



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**Educational Capacity Strengthening for Risk Management of Non-native Aquatic Species in Western Balkans (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro) - RiskMan**

Erasmus+ KA2 – Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices –  
Capacity Building in the field of Higher Education  
Reference N.: 619384-EPP-1-2020-1-TR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

# **Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan**

<b>Project acronym:</b>	RISKMAN
<b>Project full title:</b>	Management of non-native aquatic species in Western Balkans (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro)
<b>Project No:</b>	619384-EPP-1-2020-1-TR-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP
<b>Number of grant contracts:</b>	
<b>The web address of the project:</b>	www.riskman.mu.edu.tr
<b>Funding Scheme:</b>	ERASMUS+
<b>Coordinator Institution:</b>	Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University
<b>Coordinator:</b>	Prof. Dr. Ali Serhan Tarkan
<b>Project duration:</b>	24 months
<b>Work package:</b>	WP 6 Quality plan
<b>Lead organization of WP 6:</b>	University of Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
<b>Task 6.2</b>	Develop a monitoring, evaluation and quality plan
<b>Task leader:</b>	University of Sarajevo
<b>The version of the document:</b>	v.03
<b>Date:</b>	30/11/2021
<b>Status:</b>	Final
<b>Responsible partner:</b>	UNSA
<b>Dissemination level:</b>	Internal

*The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*

## Table of Contents

Versioning and contribution history .....	4
List of abbreviations .....	4
List of the RISKMAN partners .....	5
Purpose and objectives .....	6
Aims and role of the evaluation in a project .....	6
Project Quality Assurance .....	7
Indicators of Achievement .....	11
Project Quality Control .....	12
Project Risk Management .....	16
Partners' technical and financial reporting .....	17

## I

**Versioning and contribution history**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Task Leader</b>	<b>Task Team</b>
v.01	08/06/2021	First draft	Durmić-Pašić Adaleta	UNSA
v.02	29/11/2021	Final draft	Kalamujić Stroil Belma	UNSA
<b>v.03</b>	<b>30/11/2021</b>	<b>Final</b>	<b>Durmić-Pašić Adaleta</b>	<b>UNSA</b>

**List of abbreviations**

<b>CBHE</b>	Capacity Building in Higher Education
<b>EACEA</b>	Education, Audiovisual, and Culture Executive Agency
<b>EQE</b>	External Quality Evaluator
<b>IOA</b>	Indicators of Achievement
<b>MEQuP</b>	Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan
<b>NEO</b>	National Erasmus Office
<b>PMT</b>	Project Management Team
<b>QA</b>	Quality Assurance
<b>QC</b>	Quality Committee
<b>RISKMAN</b>	The acronym of the project: Management of non-native aquatic species in Western Balkans (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro)
<b>SC</b>	Steering Committee
<b>TL</b>	Task Leader
<b>TT</b>	Task Team
<b>WP</b>	Work Package
<b>WPL</b>	Work Package Leader



## **LIST OF THE RISKMAN PARTNERS:**

**P1** MUĞLA SITKI KOÇMAN UNIVERSITY (TR)

**P2** UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI PALERMO (IT)

**P3** PSI HYDROBIOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OHRID (MK)

**P4** ASSOCIATION FOR ECOLOGY EKOMENLOG OHRID (MK)

**P5** SVEUČILIŠTE U ZAGREBU (HR)

**P6** ALBANIAN CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT (AL)

**P7** ALB ADRIATICO 2013 (AL)

**P8** UNIVERSITETI BUJQESOR I TIRANES (AL)

**P9** UNIVERZITET U SARAJEVU (BA)

**P10** JAVNA USTANOVA UNIVERZITET CRNE GORE PODGORICA (ME)

**P11** iSea, ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANISATION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM (GR)

**P12** UNIVERZITET U BIHAĆU (BA)

**P13** KOLEGJI UNIVERSITAR I BIZNESIT (AL)

## **PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

This document presents the Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan (MEQuP) for the Erasmus+ project "Management of non-native aquatic species in Western Balkans (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro)" (RISKMAN). It is developed in the scope of the WP6 (Quality plan) of the project in compliance with the project description and all applicable rules and guidelines. The tasks of WP6 are the establishment of a Quality Committee (QC), development of a Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan (MEQuP) applicable in the teaching process, regular QC meetings, evaluation of student and participant satisfaction, and monitoring visits by external evaluators.

The Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan formalizes a guideline for partners of the RISKMAN project to ensure the highest possible quality of the project activities, outputs and outcomes, and project management. The electronic version of the MEQuP will be made available on the public website of the RISKMAN project ([www.riskman.mu.edu.tr](http://www.riskman.mu.edu.tr)).

The Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan contains:

- Aims and role of the evaluation in a project,
- Project Quality Assurance,
- Indicators of Achievement,
- Project Quality Control,
- Project risk management,
- Partners' technical and financial reporting.

### **Aims and role of the evaluation in a project**

The purpose of The Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan is to describe how quality will be managed throughout the lifecycle of the project. It also includes the processes and procedures for ensuring quality planning, quality assurance, and quality control. All target groups should be familiar with how quality will be planned, assured, and controlled.

The purpose of this plan is to:

- Ensure quality is planned,
- Define how quality will be managed,
- Define quality assurance activities,
- Define quality control activities,
- Define acceptable quality standards,
- Ensure quality of checklist for review of deliverables.



## **PROJECT QUALITY ASSURANCE**

### **Organization, responsibilities and interfaces**

All partners are responsible for the quality of project implementations regarding procedures and outcomes, in full respect to the signed partnership agreements between the project coordinator and each project partner. The Quality Committee (QC) and External Quality Evaluator (EQE) are responsible for the quality of the entire project implementation. Being aware of the project hierarchy, they shall take suitable corrective activities to improve the quality of processes, procedures, and outcomes concerning the project.

Different roles are identified regarding the development of the project activities and in particular the project quality assurance procedures. Different roles are accompanied by different responsibilities.

### **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 to other partners involved in the activity,
- Is responsible for coordinating the work of other partners involved in the activity and providing guidance when necessary,
- Is responsible for aligning the contributions of the other partners involved in the activity in order to produce the deliverable,
- Is responsible for the submission of the draft deliverable to the WPL and together with the WPL for preparing the Technical Report to the QC and the SC,
- Is responsible for implementing the suggestions of the QC team and assigning amendments when needed,
- Is responsible for sending the amended draft deliverable,
- Reports any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity to the WPL,
- Cooperates with the WPL and other partners in the same WP in order to ensure the activity's progress in conformity with other activities and that any cross-activity inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the WP description (respecting any changes approved by the SC as recorded in the respective minutes).

### **Other partners involved in the activity and co-authors**

- Are responsible for the production of their part in the deliverable according to the Task Leader's instructions,
- Make sure that their written contributions comply with the Word Document Template to ensure that the Task Leaders will be able to put all contributions together in the desirable format,
- Are responsible for providing all the complementary information regarding their work to the TL (i.e., references, bibliography, methodologies used, contact details of people interviewed, etc.),

- Are responsible to implement amendments to their contribution as a result of the amendments requested by the QC team after consulting with the Task Leaders.

### **WP Leader**

- Is responsible for preparing and updating the WP action plan and ensuring that all activities stay within the defined time frame,
- 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 to accomplish the WP's objectives and that any cross WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as foreseen by the project description,
- Sends reminders on 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 comments and suggestions on the draft deliverables to the Task Leaders,
- Cooperates with the Task Leaders in ensuring the implementation of the suggestions of the QC,
- Verifies the adequate implementation of the recommendations.

### **Quality Committee**

The Quality Committee (QC) is direct support to the Project Coordinator in monitoring and assessing the quality of the project and its results as well as in developing the Monitoring, evaluation and quality plan (MEQuP). It is the highest decision making body of the partnership that takes the final decision for the quality of major deliverables and project itself. The Quality Committee includes members from MSKU project team and one member from each participating institution. The Quality Committee consists of the following members, coming from both programme and partner countries:

- Pešić Ana - University of Montenegro, Montenegro
- Giovos Ioannis - iSea, Greece
- Uçma Uysal Tugba - MSKU, Turkey
- Aldemir Ceray - MSKU, Turkey
- Troçe Ornela - Alb-Adriatico 2013, Albania
- Špelić Ivan - University of Zagreb, Croatia
- Trajanovski Sasho - HIO, North Macedonia
- Zdraveski Konstantin - Ekomenlog Ohrid, North Macedonia
- Džafić Subha - University of Bihać, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Durmić-Pašić Adaleta - University of Sarajevo-INGEB, Bosnia and Herzegovina

- Hala Edmond - Agricultural University of Tirana, Albania
- Bakiu Silvia – ACEPSD, Albania
- Dinoshi Irsida – UCB, Albania
- Sarà Gianluca – UNIPA, Italy.

