ECP 2006 DILI 510049

ENRICH

Quality Plan

Deliverable number	*D 1.1*
Dissemination level	*Public*
Delivery date	*29/05/2008*
Status	*Draft*
Author(s)	*Jakub Heller, CCP*
	Adolf Knoll, NKP

*e*Content*plus*

---

[1] OJ L 79, 24.3.2005, p. 1.

Document Version Control

Version	Date	Change Made (and if appropriate reason for change)	Initials of Commentator(s) or Author(s)
0.0	30/1/2008	Initial Version of Quality Plan	JH, CCP
0.1	10/03/3008	Updated according discussion at 3 month meeting	JH, CCP
1.0	10/05/2008	Amended according to requests of the project officer, technical quality aspects added	JH, CCP

Document Review

Reviewer	Institution	Date and result of the review
Zdeněk Uhlíř	NKP	15/02/2008 Document approved for submission to EC.
Jakub Heller	CCP	03/03/2008, amendments according to the discussion held in Copenhagen
Tomáš Psohlavec	AIP	20/05/2008 Updated version approved by the Technical Coordinator

Approved By (signature)	Date

Accepted by at European Commission (signature)	Date

1 Executive Summary

ENRICH Quality Plan defines the project management structure, procedures, organisation and the methodology that consortium partners will use during the project to support quality management.

CONTENT

2 Introduction

2.1 Purpose of the Quality Plan

The Quality Plan defines the processes and the methodologies that all the partners shall apply throughout the realization of ENRICH project funded under eContent+ programme of the European Union. It forms a common standard for the entire project lifecycle. All partners are involved in quality assurance activities.

The Quality Plan is a project deliverable D 1.1.

Its purpose is to identify processes that will be applied to assure quality, define roles and responsibilities to ensure a successful project and deliverables, provide ENRICH management boards and quality engineers with indicators to allow them to take appropriate decisions, and to track and report on project progress, describe the document and entity management practices to be used by ENRICH (e.g. procedures, rules).

2.2 Context Domain

The ENRICH Quality Plan is designed to be used in conjunction with:

- ENRICH, Annex 1 'Description of Work'

- The Contract

- The Consortium Agreement

2.3 Use Domains

The Quality Plan shall be used by all Consortium Partners. It covers all protocols related to

- Deliverables due to the European Commission, and

- Internal Project Outputs, and

- Exchange of all documents and entities between consortium members.

Consortium Partners should monitor, check, and validate the work performed by their own staff in accordance with the ENRICH Quality Management Plan.

2.4   Applicable documents

[A1]   ECP 2006 DILI 510049 ENRICH , Annex 1 'Description of Work'
[A2]   The Contract
[A3]   The Consortium Agreement

2.5   ENRICH Quality Plan evolution procedure

This is a living document. It will be reviewed during the Management Board meetings and may be revised to reflect, such factors as:

- Changes in the context/environment of the Project

- Changes the available skill set of staff

- Changes in the available technologies.

Amendments may be requested by any consortium partner but each amendment must be analysed by the Coordinator and Technical Coordinator and then approved by the ENRICH Management Board.

2.6   Lack of adherence to the Quality Plan

If there is a conflict between a Consortium Partner's internal Quality Management procedures and those defined in this document, this should be brought to the attention of the ENRICH Management Board. Normally, greater weight will be given to the ENRICH Quality Management Plan.

On demand of the of members of the consortium the Coordinator may arrange for the work of any of the participating Consortium Partners to be reviewed. The lead reviewer must not be a member of staff of the Consortium Partner being reviewed. Partners will be given one months notice of the intention to perform a review.

Where problems are identified during a quality audit, corrective actions shall be agreed between the auditor, the respective WP Leader(s) and the quality representative. The reviewer shall ensure that the agreed corrective action is effectively implemented within the set time-scale and the auditor shall verify the implementation.

2.7   Abbreviations

[Ax]	Applicable Document
ENRICH	European Networking Resources and Information concerning Cultural Heritage
DoW	Description of Work
EC	European Commission
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader
PM	Project Manager
TGC	Technological Group Committee
WPC	Work Package Management Committee
MB	ENRICH Management Board

3 Quality objectives

The ENRICH quality objectives are to set quality measures, to provide support to consortium partners to achieve these and monitor adherence to the Quality Plan throughout the project's lifecycle. The Quality Plan is designed to provide for the assurance of quality, according to the main ENRICH Project characteristics.

3.1 Project characteristics

The objective of the ENRICH project is creating a base for the European digital library of cultural heritage (manuscript, incunabula, early printed books, archival papers etc) by integration of existing but scattered electronic content within the actual Manuscriptorium digital library through the way of the metadata enrichment and coordination between heterogeneous metadata and data standards as well.

