CERTH/HIT	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	TUCO	DEUSTO
D10.2	H - Requirement No. 4	WP10	CERTH/HIT	Ethics	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	SWM	VIAS

The total number of quality reviews per Drive2theFuture Partner is shown in the following table:

Table 3 Drive2theFuture Number of Quality Reviews per Partner.

Partner	No. of Quality Reviews	Partner	No. of Quality Reviews
CERTH	4	**WEGEMT**	3
VTI	3	**AIT**	4
TOI	3	**UITP**	3
NTUA	3	**VED**	3
CTL	3	**PIAGGIO**	4

Partner	No. of Quality Reviews	Partner	No. of Quality Reviews
VUB	3	**FIA**	3
UDEUSTO	3	**IAM**	2
IFSTTAR	3	**PZM**	3
SWM	3	**WL**	2
EURNEX	3	**TUB**	1
DBL	3	**TUCO**	1
FhG/IAO	3	**INFILI**	2
TUM	3	**STELAR**	-
FZI	3	**ACASA**	3
IRU	3	**VIAS**	3
HUMANIST	3		

Annex B: Quality Improvement Report template

QUALITY IMPROVEMENT REPORT

Project Title	Drive2theFuture
Project number	815001
Deliverable number & Title	Dx.y - Title
Workpackage No & Title	WPx, Title
Activity number & Title	A x.z Title
State	DRAFT
Confidentially Level	CO
WP contributing to the Deliverable	WP1, A1.3
Date of Review	
Deliverable Authors	
Email	
Affiliation	
Quality Manager	Dr. Mary Panou (CERTH)

Procedures used for quality review

Quality Improvement Report

The **Drive2theFuture** Consortium uses the **Quality Improvement Report** process for its internal quality assurance for deliverables to assure consistency and high standard for documented project results.

The Quality Improvement Report is processed individually by selected reviewers. The allocated time for the review is 7 working days. The author of the document has the final responsibility to reply on the comments and suggestions of the Peer Reviewers and decide what changes to the document and actions are to be undertaken.

Reviewers (in addition to the Quality Manager):

Coordinator	
External Expert	
Internal Reviewer 1	
Internal Reviewer 2	

Overall Peer Review Result:

Deliverable is:

☐Fully accepted	☐ Accepted with minor corrections, as suggested by the reviewers	☐ Rejected unless major corrections are applied, as suggested by the reviewers

Overall rating of the Deliverable:

Provide a rating from 1 to 5: ....

Procedures used for quality review

Consolidated Comments of Quality Reviewers

(Please note that they will be transmitted to the author and the European Commission)

General Comments
Deliverable contents thoroughness
Reviewer comment:
Author reply:
Innovation level
Reviewer comment:
Author reply:
Correspondence to project and programme objectives
Reviewer comment:
Author reply:

Specific comments	
Relevance	**Reviewer's comment:** ❑Yes ❑No ❑Partially ❑Not applicable **Provide justification for any of the selections made above:**
	Author's response:
Response to user needs	**Reviewer's comment:** ❑Yes ❑No ❑Partially ❑Not applicable

	Provide justification for any of the selections made above:
	Author's response:
Methodological framework soundness	Reviewer's comment:
	Author's response:
Quality of achievements	Reviewer's comment:
	Author's response:
Quality of presentation	Reviewer's comment:
	Author's response:
Deliverable Layout/ Spelling/ Format	Reviewer's comment:
	Author's response:

Annex C: Request for corrective action

Drive2theFuture

	Request for Corrective Action
WP:	
Activity:	
Requesting Participant:	
Number of request:	

No	ISSUE	Reasoning	Proposal for remedy	Deadline for remedy implementation

ANNEX D: Decision on corrective action request

Drive2theFuture

Decision for Corrective Action

Decision for Corrective Action
CORRECTIVE ACTION DECISION   **Number:**   **Title:**   **Date:**
SECTION 1 Description of issue   Relevant WP / Activity: ……………………………………..
SECTION 2 Reasoning / Cause
SECTION 3 Immediate corrective action to be taken   To be implemented by …………… Date …………
SECTION 4 Follow Up Action and Effectiveness Monitor   List Changes to be made: 1.   2.   3.   4.   5.   The Corrective/Preventive Action has been completed and has/has not effectively cured the problem.   Further action has been requested on Corrective Action Request No………………………

Annex E: Internal audit report

To prepare "drivers", travellers and vehicle operators of the future to accept and use connected, cooperative and automated transport modes and the industry of these technologies to understand and meet their needs and wants.

