This project is funded by the European Union

Ref. Ares(2025)5178554 - 28/06/2025

EPD-NET

Filling the Gap: Development of Ecological Planning and Design Learning Network and Adaptive Smart Training Module for Disaster Resilient and Sustainable Cities

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

The EPD-Net digital learning network developed for disaster-resilient and sustainable cities not only generates knowledge but also offers a holistic transformation model where quality is traceable, measurable and sustainable.

This report is followed by the External Evaluation Report for D1.1, D1.2, D1.3, and D1.4.

This project is funded by the European Union

EPD-Net Quality Assurance Plan

Deliverable Code: D1.1
Work Package: WP1 - Project Management
Lead Institution: Eskisehir Technical University (ESTU)
Contributing Partners: All Partners
Submission Date: M4 - June 2025
Version: v08

CONTENT

ABBREVIATIONS

AB	Accreditation Body
AI	Artificial Intelligence
AIJU	Asociacion De Investigacion De La Industria Del Juguete Conexas Y Afines
AU	Ankara University
BS	Basarsoft
CTLA	Turkish Chamber of Landscape Architects
CU	Cukurova University
EQF	European Qualifications Framework
ESG2015	European Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance
ESRI	Environmental Systems Research Institute Turkey Branch
ESTU	Eskisehir Technical University
GA	Grant Agreement
GIS	Geographical Information Systems
HEI	Higher Education Institution
HU	Harran University
IFLA	International Federation of Landscape Architects
IKU	Istanbul Kultur University
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LAAA	Latvian Association of Landscape Architects
LBTU	Latvia University of Life Sciences and Technologies
LE	Large Enterprise
MENDELU	Mendel University in Brno
NC	NetCAD
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NLP	Natural Language Processing
NMBU	Norwegian University of Life Sciences
PC	Professional Chamber
PI	Performance Indicator
PF	Previform - Laboratório, Formação, Higiene e Segurança no Trabalho, Lda
PM Team	Project Management Team
PMS	Project Management System
QAP	Quality Assurance Plan
RI	Research Institute
SC	Steering Committee
SK	Semantic Kernel
SME	Small and Medium Enterprise
SPU	Slovak University of Agriculture in Nitra
TAPLAK	Design and Planning Accreditation Board

THCA	Turkish Healthy Cities Association
UX	User experience
VET	Vocational Education and Training
VSB	Technical University of Ostrava
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

The EPD-Net Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) outlines a comprehensive, structured, and participatory framework designed to ensure that all project activities and deliverables meet the highest standards of quality, relevance, and impact throughout the project's 36-month life cycle. This plan, developed under WP1 - Project Management (Task 1.1), is aligned with the objectives and methodology detailed in the Grant Agreement (GA No: 101183961) and integrates best practices from both academic and applied domains in environmental planning, disaster resilience, and digital learning.

The QAP addresses **all work packages (WP1-WP6)** and functions as a horizontal mechanism, promoting internal coherence, stakeholder responsiveness, and external accountability. It defines key quality principles, roles and responsibilities, review protocols, feedback systems, and measurable indicators, ensuring consistency across:

- Needs analysis and content development
- Training module design and digital delivery
- Pilot implementation and user testing
- Stakeholder engagement, dissemination, and sustainability planning

The EPD-Net QAP has **learning-oriented architecture**, combining traditional quality assurance (verification and validation) with **adaptive feedback loops**, supported by tools such as:

- Gantt-based implementation monitoring
- The EPD_Assist Artificial Intelligence (AI)-supported module for user data integration
- ECHO co-design model for peer review and training iteration
- External expert evaluations at critical milestones

Each WP leader is responsible for quality within their scope, while overall coordination and documentation are ensured by ESTU, supported and validated by the Steering Committee (SC).

The plan incorporates scheduled review points at M4, M12, M18, M24, and M34 to allow for ongoing adjustments, escalation of quality concerns, and the integration of risk management insights. To align with the SC's meeting schedule, which occurs at M3, M6, M9, M12, M15, M18, M21, M24, M27, M30, M33, and M36, the reviews at M4 and M34 will be aligned with the nearest available SC meetings (M3

and M36, respectively). This ensures that quality concerns and risk management insights are discussed and addressed in a timely manner.

Additionally, quality control tools, including version tracking, control checklists, evaluation forms, and corrective action records, will be provided in the annexes for systematic use throughout the project.

In essence, the EPD-Net QAP transforms quality from a static requirement into a **continuous, collaborative, and transparent process**, enhancing the credibility, replicability, and scalability of all project outcomes.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

1.1 Introduction

EPD-Net Project (*Filling the Gap: Development of Ecological Planning and Design Learning Network and an Adaptive Smart Training Module for Disaster Resilient and Sustainable Cities*, GA No: 101183961) is a European Union-funded, multi-partner Erasmus+ cooperation project. The project, coordinated by Eskişehir Technical University, aims to increase knowledge production, teaching and digital capacity in the field of ecological planning and design for disaster-resilient and sustainable cities.

In this context, the quality of project deliverables directly affects not only the contextual success but also the effectiveness of the implementation process and the sustainability of the outputs. The quality assurance system has been established to ensure that the project achieves the planned objectives, that its outputs are fit for purpose, that they are completed on time and that all stakeholders participate effectively in this process.

This report has been prepared to document the quality management process in the EPD-Net Project, set quality standards, and make quality-related practices transparent for all stakeholders.

1.2 Purpose

The main purpose of this QAP is to ensure that the following objectives are realised during the implementation of the project:

- **Strategic Alignment:** To ensure that project activities are carried out in line with Erasmus+ programme priorities, application form objectives and necessary quality standards.
- **Process Quality:** To ensure that the tasks defined in all WPs are performed in a timely, effective, transparent and high-quality manner.
- **Output Quality:** To set common quality standards for all intellectual outputs, such as training modules, reports, digital platforms, and learning resources developed and to monitor their implementation.
- **Indicator-Based Monitoring**: To systematically monitor PIs to ensure achievement of the quantitative and qualitative targets specified in the project application.
- **Participatory Approach:** To enable all partners, instructors, students and other stakeholders to contribute to the quality assurance process and to enable continuous improvement through feedback mechanisms.
- **Risk Management:** To ensure the timely implementation of preventive and corrective actions by identifying quality risks that may threaten the process in advance.

This report is structured on the QAP (T1.1) developed under WP1. It also sets out concretely how the quality assurance principles will be applied in all WPs of the project and structures the monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes. The quality assurance process consists of internal evaluation, joint

evaluation, and external monitoring components and is designed to be actively operational throughout the entire life cycle of the project, not at the end of the project.

2. QUALITY ASSURANCE STRATEGY AND APPROACH

2.1 Basic Principles of Approach to Quality Assurance

The EPD-Net Project views quality assurance as an ongoing process aimed at improving practices throughout the project lifecycle. It is integrated into every phase of the project to ensure continuous learning and process optimization. In contrast, quality control focuses on the assessment of final outputs to ensure they meet predefined standards. The project is guided by the following core principles of quality assurance.

- **Holism:** Quality assurance processes are structured to cover the entire project lifecycle, including project management, communication, collaboration, output production, dissemination, and sustainability, not just specific WPs.
- **Process Orientation:** Quality assurance focuses on the methods, planning, and implementation processes, emphasizing transparency, cooperation, and stakeholder participation. These elements are central to maintaining continuous improvement and process optimization throughout the project.
- **Continuous Improvement**: Through monitoring, evaluation, and feedback loops, the experience and knowledge gained during the project ensure that practices are updated and the quality of outputs is improved.
- **Stakeholder Engagement and Inclusiveness:** In addition to academic partners, active participation of all stakeholders, such as instructors, students, local authorities, decision makers, and civil society in quality processes is essential.
- **Transparency and Accountability:** An open and documented structure has been adopted in communication between partners, decision-making processes, and output assessments.
- **Data-Based Decision Making:** Quality management is based on qualitative and quantitative indicators. Indicators, surveys, feedback forms, and monitoring reports form the basis of quality decisions.

2.2 Strategic Implementation Approach

The quality assurance system in the project has a multi-layered structure. This system is implemented in the following strategic dimensions:

a) Preventive Quality Strategy (Proactive Approach)

Quality standards, responsibilities, timelines, and checkpoints were clearly defined before the start of project activities. Especially defined in the QAP:

- Distribution of roles and tasks between partners,
- Checkpoints (milestones) for critical processes,
- Indicators and target values,

It forms the basis of preventive quality practices. Thus, possible deviations can be prevented before they start.

b) In-Process Quality Monitoring (Dynamic Quality Management)

For all WPs:

- Constant dialogue,
- Bilateral and multilateral meetings,
- Joint reporting and interim evaluation surveys

ensure that quality is monitored in the process. These mechanisms provide both managerial and contextual quality control.

c) Periodic Evaluation and Corrective Action

Quality will be re-assessed through periodic internal evaluation reports, feedback from WP leaders and review meetings with the PM team. Especially when the project reaches mid-term (e.g. around month 18), a mid-term review will be conducted, and the work plan will be updated if necessary.

d) Final Evaluation and Dissemination

The comprehensive evaluation at the end of the project aims to measure the validity and immediate impact of its outputs. This evaluation also forms the basis for the sustainability strategy.

2.3 Integrative Role of Quality Assurance System

The quality assurance approach horizontally supports the following key areas in the EPD-Net Project:

- **Educational Content and Learning Modules (WP3):** The content is checked for academic quality, accessibility, inclusiveness, and compliance with digital competence standards.
- **Software and Digital Platforms (WP3):** The user experience (UX), technical competence, and sustainability of the smart education module to be developed are evaluated within the framework of quality.
- **Piloting and Feedback Processes (WP4):** The outputs of pilot tests are the main feeder element of quality management. Improvements are made in line with the feedback from the user.
- **Dissemination Activities (WP5):** The immediate impact of dissemination activities such as websites, social media, open access publications, etc., access rates, and compliance with target groups are measured by quality indicators.

2.4 Relationship between Quality Assurance and Other Project Components

Quality management is integrated within project management with other functions such as risk management, performance monitoring, and dissemination. These relationships can be summarised as follows:

Component	Impact on Quality Assurance
Risk Management	The effects of risks on quality are monitored and integrated with preventive planning.
Performance Indicators (PIs)	Objective monitoring of the determined quality standards is done through PIs.
Project Management	Quality management is an integral part of overall project management, handled by the coordinating team to ensure seamless alignment with the project's objectives and processes.
Dissemination	The quality of the dissemination strategy is assessed through target audience reach and impact measurement.

3. QUALITY CRITERIA AND STANDARDS

3.1 General Approach

The EPD-Net Project has defined its quality criteria and standards in line with the European Commission's Erasmus+ guidelines, the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015), and project-specific needs. Quality standards are applied at two levels, both for **process management** and **output production**:

- **Managerial Quality Criteria:** On-time delivery, transparent communication, coordination between WPs, financial accuracy, reporting standards, etc.
- **Academic/Contextual Quality Criteria:** Scientific validity, methodological consistency, open access, inclusiveness, suitability to user needs, digital accessibility, etc.

These criteria have been agreed upon by all partners and are expected to be applied at each stage of the project.

3.2 Process Quality Criteria

Quality in process management is measured by compliance with certain implementation standards. These standards are the basis for assessing whether WPs are carried out in accordance with the planned activities:

Criteria	Description	Minimum Standard
On Time Delivery	Completion of the activities according to the planned schedule	90% on-time delivery rate
Reporting Quality	Compliance of interim and final reports in terms of content, form, and format	Full compliance with the Erasmus+ report format
Participation Rate	Active participation in workshops, meetings, and online sessions	At least 80% participation of each partner
Communication Transparency	Supporting all internal communications with documents, open sharing	Centralised archiving on Clickup- shared PM tool
Risk Reporting	Reporting the problems encountered in a timely manner and suggesting solutions	Intervention within a maximum of 2 weeks for each risk

3.3 Deliverable Quality Criteria

The main deliverable of the project includes a smart training module, teaching materials, open-access reports, and multilingual content. These outputs will be assessed based on several quality criteria. The **scientific validity** of the content will be evaluated through academic peer review to ensure it is grounded in current information and academic references. The **user orientation** of the content will be assessed by conducting pilot tests and gathering feedback forms to ensure its suitability for the target audience, including students, academics, and local administrations. In terms

of **open access and multilingualism**, the content will be made accessible, downloadable, and available in languages other than English, with publication and platform access checked to confirm this. The **format and quality** of the content will be evaluated for visual, linguistic, and structural integrity, ensuring compliance with standardized templates and formatting guidelines. Lastly, the **sustainability** of the content will be ensured by designing it to be easily updated and remain relevant and accessible after the project ends, allowing for long-term use.