The objectives of ENRICH are:
- creation of European digital library research environment for specific historical cultural heritage consisting of manuscripts, incunabula, early printed books, historical archival materials, maps, etc.
- adaptation of existing Manuscriptorium platform for accessing, use, re-use and data harvesting of digitized manuscripts held by libraries, museums and archives in EU Member States, Associated States, Candidate Countries, and other European countries which will enable interoperability between digitized objects and collections
- adaptation of existing Manuscriptorium platform enabling interoperability of existing partner systems for authorizing the use of the digital content
- implementation of multilingual ontologies enabling search in local languages, retrieval of data in source languages, enabling personalized indexing and creation of personal collections and presentations

The key results of ENRICH will be:
- A functioning platform based on Manuscriptorium incorporating:
  - Single interface for accessing manuscripts and related metadata from a single access portal integrated to TEL
  - Viewing source digital documents from its original location
  - Conversion of data in variable formats into XML format
  - Use of "connector" tool in cases where the conversion of existing information is problematic (in cases when data is stored within a system which prevents direct access to it, the attachment of the data must be carried out ad hoc by means of the so-called connector, ensuring the conversion of data and metadata to a form which can be attached to Manuscriptorium)
  - Broad range of data storage methods
  - M-tool available for download and free use - enables the creation of basic metadata with links to image data stored at freely accessible http addresses.
  - Creation of personal collections
  - Transliteration of digitized document to full text (OCR plus subsequent human correction)
- A networked repository of data and metadata from 12 partner "content owner" organizations and 6 associated partner organizations providing access to more than 150 000 document descriptions

- Multilingual search and translation of metadata based on VICODI project developments covering search and translation of metadata from/into Czech, Polish, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Portuguese, German, English, French, Danish, Hungarian, Italian and Russian.
- A Europe-wide dissemination and take-up strategy among all EU Member States, Associated States and Candidate Countries through wide-ranging dissemination activities. Dissemination and validation workshops will take place in all the participating countries, i.e. a minimum of 11 events.
- An exploitation plan developed in conjunction with appropriate national policy makers, which will support convincingly the roll-out of the ENRICH platform and services across Europe.

3.2 Quality System

The quality system applied on the project is described in the present Quality Plan and subsequent revisions to it.

3.3 Quality organisation

In order to provide a distributed quality organisation and a strong co-ordination, the following quality organisation is to be set-up:

- Clear guidance on the preparation of documents
- A Quality Management Review cycle for all deliverables, activities, and services

The Project Manager and the Workpackage Leaders are responsible for establishing the project quality system and assuring project quality.

In assuring quality, the main role of the Project Manager and the Work package Leaders will consist of regular monitoring of the application of the Quality Plan through actions such as: verification of documents, participation in reviews and audits, follow-up of corrective actions and analysis of quality indicators. These roles will be performed throughout the project lifecycle.

4 Assurance of technical quality, its monitoring and evaluation

All the technical work that has to be done in order to reach the Projects overall goals will be based on analyses preceding or newly evolved in the frame of the ENRICH project. The contents of the work is described in the Description of work.

In order to ensure the overall high quality of the technical work within the ENRICH project the technical work is split into relatively small, discrete yet related Tasks grouped into particular thematic Workpackages. Such an allocation of particular work tasks with defined inputs, outputs, relations and interdependencies enables the Task Leaders to focus on their part of technical work and to fully optimise their results to dedicated Task objectives without their work being over affected by the approaches, tools, methodics and generally way of work applied in the other Tasks and Workpackages by the other Leaders and participants.

Due to the significant diversity of various tasks that have to be fulfilled within the ENRICH project such approach of independent Task solution and mutual „tolerance" between the Tasks is necessary in order to provide high quality results.

The Workpackage Leaders will have to ensure that the work will respect the common requisities to any technical work: the analyses produced will respect the preceding user demands and need surveys (where these will be performed), the subsequent realization will correspond to the analysis and finally the feedback provided by evaluation of the outcomes will reveal possible deviations or mistakes and will serve as a base for correcting the outcomes of the project in order to fully adapt the outcomes to the most actual user needs.

In such a net of various different tasks the very important information for the Task and WP Leaders will be created in frame of the WP7. Basically this whole workpackage is dedicated to technical aspect of quality of ENRICH project outcomes. It will provide continuous feedback by evaluating the Tasks (and even particular logical subtask - in order to provide as much accurate information as possible) and their outcomes as described within the Description of Work.

Correct usage and timed implementation of the provided feedback from WP7 by the all WP and Task Leaders will ensure that the diverse Tasks will finally produce desired homogenous outcomes as they are described in the DoW.

The Deliverable D7.1 (Methodology for Testing and Validation of e-Applications) will be the first step of WP7 in order to ensure the above mentioned and will provide basic guidelines for the evaluation of the technical works results that will be subsequently concretized as the ENRICH project goes further.

The D7.1 and the designed evaluation principles and criteria will respect the preceding results of European and worldwide projects and their outcomes published and verified during the last years which also will ensure that the quality of technical work will be based and evaluated on the most actual experiences and perspective approaches and methodologies. The combination and diversity of Tasks that have to be resolved during the ENRICH project will require to combine the available outcomes and knowledge into a brand new set of evaluation criteria adapted to the Projects needs.

The D7.1 will be supplied by most concrete documentation on evaluation of each particular evaluated (sub)Task later during the Project (including particular evaluation steps, metrics, surveys, etc..). The concrete content/items for evaluation, related to the Tasks, formulated inside the WPs, ~~will be~~ created within the WP7 will be updated as the ENRICH Project advances. The particular contents will be based on the initial user surveys and analyses and often of course can not be concretized without the knowledge of results of the preceding Tasks.