INTERNAL AUDIT DEFICIENCY REPORT No. _____

<to be filled by the QM>

AUDITED PARTNER:		REF. NO:
REFERENCE:		DATE:

Inspection findings & actions		
PART 1: DEFICIENCY DETAILS	Inspected by: Partner Representative: (name & company)	Date:
PART 2: CAUSE		
PART 3: CORRECTIVE ACTION	Name: Implementation Date: Date:	
PART 4: FOLLOW UP AND CLOSE OUT	Name: Date:	

Annex F: Internal Report Template

Contract No: 815001

Internal Report X.Y: TITLE

Work package	
Activity	
Internal Report	
Authors	
Status	
Version	
Dissemination Level	
Document date	
Delivery due date	
Actual delivery date	
Reviewers	

Version History

Document history			
Version	**Date**	**Modified by**	**Comments**

Legal Disclaimer

This document reflects only the views of the author(s). Neither the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) nor the European Commission is in any way responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Abbreviations List

Abbreviation	Definition

Executive Summary

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of the Document

1.2. Intended audience

1.3. Interrelations

2. Level 1 Title

2.1. Level 2 Title

Table 4: Title

2.1.1.   Level 3 Title

Normal Text

- Bulleted Text
  - Bullet level2

5. Numbered Text

2.1.1.1.   Level 4 Title

Figure 1: Title

Table 5: Title

	•
	•
	•
	•

Table 6: Title

.

Landscape page layout

Annex G: Dissemination events reporting forms

DRIVE2THE FUTURE - **LIST OF PAPERS**

Title Paper	Author/s	Partner	Date/Issue	Country, City	Event	Type of audience, target group	Impact (# of attendees, reach, press publication, circulation etc.)	Countries, cities, regions addressed	Relevant contacts made	Impact

Annex H: Deliverables template

Contract No: 815001

Dx.y: TITLE

Work package	WP9
Activity	Project Management
Deliverable	
Authors	
Status	
Version	
Dissemination Level	Public
Document date	
Delivery due date	M2
Actual delivery date	
Reviewers	

Version History

Document history			
Version	**Date**	**Modified by**	**Comments**

Legal Disclaimer

This document reflects only the views of the author(s). Neither the Innovation and Networks Executive Agency (INEA) nor the European Commission is in any way responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Abbreviations List

Abbreviation	Definition

Executive Summary

3. Introduction

3.1. Purpose of the Document

3.2. Intended audience

3.3. Interrelations

3. Introduction

4. Level 1 Title

4.1. Level 2 Title

Table 7: Title

4.1.1.   Level 3 Title

Normal Text

- Bulleted Text
  - Bullet level2

6. Numbered Text

4.1.1.1.   Level 4 Title

4. Level 1 Title

Figure 2: Title

Table 8: Title

	•
	•
	•
	•

Table 9: Title

.

Landscape page layout

Annex I: List of Internal Quality reviewers per partner

#	Name	Short Name	Appointed Reviewers	Email address
1	ETHNIKO KENTRO EREVNAS KAI TECHNOLOGIKIS ANAPTYXIS	CERTH	Maria Gkemou Evangelos Mitsakis	mgemou@certh.gr emit@certh.gr
2	STATENS VAG- OCH TRANSPORTFORSKNINGSINSTITUT	VTI	Jonas Jansson Jan Andersson	Jonas.jansson@vti.se jan.andersson@vti.se
3	TRANSPORTOKONOMISK INSTITUTT	TOI	Truls Vaa	Truls.vaa@toi.no
4	NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS - NTUA	NTUA	Tassos Dragomanovits Julia Roussou	dragoman@central.ntua.gr jroussou@mail.ntua.gr
5	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA LA SAPIENZA	CTL	Roberto Carroccia Brayan González Hernández	roberto.carroccia@uniroma1.it brayan.gonzalez@uniroma1.it
6	VRIJE UNIVERSITEIT BRUSSEL	VUB	Quentin De Clerck Jules Nuyttens	quentin.de.clerck@vub.be jules.antoine.nuyttens@vub.be
7	UNIVERSIDAD DE LA IGLESIA DE DEUSTO ENTIDAD RELIGIOSA	UDEUSTO	Unai Hernandez Pilar Elejoste	unai.hernandez@deusto.es pilar.elejoste@deusto.es
8	INSTITUT FRANCAIS DES SCIENCES ET TECHNOLOGIES DES TRANSPORTS, DE L'AMENAGEMENT ET DES RESEAUX	IFSTTAR	Abderrahmane Bouezoul Stéphane Espie	abderrahmane.boubezoul@ifsttar.fr stephane.espie@ifsttar.fr
9	SWARCO MIZAR SRL	SWM	Laura Coconea Viviana D'Antoni	laura.coconea@swarco.com viviana.dantoni@swarco.com
10	EURNEX e. V.	EURNEX	Celestino Sánchez Armando Carrillo	cesama@eurnex.eu acarrillo@eurnex.eu
11	DEEP BLUE SRL	DEEP BLUE	Marco Ducci Damiano Taurino	marco.ducci@dblue.it damiano.taurino@dblue.it
12	FRAUNHOFER GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FOERDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V	Fraunhofer	Lesley-Ann Mathis Frederik Diederichs	lesley-ann.mathis@iao.fraunhofer.de Frederik.Diederichs@iao.fraunhofer.de
13	TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITAET MUENCHEN	TUM	Christelle Al Haddad Christos Katrakazas	christelle.haddad@tum.de c.katrakazas@tum.de
14	FZI FORSCHUNGSZENTRUM INFORMATIK	FZI	Marc Zofka Philip Schoerner	zofka@fzi.de schoerner@fzi.de
15	IRU PROJECTS ASBL	IRU	Carlo Giro	Carlo.Giro@iruprojects.org

