



MINERVA 2019-2022

Strengthening Research Management and
Open Science Capacities of HEIs in Moldova and Armenia

Monitoring and Evaluation Manual

Project Acronym:	MINERVA
Project full title:	STRENGTHENING RESEARCH MANAGEMENT AND OPEN SCIENCE CAPACITIES OF HEIS IN MOLDOVA AND ARMENIA
Project No:	597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2019
Project duration:	36 months

The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of the Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.



DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET

Title of Document: Monitoring and Evaluation Manual

Work Package:	WP5 Quality Plan
Last version date:	31/04/2019
Status :	Draft
Document Version:	v.01
File Name	MINERVA_Monitoring and Evaluation Manual_v.01
Number of Pages	43
Dissemination Level	Internal (project`s consortium) - RESTRICTED

VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY

Version	Date	Revision Description	Responsible Partner
v.01	31/04/2019	The first version of the document structure, done by the WP5 team	P15-UM/FR



TABLE OF CONTENT

DOCUMENT CONTROL SHEET	2
VERSIONING AND CONTRIBUTION HISTORY	2
1. INTRODUCTION	5
2. QUALITY EXPECTATIONS.....	7
2.1. Quality of the project implementation	7
2.2. Quality of project deliverables	7
<i>2.2.1. Visual identity requirements</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>2.2.2. Quality of meetings/workshops, trainings, conferences and seminars</i>	<i>9</i>
<i>2.2.3. Quality of promotional materials</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.2.4. Quality of websites and other electronic tools</i>	<i>11</i>
<i>2.2.5. Quality of methodologies</i>	<i>11</i>
2.3. Quality of Project Management.....	11
2.4. General Project Guidelines	12
2.5. Amendments to the guidelines	12
3. INTERNAL MONITORING	13
3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy	13
3.2. Quality responsibilities	14
<i>3.2.1. Task Leader</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>3.2.2. WP Leader.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>3.2.3. Quality Assurance Group (QAG)</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>3.2.4. Project Coordinator.....</i>	<i>15</i>
<i>3.2.5. Project's Consortium Board (PCB).....</i>	<i>16</i>
3.3. Common templates and formats.....	16
3.4. Quality feedback by the target groups.....	17
3.5. Project Risk Management	17
<i>3.5.1. Practical approach of risk identification.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>3.5.2. Risks / Uncertainties Monitoring procedure</i>	<i>18</i>
4. EXTERNAL MONITORING	19
5. EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REPORTING	20
Annex A Indicators and success criteria for project outcomes and outputs	22
Annex B Word template for project document deliverables.....	29
Annex C PowerPoint template for project presentations	30



Annex D Attendance sheet template for different meetings / events.....	31
Annex G External monitoring report	35
Annex H Event report template for different meetings / events	39
Annex I Problem report/corrective - preventive measures form	43



1. INTRODUCTION

The MINERVA project's main objective is The main aim of the MINERVA is to develop conditions for the implementation of the core principles of Open Science at universities in Moldova and Armenia. MINERVA project aims to improve institutional HR policies and practices through a series of bylaw changes that will prepare researchers for the labour market and society by facilitating their career development. The project will enhance their level of competences through a series of practical trainings in transversal and transferable skills. Thus it will harmonize the management of university research potentials and foster regional cooperation in the Eastern Partnership Countries converging with EU developments in higher education sector.

In order to ensure high project implementation and results' quality, the consortium will continuously collect, collate, analyse and react to data and feedback from target users, consortium members and internal and external stakeholders. Quality Control and Monitoring will aim at identifying quality issues at a stage early enough to allow the partnership to take timely measures for improvement.

The role of the current Monitoring and Evaluation manual is to help set appropriate quality standards and targets and to ensure that all activities and deliverables in the MINERVA project are in compliance with the predefined requirements. The Quality Plan could be described as a guide for the quality control activities to be implemented throughout the project lifetime. The document establishes, inter alia, a set of criteria for measuring the quality of different types of activities and products defined and applied in line with the project Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) and the approved project activity timeline. The document also determines which structures are responsible for the different quality control activities and lays out a communication plan for all involved project participants and stakeholders.

As specified in the approved application form, quality assurance and quality control will be carried out on internal and external levels.

The Monitoring and Evaluation manual content covers:

- Internal monitoring, quality and risk management;
- External monitoring;
- Evaluation of the technical and financial reporting.

Chapter 2 clearly defines monitoring and evaluation of quality of key project outputs and events. In the process of project evaluation, both quantitative and qualitative indicators will be used to assess progress and quality of key project outputs and events including report on current research potentials, report on current Open Science infrastructure and policies in WP1, WP2's Study visit to transfer knowhow on OSP strategies in EU countries, Set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OS, Institutional policies of OS, Recommendations for the national policy for improving the OS practices; WP3's Thematic Training Seminars in EU, National



standards for the OS services, Integrated system of institutional repositories, Thematic Training Seminars for researchers, journal editors, and possible funders, Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform; WP4's Study visit to EU partners, bylaws relevant for HR enhancement, Seminars on HRS4R development, Seminars on HRS4R assessment, plagiarism monitoring tools, Training sessions for researchers, Training sessions for young researchers; WP6 networking and awareness raising events. Feedback from target users will be collected, collated and analysed throughout the project life through questionnaires (upon finalisation of project outputs, trainings and events, and during the introductions of new services and the implementation of new practices), as well as via interviews and focus groups during partner meetings.