3.4 Quality Management Milestones

The quality control milestones, including control points with critical dates for the quality management of the project, are outlined in the table below and are also reflected in the project's Gantt chart. These milestones represent the key stages to be evaluated in terms of both managerial and contextual quality.

Month (M)	**Event / Action**	**Responsibility**	**Output**
M1	Kick-off Meeting + Setup of ClickUp	Coordinator	Meeting Report/Minutes
M2	QAP finalization	PM Team	D1.1
M3	Risk Register launched	Coordinator	D1.2
M4	QAP submitted to external auditor	Coordinator	D1.1
M6	First Quarterly Monitoring Report (QMR) + Czechia SC Review	Coordinator	Report
M9	WP-level Engagement Report	WP2, WP3	Internal
M12	Mid-Year Quality Assurance Evaluation + Risk Update	PM Team	Quality Assurance/Risk Integration
M15	Start of Pilot Testing Monitoring	WP4	Pilot Data
M18	External Mid-Term Review	Coordinator	EC Evaluation Dossier
M21	WP5 Contribution Matrix Check	Coordinator	Performance Update
M24	Sustainability Indicator Check	WP5	Policy Alignment Memo
M30	Final Risk & Quality Assurance Reconciliation	PM Team + Coordinator	Risk Wrap-up Notes
M34	Internal Closure Audit	SC + PM Team	Internal Final Review
M36	Final Project Monitoring Report	Coordinator	Final Reporting to EC

3.5 Updating Standards

Quality standards are not fixed rules but dynamic learning systems. They can be revised based on insights gained from pilot tests, UXs, and feedback from partners. Each proposed update is submitted in writing to the PM Team and, upon consensus, is implemented by the SC. This flexibility ensures that quality remains a living, evolving structure throughout the project.

3.6 Alignment with Erasmus+ and ESG Quality Frameworks

The EPD-Net quality assurance system is designed to comply with the quality expectations of the Erasmus+ programme and aligns with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015). Although the QA approach is tailored to the specific needs of this partnership, it incorporates essential elements such as learning outcome validation, stakeholder feedback, transparency of evaluation processes, and continuous improvement mechanisms.

Internal and external quality assurance procedures follow principles of relevance, usability, inclusiveness, and impact, as emphasised by both Erasmus+ and ESG. Pilot testing, peer review, and external expert validation are among the measures implemented to ensure quality at all stages.

4. MONITORING AND EVALUATION MECHANISMS

4.1 Structure of the Monitoring and Evaluation System in EPD-Net

The monitoring and evaluation process in the EPD-Net Project is structured with separate plans within the scope of project management. This system creates a holistic quality cycle based on the following 3 basic plans:

1. Project Monitoring Plan
2. Project Evaluation Strategy Plan
3. Performance Monitoring System with PIs

These three structures will be developed under WP1 and will operate in synchronisation with the QAP. All plans will be prepared under the leadership of ESTU and HU and will be developed with regular feedback from partners.

4.2 Monitoring Approach and Tools

Monitoring involves the continuous assessment of the project's progress in terms of time, budget, and alignment with objectives. The project utilizes **ClickUp** as the Project Management System (PMS) to facilitate efficient tracking and collaboration. For more detailed information on the monitoring process, please refer to the project's dedicated monitoring plan, which is deliverable No. 1.3 in the EPD-Net project.

4.3 Evaluation Strategy

The evaluation focuses on measuring the project’s outcomes, the fitness for purpose of the outputs, and stakeholder satisfaction. For more detailed information, please refer to the project’s dedicated Evaluation Strategy Plan, which is deliverable No. 1.4 in the EPD-Net Project. This plan outlines the methods for evaluation. The evaluation cycle will be reviewed during SC meetings, and reports will be provided in alignment with the project’s reporting phase

4.4 Key Performance Indicators (KPIs)

In the context of the EPD-Net Project, PIs have been systematically defined as key instruments for supporting quality assurance and continuous improvement processes. From the overall set of indicators, five have been selected and designated as KPIs due to their critical relevance to the project's strategic objectives and operational priorities. These KPIs provide a structured basis for assessing project performance, facilitating evidence-based decision-making, and ensuring accountability in the achievement of the expected results.

Indicator Code	Description	Target	Method
KPI1	Smart training module completion rate	%100	Development progress monitoring
KPI2	Participant satisfaction rate	%70	Post-pilot survey
KPI3	Stakeholder (sector/academia) satisfaction rate	%75	Feedback after the presentation
KPI4	Number of module versions produced	3	Version control
KPI5	Number of organisations that find the module useful	50	Post-dissemination survey

These indicators are elaborated in the monitoring and evaluation plans to be defined under WP1 and will also be implemented in connection with training module development (WP3), pilot testing (WP4), and sustainability (WP6) WPs.

5. INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCESSES

5.1 General Approach

Quality assurance in the EPD-Net Project is not limited to the evaluation of results but is structured as a dynamic and multilevel control system integrated into the whole project life cycle. The quality control process is systematic, supported by internal control mechanisms (project teams, WP leaders, PM Team) and the contribution of an independent evaluators.

5.2 Internal Quality Control Process

a) Task Distribution and Team Organisation

- **The WP1 Leader (HU)** and co-leader (ESTU) are responsible for the preparation and implementation of the QAP and the conduct of the internal audit process.
- **WP leaders designated for** each **WP** ensure that activities related to their WPs are carried out on time and in accordance with quality standards.

- All partners provide feedback during the **T1.1** (QAP preparation process), contribute to the review process and give final approval of the plan during appropriate SC meeting.

b) Internal Quality Tools and Practices

- **Quality control checklists:** Structures will be created for each deliverable to control content, format, and timing (Annex 2).
- **Monthly WP meetings:** These are conducted by all WP leaders; progress, quality deviations, and corrective actions are discussed here.
- **Gantt-based quality mapping:** Deviations based on the time schedule are regularly monitored using ClickUp, which supports tracking and visualizing project timelines and progress

5.3 External Quality Control Process

Independent external experts are engaged to objectively assess the transparency, and accountability of the project. In this context, the external consultancy responsibilities briefly include:

- **Quality Assurance:** The QAP is subject to external review, followed by recommendations by an independent expert.
- **Risk Management:** The Risk Management Plan is subject to external review by the external consultant.
- **Monitoring Approach:** The Monitoring Plan is subject to external review by the external expert.
- **Evaluation Strategy:** The Evaluation Strategy Plan is subject to external review by the external expert.

These experts will be selected from outside the project team. The selection of external consultants will be based on an open and transparent tender process led by the project coordinator. The reviewing process will be finalized with a report in PDF format.

5.4 Team Meetings and Quality Audit Coordinated Events

The EPD-Net Project's quality control processes depend on key events such as teamwork meetings, annual evaluations, pilot feedback sessions, and sustainability panels. These events, aligned with the project's quality assurance framework, ensure continuous monitoring and improvement. The critical meetings include:

- **E1.2**: WP1 Team Work Meeting (Sept 2025) – Approval of QAP, Risk Management Plan, Monitoring Plan, and Evaluation Strategy Plan.
- **E2.1**: WP2 Team Work Meeting (Nov 2025) – Ensure the quality of WP2 outcomes (Slovakia).
- **E2.2**: Annual Evaluation and Coordination Meeting 1 (Dec 2025) – Evaluation of relevant outputs (including WP1, WP2 and partially WP3) and project progress, as well as KPI, PI controls and coordination improvement.

- **E3.1**: WP3 Team Work Meeting (May 2026) – Ensure the quality of WP3 outcomes and improve the smart training module based on feedback (Portugal).
- **E4.1**: WP4 Team Work Meeting (Sept 2026) – Ensure the quality of WP4 outcomes (Spain).
- **E5.1**: Annual Evaluation and Coordination Meeting 2 (Dec 2026) – Evaluation of WP3-WP4 outputs and pilot test results.
- **E6.1**: WP5 and WP6 Team Work Meeting (Sept 2027) – Quality control of dissemination and sustainability outputs (Latvia).
- **E6.2**: Annual Evaluation and Coordination Meeting 3 (Dec 2027) – Final outputs assessment, and KPI/PI check.
- **E6.3**: Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management Conference (Jan 2028) – Dissemination and impact assessments from external stakeholders (Türkiye).
- **E6.4**: Sustainable Model Workshop and Panel (Jan 2028) – Sharing feedback and evaluating the ECHO model's permanent applicability (Online).
- **(*)**: Monthly WP Meetings – Continuous monitoring, coordination, and quality control (Online, every month).

These meetings ensure that the quality assurance system of the project remains dynamic and evolving, with decision-making and evaluation processes being interactive and continuous. The involvement of external consultants strengthens the accountability of the project.

5.5 Compliance and Corrective Actions

In response to quality deviations, corrective actions will be taken promptly. WP leaders will implement necessary adjustments, such as rescheduling delayed deliverables or revising deliverables with poor content quality. The project coordinator will evaluate and monitor these adjustments to ensure they address the identified issues. Each corrective action will be integrated into the ClickUp, serving as a reference for future checks to prevent recurrence.

6. FEEDBACK, REVISION, AND CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

6.1 Basis of the Feedback System in EPD-Net

The EPD-Net Project integrates a multi-layered feedback system throughout the project lifecycle, fostering continuous improvement. This system ensures two-way communication among academic partners, target groups, pilot participants, and sectoral stakeholders. Key elements include multi-source feedback from students, trainers, local authorities, NGOs, and non-academic users; a dynamic, continuous feedback cycle throughout various stages of the project; and the use of both digital and face-to-face tools such as questionnaires, mentoring sessions, and ECHO-based workshops.

6.2 Feedback Mechanisms and Timing

The following table outlines the various tools and methods used throughout the EPD-Net Project to collect feedback, assess progress, and ensure continuous improvement. These tools are designed to gather insights from different target groups, including students, trainers, local actors, and non-academic users, at various stages of the project. Each tool serves a specific purpose, from measuring content quality and UX to assessing the impact of the project's outputs.

Tool / Method	Timing	Application Supervisor	Target Group	Objective
Questionnaires and feedback forms	During WP1/WP2 as predefined tasks, after/during WP3/WP4	ESTU, HU (as WP1 Leader), IKU, CTLA	Students, trainers, local actors, etc.	Need analysis, content requirements, accessibility, UX, and satisfaction measurement
Pilot training implementation (based on ECHO model)	During and after WP4	CTLA, BS	Instructors, non-academic users	Development of the model with participant feedback
Mentoring and workshops	After WP3 and during WP4	AIJU, HU	Educational module developers	Content revision with practitioner feedback
Quick surveys and mini-assessments	After module updates (as many as needed)	ESTU	Digital users	Monitoring functionality and impact of interim version updates

6.3 Revision Process and Harmonisation Cycle

As defined in the project proposal, the reflection of the feedback obtained in the decision-making processes is realised through the following revision process:

1. **Data Collection:** All feedback (survey, focus group, external consultant reports) is collected and documented by relevant WP leaders.
2. **Analysis and Prioritisation:** The PM Team analyses the findings on the basis of content, timing and impact.
3. **Revision Proposal Development:** The relevant WP leader submits the proposed changes as a report to the coordinator and/or PM Team.
4. **Decision Making:** The proposal is discussed in SC meetings and approved by common consensus.
5. **Implementation and Monitoring**: Accepted changes are integrated into project plans and tracked through **ClickUp**, utilizing Gantt charts and PI tracking features to ensure seamless monitoring of progress.

This structure covers not only outputs but also process, timing, communication and indicator systems. The rationale, implementation period and responsible persons for each revision are clearly identified.

6.4 Continuous Improvement and Learning System Structure

The EPD-Net Project ensures continuous improvement through following key structures. The **ECHO Learning Model** incorporates multi-layered stakeholder feedback, with trainers serving as both users and content developers, ensuring that feedback is directly integrated into module updates. The **AI-Supported Adaptive Training Module (EPD_Assist)** utilizes AI to track user data, offering content tailored to students, instructors, and industry users, with regular updates based on feedback to enhance both content and functionality.

