Rapid Multi-Risk Needs Evaluation and Planning Platform

101193586 - EMERGE - UCPM-2024-KAPP-PV

Project Management
Quality Procedures Manual

Work package:	01
Deliverable Number:	1.4
Lead Beneficiary:	JBE
Coordinator:	IZIIS
Contributing Beneficiaries:	UPT, AUTH, EUCENTRE, IUSS, NOA, CMC, PRD, AKMC, PPI, INFRATECH
Dissemination Level:	Public
Version:	01
Due Date:	April 30, 2025
Submission Date:	April 30, 2025

Rapid Multi-Risk Needs Evaluation and Planning Platform

101193586 - EMERGE - UCPM-2024-KAPP-PV

Project Management

Quality Procedures Manual

WP-01 | D1.4

Wan Wijk, T., Pol, J., Nethmini, H., Salic Makreska, R., Gjorgjiev, I., Bojadjieva, J., Sesov, V., Apostolska, R., Capragoski, G., Baballëku, M., Pitilakis, D., Riga, E., Amendola, C., Borzi, B., Monteiro, R., Joan-Ktenidou, O., Stefanoski, S., Atanasovska, V., Klajdi, N., Beck, A., Zgjanjolli, R.

April 30, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary

The Quality Procedures Manual (Deliverable D1.4) outlines the mechanisms, roles, and tools established within the EMERGE project to ensure effective quality management across all phases of implementation. Developed under WP1, this manual provides a comprehensive structure for internal quality assurance (QA) and quality control (QC), supporting the delivery of scientifically robust, timely, and consistent outputs.

The document defines the responsibilities of key actors in the project's quality framework, including the Project Coordinator, Work Package Leaders (WPLs), Task Leaders (TLs), and the Internal Review Panel (IRP). It explains how quality assurance is integrated into EMERGE's management hierarchy (ML1–ML4) and formalizes the deliverable review process. Internal drafts are reviewed using a standard checklist, revised based on consolidated IRP feedback, and approved prior to submission to the European Commission.

In addition to document and deliverable quality, the manual outlines procedures for risk tracking, metadata and data versioning, ethical and legal compliance (GDPR, IPR, conflict of interest), and archiving. It also highlights the project's internal performance indicators, including timeliness, stakeholder feedback, and review cycle efficiency—used to support continuous improvement and alignment with Article 21 of the Grant Agreement.

This manual serves as a practical reference for all consortium members, reinforcing accountability, transparency, and collaboration throughout the EMERGE project lifecycle.

1. Introduction

The Quality Procedures Manual (QPM) has been developed to support the effective implementation and internal coordination of the EMERGE project by providing a unified structure for quality assurance and control. The QPM sets out the standards and procedures for reviewing, validating, and documenting project outputs in line with the requirements set forth in the Grant Agreement and the principles of sound scientific and operational management.

1.1. Project Management Board (PMB – ML1)

The Project Management Board (PMB) represents the highest decision-making body in the project's governance structure (Management Level 1 – ML1). It consists of one representative from each partner's organization and is chaired by the Project Coordinator. The PMB holds responsibility for approving deliverables, reviewing progress, resolving strategic issues, and validating internal procedures including those related to quality assurance. Recommendations from the Internal Review Panel (IRP) and the External Project Advisory Committee (EPAC) are considered in PMB decision-making processes.

1.2 Relation to the Grant Agreement and D1.2

This manual builds upon the project management and coordination framework described in Deliverable D1.2 and ensures compliance with several relevant articles of the Grant Agreement:

- Article 20 (Record-keeping and supporting documentation)
- Article 21 (Reporting requirements)
- Article 25 (Checks, reviews, audits)

It complements the principles of quality assurance outlined in Task 1.3 of the Description of the Action and provides operational detail to ensure that all partners meet their obligations concerning documentation, review, and reporting.