#	Name	Short Name	Appointed Reviewers	Email address
16	HUMANIST	HUMANIST	Lucile Mendoza	lucile.mendoza@humanist-vce.eu
17	FOUNDATION WEGEMT - A EUROPEAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITIES IN MARINE TECHNOLOGY AND RELATED SCIENCES	WEGEMT	George Smyrnakis John Ergas	george.smyrnakis@ncl.ac.uk ergas@wegemt.eu
18	AIT AUSTRIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY GMBH	AIT	Wolfang Ponweiser Peter Fröhlich	wolfgang.ponweiser@ait.ac.at peter.froehlich@ait.ac.at
19	UNION INTERNATIONALE DES TRANSPORTS PUBLICS	UITP	Michele Tozzi Guido Di Pasquale	michele.tozzi@uitp.org guido.dipasquale@uitp.org
20	FONDATION PARTENARIAL MOV'EOTEC	VED	Ebru Burcu Dogan Mercedes Bueno Garcia	ebru.dogan@vedecom.fr mercedes.bueno-garcia@vedecom.fr
21	PIAGGIO & C S.P.A.	PIAGGIO	Dr. Giada Serafini Eng. Irene Ducci	giada.serafini@piaggio.com irene.ducci@piaggio.com
22	FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DE L'AUTOMOBILE	FIA	Olivier Lenz David Ertl	olenz@fia.com dertl@fia.com
23	THE INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED MOTORISTS LIMITED	IAM RoadSmart	Nicola Mason Kate Tonge	Nicola.mason@iam.org.uk Kate.Tonge@iam.org.uk
24	POLSKI ZWIAZEK MOTOROWY	PZM	Marzena Jougounoux Adam Sobieraj	marzena.jougounoux@pzm.pl adam.sobieraj@pzm.pl
25	WIENER LINIEN GMBH &CO KG	Wiener Linien	Susanne Pröstl Georg Brenner	susanne.proestl@wienerlinien.at georg.brenner@wienerlinien.at
26	TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITAT BERLIN	TUB	Philipp Schneider Armin Emde	drivetothefuture@railways.tu-berlin.de drivetothefuture@railways.tu-berlin.de
27	TUCO YACHT VÆRFT APS	TUCO	Morten Andersen Jonas Pedersen	ma@tuco.dk jonas@tuco.dk
28	INFILI TECHNOLOGIES PRIVATE COMPANY	INFILI TECH	Antonis Litke Nikos Bakalos	alitke@mail.ntua.gr bakalosnik@gmail.com
29	STELAR SECURITY TECHNOLOGY LAW RESEARCH UG	STELAR	N/A	N/A
30	AUTOMOBIL CLUB ASSISTENCIA SA	ACASA	Mr. Marc Figuls Mr. Martí Massot	marc.figuls@racc.es marti.massot@racc.es
31	VIAS INSTITUTE	VIAS	Jean-Francois Gaillet Babette DeWilde	Jean-Francois.Gaillet@vias.be Babette.DeWilde@vias.be