From the technical point of view, the project will develop 5 main results or outputs in frame of WP3, WP4, WP5 and WP6. Each of these results will be separately tested and evaluatd using pre-defined set of standardized criteria. These 5 main results are:

- **Migration Tool developed in WP 3;**
- **Tools for creation of virtual documents by researchers developed in WP 4;**
- **Possibilities for sharing of large data sets investigated and developed in WP 5;**
- **Personalized Translation Interface developed in WP 6 evaluated and validated;**
- **The usability of the collaborative environment in the ENRICH project.**

The basic principles and evaluation criteria used within WP7 will be based on the study of evaluation methodologies used worldwide for testing and evaluation of e-Applications. The selected approach deals with the set of criteria assigned to each sub-task/sub-result to be evaluated, organized in a form of the matrix. The methodology is more specifically described in D 7.1, including the list of all sub-tasks/sub-results for evaluation and n respective criteria/sub-criteria.

The set of quality criteria was proposed (but it can be later changed according to actual needs. Most of the tools have not been developed yet and it is even not clear which technology will they be based on, therefore it can not be fixed at the moment which sub-criteria should be used for their evaluation.

The possible set of criteria at the moment was formulated as follows:

- **Interoperability -**
- **Adaptability**
- **Usability**
- **Security**
- **Multilinguality and localisation**

Each one of those criteria was related to the concrete sub-tasks formulated in WP3, WP4, WP5, WP6 and the sub-criteria (sub-tasks) will be rated using the range defined as:

> **0 – Failed or feature does not exist.**
> **1 – Has poor support and/or it can be done but with significant effort.**
> **2 – Fair support but needs modification to reach the desired level of support.**
> **3 – Good support and needs a minimal amount of effort.**
> **4 – Excellent support and meets the criteria out of the box, minimal effort.**

The results of such evaluation will be then statistically processed, grouped and graphically presented, together with the written recommendations to the Task/WP leaders. The results of the evaluation will be also provided to all partners involved in the respective WP.

Only a very brief overview of the technical evaluation of the project results is presented here in D 1:1 in order to avoid overlapping with D 7.1 because these two deliverables are very closely related.

In case that the findings of the testing and evaluation of e-Applications will be below the minimum acceptable rating/score or some other fatal insufficiencies will be found, the respective Task/WP leaders will be given 2 weeks after receipt of such evaluation from WP7 leader for preparation of corrective actions and their presentation to the Technological Group Committee (see the chapter 5.3.1 dealing with project management). This proposal of correction actions shall include the time frame of its implementation, because the most of the evaluation works are foreseen to be carried out in the final stage of the project and it is assumed that there can be relatively short period for the implementation of correction actions. The proposal of corrective actions shall also include the responsibilities of the partners participating on the Task and proposed corrective actions. The Technological Group Committee will decide within one week whether the proposed measures are sufficient and confirm their agreement with the implementation of this corrective plan.

5 Project presentation

5.1 *Project objectives, goals and Description of Work*

The overall objectives, goals and description of work of the project are given in the Annex 1 "Description of Work" [A1],.(DOW in the following)

5.2 *Consortium organisation*

5.2.1 Consortium Participants

The following table provides the participants list.

Particip. Role	Particip. Number	Participant name	Participant short name	Country	Date enter project	Date exit project
CO	1	National Library of Czech Republic	NKP	Czech Republic	1	24
BE	2	Cross Czech a.s.	CCP	Czech Republic	1	24
BE	3	AiP Beroun s r.o.	AIP	Czech Republic	1	24
BE	4	Oxford University Computing Services	OUCS	United Kingdom	1	24
BE	5	Københavns Universitet - Nordisk Foskningsinstitut	KUNF	Denmark	1	24
BE	6	Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale di Firenze – National Library in Florence	NLF	Italy	1	24
BE	7	Università degli Studi di Firenze - Centro per la comunicazione e l'integrazione dei media Media Integration and Communicaiton Centre Firenze	MICF	Italy	1	24
BE	8	Institute of mathematics and informatics	IMI	Lithuania	1	24
BE	9	University Library Vilnius	ULV	Lithuania	1	24
BE	10	SYSTRAN S.A.	SYS	France	1	24
BE	11	University Library Wroclaw	ULW	Poland	1	24
BE	12	Stofnun Árna Magnússonar í íslenskum fræðum	SAM	Iceland	1	24
BE	13	Computer Science for the Humanities - Universität zu Köln	CSH	Germany	1	24
BE	14	St. Pölten Diocese Archive	DSP	Austria	1	24
BE	15	The National and University Library of Iceland	NLI	Iceland	1	24
BE	16	Biblioteca Nacional de Espana - The National Library of Spain	BNE	Spain	1	24
BE	17	The Budapest University of Technology and Economics	BUTE	Hungary	1	24
BE	18	Poznan Supercomputing and Networking Center	PSNC	Poland	1	24

CO- Coordinator, BE – Beneficiary

5.3 Project management structure

Project management structure is given in the DOW as follows:

5.3.1 Project Management Structure and Responsibilities

ENRICH will be managed by the Coordinating Partner supported by a Management Board on which all partners will be represented. This Board will provide overall management, guidance and decision-making and will assure inter-workpackage communication. The Board will meet at least five times during the duration of the project. Participation of representatives of associated partners on the meetings of Management board will be supported, but these representatives will not have any executive or decision making rights. Where possible, these meetings will coincide with events (e.g. workshops, seminars) or other workplan activities. At all times, regular consultation and discussion between Consortium Partners will take place using e-mail and telephone. The overall management responsibility will rest with the Coordinator, National Library of Czech Republic. Because of the relatively high number of partners and budget allocated to the project, Cross Czech a.s. experienced from previous EC funded projects and highly specialized in project management was assigned to become an administrative and financial coordinator and AIP Beroun as the developer and administrator of Manuscriptorium will carry out the technological coordination. To maximise outreach and impact and to ensure delivery of the project and implementation of the full scope of activities envisaged for ENRICH project, a specific managerial structure has been designed. The managerial structure described below consists of three independent committees, interlinked to ensure an overall cohesion of activities:

- Management Board (MB);
- Work Package Management Committees (WPMCs);
- Technological Group Committee (TGC)

The Management Board (MB):

Membership of the Management Board: 1 representative of each consortium member. The MB will discuss joint project activities, define the schedule of activities inside and among the various workpackages, evaluate and validate the progress of the project and propose corrective actions in the event of problems. In addition, the MB will monitor the technical direction of the project, approve all major technical decisions, decide and approve any budget variances, approve all official deliverables, assign specific responsibility to the most suitable partner representative when new events require it, review and/or amend the work plan, review and/or amend the cost or time schedule under the EC Contract, review and/or amend the termination of the EC Contract, and lay down procedures for publications and press releases with regard to the ENRICH project. Extensive use of information technology (video and audio conferences, dedicated Web pages and mailing lists) will also be made.

Work Package Management Committees (WPMC):

For each workpackage, there is a Work Package Management Committee WPMC responsible for overseeing the integration and specific actions to be undertaken by that workpackage. Each WPMC is composed of the main contact person of each institution participating in the workpackage and is chaired by the Workpackage Leader. Each WP leader nominates from

his/her WPMC one or more members to act as liaison with the other WPMCs, in order to promote and coordinate integration between workpackages.For each workpackage, the WPSC will monitor the activity of the different tasks according to the workplan, and will ensure that the deadlines for milestones and deliverables are met. The Work Package Management Committee is responsible for the allocation of funds among the members of the WP. All recommendations for new or different activities that arise from the WPSC will be submitted to the Management Board, of which the WP leaders are members. The specific tasks to be carried out by each separate WP are defined in the workpackage description of ENRICH project.

Technological Group Committee (TGC)
The Technological Group Committee will be established to coordinate the implementation of developed and/or selected technologies and tools into Manuscriptorium platform, to ensure their full complementarity and interoperability and to adjust the time schedule according to the results of all technological actions undertaken in frame of the ENRICH project. The Technological Group Committee will be chaired by the Technological Coordinator – AIP Beroun representative. Other members of technological group committee will be: NKP, OUCS, KUNF, MICF, IMI, SYS, CSH and PSCN. TGC management board will monitor the activities within the different tasks and workpackages, and will ensure that the works carried out within separate workpackages follow the common strategy of development of the whole system to prevent the conflicts and misunderstandings in the common vision. The Work Technological Group Committee is responsible for informing all the partners working on particular WPs regarding all decisions taken by the TGC that have any relation to their work. All recommendations for new or different activities that arise from the TGC will be submitted to the Management Board and respective Work Package Management Committee to confirm the decision taken by TGC.

Day-to-day management
The National Library of the Czech Republic (NKP) will be responsible for overall project coordination. NKP will closely cooperate with Cross Czech a.s. (CCP) within the overall project management and mainly on the financial and administrative management issues. This will include ensuring that reports are delivered on time to the Commission that the workpackages are effectively interlinked, that cost statements and periodic reports are collated and delivered on time and that processing and reimbursement of costs is done in a timely fashion. The Coordinator will also be responsible for the negotiations with the European Commission and for collecting and distributing deliverables. This will be in part by the appointing a Project Manager from Cross Czech a.s. to manage ENRICH project on a day-to-day basis. This Manager will be responsible to the Management Board for:
- developing a detailed project plan and briefing Contractors on their roles and responsibilities (together with NKP)
- monitoring progress on workpackages and signalling pressure areas to the Management Board;
- ensuring the quality and timeliness of all deliverables and project outputs (together with NKP representatives and Technological Coordinator;
- fulfilling the reporting obligations to the European Commission and liaising with Commission staff (together with NKP representatives)
- financial management and preparation of project records and cost statements;
- implementing membership registration and communication mechanisms (including ensuring compliance with data protection legislation);

- troubleshooting technical problems for Contractors; and ensuring regular flow of communications on project progress around the Consortium.
- maintain the ENRICH project plan and produce consolidated reports on efforts, results and resource consumption (together with NKP)
- guarantee the financial coordination and supervise the reimbursement of the partners (together with NKP)
- manage the distribution of information inside and outside the consortium;
- maintain a central archive of all documents produced within the ENRICH project;

NKP will:
- provide the technical infrastructure for the Website (although the content will be managed by another partner);
- ensure the reimbursement of the partners;
- supervise the Coordination Action Manager's activities
- chairing the Management Board

The Technological Coordinator assigned by AIP Beroun, the developer and administrator of current Manuscriptorium will be responsible for:
- chairing the Technological Group Committee;
- monitoring the time schedule and the timing of the related activities;
- recommending appropriate actions to correct delays;
- creating and maintaining the conditions necessary for successful and effective collaboration;

6 Project milestones and Deliverables

6.1 Introduction

As the quality management plan will be applied to all milestones and deliverables we here include the list of milestones, deliverables, and project outputs that will be governed by the quality plan. The Quality Management Plan also governs all other activities carried out in frame of ENRICH project.