1.3 Scope and Applicability

This manual applies to all project partners and covers the following aspects of the quality process:

- Roles and responsibilities in quality management
- Review and validation of deliverables
- Data integrity and document versioning
- Risk monitoring and deviation control
- Ethical, legal, and IPR compliance
- Internal reporting and performance tracking

- KPIs evaluation and adjustments

It serves as a living document and will be updated, if necessary, during the project lifecycle based on the outcomes of internal evaluations or recommendations from the PMB.

2. Quality Assurance Framework

The Quality Assurance (QA) Framework in the EMERGE project sets the foundation for a structured and transparent approach to delivering high-quality results. This chapter provides a detailed overview of how quality is defined, managed, and embedded in project execution through shared principles, procedures, and assigned roles. The framework ensures that both the process and outcomes of EMERGE adhere to European Commission expectations, scientific standards, and stakeholder needs.

2.1 Quality Principles and Objectives

The QA strategy in EMERGE is guided by five overarching principles:

- Accuracy – Ensures that all outputs are based on validated data, reliable methodologies, and scientific rigor.
- Consistency – Promotes uniformity across documents and results by applying shared templates, procedures, and terminology.
- Timeliness – Reinforces compliance with project deadlines and milestones.
- Transparency – Enables tracking of reviews, updates, and decisions through documented processes and version control.
- Relevance – Ensures that deliverables and activities are directly aligned with the objectives of the project and the needs of end-users.

These principles are translated into operational goals such as early detection of quality issues, reduction of errors, efficient communication, and improvement of stakeholder satisfaction.

2.2 Integration with Project Governance

The QA framework is fully integrated into the project's four-tiered management structure (ML1 to ML4) described in D1.2. Each tier has defined responsibilities that support a layered and interdependent approach to quality control:

- ML1 – PMB provides overall QA direction, endorses review protocols, and ensures alignment with strategic objectives.
- ML2 – Project Coordinator (PC) supervises QA plan execution, manages deliverable approvals, and reports quality metrics.
- ML3 – Work Package Leaders (WPLs) coordinate implementation of QA standards within their respective work packages.

- ML4 – Task Leaders (TLs) conduct hands-on task-level QA checks and maintain task documentation.

This hierarchical structure ensures that quality is monitored and upheld at all levels of project execution, from strategic planning to technical task delivery.

Furthermore, the Internal Review Panel (IRP) operates as an independent body tasked with reviewing deliverables before submission, while the External Project Advisory Committee (EPAC) provides additional strategic and user-centered feedback to strengthen QA integration.

2.3 Roles and Review Bodies

Effective QA depends on clear delegation of responsibilities. Each actor in the management structure contributes to QA implementation according to their function:

Project Coordinator (PC)
- Oversee QA strategy and enforce project-wide standards.
- Ensures that all outputs undergo appropriate review cycles.
- Maintains communication with the EC and ensures compliance with GA requirements.

Work Package Leaders (WPLs)
- Ensure the integration of QA protocols in all WP tasks.
- Facilitate the preparation and timely delivery of high-quality outputs.
- Liaise with Task Leaders and IRP to coordinate internal reviews.

Task Leaders (TLs)
- Are responsible for the daily execution of activities at the task level.
- Conduct quality checks during implementation and before handover to WPLs.
- Ensure consistency with WP objectives and formatting standards.

Internal Review Panel (IRP)
- Functions as an internal peer-review mechanism.
- Applies the quality checklist (Annex 1) to evaluate draft deliverables.
- Issues feedback and supports WPLs in refining outputs prior to submission.

This structured delegation reinforces accountability while promoting proactive engagement of all partners in maintaining project quality.

3. Internal Quality Review Process

The Internal Quality Review Process is the backbone of EMERGE's quality control system. It ensures that all deliverables and key project outputs undergo rigorous scrutiny before their final submission to the European Commission. This process guarantees that

content is scientifically robust, timely, and aligned with the objectives of the project. It also helps promote transparency and accountability across all partner institutions.

The review process is designed to be efficient yet thorough, providing ample time for review, feedback, and revision. All major outputs, particularly those listed as official project deliverables, are subject to this internal review cycle.