6.5 Institutionalisation and Permanent Quality Improvement Structures

The E6.4 Sustainable Model Workshop and Panel, to be held in the final phase of the project, will provide a comprehensive, external stakeholder-focused quality assessment for all outputs. The final version of these quality outputs will directly inform the institutionalisation of the EPD-Net curriculum for disaster-resilient cities. Additionally, feedback on quality and impact, including from non-academic users, will play a crucial role in ensuring the long-term sustainability of the module in the public domain.

7. RESPONSIBILITIES AND ROLES

7.1 Management Structure in Quality Assurance

The EPD-Net Project manages quality assurance processes through a three-tier governance structure. This structure provides a holistic system that enables both internal project oversight and stakeholder and consultant engagement:

1. **Executive and Strategy Body: SC**

- It consists of all WP leaders, the project coordinator (ESTU), associated partner representatives and stakeholder representatives.
- It is the final decision maker in quality processes.
- Duties include approval of quality indicators, acceptance of evaluation results, monitoring of methodological revisions.

2. **Implementation and Coordination Body: Project Coordinator (ESTU), WP1 Leader (HU) and the PM Team:**
    - ESTU and HU are primarily responsible for the preparation, monitoring, and revision of all quality assurance documents.
    - They work closely with WP leaders, and coordinate the processes among partners and external consultants.
    - In particular, they coordinate the QAP (T1.1), Risk Management Plan (T1.2), Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Evaluation Strategy Plan (T1.4) and Feedback Based Revision Processes.
3. **WP Leaders (WP Leaders):**
    - Each WP leader (e.g. WP1: HU, WP2: MENDELU, WP3: IKU, WP4: CTLA, WP5: LAAA, WP6: AU) is responsible for defining, implementing and monitoring the quality metrics within their WP.
    - WP leaders report to the coordinator at appropriate meetings.

7.2 Allocation of Tasks in the Quality Assurance Process

The quality assurance process in the EPD-Net Project is managed by WP1 and the PM Team as follows:

- **WP1 Leader (HU)**: Oversees the overall quality assurance system, ensuring alignment with project objectives and coordinating the PM Team.
- **PM Team**: Responsible for monitoring the quality of all deliverables, collecting stakeholder feedback, and implementing improvements. They also manage risk identification and mitigation strategies.
- **Task Distribution**: Regular evaluations of project progress, feedback collection, and quality checks are carried out by WP1 and the PM team. Regular quality reports will be produced on project milestones to ensure consistent quality control.
- **Collaborative Coordination**: The WP1 leader ensures all quality assurance tasks are integrated and executed according to the project's timeline and goals.

8. RISK MANAGEMENT AND PREVENTIVE ACTION PROCESSES

Please refer to the Risk Management Plan for details on this section

9. QUALITY ASSURANCE STRATEGIES FOR MONITORING, DISSEMINATION, AND SUSTAINABILITY OF OUTPUTS

9.1 Mainstreaming and Integrating Monitoring and Evaluation Processes with Sustainability

The EPD-Net Project not only focuses on the quality of project outputs but also integrates quality assurance mechanisms directly into these processes to ensure their **effective dissemination** and **long-term sustainability**.

In this context, the quality assurance system works in three main dimensions:

- **Monitoring and Feedback Systematics:** After dissemination (WP5) and sustainability (WP6) activities, stakeholder satisfaction, effectiveness, and benefit analyses are regularly measured.
- **Evaluation based on Impact Indicators:** The level of impact is monitored through the changing attitudes and behaviours of users, the potential to turn into policy recommendations, and the integration of training outputs into institutions.
- **Compliance of Processes and Tools with Quality Standards:** All materials, modules, and strategies produced are controlled and disseminated according to quality criteria.

9.2 Assuring the Quality of Dissemination (WP5)

The dissemination plan (T5.2) to be developed under WP5 is supported by the following quality assurance measures:

Materials	Quality Measure	Monitoring Tool
Website and social media	Multilingual and accessible design; weekly content update	User statistics, interaction data
Printed and digital materials	Compliance with graphic standards, understandability	Feedback from the target groups
Presentations and lectures	Content customised for the target audience	Satisfaction Surveys, when applicable
Final Project Report (T5.4)	Structure based on stakeholder feedback, plain language	E5.1 (Evaluation Meeting by all partners)

Furthermore, the **communication and visibility strategy** is taken as a basis for EU visibility and quality compliance of the dissemination process.

9.3 Quality of Sustainability and Mechanisms for Lasting Impact (WP6)

The sustainability strategy (T6.1-T6.4) to be developed under WP6 is integrated into the quality assurance system in the following ways:

a) Enterprise Integration of the module (monitored by KPI)

- The inclusion of the module in the training programmes of HEIs, VET, NGOs, and accreditation bodies are significant strategies will be encouraged and monitored.
- Microcrediting solution and quality standard according to ECVET/EQF compliance will be ensured.

b) User-Based Monitoring

- The EPD_Assist tool will be designed to track user interaction, success prediction, and content effectiveness.
- Content will be improved by versioning with AI-supported analysis.

c) Monitoring and Dissemination through the ECHO Model

Quality diffusion is ensured through ongoing feedback and the continuous updating of content and application methods. The feedback modelling method allows for regular updates, ensuring that the content and teaching techniques remain relevant and effective throughout the project.

9.4 Efficiency Measurement with PIs

The following KPIs have been identified as quality measures directly related to dissemination and sustainability:

Indicators	**Measurement Method**	**Target Value**
KPI2 Participant satisfaction rate	Post-pilot survey	70%
KPI3 Stakeholder satisfaction rate	Feedback after the presentation	75%
KPI4 Number of module versions	Version control	3
KPI5 Number of organisations that find the module useful	Post-dissemination survey	50

All these indicators will be monitored at annual evaluation meetings and revised when necessary.

9.5 External Approval of Quality and Impact Assessment

- With **E6.3 Conference on Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management** and **E6.4 Sustainable Model Workshop and Panel Online Workshop and Panel,** the outputs of the project will be evaluated on a public platform.
- These meetings will also be the venues where quality indicators will be publicised.

10. MONITORING AND UPDATING PROCESS OF QAP

10.1 Dynamic Quality Management Based on Updateability Principle

In the EPD-Net Project, quality assurance is not designed as a fixed, one-off plan, but as a continuously updated and learning system throughout the project lifecycle. This approach requires the QAP (D1.1) to be updated strategically throughout the process, not just at the start. The updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using **ClickUp**, ensuring efficient monitoring and seamless integration of updates.

The updateability of the QAP is based on three principles:

1. Periodic Review
2. Feedback-Based Revision
3. Documented Decision-Making Mechanism

10.2 Review and Update Stages

The revision and monitoring process of the QAP is structured in the following steps:

Phase	Description	Timing / Trigger	Responsible Actor(s)
Preparation and Initial Approval	D1.1 plan is created, E1.2 joint approval is obtained at WP1 Team Meeting.	M7	HU (WP1) + All Partners
Annual Review 1	Quality practices and the need for plan revision are discussed at the evaluation meeting (E2.2).	M10	WP1 + SC
Medium Term Revision	Revision of the plan	M18	WP1
Annual Review 2	The impact of the revised plan is assessed at the E5.1 meeting.	M22	WP1 + WP Leaders
Final Control Before Closing	M34 assesses the consistency of the plan with all outputs.	M34	WP1 + SC
Final Version	The final version is integrated into the sustainability strategy and approved at the E6.2 meeting.	M34	Coordinator + Partners

10.3 Monitoring Tools and Documents

The following tools are used to monitor the effectiveness of the QAP and to evidence update decisions:

- **Internal Quality Audit Sheets:** Completed by WP leaders at the end of each WP. Internal audit reports are generated.

- **Decision Record Tables:** All revision proposals and decisions are recorded in a specially formatted decision book (e.g. Revision ID - Date - Rationale - Implementing WP).
- **Compliance and Consistency Reports:** Document the alignment between the QAP and the Risk Management Plan, Monitoring Plan, Evaluation Strategy Plan, and Dissemination Plan.

10.4 Modification Types and Implementation Protocol

Changes that can be made to the QAP are classified in three categories:

Category.	Example Changes	Application Protocol
Minor Changes	Timetable revision, terminology adaptations	WP1 leader's and or PM Team's decision is sufficient, reported.
Moderate Changes	Update of indicator, change in format, and reporting system	SC approval required, partners are informed.
Major Changes	Change in review cycle, change in audit system	The agreement of all partners is required, the plan is revised and re-approved.

10.5 Integration with Continuous Improvement

The QAP is not only a retrospective evaluation tool but also plays a proactive role in shaping future quality improvements. In this context:

- The data outputs from **EPD_Assist**, developed under WP3, will be analyzed and used to update the QAP, with updates tracked and managed through **ClickUp** to ensure continuous monitoring and revision.
- Feedback from the WP4 pilot implementations will directly influence revisions to the QAP's content and process standards, and these updates will be captured and monitored in ClickUp to maintain consistency across all project activities.
- By aligning the QAP with the WP6 sustainability plan, the quality assurance processes will continue to drive impact and improvement even after the project concludes, with progress tracked and updated in ClickUp to ensure long-term sustainability.

10.6 Version Control of Documents

For each plan version, version number, date, responsible person, and summary of changes are kept. Versions are shared on the ClickUp platform.

11. CONCLUSION

EPD-Net Project aims to develop a digital learning ecosystem based on ecological planning and design for disaster-resilient and sustainable cities. In line with this goal, a **quality assurance system** has been designed that focuses not only on outputs but also on process, participation, impact, and permanence. This system is embodied in the documents created within WP1 and integrated into all WPs: **QAP (T1.1), Risk Management Plan (T1.2), Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Evaluation Strategy Plan (T1.4**), and **Needs Analysis Report (T1.5**).

The greatest strengths of the project's quality management system are the following:

- **Holistic and Integrated Structure:** The quality assurance system is not only the responsibility of WP1, but also actively operates in the processes and outputs of each WP from WP2 to WP6. In particular, digital module development, pilot tests, dissemination, and sustainability steps are directly related to quality.
- **Multi-layered Participation and Feedback:** A wide range of target groups, from educators to public administrators, students to sector representatives, are included in the feedback system. This structure provides a basis not only for evaluation but also for co-learning and co-development.
- **Living Documents and Versioning:** Quality plan, risk plan, and other management documents are not fixed; they are prepared in continuously updatable, version controlled, and traceable structures. This flexibility allows rapid adaptation to changing conditions and feedback.
- **Sustainability and Quality Link:** Components such as the ECHO model, EPD_Assist are designed to ensure that the quality system continues to function after the project.

In conclusion, this report reflects the structure of the EPD-Net Project, which aims not only at "achieving success" but also at "securing and replicating success". The quality assurance framework is systematic, measurable, participatory, and transparent, and fully complies with the quality expectations of the Erasmus+ programmes. This system is the product of a common quality culture in which all partners of the project take responsibility and own it together.

12. ANNEXES AND REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

This section presents the documents, templates, tables, and indicators to be used in the implementation, monitoring and revision of the QAP. These are related to output D1.1 QAP and will be used throughout the project life cycle.