6.2 Project Planning and Milestones

The schedule for the main project milestones is outlined in Description of Work.

6.3 EC Project deliverables

The external Project deliverables (i.e. those to be delivered to the Commission) are listed in the DoW. For convenience it is repeated here:

Deliverable No	Deliverable title	Delivery date	Nature[1]	Dissemination level[2]
D 1.1	Quality Plan	2	R	PU
D 2.1	Survey results and their interpretation	3	R	PU
D 8.1	Dissemination plan	3	R	PU
D 8.2	Project Presentation	3	R	PU
D 8.3	Printed publicity brochure	4	P	PU
D7.1.	Methodology for Testing and Validation of e-Applications	5	R	PU
D 1.2	Progress Report 1	6	R	CO
D 6.1	ENRICH Corpus Analysis report	6	R	PU
D.3.1	Revised TEI conformant specification	7	R	PU
D 2.2	Description of the standards used by the partners, definition of collaboration principles, data and metadata standards	8	R	PU

---

[1]
    R   = Report
    P   = Service/Product
    D   = Demonstrator/Prototype
    O   = Other

[2]
    PU=   Public
    PP =   Restricted to other programme participants (including Commission services and project reviewers).
    CO   =   Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including Commission services and project reviewers).

D.3.2:	Documentation and training materials for use with specification	10	R	PU
D 5.1	Definition of basic conditions for sharing of large data sets in the frame of Manuscriptorium	10	R	PU
D 1.3	Progress Report 2	12	R	CO
D 1.4	Annual report	12	R	CO
D 4.1	Definition of requirements for the creation of personalised virtual digital libraries	12	R	PU
D 5.2	Report on pilot full integration and publication of selected partner's metadata in Manuscriptorium	12	R	PU
D 6.2	Personalised Translation Interface delivery report	12	R	PU
D 1.5	Pre-financing request	12	R	CO
D 3.3	Report on development and validation of migration tools	15	R	PU
D 5.3	Report on pilot full integration and publication of selected partner's metadata and externally stored data in Manuscriptorium	16	R	PU
D 4.2	Report on search behaviour of Manuscriptorium users	17	R	PU
D 1.6	Progress Report 3	18	R	CO
D 4.3	Report on pilot implementation of tools for creation of virtual documents by researchers	22	R	PU
D.3.4	Report on METS/TEI interoperability, best practice with respect to handling of Unicode and non-Unicode data in Manuscriptorium and P5 conversion techniques	23	R	PU
D 4.4	Report on definition of typical model searches and their implementation	23	R	PU
D7.2.	The Evaluation Report	23	R	PU
D 1.7	Progress Report 4	24	R	CO
D 1.8	Final Report	24	R	CO
D 6.3	ENRICH Translation Stylesheet delivery report	24	R	PU
D 6.4	Vicodi Ontologies implementation report	24	R	PU
D 8.4	Conference with proceedings (summary of papers) at the end of the project	24	O	PU
D 8.5	Exploitation plan for further use of project results	24	R	CO
D 8.6	Project Presentation (results)	24	R	PU

D 1.9	Financial statement	24	R	CO

7 Project monitoring and reporting

7.1 Introduction

Project monitoring and reporting will be performed by means of:

- Periodic progress meetings;
- Periodic progress reporting:
- Review of main project milestones;
- Reviews of all documents and deliverables by partners.

7.2 Reporting

Information necessary for reporting will be collected via the e-mail on a regular basis from all partners.

7.2.1 Progress Report Document Templates

Project Reporting Documents are available in the internal part of the Project website.

8 Maintenance of Project Records

8.1 Data, Research, and Other Non-Financial Records

All original data, research materials, and project records (e.g. details of events hosted) generated by participants in the ENRICH Consortium must be retained and available to consortium partners for a period of five years following the end of the project.

8.2 Financial Records

The retention of financial records (including timesheets) is governed by The Contract and the Consortium Agreement.

8.3 Website

The ENRICH web site is a key output of the project. Its contents will be maintained for five years after the close of the project.

9 Human Subjects and Data protection

9.1 Human Subjects

All Consortium Partners must ensure that their researchers and other support teams comply with the Human Subjects policies and regulations of their employer, and legal jurisdiction.

9.2 Data Protection

All Consortium Partners must abide by their national legislation and EU directives in relation to the management of personal data.

10 Risk management

The management of risks in ENRICH project is detailed in the DoW. Two main aspects of risks will be taken into account:

- Risks related to technical activities and validity of results
- Risks stemming from relatively large number of partners and their various types

In order to contain those risks the Project is organised along the following principles:

The project management is structured to ensure smooth communication between technology providers, content partners and end-users, to monitor the progress and to keep up to date with the evolution. To ensure the successful completion of the activities and the validity of their results, each work package is run as an autonomous project with defined relations and dependencies with other WPs, i.e. contains of planning of work, validation and quality assurance activities. This ensures that the project remains focus on its original objectives.