3.1 IRP Structure and Scope

The Internal Review Panel (IRP) is a permanent body within EMERGE composed of one expert from each partner institution. The IRP is multidisciplinary in nature, ensuring diverse perspectives and technical rigor in the review process. Members are nominated based on their expertise and availability and are expected to act impartially, even when reviewing work produced by their own organization.

The IRP is coordinated by the Project Coordinator and operates under clearly defined procedures for document circulation, evaluation, and feedback provision. It meets virtually on a regular basis and ad hoc when deliverables are ready for review.

The internal review applies to all public and confidential deliverables as identified in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement. It may also be extended to technical documents, interim reports, and dissemination materials if deemed necessary by the WP Leaders or the Coordinator.

The scope of the review includes:

- Scientific accuracy and methodology
- Compliance with the project work plan
- Clarity of content and structure
- Consistence with formatting and communication standards
- Alignment with EU and project branding requirements

3.3 Review Workflow and Timeline

The internal review process is organized in a structured workflow designed to minimize delays while ensuring high quality.

Draft Submission
Task Leaders or Work Package Leaders submit the first version of the deliverable to the IRP at least two weeks prior to the official submission deadline. The document must be complete and follow the formatting template and naming convention outlined in Chapter 4.

IRP Evaluation and Checklist
Each IRP member reviews the deliverable using a standardized checklist (Annex 1), assessing scientific content, structure, clarity, formatting, and compliance with Grant

Agreement requirements. Comments are submitted in a structured feedback template to ensure comparability and clarity.

Feedback Consolidation
The IRP rapporteur—nominated for each review cycle—collects and compiles all comments into a single document. This feedback is then forwarded to the responsible WP Leader and Task Leader, who coordinates the revision process. If needed, a short meeting may be held to clarify the review findings. This is done using the IRP Comment Summary Template (Annex 3).

Revision and Resubmission
Based on IRP feedback, the deliverable is revised and returned for final clearance. The Project Coordinator reviews the updated version to verify that all mandatory corrections have been made and that the document is ready for official submission.

3.4 Documentation and Version Control

To ensure traceability, all versions of deliverables are archived in a shared project repository (OneDrive), including:

- Draft version submitted to IRP
- Review comments and IRP summaries
- Revised version of post-feedback
- Final approved version

Version numbers must be clearly indicated (e.g., Dx.x_v0.1-draft, Dx.x_v1.0-final) and the review timeline recorded. A central register maintained by the Project Coordinator ensures all reviews are tracked, and lessons learned are applied in future cycles.

This structured process supports not only compliance with the Grant Agreement but also contributes to capacity building among partners through constructive peer exchange.

4. Deliverables Preparation and Submission

The preparation and submission of deliverables within EMERGE follow a systematic and transparent process to ensure consistency, compliance with Grant Agreement requirements, and high quality of outputs. This chapter describes the structure, formatting, routing, and final approval procedures applicable to all project deliverables and outputs.

4.1 Document Template and Format

All project deliverables must use the official EMERGE document template, which includes the project title, grant number, disclaimer, partner logo area, and versioning

metadata. The formatting guidelines are based on EU visibility rules and internal consistency standards established in WP1.

Documents should:

- Be written in clear, professional English;
- Use standardized headings, footers, and page numbering;
- Include the Deliverable ID, version number, and confidentiality level;
- Be submitted in both editable (e.g., .docx) and final (.pdf) formats unless stated otherwise.

These standards ensure that documents are recognizable, traceable, and suitable for public dissemination when applicable.

4.2 File Naming and Versioning Conventions

Proper file naming and version control are essential for ensuring traceability and reducing confusion in document exchanges across partners. The following naming convention must be used: Additional guidance is provided in the File Naming and Versioning Guide (Annex 4).

[DeliverableID]_[ShortTitle]_V[VersionNo]-[Status].docx/pdf
Example: D1.4_QualityManual_V1.0-final.pdf

Version statuses may include draft, revised, final, and resubmitted. All intermediate versions (e.g., V0.1-draft) should be stored in the shared document repository. Version logs and histories should be maintained where relevant.