Quality Committee meetings will be organized during the management committee meetings or linked to other project events, for reasons of cost-effectiveness, and take place at least twice per year during the life-time of the project. It is coordinated by the QC manager, as agreed by the Steering Committee. The obligations and responsibilities of the QC comprise the following:

- The QC is responsible for the Quality Assurance exercise of deliverables,
- The QC receives each draft deliverable from the reviewer and provides feedback using the Quality Assurance Checklist (Annex 9 – Quality Assurance Checklist for Review of Deliverable). The Task Leader should make each deliverable available to be reviewed by a person of the QC that has not been involved in producing the deliverable,
- The QC sends the checklist for reviewing the deliverable to the WP/Task Leader and verifies the adequate implementation of the recommendations. In cooperation with the WP Leader, the latter has to be included in the Quality Control Report of the deliverable,
- Cooperates with the project coordinator and SC on general issues related to the level of quality of the project's deliverables as appropriate.

### **Steering Committee**

- Officially approves and finally accepts the deliverables.

### **Project Management Team**

- Cooperates with the QC and the WP/Task Leaders on all matters arising relevant to ensuring the quality of the project's deliverables,
- Cooperates with the WP Leaders to ensure that all WPs are in progressing in conformity with each other and that any cross-WP inputs and outputs are being delivered as stated in the WP description,
- Informs the QC, the WP Leaders and the Task Leaders of any changes in the Partnership Agreement and the related work plan or any implicit changes in the implementation of the project that may affect the timing or the content of the relevant deliverables,
- Officially approves and finally accepts the deliverables.

### **Indicators of Achievement**

All expected outcomes will be measured in terms of accomplished achievements. For this purpose, Indicators of Achievement (IOA) for each expected result are established. After the completion of the activity, the project coordinator will measure the IOA for the obtained result, thus establishing the rate of achievement.

**The general objective** of the RISKMAN project is to promote the education of stakeholders and

higher education in the field of risk management of non-native (NN) aquatic species and to stimulate research and cooperation on the management of NN species in the Western Balkan Region (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro).

**Indicators:**

- Graduated students are competent for effective management of non-native aquatic species in Western Balkan partner countries. This indicator will be measured through the HEIs' annual reports on students' graduations.
- Increased request for educational training from the public and private environmental monitoring sector. The indicator will be measured through the HEI's annual reports on the number of realized training sessions for professionals in the environmental monitoring sector.
- Increase in the quality of regional cooperation in education and research regarding management of non-native aquatic species in Western Balkans.

**The specific objectives of the RISKMAN project:**

- Updating the skills of the higher education system and stakeholders' awareness in the field of aquatic NN species in the Western Balkans in line with the international directives given by FAO, IUCN and the strategies of European Policy Cooperation.
- Supporting involved Western Balkans Partner countries to address the challenges facing their higher education institutions and systems concerning the management of aquaculture sector and NN species, including risk assessment, stakeholders' participation, planning and governance of aquaculture facilities and industries.
- Promoting communication and awareness of stakeholders (workers in aquaculture and tourism sectors, and fishers) about the threat posed by NN species to biodiversity.
- Promoting voluntary convergence with EU developments in higher education and aquaculture industries and contributing to cooperation between the Project partners on the management of NN species.
- Develop regional academic RISKMAN network to organize and promote regional cooperation in the management of non-native aquatic species.

**Indicators:**

- National (3) and Regional (1) overviews of legislations and directives adjusted to EU and international requirements and standards in the Western Balkan Partner Countries.
- Complete available overview of current policy level documents and principles addressing NN species in the 3 WB countries.
- Overview of existing European practice and principles for NN species education in WB countries.
- Identification of crucial points, benefits and possible difficulties/weaknesses in Western Balkan policies compared with the existing European practice from programme countries.