In addition, all key intellectual outputs including, the report on current research potentials, report on current Open Science infrastructure and policies, Set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OS, Institutional policies of OS, Recommendations for the national policy for improving the OS practices, National standards for the OS services, Integrated system of institutional repositories, Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform, HRS4R, Plagiarism monitoring tools will be reviewed by evaluators appointed by the project's coordinator and WP5 leader. The evaluators will be persons with relevant expertise who have not participated in the development of the output that they are evaluating. The purpose of the internal evaluation will be to monitor specifically the quality of the intellectual outputs in order to ensure applicability of the project results to the needs and expectations of the target groups.

Chapter 3 defines the internal monitoring strategy and outlines the responsibilities of the project partners as well as the core principles of the risk management strategy.

Chapter 4 describes the external monitoring strategy. Chapter 5 focuses on the financial and technical reporting duties of the partners and finally, the Annexes to the document provide templates (which are also available separately) to be used by the project partners.



2. QUALITY EXPECTATIONS

The present chapter presents the expectations of the project consortium with reference to the MINERVA deliverables and activities as well as the expectations relevant to the project management.

2.1. Quality of the project implementation

MINERVA is following the overarching aim **Strengthening the position of Moldovan & Armenian (MD&AM) universities within the international research arena through the implementation of open access, open data and open methodology principles and the advancement of research dissemination, transparency, accountability, and inclusiveness**. The partners agree that this overall objective shall always be in the forefront of all decisions to be taken. The partners therefore might decide to prioritise certain activities over others which have a higher impact in relation to the achievement of the objectives. Quality in the project means that the achievement of the objectives might be more important even if it means e.g. postponing a deadline or changing some aspects of an activity.

To remind all partners, the four specific objectives of the project are:

OB1: To advance national and institutional guidelines, policies, and incentives related to the open science in Moldova and Armenia, by January 2022;

OB2: To establish digital repositories at all project's partner HEIs in Moldova and Armenia and to foster their infrastructural development and interoperability, by January 2021;

OB3: To build human research capacities in order to ensure the sustainable implementation of open science principles and enhance the social inclusiveness and accountability of publicly-funded research, by January 2022.

2.2. Quality of project deliverables

The deliverables of the MINERVA project may be classified into reports, events (such as study visits, trainings, seminars and conferences), methodologies which include for example the strategies, guidelines, action plans and recommendations, and “other products” (OS Platform).

A common quality expectation for all deliverables is their relevance to reach the overall objective and the specific objectives, with a further focus on their development in an efficient and effective manner. Timely delivery following the project work plan as identified in the MINERVA project's timeline (modified and agreed by the Project Consortium Board (PCB) on six-month basis) is expected.

In the process of quality control and monitoring, activities, outputs and outcomes will be benchmarked against the project timeline and the quantitative and qualitative indicators defined in the LFM. Depending on the deliverable, indicators may refer to reports, teaching and learning



materials produced, website content and data, online platforms and forums, number of events organized, number and level of satisfaction of event participants, number of online registrations, downloads and visits, evaluation from target users of project results' impact and sustainability. Table 1 below presents the indicators and criteria for measuring their success and feedback tools needed to be developed per type of output/ outcome (Table 1). Annex A of the Monitoring and Evaluation manual provides detailed presentation of the indicators, criteria and assessment tools for each of the 7 WPs and their outputs and outcomes.

Table 1: Indicators and criteria for measuring project outputs and outcomes' success (for more details, please refer to Annex A)

Output/ outcome	Indicators	Success criteria	Feedback tools and templates
Events	Number of participants; Feedback from participants;	The number is different for each kind of event Positive feedback from participants ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success)	Events' agenda, attendance list, materials, minutes, photos, videos and other relevant evidence incl. participants' venue and traveling information form; Events evaluation forms; Feedback surveys' results;
Reports	Document's content and length; Number of pages; Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders; Feedback from QAT and PCB; Feedback from the External Evaluator;	Document's content and length differs depending on the report type (for more details see Annex A); QAT and PCB approval Positive feedback from target users and relevant target users ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success); Positive feedback from the External Advisory Board;	Report templates; QAT and PCB meeting minutes; Target users and stakeholders' evaluation forms; External Advisory Board communications incl. the External Evaluation Report;
Learning Materials	Topics covered in the content; Audio-visual materials' length and quality;	Min. requirements concerning content and audio-visual materials length and quality; Positive feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders ($\geq 75\%$	Evaluation forms; Feedback survey results; External Evaluator's assessment;



	Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders;	positive feedback is considered success);	
Product/ services	Depending on the product/ service there are a number of indicators incl. number of target users, documents' content and length, number of newly established structural units etc.; Feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders;	Depending on the product/ service, the proposed indicators differ (for more details see Annex A) Positive feedback from target users and relevant stakeholders ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success);	Depending on the product/ service, there are a number of feedback tools to be used incl.: Evidence of newly established units incl. proof of embedding of these in the universities' organizational charts; Evaluation forms of target users and relevant stakeholders; Feedback survey results;

2.2.1. Visual identity requirements

All reports and documents will respect the visual identity of the MINERVA project (e.g. logo, title and Erasmus+ project number).

A consistent and common format for all document deliverables is to be followed which includes a common front page and common styles (fonts, headers, tables of content, etc.). The template for document deliverables is provided in Annex B and separately for the project partners. In all documents, the partners will use references, page numbering, and figures as well as table numbering.

Additional guidelines on the usage of the project logo and rules of EACEA are available in dissemination strategy.

2.2.2. Quality of meetings/workshops, trainings, conferences and seminars

All events organized by the project will be implemented professionally. The organizers provide in due time a full information package to the participants including the draft agenda, letter of invitation and a note on the logistics (informing about travel arrangements, venue, suggested hotels, etc.). Time for preparation activities depends on the type of event e.g. several months for conferences and several weeks for trainings. This will be defined in separate action plans by WP leaders.