4.3 Quality Checkpoints and Approval Routing

The EMERGE quality control process is built on a layered validation system to ensure consistency and accountability throughout document development.

4.3.1 Internal Deadlines

Each deliverable should undergo an internal review at least three weeks prior to the EC deadline. WPLs and TLs are responsible for preparing deliverables on time, initiating review with the IRP, and updating the versions based on comments received.

A calendar of internal deadlines is managed by the Project Coordinator and circulated regularly to ensure clarity and planning. For planned timing across WPs, see the QA/QC Timeline (Annex 2).

4.3.2 Final Approval by Coordinator

Once IRP feedback has been addressed and the final version is complete, it is submitted to the Project Coordinator for quality verification and final approval. The Coordinator confirms:

- All required sections and formatting are present;
- Review comments were incorporated appropriately;
- The document meets the standards set in the QPM and Grant Agreement.

Upon approval, the document is ready for official submission.

4.4 Submission through the EC Portal

The Project Coordinator is responsible for uploading all final deliverables to the EU Funding & Tenders Portal in compliance with Article 21 of the Grant Agreement. The final submission must:

- Use the appropriate document type and confidentiality classification (PU, CO, EU-RES, etc.);
- Be uploaded in the required format (pdf, .zip, etc.);
- Be accompanied by brief metadata when requested (e.g., abstract or summary).

Each submission is logged and confirmed with a timestamped entry in the internal deliverable's tracker.

This structured approach ensures that all deliverables are handled with consistency, accountability, and compliance, while also minimizing delays or errors in official communications with the European Commission.

5. Risk Monitoring and Quality Control

Effective risk monitoring and mitigation are essential components of EMERGE's internal quality strategy. Risks can arise from scientific uncertainties, delays in implementation, technical incompatibilities, or coordination difficulties between partners. This chapter outlines the processes in place to identify, assess, track, and respond to such risks in a proactive and structured manner.

5.1 Link with Risk Register (D1.2)

The project maintains a comprehensive Risk Register, detailed in Deliverable D1.2, which includes eight primary risks identified at the start of the project. Each risk is evaluated in terms of its likelihood and impact and assigned a mitigation strategy along with a responsible WP. The Quality Procedures Manual draws directly from this register to guide how QA-related risks should be handled.

All identified risks that may affect the quality, timing, or completeness of project deliverables are continuously monitored and reviewed during project meetings. This includes:

- Scientific or technical challenges that may delay tasks;
- Partner underperformance or unavailability;
- Loss of key personnel;
- Data management or validation issues.

Risk monitoring is the shared responsibility of the Project Coordinator, WP Leaders, and Task Leaders. The following tracking procedures are applied:

- Risks are reviewed and discussed during each PMB meeting and WP coordination session;
- New or emerging risks are recorded in the Risk Register;
- Risk status (open, mitigated, closed) is continuously updated by responsible persons;
- For QA-specific risks, the IRP is consulted to advise on mitigation and escalation.

This dynamic approach enables the project to remain agile and responsive, while also providing a reliable mechanism for ensuring that QA concerns are escalated appropriately.

5.2 Risk Tracking and Deviation Handling

Despite best efforts, deviations from the project plan or quality standards may still occur. These include:

- Missed internal deadlines or deliverable delays;
- Review feedback not being implemented properly;
- Output does not meet expected quality thresholds.

Deviations are first identified during IRP reviews, internal reporting, or progress meetings. Once identified, they are escalated to the WP Leader and the Project Coordinator. If the deviation may affect the successful delivery of the project, the PMB is consulted to determine corrective measures.

A corrective action log is maintained by the Coordinator, and actions are tracked until resolution.

5.4 Corrective Action and Mitigation Review

When a risk is confirmed or a deviation is reported, the project follows a clear process to resolve the issue:

- Root cause analysis is conducted with input from the relevant WP or task.

- Mitigation measures are proposed and documented (e.g., task reallocation, timeline adjustment).
- Corrective actions are implemented under the supervision of the Coordinator.
- A follow-up review is conducted to assess whether the issue has been resolved and if preventive steps are needed.