- Creation of a joint document defining the status of Western Balkan regulations and legislations regarding management of NN Aquatic Species by discussion and wider dissemination of the plan roadmap and good practices with the stakeholders (dissemination of results by the Project tools and national specialized journals).
- Overview of the status of NN aquatic species in WB disseminated at the HEI and stakeholders (at least one scientific papers review)
- Participation in the interview for the assessment of the stakeholder's knowledge about the status of NN aquatic species in WB (at least 15 questionnaires per country = 45).
- Participation and utilization of stakeholders to the online platform and database (at least 30 visits per partner country in the first year of project = 90 visits).
- Overview of literature background of existing risk management model in the literature.
- Development of Risk management model for NN aquatic species for WB (at least 30 visits to the project website per each of the partner WB countries = 90).
- Introduction of three (3) new courses for the curriculum of HEI of WB.
- Number of researchers/trainers in Partner Countries trained to share their acquired skills on Risk Management of NN aquatic species to students, unemployed young and other stakeholders (at least 5 per Partner country= 15).
- Implementation of training activities for trainers of WB (at least 5 trained trainers for each country = 15).
- Number of students of higher education institutions in Balkan Partners Countries selecting the new proposed courses related to Risk Management of NN aquatic species in their studying curriculum (at least 15 per Partner country= 45).
- Involvement and interest of the students of HEI in the new courses during the pilot test.
- Tailored courses materials available and ready-to-use.
- Involvement and interest of participants in the tailored courses (at least 30 participants for each country = 90).
- Number of unemployed young and youth adults in Balkan Partners Countries participating in the tailored courses related to Risk management of NN aquatic species to become a "Risk Manager" (at least 30 per Partner country= 90).
- Number of participants (citizens, workers in aquaculture and tourism sectors, and fishers) at organized dissemination activities, workshops and presentations to increase awareness about the threat posed by NN species to biodiversity (at least 30 per Partner country= 90).
- Active involvement of public stakeholders (public administrators, policymakers, NGOs and industries representatives) in voluntary convergence with EU developments in higher education and aquaculture industries and contribute to cooperation between the Project partners on the management of NN aquatic species by their participation to the specialized workshop and dissemination activities (at least 3 per each Partner Country= 9)
- Implementation of dissemination and exploitation plan and its publication on the project

web site.

- Launch of website and social media and their promotion (at least 500 people following the social media and access to webpage).
- Number of delivered Handbook reporting roles, procedures, methodologies and evaluation of practices for all beneficiaries (at least 50 per Partner country= 150).
- Interim and final dissemination and exploitation report (IDER and FDER) published on the project web site and available to stakeholders.
- Organization of Quality Committee (1 member for each partner + 2 staff members of the coordinator MSKU).
- Meetings of the Quality Committee.
- Written progress reports that elaborate the progress of the project and address it to the project coordinator.
- Number of participants to the Regional/National workshops and web-binaries on “Risk Management of NN Aquatic Species” in Western Balkan Partner Countries (at least 15 per Partner country= 90).
- Participation of stakeholders to the Final Conference.
- Implementation of Kick-Off Meeting and other Consortium Meetings by wide participation of all partners.
- Training and Technical Group composed of 2 members from each partner organization.
- Project initiation documents available to all partners; Project coordination board; Activities of the StC committee meeting.
- Implementation of the final project reports (management, quality assurance and exploitation of results).

## **PROJECT QUALITY CONTROL**

### **Internal quality monitoring**

A specific monitoring and evaluation system will be set up by the Quality Committee (QC) to provide constant and clear information about the effectiveness of carrying out the action to the management, allowing the optimization of resources and redirection of activities which can be affected by problems.

Internal monitoring including self-evaluation will be carried out by all partners by using the logical framework matrix (LFM), workplan, budget correctness, monitoring visits of the Erasmus+ National offices and external evaluator, and questionnaires/satisfaction surveys of target groups (e.g., participants of dissemination and training events).

### **Project Monitoring, Evaluation and Quality Assurance Strategy**

Activity will be supervised by MSKU via Internet quarterly. Local coordinators and RiskMan partners are responsible for daily monitoring issues. The results of monitoring will be summarized

and sent to MSKU as a written report every 6 months.

The quality assurance of the RISKMAN project is carried out at two levels of quality control:

(1) Deliverables from authors, Task Leaders (TL), and WP Leaders (WPL),

(2) Quality Committee (QC).

### **Deliverables from authors, Task leaders and WP leaders level**

The 1st level corresponds to the activity level. The presentation of deliverables and activities of the project is a joint responsibility of the associated TL and his/her Task Teams (TTs), partners involved in the activity and corresponding WPL. The WPL ensures the quality of the deliverables and that deadlines are met as identified in the application form and action plan (modified and approved by the QC on a six-month basis).