The meeting organizers ensure smooth registration processes (including list of attendees for signatures) and the implementation of the meetings respecting appropriate time for coffee and



lunch breaks as well as the availability of all necessary materials (e.g. pens and paper, beamer, etc.). The organizers will also ensure the recording of minutes of the meetings in a concise style including a list of action points. Material associated with the meetings will reflect the visual project identity. Where appropriate (e.g. for trainings, seminars) also feedback forms will be distributed among participants (Annex F) and event reports related to feedback forms will be prepared by organisers (Annex H).

Each event will be documented by various materials as described in the table below.

Table 2. Documentation of MINERVA event:

Type of event	Materials	Available at	
		MINERVA web-site	Partners web page
Country Workshops/ Seminars/ Training sessions	News	X	X
	Agenda	X	X
	List of participants*	X	
	Minutes	X	
	Gallery	X	X
	Presentations**	X	
	Report on feedback forms		
Consortium meetings and Conferences	News	X	X
	Agenda	X	X
	List of participants*	X	
	Minutes	X	
	Gallery	X	X
	Presentations**	X	
Study visits/Thematic Trainings seminars	News	X	X
	List of trainees*	X	
	Training materials	X	×
	Report on feedback forms		
	Minutes	X	X
	Gallery	X	X
TG Information sessions/ Career development sessions	News	X	X
	List of participants*	X	
	Gallery	X	
	Minutes	X	
	Report on feedback forms		
Mass-media appearance	News	X	X
	List of participants*	X	
	Gallery/link URL	X	X
	Minutes	X	

*Name and affiliation will be visible; all personal data will be hidden.

** Upon the approval of the presenter.



2.2.3. Quality of promotional materials

Communication and dissemination activities of the project will adhere to the Communication and Dissemination strategy of the MINERVA project (WP6). All promotional materials will reflect the visual identity of the project and Erasmus+ programme. The project coordinator (P1-ASEM) is responsible for design of all promotional material. The draft version will be sent to all partners for comments and suggestions, before printing, publishing and distribution. The promo materials will be disseminated by all project partners at events which are relevant to reach the project's target group (i.e. not only events organized by the project itself, but also general events with a focus on university lifelong learning).

2.2.4. Quality of websites and other electronic tools

The project envisages setting up the public MINERVA web-site, MINERVA Facebook page. All representation tools will be continuously updated by the project's partners and are intended to effectively communicate the results of the project.

P1- ASEM will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the MINERVA web-site, and each partner will be responsible for their own web-site and HTML catalogues. All partners are asked to include a short description of the MINERVA project with a link to the official website on the institutional webpage.

The MINERVA webpage can be accessed by all partners depending on their assigned tasks and roles. All tools will be implemented with high performance, good functionality and stability.

2.2.5. Quality of methodologies

The methodologies (e.g the report on current research potentials, report on current Open Science infrastructure and policies, Set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OS, Institutional policies of OS, Recommendations for the national policy for improving the OS practices, National standards for the OS services, Integrated system of institutional repositories, Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform, HRS4R, Plagiarism monitoring tools) developed within MINERVA project will always be tailored to the defined target groups, they will be tested and refined and particular emphasis will be put on their usability. The methodologies will always be well understandable, readable and developed with a strong focus on the future practical and sustainable implementation in order to reach the desired project impact.

2.3. Quality of Project Management

The project management structure has been established at the beginning of the project phase to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work. It involves the Contractor, the



Grant Coordinator (GC), Executive Board (EB), Project's Consortium Board (PCB), a Project Coordination Team (PCT) and Quality Assurance Team (QAT). The PCB will review the activities and decide on any necessary contingency measures in reorganisation tasks and resources – as usual with a strong focus on the project impact. The project management will be transparent and flexible but also strict enough to ensure the implementation of the project activities in order to achieve the project's objectives.

The MINERVA's management structure is based on vast managerial experience of all partners and is established to ensure effectiveness, decisiveness, flexibility and quality of work.

All partners will be involved in each WP. In accordance with the defined plans (Coordination Plan, Risk Management, Communication, Dissemination & Sustainability) with respect to the equality of all project partners, leaders of the WPs will have a greater responsibility for implementation of WP & cooperation with all project's partners, together with the GC. The assignments are evenly distributed among the all project partners.

Each partner is equally and independently responsible for assigned activities, money use and reporting. Site Managers (contact persons) have the responsibility for the local management.

2.4. General Project Guidelines

MINERVA project will follow different project guidelines and respects the requirements of the programme. Apart from the Monitoring and Evaluation Manual at hand, the reference documents include:

EACEA – MINERVA project Grant Agreement

MINERVA project Partnership Agreements

MINERVA Communication and Dissemination Strategy

MINERVA Handbook

EACEA - Guidelines for the Use of Grants

EACEA - Frequently Asked Questions

2.5. Amendments to the guidelines

The procedures in this manual can be amended by agreement of all partners or by a decision taken by the Project Consortium Board (PCB). Any new version is communicated to all the partners and takes effect 15 calendar days after this communication.



3. INTERNAL MONITORING

Internal monitoring will be carried out by all partners, including self-evaluation by using the LFM, Timeline, budget and cash flow tables, PCB meetings, monitoring visits of the QAT and questionnaires / satisfaction surveys of target groups (e.g. participants of dissemination and training events; see also Annex F and Annex H). The MINERVA project and partners' webpage will also be used for monitoring of project activities.