Lessons learned from each case are used to update QA practices, internal workflows, and future deliverable planning. This ensures the continuous strengthening of the EMERGE quality management system throughout the project lifecycle.

6. Data Management Quality

High-quality data management is critical for the success of the EMERGE project. It underpins the reliability of risk assessments, tool development, and policy recommendations. Data must be collected, stored, processed, and shared in a way that ensures integrity, transparency, traceability, and compliance with the applicable legal and scientific standards. This chapter outlines the procedures in place to maintain data quality throughout the project lifecycle.

6.1 Quality Control of Collected and Produced Data

Each partner is responsible for the quality of the data they collect or generate. Quality control measures include:

- Ensuring accuracy, completeness, and consistency of raw and processed data;
- Using validated tools, sensors, and survey protocols;
- Applying harmonized classification and georeferencing standards;
- Documenting sources, assumptions, and processing steps.

WP Leaders oversee the adherence to quality standards, while the Project Coordinator monitors cross-WP consistency. Where appropriate, peer review of data sets and outputs will be organized to verify fitness for purpose.

6.2 Traceability and Versioning of Datasets

To ensure data traceability, all datasets—whether raw, intermediate, or final—must be versioned and stored in clearly structured directories. Version numbers and change logs must accompany every update.

Each dataset must include metadata explaining:

- Who produced it and when;
- What it contains and in which format;
- How it was created or modified;
- Under what usage conditions it may be shared or published.

A shared repository (OneDrive) is used to host project data. Access rights are managed by the Project Coordinator and WP Leaders to safeguard confidentiality and integrity.

6.3 Documentation and Metadata Standards

All datasets and models must be documented using standardized metadata protocols. Metadata should provide sufficient descriptive, technical, and administrative information to ensure that data can be understood, reused, and verified.

Minimum metadata fields include:

- Dataset title and description;
- Responsible institution and contact person;
- Date of creation and latest revision;
- Format, resolution, and coordinate system (if applicable);
- Data license or access rights;
- Link to related deliverables or publications.

This documentation is essential for ensuring transparency and reusability, particularly for scientific outputs and when interacting with external stakeholders.

6.4 Compliance with GA Articles 19, 20, 25

All data-related activities in EMERGE must comply with the relevant provisions of the Grant Agreement:

- Article 19 – Data management obligations, especially concerning open access and FAIR principles;
- Article 20 – Record-keeping and retention of supporting documents for audits;
- Article 25 – Reviews, audits, and access to data by the granting authority or its representatives.

Partners must ensure that data is securely stored and accessible for at least five years after the project ends. Sensitive data must be anonymized or protected according to GDPR and ethical standards.

These practices are developed directly in line with the obligations outlined in the Grant Agreement and implemented as part of the overall quality assurance procedures under WP1.

7. Communication and Coordination

Effective communication and coordination mechanisms are essential for implementing quality assurance processes and maintaining consistency across the EMERGE consortium. This chapter outlines the internal procedures and tools that ensure timely information sharing, decision tracking, and document management among partners.

7.1 Reporting Cycles and Checkpoints

Regular reporting and status updates are the backbone of internal coordination. Each Work Package Leader is responsible for organizing periodic WP-level updates, including monthly check-ins or written progress summaries. At the project level, reporting is coordinated by the Project Coordinator and discussed during PMB meetings.

The reporting cycle includes:

- Monthly WP-level updates (written or virtual);
- Quarterly internal updates to the Coordinator;
- Biannual review during PMB sessions;
- Pre-submission review checkpoints for deliverables.

These checkpoints ensure that QA indicators such as timeliness and completeness are continuously monitored.

To maintain institutional memory and follow-up on decisions, formal minutes are taken for all project meetings, including:

- Kick-off and consortium meetings;
- WP-level coordination calls;
- Thematic or task-specific workshops;
- PMB and advisory body meetings.

Each meeting log includes:

- Date, participants, and agenda;
- Summary of key discussions;
- Action items with responsible persons and deadlines;
- QA/QC concerns raised, if any.