### **Quality Committee level**

The QC reviews submitted technical reports about activity/WP implementation. The QC has five (5) working days to respond by sending comments using the template for the quality control report (Annex 9). The activity/WP leaders have five (5) more working days to conform to the QC comments and organize the work to address them. The QC makes final decisions on the approval of major deliverables.

### **External quality monitoring**

External evaluator, National Erasmus Office (NEO), and EACA will perform external monitoring of the project. NEO performs three types of monitoring based on the deliverable achievement:

- Preventive (in the first project year),
- Advisory (after the first project year),
- Control (after the end of the project – sustainability check).

Based on the progress of these aspects, the NEO sends a report on their findings to EACEA.

The monitoring by NEO includes the assessment of various aspects of the project implementation such as relevance (is the project still relevant in terms of its goals and achievements), efficiency (are the activities in work packages finished in time), effectiveness (how well are project-specific objectives met), impact (at the level of departments, faculty, university, etc.) and, sustainability (lasting project outcome).

Apart from the monitoring from NEO and EACEA, the Coordinator will additionally subcontract the External Quality Evaluator (EQE) for the preparation of the External Report on the project's financial statements following the recommendations and templates of EACEA. The external evaluator will be responsible for the quality control of the master curricula and their materials. Quality control refers to the activities that maintain or improve teaching materials; it will ensure transferability and durability of the results as well as the relevance of the actual project implementation to the current needs. The reports are to be submitted to the project coordinator for further improvement. Quality control is carried out to demonstrate compliance of the training content with the competencies targeted by teaching outcomes.

## **Quality of project deliverables**

The deliverables of the RISKMAN project may be classified into two categories:

- Tangible deliverables (reports, publications, manuals, methodology, plans, printed and electronically available promotional material)
- Intangible deliverables in the form of organized events (trainings, workshops, round table events, open day events, etc.), developed and launched innovation platforms, integrative approaches in continuing education, etc.

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.

## **Quality of RISKMAN documents**

A consistent and common format for all document-based deliverables is to be followed by all partners using templates.

The list of related annexes:

Annex 1 – Attendance list

Annex 2 – Training Evaluation Form

Annex 3 – Meeting/Workshop/Conference/Event Evaluation Form

Annex 4 – Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Training

Annex 5 – Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Meeting/Workshop/Conference

Annex 6 – Participant Feedback Form for Round Table

Annex 7 – Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Round Table

Annex 8 – Event Report

Annex 9 – Quality Assurance Checklist for Review of Deliverable

Annex 10 – Epidemiological list

Annex 11 – Rules of Procedure.

The templates cover the quality and management domain and are adopted by the Steering Committee members to ensure a common appearance of deliverables as well as to ensure that a minimum amount of information will appear consistently in all documents produced by the project. When partners produce studies and publications as a deliverable, they are obliged to add an Erasmus+ logo and the sentence “Co-funded by Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union” on the cover or the first page.

## **Quality of promotional materials**

Promotional material will reflect the visual identity of the project and the Erasmus+ program and are an important part of dissemination activities. P1 Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University (TR) as the project coordinator institution will provide document templates with logos designed and produced on a subcontracting basis. The materials will be disseminated by all project partners at



relevant events 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 research, technological development and innovation). Indicators of quality of promotional materials are the number of distributed promotional materials, the broadcast rating and a number of views (for video materials). The quality of this deliverable should be evaluated using the form in Annex 9. All promotional materials distributed during the dissemination events will be evaluated together with the event (Annex 2-8).

### **Quality of websites and other electronic tools**

The project includes setting up the public RISKMAN website ([www.riskman.mu.edu.tr](http://www.riskman.mu.edu.tr)) as an interface tool for project management. All representation tools will be continuously updated by the partners and are intended to effectively communicate the results of the project. Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University (TR) will be responsible for setting up and maintaining the RISKMAN website with all information and materials received from project partners.

All partners are asked to promote the RISKMAN project on their websites and other electronic tools (such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn profiles/groups, newsletters, etc.) by providing a short description of the project, the logo, and a link to the RISKMAN website.