For the harmonization of legislative framework on open science, developing infrastructure for open science and building capacities of research management will be applied: from team member to WP leader, then to the coordinator and after that to the PCB for final approval.

3.1. Project Quality Assurance Strategy

The Quality Assurance in MINERVA project includes four levels of quality control: (1) Deliverable authors, Task and WP leaders; (2) Deliverable reviewers; (3) Coordinator level; and (4) Consortium Board level and final approval.

1. Deliverable authors, task and WP leaders:

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project are a joint responsibility of the associated Task Leader and his/her team, further partners involved in the activity and of the corresponding WP leader. It shall guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverable as identified in Application Form and WP action plans (modified and agreed by the PCB on six-month basis). They present a “final draft deliverable” to the QAT (i.e. the deliverable reviewers).

2. Deliverable reviewers (QAT and Advisory Team):

The 2nd level of control is elaborated by at least two assigned reviewers of the QAT who are not leaders of Task/WP within which the deliverable is produced. The reviewers have 5 working days to respond by sending comments using the template for the quality assurance check list (Annex A). The deliverable authors have 5 more working days to conform to the reviewer comments or send their written objections. In this case the reviewers will have another 5 days to send back their final comments.

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

3. Coordinator level:

The 3rd level control is carried out by the Grant Coordinator. If a draft deliverable has not passed the 2nd level control and there are disagreements between the deliverable authors and the reviewers, the Coordinator will take the necessary corrective actions in order to come up with acceptable deliverables. If necessary, the Coordinator may involve the rest of the consortium. A



draft deliverable that has passed the 2nd level of control will still be checked by the Coordinator for final comments and when accepted it will be forwarded to the Project Consortium Board for formal approval.

4. Project Consortium Board level and final approval:

The 4th level control is elaborated at the Project Consortium Board level. The Project Consortium Board is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the approval of major deliverables. It shall be possible to include a deliverable in the project reports even if its formal approval is still pending, if it has passed the 2nd and 3rd level of control without profound disagreements as then no major alterations are to be expected.

It is expected that the partners will also establish internal quality control mechanisms, i.e. the site manager will always check the output of his co-workers before sending documents to the MINERVA team or before uploading them on the project communication tools.

3.2. Quality responsibilities

4 structures/ bodies will be mainly involved in the processes of monitoring and evaluation of the quality of the project achievements, each one operating at a different level, in order to avoid miscommunications and overlaps.

3.2.1. Task Leader

- Is responsible for coordinating the development of the deliverable(s) according to the deliverable template.
- Is responsible for assigning parts of the work leading to the deliverable to the other partners involved in the activity.
- Is responsible for coordinating the work of the other partners involved in the task, providing guidance when necessary.
- Is responsible for aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the task, in order to produce the deliverable.
- Is responsible for the submission of the draft deliverable via MINERVA to the WP leader (1st level control), the QAT (2nd level control) and the grant coordinator (3rd level control).
- Is responsible for implementing the suggestions of the QAT team, assigning certain amendments to the other partners contributing to the task as appropriate.
- Is responsible for sending the amended draft deliverable.
- Reports to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.
- Cooperates with the WP Leader and the other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in conformity with other activities and that any cross-task inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the Project Consortium Board as recorded in the respective minutes).



3.2.2. WP Leader

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

3.2.3. Quality Assurance Team (QAT)

- Collect and verify the completion of deliverables submitted by the respective WP leaders.
- Sends the Quality Assurance Check List to the Task Leader and the Coordinator.
- Check and prevent any procedural non-conformity. Identify and record any relevant problems.
- Initiate, recommend and/or provide solutions through the reporting system in place.
- Verify that action has been taken to solve problems.
- Facilitate the communication with the External Evaluator.
- Supervise and report during the Quality Panels scheduled to take place at the partner meetings.
- Supervise the drafting, development and implementation of Interim and Final Internal Evaluation Reports.

3.2.4. Project Coordinator

- Cooperates with the QAT and the Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables.
- Accepts the deliverable or provides final comments to the Task Leaders and WP Leaders (3rd level control).
- Cooperates with the WP Leaders in order to ensure that all WPs are progressing in conformity with each other and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description.



- Informs the QAT, the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related Timeline or any implicit changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables.
- Officially submits all approved deliverables after their approval (4th level control).

3.2.5. Project's Consortium Board (PCB)

PCB is a project management body, which as far as quality is concerned, is responsible for ensuring that the project achieves its objectives by verifying the quality of the delivered outcomes, and by providing data for the annual Project Progress Reports. The PCB ensures that the content of the deliverables is in accordance to the project specifications and predefined standards and that it is of appropriate academic quality. The consortium will introduce the principle of rotation in the PCB membership to guarantee that all project partners are equally involved and committed to the project management processes. Over the 36 project months, PCB will consist of representatives of both the project partner institutions in the EU and the PCs. In addition, in each of the PCs a local management facilitator will be selected by the PC HEIs themselves to support the project coordinator when dealing with country-specific management issues.

PCB plays a crucial role in the overall planning, monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and deliverables. More specifically - quality control wise - the PCB is charged with the tasks to:

- Check the quality of the project deliverables, and Interim and Final Quality Reports.
- Ensure that the produced content is of appropriate academic quality and in accordance with project requirements and specifications.
- Co-hosts the quality panels during the partner meetings.

3.3. Common templates and formats

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

The document template is given in Annex B of this manual as a separate document.

All presentations shall be based on a common MS PowerPoint template. The template is provided in Annex C as a separate document which will be also shared with the Project's partners.