Annex 1. Indicators and Performance Measurement Tables

PIs	Relevant WP and Project Objective	Target Value
KPI1. Smart training module completion rate	Obj.1 WP3	100%
KPI2. Participant satisfaction rate with the smart training module	Obj.1 WP4	70%
KPI3. Stakeholder (sector/academia) satisfaction rate	Obj.1 WP6	75%
KPI4. Number of smart training module versions developed	Obj.1 WP3	3
KPI5. Number of organisations/individuals/organisation types that find the smart training module useful	Obj. 2 WP6	10/50/5
PI1. Satisfaction rate with the project management plans (%)	WP1	80%
PI2. The number of literature and case studies examined	WP2	200
PI3. Completion rate of training materials	WP3	100%
PI4. Rate of smart training module containing or developed through the deep-tech	Obj. 4 WP3	50%
PI5. Completion rate of the pilot training	WP4	85%
PI6. Average rate of increased skills/knowledge	WP4	80%
PI7. Average rate of increased skills in deep tech	Obj.4 WP4	50%
PI8. Participants' satisfaction with the AI-aided solutions (EPD_Assist)	Obj. 4 WP4	70%
PI9. Website and social media accounts of the project reach numbers.	WP5	**Mid Term:** 5000 monthly website visits, 15000 monthly engagements and 1000 followers

		Long Term: 1500 monthly website visits, 20000 monthly engagements and 3000 followers
Pl10. Number of news/posts shared on website and social media accounts of the project.	WP5	2 per week throughout the project
Pl11. Number of emails sent to deliver dissemination materials such as brochures, flyers, newsletters, posters	WP5	4 per month and to 1000 different stakeholders
Pl12. Number of conference presentations	WP5	25
Pl.13. Number of publications	WP5	25
Pl14. Participation number to the Conference	WP6	500
Pl15. Satisfaction rate of project partners and stakeholders on the effectiveness and efficiency of collaboration and knowledge sharing	Obj.3 WP6	75%
Pl16. Number of partnerships formed with stakeholders (sector/academia)	Obj.3 WP6	10

Annex 2. Quality Control Checklist (Sample / WP Leaders To Develop WP-Specific Checklists)

- Was the output delivered on time?
- Is the content in line with the project objectives?
- Has stakeholder feedback been received?
- Have format and language conformity been checked?
- Has an external expert opinion been obtained?
- Has version information been added?

Annex 3. Reading Between the Lines: WP Info Pack: Extracted Highlights from the EPD-Net Project Proposal

Project Key Elements Overview

Project Governance

The project adopts a structured and inclusive governance model to ensure effective coordination and decision-making throughout its lifecycle. The main bodies involved in project management include the SC, the Project Coordinator and Management Team, and WP Leaders. Additionally, Advisory Boards will be established as needed, and stakeholder involvement mechanisms will be integrated to enhance participatory decision-making.

Communication Structure

A clear and collaborative communication structure is essential for ensuring alignment across project partners. The project follows a consensus-based decision-making approach, supported by regular internal meetings, progress updates, and partner consultations. ClickUp is used as the central platform to track tasks, document progress, and ensure transparent communication across all teams. Stakeholder engagement will be systematically incorporated, ensuring inclusiveness and transparency throughout all project phases, with clear documentation and updates available via ClickUp.

A key guiding principle of the EPD-Net Project is the adoption of diverse feedback, recommendations, perspectives, and reflections. This inclusive and adaptive approach ensures that the project addresses the needs of a broad range of target groups and remains responsive to both current and future challenges. The Communication Management Plan further supports this by outlining structured processes for managing internal and external communications, ensuring consistency and clarity in messaging. This integrated approach is fundamental to aligning project outcomes with the evolving demands of communities and the wider industry.

Conflict Resolution

The project adopts a constructive and solution-oriented approach to managing conflicts, aiming to resolve disagreements in a manner that maintains the integrity of the project and its objectives. In cases of disagreement, the initial approach will be to encourage open and respectful dialogue between the parties involved. The goal will be to reach a consensus through discussion. Should the disagreement persist despite efforts to resolve it through dialogue, the Project Coordinator will step in to mediate the situation, facilitating a constructive conversation aimed at finding a mutually agreeable solution.

If the conflict remains unresolved after mediation by the Project Coordinator, the issue will be escalated to the SC, which will evaluate the situation and propose further recommendations for resolution. In cases where these recommendations fail to resolve the conflict, more formal and invasive measures will be implemented. These may include the involvement of external, neutral third-party mediators or arbitrators, who will be called upon to provide an independent assessment and guide the parties through the resolution process. If necessary, the third-party mediators may have the authority to make binding decisions to bring the matter to a close. In the event that external third-party mediation or arbitration fails to resolve the conflict, the project will enter a more formal phase of resolution, potentially involving legal action if necessary. This could involve engaging with a formal

dispute resolution body or seeking legal recourse depending on the nature of the conflict and its impact on the project. At this point, a legal framework, such as contract law or the terms outlined in the project's formal agreements, will be invoked to ensure compliance with obligations and prevent further disruption to the project's objectives.

Furthermore, if the conflict continues to threaten the integrity or progress of the project, the SC may consider more drastic measures, including re-evaluating the involvement of the parties in the project. This could result in the removal of individuals or organizations from the project, following a thorough review of the situation. The aim of these actions would be to protect the project's overall goals, ensuring that disruptive conflicts do not undermine the success of the initiative.

These steps represent a last resort, emphasizing commitment to resolving conflicts through dialogue and mediation before resorting to legal or organizational measures. However, in cases where the project's success is jeopardized, these more formal actions will be pursued to bring the matter to a conclusion.

Additionally, to prevent conflicts from escalating, regular check-ins will be held to allow stakeholders to raise any concerns early on, fostering an open and transparent environment. These check-ins will serve as a preventive measure, ensuring that potential issues are addressed before they develop into significant disagreements.

This protocol ensures that there is a clear, systematic approach to conflict resolution, emphasizing both proactive and reactive measures to handle disputes effectively and maintain a collaborative working environment throughout the project's lifecycle.

Monitoring and Evaluation

To ensure consistent progress and performance, the project implements a robust monitoring and evaluation framework. This includes clearly defined PIs, KPIs, periodic reporting, and structured review sessions. These tools will help the consortium assess project effectiveness, identify areas for improvement, and make data-informed decisions to enhance project outcomes.

Dissemination and EU Funding Visibility

Dissemination is a core component of the project, aimed at ensuring the broad reach and impact of its outcomes. Project results will be disseminated through publications, events, social media platforms, and targeted outreach to key stakeholders. All dissemination activities will also highlight the role of EU funding, with appropriate acknowledgement and use of the EU logo in accordance with official guidelines. A visual identity will be developed for the EPD-Net Project to ensure consistency and visibility across all materials.

Inclusivity and Gender Equality

The EPD-Net Project is committed to promoting inclusivity and gender equality in all aspects of its activities. To ensure this, gender-sensitive language will be used consistently in all project outputs, including training modules, guidebooks, and communication materials. The project team will ensure balanced representation and participation of female, male, and non-binary individuals in all activities, such as surveys, interviews, and focus groups. Efforts will be made to actively include diverse voices in all project activities, ensuring equal opportunity and representation.

In addition to ensuring gender balance, the project will monitor and assess the participation of disadvantaged groups among project workers, participants, and beneficiaries. This will include individuals from underrepresented gender groups, as well as those from diverse cultural backgrounds, with disabilities, or from disadvantaged socioeconomic statuses. This evaluation will be part of the ongoing project activities and will not require the creation of separate reports, but will be considered when assessing the inclusivity and accessibility of the project.

The project will regularly review the participation levels of different groups to ensure that any disparities in representation are addressed. When imbalances are identified, steps will be taken to promote more inclusive participation, ensuring that marginalized groups are actively engaged and have equitable access to the benefits of the project.

Capacity Building

Capacity building is a central pillar of the project, aiming to enhance the skills and knowledge of professionals in ecological planning and disaster management. The smart training module, developed within the project, will be integrated into the curricula of partner institutions, including HEIs and VETs. Short-term implementation will include courses and training programmes, while in the medium and long term, certificate programmes and institutional adoption will extend the project's reach.

Sustainability Strategy

To ensure the project's impact continues beyond the funding period, a comprehensive sustainability strategy is in place. All outputs will be made available through open-access channels and open licences. A business model will be developed to support the continued provision of training and services in ecological planning and disaster management. Institutional uptake and cross-sector collaborations will help maintain the long-term relevance and applicability of these initiatives.

Global Outreach

The project aspires to extend its impact beyond Europe, reaching vulnerable communities in regions such as Africa, Asia, and South America. Turkey, as a high-risk country for disasters, will serve as a real-world laboratory for pilot studies exploiting the ECHO model. International networks such as IFLA and ESRI will be utilised to disseminate knowledge and engage policymakers at a global level.

WP Teams and Team Management

Effective Project Implementation and WP Management

To ensure effective implementation of the project, dedicated teams are established for each WP. Each team is led by a WP Leader and supported by an Associate Team Leader. These teams will be equipped with the necessary resources and support to carry out their responsibilities successfully. All WP and task-level teams are responsible for monitoring progress and ensuring the achievement of objectives. They are expected to report regularly to the Project Coordinator and the SC, maintaining alignment with the overall project goals.

The inclusion of Associate Team Leaders is a deliberate strategy to involve a broader range of partners in management roles, promoting collaboration and creating synergies across the EPD-Net project. Besides, milestones and deliverables are assigned lead beneficiaries to facilitate effective monitoring and management. Additionally, clear timelines and verification methods are defined to track progress and ensure the successful completion of milestones.

The key responsibilities of the WP teams include;

- Ensuring that each WP is completed on time and to a high standard.
- Following and measuring relevant PIs.
- Successfully achieving milestones.
- Producing deliverables in a timely manner with high-quality content and required formats.

From this perspective, WP Leaders play a critical role in managing their respective WPs. Their responsibilities include:

- Considering each WP as a sub-project (mini project) to be appropriately managed in line with the main project requirements (goal, targets, tasks, deliverables, milestones, PIs) and developing a project management plan for their WP.
- Defining detailed sub-tasks (break your tasks into detailed pieces), assigning team members for tasks/sub-tasks, and creating sub-working groups with a task/group leader if necessary (ensuring fair task distribution based on allocated person/month values).
- Planning WP specific milestones, deadlines, sub-deliverables, and PIs if necessary.
- Ensuring that the minimum number of meetings as described in the project proposal for the WP (monthly meetings) are organised.
- Coordinating activities within sub-working groups to ensure smooth workflow and avoid delays that may impact project timelines.
- Ensuring that PIs and KPIs related to the WP are achieved and preparing the necessary proof documents as outlined in the PI monitoring method.
- Reviewing project commitments relevant to the WP, ensuring sub-tasking methods align with the overall project plan (Be aware of commitments in the Project Proposal relevant to the WPs, which may not always be detailed in the relevant tables).
- Preparing necessary presentations and documents related to WP in advance for scheduled project meetings and events.
- Tracking and reporting the performance of team members to inform partner institutions for budgeting and personnel cost management, if necessary.

- Recording meetings, preparing meeting minutes, and completing necessary reports using appropriate templates.
- Determining stakeholder feedback requirements for WP tasks and incorporating them into planning accordingly.
- Reviewing the risk management plan and implementing necessary precautions to mitigate identified risks.

PMS & CLICKUP Software

To support WP teams in project execution, a web-based PMS, CLICKUP software, is implemented. This system should be used for:

- Monitoring progress.
- Scheduling activities.
- Reporting and data storage.
- Timesheet management.
- Online collaboration and communication.

You will receive an email invitation to join the system and should sign in immediately. General and specialised training sessions will be provided to ensure the effective use of CLICKUP.

WP Planning & Execution Checklist

WP leaders can develop a checklist to ensure their WP planning and execution are aligned with the overall project structure while adding necessary internal detailing for effective management. The sample checklist in Table 1 can be customised to include WP-specific requirements and any other critical checkpoints.