With respect to the analysis & management of risks related to the technical activities, the project management structure & workplan have been set up along the following lines:

AIP as a technical coordinator will review technical aspects of the project and control technical activities and directions. Certain risk is raised by heterogeneity of metadata for machine translation. The metadata information available in the documents, by definition, can be very general (for instance the fields describing content of a book), but also very specific (fields covered by the ontology). For the first category, translation with SYSTRAN technology allows a good stability of the translation quality which is - for the second category, use of the multilingual ontology combined with structure-driven translation options allows a high accuracy of the translation.

The technical risks are minimized by above mentioned management structure, including Technological Group Committee. The technological coordinator will be assisted by the leading experts in development of the technologies that will be used/adjusted during the project implementation.

11 Authorship guidelines & Acknowledgements

11.1 Authorship

Where it is not possible for documents to be issued with 'Corporate Authorship', that is with ENRICH project listed as the author, the following guidelines apply. These guidelines also apply to all articles that are published by the Consortium Members based on work funded by the project.

11.1.1 Authorship Reserved For

Authorship is reserved for persons who receive primary credit and hold primary responsibility for a published work. Authorship encompasses not only those that do the actual writing but also those who have made a substantial contribution to an article or study (e.g. research assistants). Substantial professional contributions may include, but are not limited to, formulating the research problem or hypothesis, structuring the experimental design, organizing and conducting statistical analysis, interpreting the results, having responsibility for management and funding, or writing a major portion of the paper. Those who so contribute should be listed in the byline for the piece of work.

11.1.2 Acknowledgement

Lesser contributions, which do not constitute authorship, may be acknowledged in a note. These contributions may include such supportive functions as collecting or entering data, modifying or structuring a computer program, recruiting participants and suggesting or advising about statistical analysis. Substantial combinations of these with other tasks however, may constitute authorship.

11.1.3 Main Author Obligations

The author who serves as main contact should always obtain a person's consent before including that person's name in a byline or note. Each author listed in the byline of an article should review the entire manuscript before it is submitted.

11.1.4 Byline Ordering

Authors are responsible for determining authorship and for specifying the order in which two or more authors' names appear in the byline. The general rule is that the name of the principal author should appear first, with subsequent names in order of descending contribution or alternatively the Principal Author's name first with subsequent authors names appearing alphabetically.

11.2 Authorship Notes

An author note should appear with each article to identify each author's institutional affiliation, provide acknowledgments, state any disclaimers or perceived conflicts of interest, and provide a point of contact for any interested reader.

11.2.1 Structuring of Author notes

The details of the institutional affiliations of the authors should be listed and the details of a contact address of the lead author should be given.

11.3 Acknowledgements, Contributor Statement, Conflict of Interest

11.3.1 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

All publications that relate to ENRICH project should include an acknowledgement not too disimilar to this:

> The background work was conducted within the context of the European Union funded eContent+ project ENRICH (contract number: ECP 2006 DILI 510049, http://enrich.manuscriptorium.com).

11.3.2 CONTRIBUTORS

Where articles have more than one author a statement about the Contributors should be included. This statement might be something along the following lines:

> All the authors participated in the definition of this work, analysis and synthesis, and drafting of the manuscript. They agreed the final version of the document.

11.3.3 Collaborative Research Guidelines

Common authors of all public documents should establish as early as possible how the attributions of authorship are to be divided between them. Attribution of Authorship: In the absence of an agreement between the researchers, the following guidelines for attribution of authorship apply. Authorship is attributed to all those persons who have made scholarly contributions to the work and who share responsibility and accountability for the results, or who were responsible for the activity. Unless alphabetic ordering is used the order of the names in a publication is decided according to the quality of the contribution, the extent of the responsibility and accountability for the results, and custom.

Duties of the Principal Author: In the absence of an agreement between the authors, where there are co-authors, the following guidelines apply: The author who submits a manuscript for publication accepts the responsibility of having included as co-authors all persons who are entitled to co-authorship, and none who are inappropriate. The submitting author should send each co-author a draft copy of the manuscript and should make a reasonable attempt to obtain consent to co-authorship, including the order of names. Other contributions should be indicated in a footnote or an "Acknowledgements" section, in accordance with the standards of the discipline and the publisher.

12 DOCUMENTATION MANAGEMENT

12.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to describe the documentation management procedure for the ENRICH Project. It defines standard rules and procedures related to document production that all the partners shall apply throughout the project.

The documentation management procedure is applicable:

- to all partners,
- for all documents both internal documents and those that are delivered to the European Commission,
- and for documents exchanged between partners.

12.2 Definitions

Deliverable: A deliverable consists of one or more types of products (documents, websites, registries, databases, events, training).
The lists of deliverables appear both in the Description of Work and in Chapter 5.3 of this Quality Plan

Deliverable identifier: A deliverable identifier uniquely identifies each deliverable. It states the WP to which this deliverably belongs and its order

12.3 Documents publication rules

12.3.1 Documents presentation

Standard documentation templates will be used by all partners in order to produce standardised documentation. These templates are based on the templates requested by the European Commission.