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



3.4. Quality feedback by the target groups

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

In order to allow the impact assessment of the project activities, a template for feedback for different meetings / events has been developed. It needs to be adapted to the specific needs but the main items shall not be deleted. This form is provided in Annex F as a separate document which will be shared with the project's partners. Furthermore, a specific event report template (minutes) has been developed which is to be filled by project partners (organisers) for all MINERVA events (open door events, workshops, info days etc. – except PCB meetings). Furthermore, this template can be used to inform colleagues and partners about other events attended (promoting MINERVA). In the second case just the first page of the template should be prepared. This form is provided in Annex H as a separate document.

3.5. Project Risk Management

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried and reviewed out during the Project's Consortium Board meetings (Risk brainstorming) which shall lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the Work Plan/ Timeline based on a sound process.

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

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

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

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

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of outmost importance. There are several possible risks connected: the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan; the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality; an

under spending during the project implementation (also causing a shift in the headings' ratio), meaning that the project timetable is followed with reference to technical deliverables, yet the relevant expenditures are not timely invoiced or validated; etc.

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

3.5.1. Practical approach of risk identification

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

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

3.5.2. Risks / Uncertainties Monitoring procedure

- Executive Board identify possible risks/uncertainties in their WP and fill in the template (Annex I).
- The risks monitoring templates (Annex I) are communicated to QAT Team + WP5 Leader (UM) + Project coordinator (ASEM).
- QAT Team + WP5 Leader (UM) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) register, analyses and priorities risks/uncertainties.
- QAT Team + WP5 Leader (UM) + Project Coordinator (ASEM) plans and implements risk responses.



4. EXTERNAL MONITORING

The purpose of the monitoring process is to provide support and guidance to individual site managers and project management teams. It is designed to assist them in areas where they require support. The QAT (Quality Assurance Team) will be able to offer an objective point of view and be „a fresh pair of eyes “in assessing progress to date.

For external monitoring purposes an experienced quality control expert from outside the consortium will be engaged.

The tasks related to the external evaluation of the project results and implementation during the whole project life will be subcontracted to an external evaluator. The latter is expected to complete the following tasks:

- Carry out/execute regular independent peer review of project results and implementation
- Produce, as a result of his/her continuous work, an External Evaluation Report at project's final stage.

The external evaluator (an expert or organisation that is external to the consortium) will conduct online interviews with the WP leaders and various project team members and will review the complete project documentation as well as various project outputs and events evidence.

The External Evaluation Report will summarize the findings of the continuous peer review and will provide assessment of project impact and the quality of the results achieved. It will also make conclusions on the consortium efficiency. It will include an independent cost/benefit analysis of the project. The External Evaluation Report will also make recommendations for strengthening the sustainability of the project results sustainability and for ensuring long-term impact. The Report will be discussed at the final partner meeting and will be published e on the project's website.



5. EVALUATION OF THE TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL REPORTING

The main guidelines for the reporting are laid out in the Manual for contractual and financial management, discussed during the 1st Consortium meeting. Project Coordination Team (PCT) team and Coordinator will continuously monitor the partners' reporting and check the supporting documents.

As it is defined in Partnership Agreement and Manual for Contractual and Financial Management, there will be three annual reports of the partners. They will be reviewed by PCT team and approved by the Coordinator, taking into consideration following assessment criteria:

- Conformity of the expenditures with the budget of the project;
- Eligibility of the expenditures;
- Correct use of the procurement procedures, whenever required;
- Correctness and completeness of all supporting documents;
- Correctness of the calculations and applied exchange rates;
- That any changes which occurred between budget categories are eligible and justified;
- All copies of the annual reports must be signed in original by the appointed contact person of partner institution;
- Expenditures must be in conformity, including full eligibility, with the allocated Budget in the Partnership Agreement.

In case that information in Annual Report are not complete or justified, the PCT team will help and make recommendations on how this situation can be rectified prior to the final approval of the Annual report by the Coordinator. The Report approved in this way is the basis for the transfer of next instalment to the partner institution.



ANNEXES

Different supporting documents have been elaborated for the overall enhancement of the project Monitoring and Evaluation manual.



Annex A Indicators and success criteria for project outcomes and outputs

WP1 Mapping the research and open science potentials and practices Lead partner: P16-EPDRI/SI Co-leaders: P2-USMF/MD, P6-YSMU/AM Participating partners: P1-P16					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
1.1.	Report on current research potentials	Report	Number of questionnaire on research potentials in PCs	7 questionnaire on research potentials in PCs completed and e-published	Report e-published on the project webpage;
1.2.	Report on current Open Science infrastructure and policies	Report	Number of analysis on current Open Science in PCs;	7 analysis on current Open Science in PCs completed and e-published	Report e-published on the project webpage;

WP2 Harmonization of legislative framework on open science Lead partner: P14-UCA/FR Co-leaders: P5-MECRRM/MD, P10-MoESRA/AM Participating partners: P1-P16					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
2.1.	Report on EU open science practices and transfer of knowledge and skills	Event	National Policy Task Force (NPTF); Number of Study Visits to the EU realised; Feedback from target users.	1 NPTF/MD and 1 NPTF/AM established; 1 Study Visits realised; At least 100 attendees per workshop; Positive feedback from SV' attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success).	NPTF acts of establishment; Study visits' agendas, attendance lists, minutes, photos and other relevant evidence;