Sample checklist

Section	Checklist Item	Status (☐/) ✔	Notes
Alignment with Project Plan	Is the WP team familiar with the overall project objectives and structure?	☐	
	Are all WP tasks, milestones, deliverables, and PIs cross-checked with the project-level planning documents?	☐	
	Are WP-level planning elements (sub-tasks, sub-deliverables, internal milestones) fully aligned with the project-level timeline and formats?	☐	
	Are dependencies with other WPs/tasks identified and considered in your WP planning?	☐	
	Has the need for stakeholder feedback been assessed, and have necessary actions been defined accordingly?	☐	

Internal Detailing of the WP	Are your WP's main tasks broken down into smaller sub-tasks where needed?	☐	
	Are responsibilities for these sub-tasks clearly assigned to team members or sub-groups?	☐	
	Are internal deadlines defined for sub-tasks/sub-deliverables to ensure timely completion of project-level milestones?	☐	
	Are effort distributions checked against partner person/month allocations to ensure a fair and feasible work distribution?	☐	
	Have risk management plans been reviewed to identify any measures that could influence WP or task planning, and have these been integrated into the work plan?		
PI Integration	Have you reviewed which PIs/KPIs are directly linked to your WP?	☐	
	Are there methods and data collection plans in place to track those indicators?	☐	
	Are required proofs and documentation formats for each PI well-understood and planned?	☐	
Content & Deliverables Management	Are all deliverables for your WP clearly understood in terms of content, quality, and format?	☐	
	Are internal quality checks planned before submitting deliverables?	☐	
	Are there internal reviews scheduled before milestones or deliverable deadlines?	☐	
Communication & Coordination	Is there a WP-specific internal communication and meeting plan aligned with the project's requirements?	☐	
	Are sub-group coordination mechanisms in place (especially for WPs with multiple tasks or partners)?	☐	
	Are meeting notes, decisions, and task follow-ups documented and stored in the PMS systematically?	☐	

Monitoring & Reporting	Are you using the PMS for regularly tracking task progress and team performance?	☐	
	Are team member efforts monitored and reported to partner institutions in line with budgeting/person-month allocation using the PMS?	☐	
	Are potential risks or deviations in the WP flagged early and communicated to the project coordination team using the PMS?	☐	
Preparation for Project-Level Activities	Are you aware of upcoming project-wide meetings, reviews, and reporting deadlines by checking the PMS?	☐	
	Are you preparing presentations or documents relevant to your WP in advance of these events?	☐	

WP 1: Project Management

This WP includes the development of a Project Management Plan, which will also be reviewed by an external quality assurance consultant. The Project Management Plan will comprise a QAP, a Risk Management Plan, a Project Monitoring Plan, a Project Evaluation Strategy Plan, and a Needs Analysis Report outlining the scope, objectives, timelines, budget, and resources required for each phase of the project. The Project Management Plan will be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that the project stays on track and any challenges are addressed promptly. A risk management plan will also be implemented to identify potential risks and develop effective mitigation strategies to manage them

The QAP will outline the measures taken to ensure that the project activities and the outcomes meet the expected requirements and the required quality standards. This plan identifies any quality-related issues and ensures they are addressed appropriately. This plan will include regular quality checks, both internal and external, to verify that the project is meeting its objectives and delivering the desired outcomes.

The SC and Project Coordinator will follow overall achievement, while the team leaders will identify their specific monitoring and evaluation instruments and schedules.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

WP 2: Research Analysis

The EPD-Net Project aims to examine, analyse, and evaluate case studies, best practices, and stakeholder opinions (by conducting surveys, interviews, and focus groups with stakeholders), equipping spatial planners and designers with the necessary knowledge and skills to contribute effectively to disaster management efforts.

Conducting a research analysis will enable the development of necessary outputs and guiding information required for WP3. Therefore, at least, the below-given details should be considered to outline the research analysis stage.

- The content of the training module and curriculum will be based on specific scenarios and case studies related to the most common and destructive disaster types encountered in Europe, including **floods, storms, and earthquakes**
- The training module will integrate **green skills, digital skills, and resilience skills**, addressing the needs of deep-tech domains and fostering innovative, multidisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning. Remote sensing, Geographical Information Systems (GIS), AI, and other technologies will be utilised to collect and analyse data, enabling the identification of vulnerable areas and informing the design of more resilient and sustainable cities.
- The smart training module and curriculum will comprise case studies and practical applications based on the "**teaching by doing or practising**" perspective.
- Please refer to Table 2 in the EPD-Net Project Proposal for an overview of the disaster management process stages to be addressed.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

WP 3: Training Module Development

General Information

There is a significant gap in the education and training of planners and designers in disaster management, highlighting the need to develop specialised training modules to enhance their knowledge and skills in this area.

The EPD-Net Project does not aim to train individuals directly but rather to develop a curriculum, training materials, and a training manual for trainers to ensure the utilisation of ecological planning and design solutions in disaster management.

The target users of this smart module and its contents will be SMEs, HEIs, VETs, professional organisations, professionals, and academics/researchers. The curriculum will cover topics such as sustainable development, climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and ecosystem services.

The training module will integrate **green skills, digital skills, and resilience skills**, addressing the needs of deep-tech domains and fostering innovative, multidisciplinary approaches to teaching and learning. Remote sensing, GIS, AI, and other technologies will be utilised to collect and analyse data, enabling the identification of vulnerable areas and informing the design of more resilient and sustainable cities.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

Development of Curriculum and Training Materials

The content of the training module will be based on specific scenarios and case studies related to the most common and destructive disaster types encountered in Europe: **floods, storms, and earthquakes**. The curriculum will comprise case studies and practical applications based on the "**teaching by doing or practising**" perspective.

Please refer to Table 2 in the EPD-Net Project Proposal for an overview of the disaster management process stages to be addressed.

The EPD-Net project integrates the three skills categories (green skills, digital skills, and resilience skills) into the training content as follows:

- **Green skills:** The training module will cover sustainable spatial planning and design, ecological vulnerability assessment, and climate change adaptation strategies.
- **Digital skills:** The module will incorporate geospatial technologies and methods, as well as as AI applications in ecological planning and design.
- **Resilience skills:** The training will focus on fostering adaptability, change management, and community care in the context of disaster management. By developing a smart training module and new learning and teaching methods for Ecological Planning and Design in Disaster Management, the project will foster a sense of enterprise and entrepreneurial attitudes, mindsets, and skills, while also improving the quality and relevance of these skills.

The curriculum and materials will be structured within an educational quality assurance framework, where the learning and teaching mission, course content, learning outcomes, target knowledge, skills, and competencies, as well as success criteria, will be defined in line with the European Qualifications

Framework (EQF). Considering the diversity of the target groups and the planning/design practice activities, the target **EFQ levels will comprise Levels 5, 6, and 7**.

Beyond the EQF, the adoption of the below instruments will be examined, and the appropriate ones will be adopted to expand the project approach:

- Integration of ESCO (European Skills, Competences, Qualifications, and Occupations)
- Leveraging ECVET (European Credit System for Vocational Education and Training)
- Incorporating DigComp (The European Digital Competence Framework)
- Utilising EntreComp (The Entrepreneurship Competence Framework)
- Engagement with Sector-Specific Skills Alliances
- Collaboration with Europass

Within this project, the framework for integrating and benefiting from the module through a **micro-credit system** will be defined for HEIs and VET providers. Therefore, a micro-crediting method/approach should also be determined.

Development of Smart Training Module and EPD_Assist

The smart training module will comprise case studies and practical applications based on the "**teaching by doing or practising**" perspective. This platform will be designed to provide users with access to real-time data, best practices, and case studies from around the world. The module will also incorporate a learning network that facilitates collaboration and knowledge sharing among stakeholders and communities, enhancing the capacity of cities to prepare for and respond to disasters.

During the development and implementation of the SMART module, records will be kept of trainees' questions, answers, case studies, and shared experiences. Additionally, success rates and training components that require improvement, based on observed challenges, will be documented. These records will be used for AI-aided learning and continuous improvement, also known as EPD-Assist.

The recognition of the gained competencies and successful completion of the training modules will be **certified by the module launcher/performer**. The certifications can also be supported with supplements that demonstrate the alignment and compatibility of the completed training outcomes with the international frameworks. Additionally, if the module is used to run a course, the recognition approach is expected to be based on the development of relevant transcripts.

The AI-aided tool, EPD_Assist, will be a user-friendly and interactive smart module component providing a suite of tools and resources for planners, designers, and decision-makers to incorporate ecological planning and design principles into disaster management processes.

EPD_Assist will serve as a classroom assistant for both trainers and trainees, supporting the customisation of the training module to meet the varying needs of different organisations, institutions, and countries. It will be effective in selecting the required training material and cases in parallel with the needs.

EPD_Assist will integrate traditional programming languages with AI-powered big language models using Microsoft's open-source Semantic Kernel (SK) tool.

For the development of this AI-aided assistant, an open-source AI platform (e.g., OpenAI or Microsoft Azure), data processing and analysis tools (e.g., Pandas and NumPy libraries), and open-source AI-aided language models will be utilised.

EPD_Assist will utilise natural language processing (NLP), information extraction, personalisation, adaptation, and feedback techniques. NLP technology will be utilised to comprehend the user's questions and requests and extract relevant information from them. Personalisation technology will help deliver a more relevant and personalised experience, leveraging the user's previous query history and preferences.

Specific capabilities of EPD_Assist briefly (See Project Proposals for details):

- Trainer-trainer communication
- Gamification
- Motivation
- Customisation
- User behaviour analysis
- Automatic grading
- Prediction of trainee success
- Speech recognition and translation
- Analysing trainee interactions

WP 4: Pilot Testing and Evaluation

WP4 includes identifying and selecting pilot sites, delivering the smart training module, collecting feedback from participants (trainees), and developing recommendations for improving and adapting the smart training module.

Pilot testing will be conducted in collaboration with local authorities, involving 50 selected trainees. The selection principle is based on the inclusion of individuals representing the target groups of the project from various disciplines and institutions related to disaster management, ecological planning, and design processes, offering different perspectives. Inclusiveness criteria, as determined by Project KPIs, should also be considered when selecting trainees. THCA will be one of the actors responsible for selecting and participating in the pilot group, which will comprise local authorities from various Turkish cities with differing physical and infrastructural statuses. The other actors to select participants will be the NGO/PC, SME, and LE partners of the project. NGOs and PCs will be responsible for managing the pilot implementation stage of the project.

The trainers will provide feedback on the module's components during the training process and upon its completion.

Pilot implementation participants will be subject to the success criteria of the designed program, and their achievements will also be recognised. Pilot implementation participants will receive a certificate and a letter of appreciation from the consortium. The assessment of the pilot implementation and its success is based on the measurement of relevant PIs established to evaluate the success of the project objectives and WPs, as draftly outlined in Table 1 (P1.2, P4.1, P4.2) and PLAN 1 of the EPD-Net Project Proposal. Additionally, a systematic framework for collecting feedback will be designed and implemented to gather feedback from trainees on the content, scope, materials, and effectiveness of AI-aided tools. In-system monitoring and evaluations will be conducted to identify the improvement requirements, including the performance of EPD_Assist.

From this perspective, pilot testing and evaluation will involve pre-and post-tests, surveys, and focus group discussions to assess the project's impact and effectiveness. Smart training modules will be prepared to provide knowledge and skills on ecological planning and design for disaster management, and participant satisfaction will be measured. Following the pilot training, participants' knowledge and skills in ecological planning and design for disaster management will be evaluated, and the achievement of the initial objectives will be assessed.

The data and information on the performance of all module items will be reported to facilitate data analysis and the development of improvement strategies. TAPLAK will provide support in evaluating the smart training module and providing recommendations for improvement.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

WP 5: Dissemination and Outreach

The objective of WP5 is "to disseminate project updates and resources to a wider audience, promote the smart training module and project outcomes to potential partners and stakeholders, share the project outcomes with relevant organisations and individuals, and develop a final project report summarising the project activities, outcomes, and impact. WP5 focuses on disseminating the project results and engaging with stakeholders".

This WP requires close cooperation among all project partners to conduct effective dissemination activities. This includes developing a project website and social media accounts (ESTU), creating a dissemination plan and materials, delivering presentations at conferences and workshops (HEIs, RIs, VETs, NGOs and PCs), and developing a final project report. All partners will be responsible for disseminating the project results and materials to their networks, members, and stakeholders.

There are PIs with target values related to the sent dissemination materials. Therefore, comprehensive tracking and listing should be set for the success of this WP.

PLAN 2 in the Project Proposal provides a draft Communication and Dissemination Plan which focuses on the type, objective, period, target group, and method of the dissemination activity and explains the approaches to be used for their assessment. This plan will be re-evaluated during the relevant phases of the project and refined, followed by a detailed stakeholder analysis to identify key and general stakeholders who are either interested in or affected by the project outcomes and results. The dissemination strategy and the activity will be based on the results of the analysis. The dissemination plan and the components will be approved with the participation of all the partners during WP1.ü

Dissemination activities themselves are also assets for ensuring the visibility of EU funding. The measurements outlined below will be taken to ensure the visibility of EU funding.

- **Acknowledgement of funding:** The project will acknowledge the funding received from the EU in all project-related communication and dissemination activities, including the project website, social media, newsletters, publications, and project events.
- **EU Logo:** The EU logo will be included in all project-related communication and dissemination activities to ensure the visibility of EU funding. A set of guidelines for the correct use of the EU logo will be provided to all project partners, ensuring consistent and appropriate use across all materials and events. Also, a logo for the EDP-Net Project will be designed and used on all the dissemination materials and environments.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

WP 6: Sustainability and Exploitation

WP6 focuses on ensuring the sustainability of the project results. This includes developing a sustainability plan, creating an exploitation plan (for NGOs and PCs), publishing research findings and best practices, establishing a network of partners and stakeholders, and establishing a sustainable business model (for SMEs and LEs).