Minutes are uploaded to the project's shared workspace and serve as a reference for monitoring implementation.

7.2 Meeting Records and Information Tools

EMERGE uses secure, shared platforms (OneDrive) to ensure real-time collaboration and controlled document access. The tools support:

- Version-controlled document uploads;
- Role-based access management;
- Simultaneous editing and commenting;
- Shared calendars and delivery schedules.

All project documents—including drafts, reviews, and final deliverables—must be stored in structured folders that reflect the WP/task/deliverable hierarchy.

7.4 QA/QC Records Archiving

To ensure traceability, QA/QC records must be properly archived and maintained for audit purposes. These include:

- IRP review forms and checklists;
- Version histories of deliverables;
- Feedback summaries and response matrices;
- Risk escalation reports and resolution logs.

The Project Coordinator oversees the archiving system and ensures that documentation complies with Article 20 (record-keeping) and Article 25 (audits and access) of the Grant Agreement. All records must be retained for at least five years after the end of the project.

8. Ethical and Legal Compliance

EMERGE upholds the highest standards of ethical conduct, data protection, and legal compliance across all project activities. This chapter outlines the framework for safeguarding privacy, managing intellectual property, ensuring ethical research practices, and addressing conflicts of interest. The procedures described here reflect both the obligations of the Grant Agreement and the principles of responsible research and innovation (RRI).

8.1 Data Protection and GDPR

All partners must comply with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR – EU 2016/679) when processing personal data. This includes:

- Identifying lawful grounds for processing (e.g., consent or legitimate interest);
- Ensuring data minimization and purpose limitation;
- Applying appropriate technical and organizational safeguards;
- Informing data subjects and providing rights of access, rectification, and erasure.

The Project Coordinator, in cooperation with relevant institutional Data Protection Officers (DPOs), ensures that data protection requirements are considered during design, data collection, and dissemination phases.

When personal data is processed (e.g., expert interviews, surveys), data protection notices and consent forms must be provided and retained in the project archive.

8.2 Intellectual Property and IPR Rules

Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) in EMERGE are governed by the Consortium Agreement (CA), which sets out:

- Ownership of results (individual vs. joint);
- Rights to use background and results for project implementation;
- Access rights for exploitation or further research;
- Confidentiality and publication procedures.

All partners must:

- Respect for ownership provisions for background and results;
- Identify protectable outputs and inform the Coordinator in advance of publications or dissemination;
- Acknowledge EU funding in accordance with Article 17 of the GA.

Deliverables, tools, and data produced in EMERGE must be labeled with the appropriate rights statement (e.g., open access, restricted, or proprietary).

8.3 Ethical Research Practices

EMERGE adheres to the ethical principles set out in Article 13 of the Grant Agreement and applicable national/international frameworks. Specific measures include:

- Ethical self-assessment for all WPs at project start;
- Avoidance of plagiarism and respect for academic integrity;
- Fair and inclusive participation of stakeholders;
- Avoidance of harm in case study work or testing exercises.

Where required, partners must seek ethical clearance from relevant institutional ethics boards before commencing fieldwork or research involving human subjects.

8.4 Conflict of Interest and Declarations

Conflicts of interest (COI) can arise when personal, institutional, or financial interests compromise—or appear to compromise—objective decision-making or research outcomes.

To mitigate such risks, EMERGE applies the following rules:

- All PMB and IRP members must declare potential conflicts annually;
- Partners must disclose any COI that may affect task delivery or evaluation;
- The Project Coordinator manages declarations and decides on mitigation measures with the PMB.

COI declarations and decisions are documented and archived for audit and transparency purposes, in line with Articles 35 and 36 of the Model Grant Agreement.

9. Monitoring KPIs and Success Indicators

To support continuous improvement and evidence-based project management, EMERGE monitors a set of internal performance indicators aligned with the quality assurance strategy and the reporting obligations under Article 21 of the Grant Agreement. These indicators help track the efficiency and impact of project implementation, enabling the Project Coordinator and Work Package Leaders to make timely adjustments.