				Positive feedback from study visit's attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success).	
2.2.	National policy of Open Science	Report	Set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OS	1 document (set of guidelines and directives for successful implementation of OS) elaborated.	Minutes of NPTF/MD and NPTF/AM; Document available on the project webpage;
2.3.	Institutional OS policies	Report	institutional policies and bylaws of OS	1 document (Institutional OS policies elaborated and adopted);	Minutes of NPTF/MD and NPTF/AM; Document available on the project webpage;
2.4.	Recommendations for the national OS policy	Report	Recommendations for the national policy	1 document elaborated (recommendations for the national policy) elaborated	Minutes of NPTF/MD and NPTF/AM; Document available on the project webpage;

WP3 Developing infrastructure for open science

Lead partner: P13-UV/ES, Co-Leaders: P3-UTM/MD, P8- YSU/AM

Participating partners: P1-P16

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
3.1.	Report on the EU standards related to OS services	Event/ Report	Number of OS-working groups; Number of Study visits to EU partners; Report on the EU standards related to OS services; Feedback from target users.	7 OS-UWGs groups formed; 3 Study visits to EU partners; 1 document (Report on the EU standards related to OS services) elaborated and published; Positive feedback from Study visits' attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success).	Study visits to EU invitations, agenda, attendance lists, videos and other relevant evidence, training materials, minutes, evaluation forms; Document available on the project webpage;



3.2.	National standards for the OS services	Report	National standards and guidelines	1 document (National standards and guidelines\ for the OS services) elaborated and published	Documents published on the project webpage;
3.3.	Integrated system of institutional repositories	Service/Product	Number of institutional repositories;	7 institutional repositories developed, standardized and integrated	Repositories developed, standardized and integrated in each PC.
3.4.	Training for the use of OS platforms	Event	Number of seminars;	7 Seminars for researchers, journal editors, and possible funders for the use of OS platforms organized; Positive feedback from seminar attendees (>=75% positive feedback is considered success).	Seminars agenda, attendance lists, videos and other relevant evidence, training materials, minutes, evaluation forms;
3.5.	Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform	Service/Product	Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform developed	1 product (Methodology for monitoring the usage of OS platform developed) developed and integrated in to OS platform	Complex statistical registry integrated in to OS platform; Methodology available on the project webpage.
3.6.	Registry of the non-government funders	Service/Product	Registry of private open science research funder	2 Registries integrated in to OS platforms (MD/AM);	Registries integrated in to OS platforms (MD/AM);

WP4 Building capacities of research management

Lead partner: P11- ULIEGE /BE, Co-Leaders: P1-ASEM/MD, P7- ASUE/AM

Participating partners: P1-P16

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
4.1.	Report on EU practices related to research management	Event/ Report	Number of Study Visits to EU partners;	3 Study Visits in EU partner institutions;	Study Visits' agenda, attendance lists, pictures and other relevant evidence, training materials;



			Report regarding best EU practices related to research management Number of bylaws; Feedback from target users.	1 Document (Report regarding best EU practices related to research management) elaborated; 7 Bylaws elaborated and adopted; Level of satisfaction from intern. students - at least 75%.	Documents available on the project webpage.
4.2.	HRS4R adopted	Event/ Report	Number of Seminars; Number of HRS4R strategies;	5 Seminars in MD and AM relised; 5 HRS4R strategies developed and adopted;	Seminars' List of participants, Training materials, pictures and other relevant information; Strategies developed, adopted by the Senates and available on the webpage.
4.3.	HRS4R improved	Event/ Report	Number of Seminars; Number of HRS4R strategies;	2 Seminars in MD realised; 2 HRS4R strategies improved;	Seminars' List of participants, Training materials, pictures and other relevant information; Strategies adjusted by the Senates and available on the webpage.
4.4.	Plagiarism monitoring tools implemented	Service/ Product	Number of plagiarism monitoring tools;	7 plagiarism monitoring tools implemented;	Plagiarism monitoring tools created;
4.5.	Researchers trained on C&C and HRS4R	Event	Number of training sessions;	7 training sessions for researchers realised; Positive feedback from TS' attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success).	Training sessions' Programme, List of participants, Training materials, pictures and other relevant information;
4.6.	Young researchers trained in various skills	Event	Number of training sessions;	7 training sessions for young researchers realised; Positive feedback from TS' attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success).	Training sessions' Programme, List of participants, Training materials, pictures and other relevant information;



WP5 Quality plan

Lead partner: P15-UM/FR, Co-leaders: P3-UTM/MD, P8-YSU/AM

Participating partners: P1-P16

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
5.1.	Internal QA reports	Event/ Report	Number of pages in MEM; Indicative topics; Number of Monitoring Visits; Number of Interim reports; Feedback from target users.	1 Monitoring & evaluation manual published; 3 Monitoring visits realised; 2 Intermediate reports prepared	Monitoring & evaluation manual published on the website; Monitoring Visits' minutes; Intermediate reports prepared and shared internally.
5.2.	External QA reports	Report	Number of pages; Indicative topics; Feedback from target users.	3 External Evaluation reports; 1 Advisory recommendations;	Report published on the website; PCB meetings minutes;
5.3.	Report of fine tuning of university procedures and regulations	Report	Number of NPTF/MD, NPTF/AM and OS-UWGs meetings	5 NPTF/MD meetings; 5 NPTF/AM meetings; 5 OS-UWGs/MD meetings; 5 OS-UWGs/AM meetings;	NPTF/MD, NPTF/AM and OS-UWGs meetings recording;
5.4.	Audit	Report	Audit report;	1 Audit report prepared;	Audit report shared with PCB;

WP6 Dissemination, exploitation and impact maximization

Lead partner: P4-CR/MD, Co-Leaders: P2-USMF/MD, P9-YSULS/AM

Participating partners: P1-P16

Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
6.1.	Project promotional package	Service/ Product;	Number of pages in brand book;	1 Project's brand book;	Project's brand book shared with partners;