All partners will establish a network of partners and stakeholders in their ecosystem and support the dissemination of research findings and best practices. One of the major actions to achieve sustainability is the development of **micro-crediting solutions for the module, aligning with the previously explained EU instruments** (WP3) to recognise educational gains, skills, and competencies related to the module's components and education/training. This will facilitate the integration of the module into the project partners' portfolios and the target groups. Therefore, this WP team should be in close contact with the WP3 team.

The project proposes to develop a learning network that connects professionals, educators and stakeholders involved in spatial planning and design. The network will provide a platform for sharing knowledge, experiences, and best practices, thereby enhancing the quality of spatial planning and design.

One of the most innovative aspects of the project is the establishment of a training hub that will collaborate with emerging methodologies, serving the goal of creating a global movement by addressing local training module needs. The ECHO model will be adapted to ensure the dissemination and sustainability of the project outputs.

There are PIs with target values related to sustainability and Exploitation. Therefore, comprehensive tracking and listing should be set for the success of this WP.

Please also see Section 4.1 Work Plan in the EDP-Net Project Proposal.

Annex 4. Directive on the Preparation and Documentation of Meeting Minutes

Purpose of the Directive

This directive outlines the procedures and standards for documenting meetings held by the EPD-Net Project partners. The aim is to ensure that all meetings are systematically recorded, stored, and made accessible for transparency, monitoring, and evaluation purposes.

General Principles and Requirements

- All meetings must be documented using the official Meeting Minutes Form, and the completed forms must be stored in the designated folders by each partner institution.
- Every meeting must be assigned a unique meeting number following a standardised format: AA/BB/CC, where:
  - AA indicates the type of meeting,
  - BB refers to the year (last two digits),
  - CC is the sequential number of the meeting.
- The abbreviations provided in the official project directory must be used when referring to partner institutions.

Meeting Numbering Format

Meeting Type	Numbering Format	Example
WP Meetings	WPx-YY-NN	WP1-25-01
SC Meetings	SC-YY-NN	SC-25-01
Partner Meetings	PartnerAbbreviation-YY-NN	ESTU-25-01
EPD-Net Meetings (e.g., workshops, evaluation meetings)	EPD-Net-YY-NN	EPD-Net-25-01

Documentation Guidelines

- The Meeting Minutes Form must be used to record all meeting content accurately.
- The "Results/Decisions" section of the form must include clear, concise, and comprehensive information to support tracking of actions and follow-up decisions.
- All meeting minutes must be written in English.
- Supporting documentation such as photos, videos, attendance sheets, or other relevant materials should be collected and archived whenever applicable.
- Joint meeting minutes (for meetings involving multiple partners) shall be documented by the Project Coordinator.
- All finalised meeting minutes must be saved in the relevant shared project repository with appropriate file naming consistent with the meeting number and date.
- It is recommended to upload meeting records promptly after the meeting to avoid delays in project documentation.

Additional Recommendations

- Clearly indicate the date, time, location (or online platform), and the list of participants in each record.
- Assign a responsible person (rapporteur) before each meeting to ensure proper documentation.
- Ensure that the action items and responsible parties are clearly stated in the meeting outcomes.
- Regular internal audits are encouraged to ensure consistency and completeness of documentation.

- In case of updates or corrections after the meeting, the revised version should be labelled appropriately (e.g., "Version 2 - Updated on [date]").

Annex 5. Expenditures that can be made in Expenditure Items

Reference documents

Erasmus+ Programme

The new Funding mechanism and the budget table - Info-session New call for proposals-Erasmus+ Alliances for Innovation

Within the scope of Erasmus+ Alliances for Future projects, various expenditures can be made in the budget. The following types of expenditures can be made in the "Consumables" category in the "Other Goods and Services" item.

1. **Office Supplies**: Daily office needs such as paper, pens, toner, and files.
2. **Laboratory Supplies**: Materials used in research and experiments, such as chemicals, glassware, and protective equipment.
3. **Computer and Electronic Supplies**: Electronic devices and accessories such as USB sticks, external hard drives, cables, and adapters.
4. **Education Materials**: Teaching and learning materials such as books, educational software, and educational videos.

These expenditures cover the materials necessary for the project to achieve its objectives and to be carried out effectively.

The "Consumables" category covers mostly short-lived and consumable materials.

The materials that can be purchased from the "Consumables" item should be short-lived and consumable.

In Erasmus+ projects, "Indirect Costs" generally cover expenditures that cannot be directly linked to project activities, such as project management and general administrative costs.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

---

1. **Office Rent and Services**: Rent for the office space used during the project and related services.
2. **General Administrative Expenses**: Administrative services such as accounting, human resources, and general management.
3. **Office Supplies**: Daily office needs such as paper, pens, and toner.
4. **Communication Expenses**: Communication expenses such as telephone, internet, and postal services.

5. **Energy and Water Expenses**: Electricity, water, and other energy expenses.

Indirect costs cover the expenditures required for the overall management and administration of the project and are usually calculated as a percentage.

In Erasmus+ projects, "Indirect Costs" generally cover general administrative costs that cannot be directly linked to project activities.

Indirect costs include expenses such as office rent and services, general administrative expenses, office supplies, communication expenses, and energy and water costs.

Equipment such as computers are not eligible for this type of expenditure as they are directly required for project activities and have a longer life span.

In Erasmus+ projects, the expenditures that can be made from the "Services for communication/promotion/dissemination" item are generally used to disseminate and promote the project results and to support communication activities.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

1. **Promotional Materials**: Promotional materials such as brochures, posters, websites, and social media campaigns.
2. **Publications**: Reports, articles, and other publications containing project results.
3. **Events**: Conferences, seminars, workshops, and other dissemination events.
4. **Communication Services**: Communication services such as press releases, media relations, and video productions.

Conference participation fees can be covered from this item.

In Erasmus+ projects, open access publication fees can be covered from the "Services for communication/promotion/dissemination" item.

In Erasmus+ projects, the expenditures that can be made from the "Services for Meetings, Seminars" item generally cover the services required for the organisation and conduct of meetings and seminars.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

1. **Accommodation and Travel**: Travel and accommodation costs for participants to attend meetings and seminars.
2. **Meeting Space Hire**: Renting venues where meetings and seminars will be organised.
3. **Food and Refreshments**: Meals and refreshments to be served at meetings and seminars.

4. **Technical Equipment and Services**: Rental of technical equipment such as sound system, projector, computer and technical support services.
5. **Organisation Services**: Event organisation, registration and logistic support services.
6. From the "Services for Meetings, Seminars" item, travel and subsistence expenses for attending a conference to present the outputs of the project can be covered.
7. This item covers the services required for the organisation and conduct of meetings and seminars and can be used to support the participation of participants in such events.

In Erasmus+ projects, expenditures from the "website" item generally cover activities such as the creation, maintenance and updating of the project website.

In Erasmus+ projects, the "Artistic Fees" item covers expenditures for artistic and cultural activities.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

1. **Artist Fees:** Fees paid to artists who perform or produce works within the scope of the project.
2. **Works of Art and Performances:** Expenditures for the organisation and execution of artistic events such as theatre, music, dance.
3. **Art Materials:** Materials required for activities such as painting, sculpture, handicrafts.
4. **Art Education and Workshops:** Expenditures for the organisation of art-related training programmes and workshops.
5. Fees to be paid to people who will prepare promotional videos may also be included.

In Erasmus+ projects, the item "Subsistence" is used to cover the daily living expenses of the participants during their travelling. The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be

1. **Accommodation**: Hotel or other accommodation costs.
2. Meals Daily food costs.
3. **Local Transport**: Public transport, taxi or other local transport costs.
4. **Daily Needs**: Expenditures made to meet the daily needs of the participants.

These expenses are covered to ensure that participants can work comfortably and efficiently during their travelling.

In Erasmus+ projects, the "Travel" item covers the travel expenses incurred by participants to participate in project activities.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

1. **Flight, Train and Bus Tickets**: Travel by participants to attend project meetings, seminars or trainings.
2. **Local Transport**: Local transport costs such as taxi, public transport or car hire.
3. **Visa and Travel Insurance**: Visa and travel insurance costs required for international travel.

These expenses are covered in order to ensure that the participants can participate effectively in the project activities.

In Erasmus+ projects, the "Accommodation" item covers accommodation costs incurred by participants to participate in project activities.

The types of expenditure that can be made from this item can be as follows:

1. **Hotel or Pension Fees**: Fees for accommodation of participants during project meetings, seminars or trainings.
2. **Renting an apartment or house**: Fees for apartments or houses rented for long-term stays.
3. **Accommodation Services**: Additional services provided during accommodation (cleaning, breakfast, etc.).

These expenses are covered in order to ensure that participants can participate in project activities comfortably and efficiently.

"Subcontracting" service in the project

1	ESTU	WP1	Cost of subcontracting: WP 1 Task 1.1. Verification will be done through review of the report by an external quality assurance consultant and documentation of the recommendations made. WP 1 Task 1.2. Verification will be done through review of the report by an external risk management consultant and documentation of the recommendations made. WP 1 Task 1.4. Verification will be done through review of the report by an evaluator and documentation of the evaluation methods and metrics used.
2	PREVIFORM	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Portuguese
3	SPU	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Slovak
4	MENDELU	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Czech
5	TAPLAK	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Turkish
6	LAAA	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Latvian
7	AIJU	WP3	Translation cost of the training materials in Spanish

According to the information in the project manuals;

It is possible to employ scholars as "seconded staff" in Erasmus+ projects.

"Seconded staff" generally refers to staff temporarily seconded from another organisation for a certain period of time during the project. These staff are temporarily involved in the project to contribute to the project activities.

Fellows may also be employed as seconded staff under certain conditions.

ANNEX 6. Timeline and WP Tables For EPD-Net

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP1: Project Management (01.03.2025- 29.02.2028)	**HU**	**ESTU**	**T1.1.** Preparation of a quality assurance plan *(The quality assurance plan outlines the measures taken to ensure that the project activities and the outcomes meet the expected requirements and the required quality standards. This plan identifies any quality-related issues and ensures they are addressed appropriately.)*	**1.03.2025**	**30.06.2025**	**MS1** Approval of the project management plan **Lead: ESTU** Approval of the project management plan that aims to ensure the project activities and the outcomes meet the expected requirements and the required quality standards. It helps to identify any shortcomings in the project processes and activities, focuses on the processes teams use to maintain standards and produce quality deliverables, and provides recommendations to improve the project quality	**30.09.2025**	**D1.1.**Quality assurance plan **Lead: ESTU**	**30.06.2025**	**E1.1.** Kick-off Meeting **Online Workshop** All Partners And Stakeholders To Discuss Project Management Issues Duration 2 days 200 Attendees **March 2025**	PI1. Satisfaction rate with the project management plans (%)
			T1.2. Preparation of a risk management plan *(The risk management plan aims to identify, assess, and manage potential risks that may arise during the project's lifecycle. This plan helps project managers to proactively manage risks and minimize their impact on project outcomes.)*	**1.03.2025**	**30.06.2025**			**D1.2.** Risk management plan **Lead: ESTU**	**30.06.2025**		
			T1.3. Preparation of a project monitoring plan *(The project monitoring plan aims to provide information to assist stakeholders in comparing performance against plans so that current or potential problems can be identified and analyzed. This plan helps project managers to proactively track the project's metrics, progress, and associated tasks to ensure everything is completed on time, on budget, and according to project requirements and standards.)*	**1.03.2025**	**30.06.2025**			**D1.3.** Project monitoring plan **Lead: ESTU**	**30.06.2025**		
			T1.4. Preparation of a project evaluation strategy plan *(The project evaluation strategy plan outlines the methodology for evaluating the project's impact and effectiveness. This plan is essential to ensure that the project's objectives are being met and that the project outcomes are in line with the initial project proposal.)*	**1.03.2025**	**30.06.2025**			**D1.4.** Project evaluation strategy plan **Lead: ESTU**	**30.06.2025**	**E1.2.** Team Work Meeting For WP1 **Workshop at Czech Republic** All Partners To Ensure the Quality of Outcomes for WP1 Duration 5 days 45 Attendees **September 2025**	
			T1.5. Preparation of a need analysis report *(The need analyses report provides an analysis of the needs of stakeholders and beneficiaries related to the project's objectives. This report helps ensure that the project addresses its intended beneficiaries' needs and that the project outcomes are relevant and useful to them.)*	**1.03.2025**	**31.08.2025**						
				1.03.2025	**29.02.2028**				**31.08.2025**		