9.1 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for QA/QC

Although the Grant Agreement does not define formal KPIs, EMERGE uses the following internal indicators to monitor QA/QC performance:

- Percentage of deliverables submitted on time vs. planned;
- Number of deliverables revised after IRP feedback;
- Timeliness and completeness of partner contributions;
- Responsiveness to IRP comments (measured via compliance logs);
- Adherence to formatting, submission, and data documentation standards.

These KPIs are reviewed quarterly by the Project Coordinator and presented during PMB meetings.

9.2 Milestone and Deliverable Monitoring

In addition to KPIs, the project tracks the achievement of predefined milestones and deliverables listed in Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement. Each WP Leader is responsible for:

- Monitoring the status of upcoming deliverables;
- Logging milestone progress in shared dashboards;
- Reporting issues or risks to the Coordinator in a timely manner.

Deviations are recorded in the quality control log and addressed using the mitigation strategies outlined in Chapter 5.

9.3 Feedback Integration from Stakeholders

Stakeholder engagement is central to EMERGE's relevance and impact. Feedback is collected through:

- Workshops, pilot activities, and validation events;
- Surveys and interviews with end users and experts;

- Regular interactions with the External Project Advisory Committee (EPAC).

Findings from these engagements are documented and reviewed for:

- Improving deliverables and platform usability;
- Adjusting communication and training materials;
- Enhancing cross-border applicability and replication potential.

9.4 Continuous Improvement Measures

The EMERGE quality assurance approach promotes a culture of learning and adaptation. Continuous improvement is supported through:

- Lessons-learned sessions after major deliverables or events;
- Documentation of best practices and challenges;
- Updates to internal templates, workflows, or tools when justified;
- Capacity-building support for partners needing QA reinforcement.

The Project Coordinator, with input from the PMB, uses these insights to update quality procedures and ensure alignment with project goals and stakeholder needs.

Disclaimer

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the European Commission can be held responsible for them.

Annex 1 – Deliverable Review Checklist

To be completed by each IRP member during the internal review of project deliverables.

Section	**Evaluation Criteria**	**Comments / Suggestions**
General Information	Deliverable ID, Title, Version Number	
Objectives Alignment	Is the deliverable consistent with project goals and GA Annex 1?	
Scientific/Technical Quality	Are the methods, data, and results robust and well-presented?	
Structure and Clarity	Is the document logically organized and clearly written?	
Use of Template	Does it follow EMERGE formatting and file naming conventions?	
Compliance and Referencing	Are references, disclaimers, and acknowledgments correctly used?	
Overall Recommendation	☐ Approve ☐ Minor Revision ☐ Major Revision ☐ Reject	

Annex 2 – QA/QC Timeline per WP

WP	DL	Title	Lead Partner	Planned Date	Draft Deadline	IRP Review Period	Final Submission
1	Dx.x	Title	Partner	[Insert Date]	[Insert Date]	[Insert Dates]	[Insert Date]

Annex 3 – IRP Comment Summary Template

Deliverable ID and Title: [Enter title]

Version Reviewed: [v0.x]

IRP Rapporteur: [Name Surname]

Date of Review: [Date]

List of Reviewers and Comments

Reviewer	Section Reviewed	Comments / Suggestions	Type (Technical / Editorial)

Annex 4 – File Naming and Versioning Guide

Standard File Naming Convention

[DeliverableID]_[ShortTitle]_V[Version]-[Status].ext

Example: D1.4_Quality Procedures Manual_V1.0-final.pdf

Versioning Guidance

V0.x: Drafts under development
V1.0: Final version submitted to EC
V1.1+: Revisions post-submission or review

Status Tags

draft: Not reviewed by IRP
revised: Updated after IRP feedback
final: Approved and submitted
resubmitted: Revised after EC comments

Version Tracking Table (Optional)

Version	Date	Description of Changes	Lead Beneficiary
V0.1		Initial draft created	
V0.2		Updated based on internal review	
V1.0		Final version for submission	

Annex 5 – Internal Review Flowchart