Each deliverable will contain:

- a title page,
- a document status sheet and change record table (for evolutionary documents only),
- the file name,
- an (executive) summary,
- a glossary if necessary,
- a list of applicable documents and reference documents (with version and date for technical documents),
- annexes as appropriate.

All documents will be written in English. All deliverables will be provided to European Commission in pdf format. All partners are encouraged to use open formats such as *.odf for circulation of documents inside the consortium. It is the responsibility of the author of the document to choose which format fits the best his/her standards and purposes of creation of particular document or other file.

English date format will be used for all documents, e.g. 24/07/2006 for 24 July 2006.

The following table gives an overview of the main attributes of a document (this does not apply to financial statements, which will use the standardized format requested by the European Commission).

Attribute	Description	Title page	Other pages
Logos	ENRICH Logo	X	X
Logos	EU Flag	X	
Project Name	ENRICH	X	
Document title	Document title according to DoW	X	
Date	Last update	X	
Partner(s)	e.g.: CCP, NKP …	X	
Author(s)	Document author(s) name(s)	X	
Document Status	See 11.6	X	
Dissemination level	Public/Confidential	X	
Deliverable identifier (D)	See 11.2	X	
Contract reference	ECP 2006 DILI 510049	X	
Executive Summary			

(D) for deliverable documents, only

12.3.2 Document identifier

Each document must be referenced by a unique document identifier to ensure effective version control.
The nomenclature is defined as:
<Project name abbreviation>_<WP number>_<Document name or number of deliverable>_<Document version_number>_<Version_Revision>_<initials of the author or the last revisioner> **e.g.: ENRICH_WP1_Qualityplan_01_00_JH**

This form of name corresponds to the file name.

12.3.2.1   Version_Revision

For a document in a draft version, the version and the revision start at 0.0. When a document is distributed internally or delivered, the Version.Revision number must always be updated. When the delivery concerns just a part of the document only the revision number is incremented. For delivery of a revision, the change control table and document change record table of the document must be updated. For a new version, if the change control table and document change record table become important, only history of Version number remains.

12.3.3 Document Revision Control Documentation

All documents except the financial statements, annual and periodic reports are to have on their second page the following:

Document Version Control

Version	Date	Change Made (and if appropriate reason for change)	Name and Institution of Commentator(s) or Author(s)

Document Review

Reviewer	Institution	Date and result of Review

12.3.4 Document Signature/Approval:

Before the table of contents each document is to contain an approval signoff form.

Approved By (signature)	Date

Accepted by at European Commission (signature)	Date

Document file name
The standard format for document file names is:
<Project   name   abbreviation>_<WP   number>_<Document   name>_<Document number>_<Version_Revision>.<file type>

e.g.: ENRICH_WP1_Qualityplan_01_00_JH.doc

12.4 Dissemination level

This attribute defines the confidential level:
- CONFIDENTIAL: Restricted circulation list (specify in footnote)
- INTERNAL: Internal circulation within project partners
- PUBLIC: Public document.

12.5 Document Status

The different statuses of a document are :
- Draft
- Finalised

The above statuses appear on the document presentation page.

12.6 Deliverable document Status

After delivery the status of the document becomes :
- Delivered
- Accepted, Accepted with remarks or Refused
- Final

The above status does not appear on the document.

12.7 Document approval and distribution

The Task Leaders are responsible for the delivery to the Workpackage Leader for review documents. The Task Leader is also responsible for delivery to the Technical Coordinator. The Workpackage Leader is responsible for making certain that documents are reviewed.
All deliverables will be provided in English. If the validation shows discrepancies, the document is rejected, and it must be modified to take into account the remarks and then a new review is carried out.

12.8 Document validation

The document is reviewed by the WP Leader, and an appointed reviewer (usually the Project Manager).

12.9 Document modification

As a document can be revised during the project lifecycle, it is necessary to use a version revision mechanism based upon the identification number in order to:
- track all the modifications that affect a document after its delivery,
- inform each partner on the last released version of a document,

- provide each partner, at any given time, with a consistent vision of the documentation state.

13 Methodology, techniques and tools

This chapter describes the methodology, the technique and tools used by ENRICH Consortium.

13.1 Document management tools

In order to improve workflow activity, it is recommended to standardise tools, the following tools will initially be used: for creation and exchange of documents within the consortium.

- Word processing: MS Word, Open Office or other fully compatible tool
- Spreadsheet: MS Excel, Open Office or other fully compatible tool
- Slides presentation: MS PowerPoint or fully compatible tool

The following formats will be used for delivering documents to the European Commission:

- Document distribution: Acrobat pdf (preference for PDF/A)

13.2 Website

The Web site has three core areas:

Category	Description	Access for
PUBLIC	the interface between the project and its constituency and will include the basic information about the project, its results and consortium members, public documents released by ENRICH, news, Details of public events, information about possibility to join the project as associated partner	PUBLIC
INTERNAL	The area for project data storage and sharing, file exchange system.	Consortium Partners with username and password
DATA/SYSTEM LEVEL	Core application service layer with publishing system	AIP and granted individuals with username and password

14 Delivery Procedure

All deliverables will be produced and delivered in English.