			T1.6. Implementation of the project according to the project management plan *(The project will be implemented according to the project management plan including a quality assurance plan, risk management plan, project monitoring plan, project evaluation strategy plan, and need analyses report. While the project is carried out according to these plans and reports, they will be evaluated regularly, and necessary revisions will be made accordingly.)*					**D1.5.** Need analysis report **Lead: ESTU**			

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP2: Research Analysis (01.04.2025- 30.09.2025)	**MENDELU**	**AU**	**T2.1.** Literature review *(Preparing and conducting a comprehensive review of the literature on the role of planners and designers in disaster management and recovery, including academic and gray literature)*	**1.04.2025**	**31.07.2025**	**MS2** Completion of the systematic literature/case study/Best practice review (M5) **Lead: AU** Completion of the literature review and best practices/case study analysis findings which includes comprehensive information on the role of planners and designers in disaster management/recovery and best practices.	**31.07.2025**	**D2.1.** Consolidated literature/case study/best practices report **Lead: AU**	**31.07.2025**	**E2.1.** Team Work Meeting For Workpackage 2 **Workshop at Slovakia** All Partners To Ensure the Quality of Outcomes for WP2 Duration 5 days At least 45 attendees **November 2025**	PI2. The number of literature and case studies examined
			T2.2. Analysis of case studies and best *practices* *(Collecting and analyzing case studies and best practices from around the world, with a particular emphasis on the effective application of Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management situations)*	**1.04.2025**	**31.07.2025**						
			T2.3. Assessment of needed skills and knowledge through surveys, interviews, and focus groups with stakeholders *(Carrying out surveys, questionnaires, one-on-one interviews, and focus groups with various stakeholders in the field of ecological planning and design to determine the abilities and information that are necessary for efficient disaster management and recovery)*	**1.06.2025**	**31.08.2025**	**MS3** Completion of surveys, interviews, and focus group meetings with stakeholders **Lead: AU** Completion of surveys, individual interviews, and focus group meetings with various stakeholders.	**31.08.2025**	**D2.2.** Needs assessment report **Lead:MENDELU**	**30.09.2025**	**E2.2.** Annual Evaluation And Coordination Meeting 1 **Online Workshop** All Partners And Stakeholders To Provide Coordination Between Partners and Different Project Teams Duration 2 days At least 200 attendees **December 2025**	
			T2.4. Development of a report summarizing the findings and conclusions of the research and analysis *(Developing a summary report that provides a synopsis of the*	**1.07.2025**	**30.09.2025**	**MS4** Development of a needs assessment report **Lead: MENDELU** Creating a report including the outputs of the need assessment tasks	**30.09.2025**				

			findings, results, and inferences drawn from research and analysis)								

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP3: Training Module Development (01.09.2025- 31.05.2026)	**ISTANBUL KULTUR UNIVERSITY**	**LBTU**	**T3.1.** Identification of learning objectives and development of a detailed curriculum for the smart training module *(Identifying and defining the learning objectives and developing a detailed curriculum including topics, durations, and methods of delivery for the Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management adaptable smart training module that includes an AI-aided LMS.)*	**1.09.2025**	**28.02.2026**	**MS5** Completion of the curriculum and learning objectives for the smart training module **Lead: IKU** Completion of the identification of the program requirements and learning objectives of the smart training module and preparation of a detailed curriculum including topics, durations, and methods of delivery for the smart training module.	**28.02.2026**	**D3.1.** Curriculum and training materials for smart training module, including lectures, case studies, exercises, and assessments **Lead: IKU**	**31.05.2026**	**E3.1.** Team Work Meeting For Workpackage 3 **Workshop in Portugal** All Partners To ensure the quality of outcomes for WP3 Duration 5 days 30 Attendees **May 2026**	KPI1. Smart training module completion rate
			T3.2. Development of content outline and training materials for the smart training module *(Preparing outline of the content as well as implementing the resources for smart training module, including lectures, case studies, exercises, and an AI-aided self-assessment system.)*	**1.09.2025**	**31.05.2026**	**MS6** Finalization of the content outlines and materials for the smart training module **Lead: IKU** Completion of the content outlines and preparation of the training resources for smart training module.	**31.05.2026**	**D3.2**. Smart Training Module, including an AI based self-evaluation system and LMS **Lead: BS**	**31.05.2026**		KPI4. Number of smart training module versions developed
			T3.3. Development of the adaptive smart learning module infrastructure *(Building the infrastructure of the adaptive smart learning module that includes an AI-aided LMS.)*	**1.11.2025**	**31.05.2026**	**MS7** Completion of the adaptive smart learning module infrastructure **Lead: BS** Completion of the development of the adaptive smart learning module infrastructure.	**31.05.2026**				PI3. Completion rate of training materials
			T3.4. Development of a training module guidebook (tutorial toolkit) for trainers and facilitators *(Preparing training module manual intended for use by facilitators and trainers that provides guidance to trainers and facilitators on how to deliver the smart training module effectively.)*	**1.03.2026**	**31.05.2026**	**MS8** Completion of the training module guidebook (tutorial toolkit) for trainers and facilitators **Lead: LBTU** Completion of the manual for the training module intended for use by facilitators and trainers.	**31.05.2026**	**D3.3.** Training module guidebook (tutorial toolkit) for trainers and facilitators **Lead: LBTU**	**31.05.2026**		PI4. Rate of smart training module containing or developed through the deep-tech

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP4: Pilot Testing and Evaluationt (01.03.2026- 30.07.2027)	CTLA	BS	**T4.1.** Identification and selection of pilot sites *(Identifying and selecting pilot sites for testing the smart training module by considering the wide range of geographical, cultural, and socioeconomic conditions present at each location.)*	**1.03.2026**	**31.05.2026**	**MS9** Delivery of the smart training module **Lead: CTLA** Distribution of the educational materials and smart training module at the selected pilot sites.	**30.11.2026**	**D4.1.** Evaluation report on pilot implementation (including feedback from participants and trainers) **Lead: CTLA**	**31.07.2027**	**E4.1.** Team Work Meeting For Workpackage 4 **Workshop in Spain** All Partners To ensure the quality of outcomes for WP4 Duration 5 days 45 Attendees **September 2026**	KPI2. Participant satisfaction rate with the smart training module
			T4.2. Implementation of smart training module at the pilot sites and feedback collection *(Delivering the smart training module at the pilot sites and collecting feedback from participants (trainers and facilitators) on the effectiveness and relevance of the module*)	**1.06.2026**	**30.11.2026**	**MS10** Determination of module improvement recommendations **Lead: CTLA** Finalization of the report on the pilot testing and evaluation including feedback analysis and improvement recommendations.	**31.03.2027**				PI5. Completion rate of the pilot training
			T4.3. Evaluation of pilot testing and feedback *(Conducting an evaluation of the pilot testing, focusing on the comments received, analyzing the feedback of the participants, and identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the smart training module to determine the areas in which the smart training module can be improved.)*	**1.10.2026**	**31.03.2027**						PI6. Average rate of increased skills/knowledge
			T4.4. Improvement of the smart training module *(Improving, adapting, and customizing the smart training module based on the findings of the evaluation.)*	**1.01.2027**	**31.07.2027**	**MS11** Improvement of the smart training module **Lead: BS** Improvement of the module in line with the pilot test results and recommendations	**31.07.2027**				PI7. Average rate of increased skills in deep tech PI8. Participants' satisfaction with the AI-aided solutions (EPD_Assist)

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP5: Dissemination and Outreach (01.03.2025- 29.02.2028)	LAAA	AIJU	**T5.1.** Development of the project website and social media accounts *(Building a website for the project and creating accounts on various social media platforms to disseminate information about the project and its findings, and to share project news, updates, and resources with a wider audience.)*	**1.03.2025**	**30.06.2025**	**MS12** Development of the project website and social media accounts **Lead: ESTU**	**30.06.2025**	**D5.1.** Project website and social media accounts **Lead: ESTU**	30.06.2025	**E5.1** Annual Evaluation And Coordination Meeting 2 ALL PARTNERS And Stakeholders To Provide Coordination Between Partners and Different Project	PI9. Website and social media accounts of the project reach numbers.
			T5.2. Preparation and delivery of dissemination materials *(Designing and creating a dissemination plan followed by the*	**1.06.2025**	**29.02.2028**			**D5.2.** Dissemination plan **Lead: LAAA**	30.09.2025		PI10. Number of news/posts shared on website and social media

			production of several kinds of dissemination materials, such brochures, flyers, and posters, to advertise the smart training module and the results of the project to prospective partners and stakeholders.)							Teams At least 200 attendees **Online/Workshop** **December 2026**	accounts of the project.
			T5.3. Conference and workshop presentations *(Giving presentations on the project's progress at various conferences and workshops, to disseminate its findings and cultivate connections with relevant organizations and individuals.)*	**1.09.2025**	**29.02.2028**	**MS13** Completion of the final project report **Lead: ESTU**	**29.02.2028**				Pl11. Number of emails sent to deliver dissemination materials such as brochures, flyers, newsletters, posters
			T5.4. Development of the final project report *(Developing a concluding report for the project that provides a summary of the project's objectives, actions, methods, outcomes, and impact, as well as recommendations for further work.)*	1.12.2027	29.02.2028			**D5.3.** Dissemination materials **Lead: LAAA**	29.02.2028		Pl12. Number of conference presentations Pl.13. Number of publications

	WP Leader	WP Assoc. Leader	WP Tasks			WP Milestones		WP Deliverables		Relevant Events/Meetings	Related PIs
			Task Name	Start Date	Due Date	Milestone Name	Due Date	Deliverable Name	Due Date		
WP6: Sustainability and Exploitation s (01.03.2025-29.02.2028)	**AU**	**NMBU**	**T6.1.** Development of a sustainability plan *(Preparing a plan for the sustainability of the project for the long-term maintenance and continuation of the project's results, which outlines how the project outcomes will be maintained and continued after the end of the project.)*	**1.06.2027**	**30.11.2027**	**MS14.** Completion of the sustainability plan **Lead: NMBU** Finalization of the sustainability plan, which outlines how the project's results will be preserved and perpetuated after the project finishes.	**30.11.2027**	**D6.1.** Sustainability plan **Lead: NMBU**	31.11.2027	E6.1. Team Work Meeting For Workpackage 5 And Workpackage 6 **Workshop at Latvia** All Partners To Ensure the Quality of Outcomes for WP6 60 Attendees **September 2027**	KPI3. Stakeholder (sector/academia) satisfaction rate
			T6.2. Development of an exploitation plan *(Preparing a plan for exploitation that outlines how the results of the project will be efficiently employed and incorporated into the fields of ecological planning and design for disaster management and recovery.)*	**1.06.2027**	**30.11.2027**			**D6.2.** Exploitation plan **Lead: NMBU**	31.11.2027	**E6.2.** Annual Evaluation And Coordination Meeting 3 **Online Workshop** All Partners And Stakeholders To Provide Coordination Between Partners and Different Project Teams 200 Attendees	KPI5. Number of organisations/individuals/organisation types that find the smart training module useful
			T6.3. Publication of research findings *(Publishing the research findings and recommendations for best practices in high*	**1.08.2025**	**29.02.2028**	**MS15.** Completion of the exploitation plan **Lead: NMBU** Completion of the exploitation plan will outline how the research findings will be efficiently employed and	**30.11.2027**	**D6.3**. Publications of project results **Lead: ESTU**	**29.02.2028**		Pl14. Participation number to the Conference

			qualified journals and conferences that are subject to peer review to provide wider dissemination of the outputs)			incorporated into ecological planning and design in disaster management and recovery.				**December 2027**	
			T6.4. Development of a cooperation network *(Development of a network of partners and stakeholders to promote the adoption of the project outcomes and facilitate further collaboration and knowledge sharing in the field)*	**1.03.2025**	**29.02.2028**	**MS16**. Establishment of a sustainable business model based on ECHO model **Lead: BS** Development of a sustainable business model to ensure the ongoing delivery of Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management smart training module and services beyond the project`s life.	**29.02.2028**	**D6.4.** Network of partners and stakeholders **Lead: NMBU**	**29.02.2028**	**E6.3**. Conference On Ecological Planning And Design For Disaster Management All Partners And Stakeholders **Conference at Turkiye** For Dissemination of The Outputs 500 Attendees **January 2028**	PI15. Satisfaction rate of project partners and stakeholders on the effectiveness and efficiency of collaboration and knowledge sharing
			T6.5. Establishment of a sustainable business model based on ECHO model (Development of a long-term, financially viable business model based on the ECHO model for ensuring ongoing delivery of Ecological Planning and Design for Disaster Management smart training module and services beyond the project duration)	**1.09.2027**	**29.02.2028**			**D6.5.** Sustainable business model based on ECHO model **Lead: BS**	**29.02.2028**	**E6.4.** Sustainable Model Workshop And Panel **Online Workshop And Panel** All Partners And Stakeholders For Sharing Echo Model Structure with The Stakeholders and Network 500-1000 Attendees **January 2028**	PI16. Number of partnerships formed with stakeholders (sector/academia)

Strategic Governance Framework of EPD-Net

This diagram illustrates the integrated governance architecture of the EPD-Net Project, linking its four core quality management pillars:

QAP (D1.1) ensures that all outputs meet defined standards of coherence, usability, innovation, and accessibility.