6.2.	Project website and open science webpage	Service/ Product;	Project's webpage Number of OS Platforms;	1 Project webpage established; 2 OS platforms created; Positive feedback from target users ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success);	Project website and stats Google Analytics; OS Platforms created;
6.3.	TG Information sessions	Event	Number of info-sessions realized; Number of Conferences;	6 info sessions organized by each PCU; 1 Launching Conference organized; Positive feedback from target users ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success);	Event's promotional and communication materials, agenda, attendance lists, photos, videos and other relevant evidence, Event participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results;
6.4.	TG Orientation sessions	Event	Number of orientation sessions;	6 Orientation sessions organized by each PCU;	Event's promotional and communication materials, agenda, attendance lists, photos, videos and other relevant evidence, Event participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results;
6.5.	Multiplier events realised	Event	Number of Country Workshops; Number of Conferences;	1 Country Workshop realised; 1 Concluding Conference realised; Positive feedback from attendees ($\geq 75\%$ positive feedback is considered success);	Event's promotional and communication materials, agenda, attendance lists, photos, videos and other relevant evidence, Event participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results;
6.6.	Survey report on TG satisfaction and impact	Report	Number of Questionnaires;	21 Reports prepared;	TG satisfaction and impact report published;
6.7.	The label "HR Excellence in Research" obtained	Service/ Product;	Number of labels "HR Excellence in Research"	5 labels "HR Excellence in Research" obtained	Labels obtained, results available on the project and institutional webpages;



WP7 Project Management Lead partner: P1-ASEM/MD Participating partners: P1-P16					
Deliverable/ Outcome Ref. N.	Title	Type	Indicator	Success criteria	Assessment tool
7.1.	Project coordination performed	Event/ Report	Document's content; Number of signed Partnership Agreements; Number of consortium meetings; Number of participants in the meeting; Number of reports; Feedback from meeting participants	1 Project handbook; Document's indicative content covered; 15 signed Partnership Agreements forwarded to EACEA within 6 months of Grant Agreement's signing; 3 Consortium meetings realised; Interim and final report submitted; Positive feedback of kick-off meeting participants	Document published on website; Signed Partnership Agreements shared internally; Meeting agenda, attendance lists, minutes, materials, photos and other relevant evidence, Meeting participants' evaluation forms, Satisfaction survey results; Reports submitted and shared internally;
7.2.	Project financial management performed	Report	Number of financial reports;	Financial reports prepared;	Financial reports, supporting documents, public procurements documents.



Annex B Word template for project document deliverables

TITLE OF DELIVERABLE: Subtitle

Project Acronym:	MINERVA
Project full title:	STRENGTHENING RESEARCH MANAGEMENT AND OPEN SCIENCE CAPACITIES OF HEIS IN MOLDOVA AND ARMENIA
Project No:	597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2019
Project duration:	36 months



Annex C PowerPoint template for project presentations



Project acronym: MINERVA

Project full title: STRENGTHENING RESEARCH MANAGEMENT AND OPEN SCIENCE
CAPACITIES OF HEIS IN MOLDOVA AND ARMENIA

Project No: 597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

Funding Scheme: Erasmus+

Title of the Presentation

Date/Place

Speaker:

Institution:

www.minerva-project.space



Annex D Attendance sheet template for different meetings / events

STUDY VISIT TO THE _____

ATTENDANCE LIST

Project Acronym: MINERVA

Project No: 597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP

WP / Deliverable/ Action:

Project partner (s)

Place/ Date

Nr. Pers.	Surname, Name	Institution, Position	Signature
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			



Annex E Word template for minutes of different meetings / events

NAME OF THE EVENT

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

Project Acronym:	MINERVA
Project No:	597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
WP / Deliverable/ Action:	
Project partner (s)	
Place/ Date	

Date:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.



Annex F Participant feedback form template for different meetings /events

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

- a) Event Date:
- b) Event Venue:
- c) Participant data (not compulsory) - First name:
- d) Participant data (not compulsory) - Last name:
- c) Participant data (not compulsory) - Organisation
- d) Participant data (not compulsory) – Country:

2. OVERALL FEEDBACK

- a) **GENERAL ASPECT:** Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The objectives of the Event were clear	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The issues on the Agenda were consistent with the Event objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Event was useful for helping our organisation to carry out the expected project activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The materials produced before and during the Event are clear to develop the project activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
All the partners contributed to the success of the Event	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Event was useful for establishing good working relationships among the partners	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Event met my expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The content of the Event was adequate selected and well prepared	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Coordinator significantly contributed to achieve the Event objectives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



b) LOGISTIC AND ORGANISATION: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree
The Agenda (and related materials) were circulated to the partnership in advance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Sufficient time was allocated to each issue on the Agenda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Organiser contributed to install a collaborative working environment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The infrastructure provided was satisfactory (IT, PC, Internet etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The Event took place in a suitable room	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

c) CONTENTS: Please indicate your agreement with the following statements by ticking the appropriate number:

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
After the Event, to which extent are project expected activities and results clear to you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After the Event, to which extent are work plan and deadlines clear to you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After the Event, to which extent are partner's role and responsibility in the project activities clear to you.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
After the Event, to which extent are the decisions taken clear to you?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

3. STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE EVENT

a) Please illustrate any strengths of the event and contributions or activities you enjoyed:

b) Please indicate how you think the event could have been improved:

c) Any further comments?