14.1 Presentation to European Commission

Before delivery to the European Commission, each deliverable will undergo a Peer Review by the Management Board in order to assess that each deliverable meets acceptable standards on the technical, quality and cost levels. This review process is documented in the change history of the document.

If it is refused, the deliverable will be modified taking into account the remarks and then a new review carried out.

The deliverables will be delivered by the Project Coordinator to the European Commission.

The final version of a document is delivered with a paper copy and an electronic copy to the European Commission. A delivery note is sent with the delivery, to describe the delivery content.

15 Quality control

This chapter describes the techniques that are used to check the application of the quality plan on the ENRICH project.

15.1 Purpose and responsibilities

The aim of quality control is to develop and produce a ENRICH deliverables and services that are of the highest possible quality:

- Workpackage and Task Leaders have initial responsibility for monitoring, controlling and ensuring the timely delivery of documents and other deliverables in their area of responsibility

- Work Package Leaders and Task Leaders will approve the quality of all deliverables and submit them to the Project Manager for forwarding on to the Commission.

- The Project Manager will arrange for all deliverables to be reviewed by a consortium member from another workpackage, or at least not directly involved in the particular Task.

- The Technical Director will verify products before their delivery to the EC, in order to ensure final product quality and attainment of project quality objectives.

15.2 Approach

Different approaches can be employed by the person involved in quality control such as:
- participating into meetings;
- reviewing the documentation;
- engaging in discussions with those involved in preparing the deliverables; and,
- evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the deliverable.

15.3 The Quality Control Stages

1. On completion of a piece of deliverable if it is a document, the Task Leader responsible will send this for comment to two agreed reviewers. This second editor will check and evaluate the work on several levels:

    - Successful communication of author's intention

    - Quality of language

    - Quality of expression

    - Length

    - Conciseness

    - Communication of significant key points

    - Synthesis and analysis

    - Compliance to ENRICH Document Templates if appropriate

2. The reviewer returns the document within two weeks to the Task Leader with comments and suggestions. The Task Leader makes certain that appropriate revisions are made.

3. The document is then passed to the Workpackage Leader for approval. The Workpackage Leader checks and evaluates the document based on the criteria above.

4. The document is passed back with further comments if needed. The Task Leader makes certain that appropriate revisions are made

5. Once approved by the Workpackaged leader and two reviewers, the WP leader should send the document to the Project Coordinator. By this stage the document should be in its final form and ready to be mounted on the ENRICH website.

6. Final approval for publication of the document will come from the Project Manager.

Task Leaders must ensure that sufficient time is included in the programme of work to ensure that quality assurance can be completed in a timely fashion.

16 External evaluation

External monitoring process, involving external experts will be applied to the most important project deliverables. The external evaluators will be suggested by the respective WP leaders. All consortium members can recommend their candidates for external evaluators in advance. The final selection will be done usually during the project meeting preceding the planned submission of the deliverable or later by e-mail confirmation. The final selection of external experts has to be approved by project Management Board and Technical Coordinator.
The list of deliverables which will undergo the external evaluation:

Deliverable No	Deliverable title	Delivery date	Nature	Dissemination level
D 3.3	Report on development and validation of migration tools	15	R	PU
D 5.3	Report on pilot full integration and publication of selected partner's metadata and externally stored data in Manuscriptorium	16	R	PU
D.3.4	Report on METS/TEI interoperability, best practice with respect to handling of Unicode and non-Unicode data in Manuscriptorium and P5 conversion techniques	23	R	PU

Two external evaluators will evaluate each of above listed documents. The deliverables will be internally reviewed according to Chapter 14.3 of this Quality Plan before they will be passed to external evaluators. After successful internal review the document will be sent to external evaluators. Further procedure will be similar to the internal review:

1) WP Leader responsible will send this document for comment to two agreed external reviewers. They will check and evaluate the work on several levels:

- Successful communication of author's intention
- Quality of language
- Quality of expression
- Length
- Conciseness
- Communication of significant key points
- Synthesis and analysis
- Compliance to ENRICH Document Templates if appropriate

2) The reviewer returns the document within two weeks to the WP Leader with comments and suggestions. If recommended by the reviewer, he returns the document to Task leader for appropriate revisions.
3) The document is then passed back to the Workpackage Leader and external reviewers for approval of revision, if any.

4) Once approved by the Workpackaged leader and two external reviewers, the WP leader should send the document to the Technical Coordinator and Project Manager. By this stage the document should be in its final form and ready to be mounted on the ENRICH website.
5) Final approval for publication of the document will come from the Project Manager and Technical Coordinator.

Project information

Project acronym:	ENRICH
Project full title:	European Networking Resources and Information concerning Cultural Heritage
Proposal/Contract no.:	ECP 2006 DILI 510049

Project Officer: Gudrun Stock

Address:	European Commission - Information Society and Media DG, Rue Alcide de Gasperi, L- 2920 Luxembourg
Phone:	Tel: + 352 / 4301 38140
Fax:	+ 352 / 4301 30269
Mobile:	
E-mail:	Gudrun.Stock@ec.europa.eu

Project Co-ordinator: Zdeněk Uhlíř

Address:	Klementinum 190, Praha 1, 19000, Czech Republic
Phone:	+420221663283
Fax:	
Mobile:	+420731612422
E-mail:	zdenek.uhlir@nkp.cz