### **Quality of RISKMAN events**

The RISKMAN project includes the following events: meetings, training, round tables with stakeholders, open days at PCs HEIs, workshops at PCs HEIs, and the final RISKMAN conference. Before each organized event, the organizers should provide full information to the participants including the draft agenda, a letter of invitation and a note on the logistics (informing them about travel arrangements, venue, suggested hotels, etc.). Time for preparation activities depends on the type of the event, e.g., several months for conferences and several weeks for training/workshop. This will be defined in separate action plans by task leaders.

The meeting organizers should provide adequate registration processes (Attendance List – Annex 1) and host the meetings respecting the appropriate time for event sessions and breaks as well as the availability of all necessary materials (e.g., training and promotional material). The organizers will also ensure the recording of the meetings' minutes including a list of action points. Feedback forms will be distributed among participants (Annex 2 – Training Evaluation Form, Annex 3 – Meeting/Workshop/Conference/Event Evaluation Form, Annex 6 – Participants' feedback form for round table). In case that event cannot be held due to the Covid-19 pandemic, it will take place online and each participant will receive an online questionnaire. For each specific event Summary of the Participant Feedback templates (Annex 4 - Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Training; Annex 5 - Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Meeting/Workshop/Conference; Annex 7 - Summary of the Participant Feedback Form for Round Table) have been developed. Organizers of the particular event are asked to fill a specific Summary of RISKMAN event within five (5) days after the event ends. Furthermore, specific event report templates (Annex 8 - Event Report) have been developed which is to be filled out by project partners (organizers) for all RISKMAN events.

Based on obligations of the beneficiaries of the Grant Agreement, related to information requirements, the partners shall inform the public, press, and media (internet included) of the

event that must visibly indicate “with the support of the Erasmus+ Programme of the European Union” as well as the graphic logos of the project and Erasmus+ Programme.

### **The Project Event strategy for the COVID-19 outbreak**

All the meetings organized within the RISKMAN project must be held in line with the highest epidemiological real-time Covid-19 health precaution which includes an Epidemiological ID for each participant. More precisely, according to Rules of Procedure and Project Management guidelines, each participant during any event organized within the RISKMAN project has to fill out Annex 10 - Epidemiological list. For further details and rules of procedure, please see Annex 11 – RISKMAN Rules of Procedure.

### **Project Risk Management**

As part of the internal quality management, a regular risk assessment will be carried out and reviewed during the Project Management Team meetings which shall lead to corrective actions and potential adaptations of the work plan if necessary.

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 underspending), timing (postponing of activities/deliverables), performance risks (project management), and sustainability of the project results. The main aim will be to provide a sound assessment, anticipate challenges in a systematic way, and minimize potential negative impacts.

The identification and assessment of new risks is a joint responsibility of all project partners who have to communicate them to the Project Coordinator and the PMT, eventually suggesting possible interventions and solutions as soon as they become aware of those risks.

The PMT 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 proposed corrective actions that will make the potential risk consequences acceptable for the consortium.

Also, the external reviewers (representatives of NEO and EACEA) will be involved in the risk management. During their monitoring visits, they will assess potential risks within the project that would lead to not meeting key indicators and if there is a risk that project partners will not be able to spend all the money according to the planned project budget.

The proper allocation of resources to the project by the individual project partners is of utmost importance. There are several possible risks connected, including the delay of the project implementation as defined in the project work plan, the rushed implementation of the work plan with low quality, and underspending 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. The project partners all have to ensure that they allocate the needed resources to the project, both human and financial.

### **Partners’ technical and financial reporting**

The main guidelines for reporting are laid out in the Project Management Programme. Partner

financial reports are linked to the transfer of installments of the Erasmus+ grant by the coordinator.

The coordinator can submit a final report, as well as financial statements to the EACEA on behalf of all beneficiaries only based on inputs received from all partners.

The PMT team and coordinator will check the supporting documents for financial reporting sent to the project coordinator. During the review, they will take into consideration the following assessment criteria:

- Conformity of the expenditures with the budget of the project,
- Eligibility of the expenditures,
- Correctness and completeness of all supporting documents and certified copies of invoices,
- Correctness of the calculations and applied exchange rates,
- Any changes which occurred between budget categories are eligible and justified,
- Financial biannual original reports signed by the appointed contact person of partner institution,
- Expenditures must be in conformity with the allocated budget, including full eligibility.

In case the information in a report is not complete or justified, the PMT team will help and make recommendations on how this situation can be rectified prior to the final approval of the report by the coordinator. The report approved in this way is the basis for the transfer of the next installment to the partner institution.