Annex G External monitoring report

External Monitoring Report (no.; date)

Project Acronym:	MINERVA
Project full title:	STRENGTHENING RESEARCH MANAGEMENT AND OPEN SCIENCE CAPACITIES OF HEIS IN MOLDOVA AND ARMENIA
Project No:	597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP
Funding Scheme:	ERASMUS+
Coordinator:	ASEM – Academy of Economic Studies of Moldova
Project start date:	January 15, 2019
Project duration:	36 months



Number of project		597912-EPP-1-2018-1-MD-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	
Visit completed by		Signature	
1. Project partner information			
1.1. Name:			
2. Visit information			
2.1. Location of visit (country, street, number)			
2.2. Date of visit:			
2.3. Contact person:	Name:	Position:	
3. Summary of progress to date			
3.1. Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule			
3.2. Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix			
3.3. Is there a risk that the project will fail to meet its key indicators? (if yes, please describe what corrective actions can be taken)			
3.4. Is there a risk that the Project partner will not be able to spent the all the money according to the Partner budget table?			
4. Description and status of the activities within project work plan			
Generally, is the project proceeding in accordance with the work plan? Specifically, which activities have not taken place which should have according to the work plan? What is the level of risk of the project not being completed on time or to the intended standard?			

5. Progress against indicators			
Outputs/outcomes	Indicator	Achieved to date	Plan to achieve indicator
PREP1	1.		
	2.		



	3.		
DEV2	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV3	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DEV4	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
QPLN	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
DISS & EXP	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
MNGT	1.		
	2.		
	3.		
6. Finance			
6.1. Is the Project partner obtaining all necessary supporting documentation and storing this properly? If not, what action will the Project partner take to rectify the solution?			
6.2. Is the Project partner experiencing any problems in terms of cash flow? This includes any problems caused by delays with payment from the ASEM?			
6.3. Are any underspends or overspends anticipated? For overspends, what is the solution to keep within Partner budget table? For underspends, are there proposals for how this can be used?			
6.4. Other			
7. Main problems encountered and recommendations			
Related to	Description of problem	Project partner Solution/s and/or recommendation/s	
Procurement/installation			



Development of strategic documents		
Implementation of strategies		
Delivery of trainings and services		
Marketing/public relations		
Technical and financial reporting		
Relations with Project coordinator, PST and QAPT team		
Other		
Report received by the Project partner		
I confirm that I have received and read the monitoring report		
Name		Date:
Scheduled date of next visit		
Personnel to be present from the Project partner		
1.		
2.		



Annex H Event report template for organisation of meetings / events

Author:	
Event Title:	
Event Date:	
Event Venue:	
Type of event: (National, international, press conference, promotional event etc.)	
Short description:	
Organiser(s):	
Agenda:	Link to the agenda
Total number of participants:	
Links to further information:	ex. MINERVA website
Other personal remarks:	
<p>Here you can include the information such:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation of MINERVA at the event? ▪ What was the subject of your presentation? ▪ Were you invited to present MINERVA or you have registered for the event by yourself? ▪ Were MINERVA promotional materials presented at this conference/event/meeting etc. ▪ MINERVA Stand? ▪ Etc. 	



1. Event Organisation Details

Invitation was sent off to participants on:	
Information Material was sent off to participants on:	
Date of Initial Participant List Compilation:	
Date of Final Participant List Compilation:	
Total Number of Participants Invited	
Date of Agenda Finalisation:	
???	
???	

2. Problems encountered during the event preparation phase

(To be filled by organisers)

Organisers: Please complete (if you have not met with any problems in that phase, please fill in “N/A”. Please also include any feedback by the participants **before** the workshop)

- 1.
- 2.

3. Event Rollout

Some general information (to be filled by organisers)

3.1. Final Event Agenda + Participant list

(Please attach the final event agenda and the list of participants)

3.2. Event Implementation – Commentary by Organising Partners

WP-leader
<i>Please add your comments, if any</i>
Task leader



Please add your comments, if any

4. Event Evaluation by Participants

4.1. Summary of the Participant Feedback Form

Results to be filled by organisers based on the questionnaire results. Please note: insert only the overall percentage of all feedback forms received (e.g. participants total number=30; 15 of them were most satisfied and 15 of them satisfied, please include 50% in the column most satisfied and 50% in the column satisfied.)

	Most satisfied	Satisfied	Moderately satisfied	Rather dissatisfied	Not at all satisfied
The event administration					
The structure of the programme					
The venue and facilities					
The presentations					
The discussions					
The event dinner and subsistence					
The overall organisation was professional.					
The time management was always to my fullest satisfaction.					
The style and level of communication between organisers and participants was professional.					
I would recommend this kind of event to my colleagues.					

Prior Experience of Similar Events – Overall %	Please fill in the overall percentage of participants with prior experience of similar events
--	---

Strengths and limitations of the event: please include comments received

Strengths of the event and contributions or activities enjoyed by participants:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX
Suggestions for the improvement:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX
Any further comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • XX • XX



4.2. Additional comments

to be filled by local partner

Please add the following additional information here

- *Charts of the statistical figures from the tables above (pie or bar charts);*
- *Any further comments concerning the feedback you received by the workshop participants*

5. Additional comments

May be filled by any of the organising partners

Please add in any other comments concerning the preparation and organisation of this event:



Annex I PROBLEM REPORT/CORRECTIVE - PREVENTIVE MEASURES FORM

Problem reported by:	
Date:	
Problem description:	
Possible causes of the problem:	

Actions undertaken to solve the problem	
Timeline	
Responsible institution and person(s)	

Actions undertaken to solve the problem	
Timeline	
Responsible institution and person(s)	