Risk Management Plan (D1.2) identifies, monitors, and mitigates internal and external risks across all WPs.

Project Monitoring Plan (D1.3) tracks the real-time progress, participation, and performance of partners and tasks via a structured, digital environment.

Evaluation Strategy Plan (D1.4) assesses the project's effectiveness, relevance, impact, and sustainability through continuous feedback and formal checkpoints.

Needs Analysis Report (D1.5) forms the evidence-based foundation of the entire project by identifying the expectations, capacities, and gaps of the target groups. Based on a comprehensive survey across stakeholders, it feeds into all subsequent plans.

Together, these interlinked systems support evidence-based decision-making, ensure compliance with the GA (GA-101183961), and create a transparent, adaptive, and impact-oriented governance ecosystem for the successful delivery of EPD-Net's objectives.

The diagram given below illustrates the integrated governance and quality management architecture of the EPD-Net project, composed of five interdependent planning instruments developed under WP1. This one-page schematic reflects how data flows, decisions are triggered, and project intelligence is synthesised-anchoring quality and accountability at the core of the consortium's operations.

*Together, these five deliverables form a **dynamic, adaptive, and learning-oriented governance model**, enabling the EPD-Net consortium to stay accountable, innovative, and impact-driven.*

Bfc
Business Focus & Consulting

EPD-NET PROJECT QUALITY AND GOVERNANCE DOCUMENTS INTEGRATED REVIEW AND ASSESSMENT REPORT

BFC IHRACAT ITHALAT
VE DANIŞMANLIK
LIMITED ŞIRKETI

20.06.2025

Contents

1. Introduction

This report has been prepared to analyse the integration of the four main management documents developed under the EPD Net Project - Quality Assurance Plan, Risk Management Plan, Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan - with each other, their in-process consistency and their compatibility with corporate systems. The project aims to increase the sustainability of organisational quality management, the management of risks with preventive approaches, the data-based operation of monitoring and evaluation systems, and the contribution of all these components to learning and decision-making processes.

The evaluation of the EPD Net Project in this framework is structured on the PDCA Cycle (Plan - Do - Check - Act), which is universally adopted in quality management systems. Each plan document analyses the extent to which it serves the relevant phases of this cycle and the mutual data flow between the outputs.

The analysis process was carried out within the framework of the following methodological elements:

- Through document content analysis, the objective, scope, indicator and tool dimensions of each plan were systematically scanned.
- Question lists were created and the structural elements in the four plans were questioned according to these questions.
- The functional components of each plan, measurement and monitoring methods, risk and deviation management models, and the contribution of evaluation outputs to organisational impact were analysed.
- Furthermore, under the heading "Extended Integration Inquiry", the interoperability of the four documents, common indicator sets, mutual feedback mechanisms and synchronisation status in terms of continuous improvement chain are addressed.

The report assesses not only the individual plans but also the holistic functioning of the systemic structure formed by these plans. At the end of the process, in the light of the evaluations made with comprehensive questionnaires, concrete analyses based on the findings regarding the integrated corporate governance system are presented.

2. Objective

The main objective of this report is to assess the overall effectiveness of the project's quality management infrastructure by analysing the individual adequacy and level of integration of the four main management plans - Quality Assurance Plan, Risk Management Plan, Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan - established under the EPD Net Project.

At the same time, within the framework of the elements, structure and targeted outputs within the project, it is aimed to comprehensively examine, evaluate and verify these plans from the perspective of an external evaluator. If deemed necessary, suggestions for improvement will be made to increase the effectiveness of the processes and plans.

In the report

- The adequacy of each plan in terms of measurable objectives, data collection and analysis systematics, feedback mechanisms and improvement cycles are assessed,
- The consistency and synchronisation of the Quality Assurance Plan, Risk Management Plan, Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan documents submitted to the project in terms of their level of

interaction, common indicator sets, continuous monitoring and improvement mechanisms are questioned,

- Through the findings, weak links, development areas and good practice patterns regarding the institutional quality system are identified,
- Ultimately, the strategic role of these plans in the organisation's decision-making, implementation and learning cycles is assessed.

3. Review Scope and Methodology

This study aims to evaluate four key management documents - Quality Assurance Plan (QAP), Project Monitoring Plan (PMP), Evaluation Strategy Plan (ESP) and Risk Management Plan (RMP) - developed within the scope of the EPD-NET project in terms of structural and contextual consistency in line with the Evaluation Categories Quality Management System Standard. The main purpose of the review process is to determine whether the project execution systematic is established in accordance with quality standards, its traceability and continuous improvement capacity from a holistic perspective.

In this context, Evaluation Categories have been designed in order to check the relevant project plans, and the evaluation categories have been used as a reference for all comparisons to be made in a concrete and consistent manner. In this way, a systematic evaluation framework was developed consisting of a total of 455 criteria consisting of 10 basic items specified as Evaluation Categories. Each criterion was matched to the principles, processes, methods and outputs contained in the management plans and a four-class analysis approach was adopted at the content level: "Adequate", "Partially Adequate", "Inadequate" and "Unclear". In the evaluation of the criteria, both the integrity of each plan and the synchronisation between plans were taken into consideration.

The analysis was carried out in three stages:

- Contextual Review: The structural and thematic relationship of each plan with the items of the Evaluation Categories was analysed through the documentation.
- Coherence and Integration Analysis: Explicit or implicit references between plans, content transitions and functional complementarity levels were determined.
- External Document Support: The Grant Agreement (GA) document within the scope of the project was used as an application source to support the missing areas.

3.1. Application Correspondence of the Items of the Evaluation Categories and Project Documents

ARTICLE 1. The quality management cycle developed within the scope of the project identifies the existence of a sustainable and user-oriented digital training and planning system,

ARTICLE 2. QAP, PMP, ESP and RMP plans prepared within the scope of the project; determining the existence of documents covering quality policy, performance monitoring, evaluation mechanisms and risk management,

ARTICLE 3. It includes the determination of the concepts used in the management plans of the project and the integrity of these concepts.

ARTICLE 4. Context: Examination of the project's purpose, scope and stakeholder requirements external environment, context analysis and strategic orientation

ARTICLE 5. Leadership: Evaluation of quality policy, allocation of responsibilities and leadership structure

ARTICLE 6. Planning: Assessment of quality objectives, risk-opportunity analysis and change management

ARTICLE 7. Support: Resource management, competence, awareness, communication and documentation processes review of consistency between plans

ARTICLE 8. Operation: Review of operational planning, risk control and piloting arrangements for activities carried out through the work packages of the Project

ARTICLE 9. Performance Evaluation: Monitoring by indicators, internal audit and governance processes Examination of compliance with QAP, PMP, ESP and RMP

ARTICLE 10. Improvement: Management of non-conformities, corrective action planning and control of continuous improvement strategies

The findings obtained in this framework reveal the extent to which the relevant project documentation overlaps with each other and with each other; at the same time, it shows that the functional integrity and contextual harmony between the plans are ensured in line with quality standards.

EPD-NET Project Multi-criteria Conformity and Integration Review in line with the Standard for Evaluation Categories of Quality Management Documents

The quality assurance, monitoring, evaluation and risk management plans developed within the scope of the EPD-NET project were analysed with an audit-oriented approach in line with the basic principles of the Assessment Categories Quality Management System standard. In this context, the plan documents were analysed in terms of content and structural integrity. Through a comparative analysis of 455 criteria, the compliance of quality management practices with the relevant standard and the consistency between plans were systematically analysed. Each Assessment Categories item was mapped to its concrete counterparts in the project documents to create a holistic quality management framework, and the traceability, sustainability and improvement capacity of the project documentation was audited within this framework.

In this context, cross-examinations were carried out with reference to the items listed below in the Assessment Categories.

ARTICLE 4. Context of the Organisation

ARTICLE 4.1 The context of the organisation and the project consortium

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the plan aligned with the context and strategy of the organisation?	CC 4.1	Adequate	"...multi-partner Erasmus+ cooperation project coordinated by Eskişehir Technical University..."
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the plan aligned with the context and strategy of the organisation?	CC 4.1	Adequate	Monitoring Plan shows full strategic alignment with GA objectives and WP structure [D1.3]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are internal and external factors that may affect project risks explained?	CC 4.1	Adequate	It is stated that risks vary in technical, organisational, financial and other areas.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Have the strategic objectives of the organisation and the impact of these objectives on risk management been determined?	CC 4.1	Adequate	The aims of the project include resilience, sustainability and innovation. **The organisation's culture, leadership structure and values should be summarised in a short section**
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is the context of the organisation reviewed and updated throughout the project lifecycle?	CC 4.1	Adequate	It was emphasised that the risk register and plan are dynamic and regularly updated.

RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are internal and external issues facing the organisation addressed in the risk plan?	CC 4.1	Adequate	"Organisational Risks: Risks arising from coordination, management, staffing, or internal communication issues among project partners or within work packages..." (Source: D1.2, p.9 - 2.4 Risk Typologies in EPD-Net) "Technical Risks... including software functionality, platform stability, and technical integration failures." "Content Risks... conceptual misalignment and lack of pedagogical adequacy." These definitions cover managerial and technical problems that organisations may encounter in their internal structures. "External/Force Majeure Risks: Risks driven by external, uncontrollable factors such as policy shifts, legal changes, geopolitical events, natural disasters, or pandemics..." (Source: D1.2, p.9 - 2.4 Risk Typologies in EPD-Net) "Sustainability Risks... including funding shortfalls, low institutional uptake, or lack of strategic alignment." (same source)
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Has the organisation defined external and internal considerations?	CC 4.1	Adequate	Both internal and external context defined Section 1.1 "Strategic Positioning"; Section 2.2 "EO2 Relevance"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are these aspects associated with the quality management system and its results?	CC 4.1	Adequate	Evaluation mechanism structured based on quality Section 1.5 "Evaluation as a Learning and Adaptation Engine"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Has the structure, capacity and resources of the organisation been assessed in the internal context?	CC 4.1	Partially Sufficient	**Organisational risk definition:** "Organisational Risks: Risks arising from coordination, management, staffing, or internal communication issues among project partners or within work packages..." *(Source: D1.2, p.9 - 2.4 Risk Typologies in EPD-Net)* This statement identifies **the subject matter of** the potential risk, but does not elaborate on the context in which this risk may occur (e.g. existing capacity, structure, resources of the organisations). **Although the roles of the participants are defined (WP Leaders, PM Team, etc.):** "Each WP Leader is responsible for... assessing changing risk conditions..." *(s.13)* However, in this assessment, **the structural capacity of the institution is not analysed at the level of an analysis, but at the task level**. In its current form, the plan does not provide a framework that comprehensively analyses **the internal context (e.g. organisational structure, capacity, manpower, technical**

				competence). This **can create gaps**, especially **in preventive planning.** **Improvement Proposal:** **For each parent organisation (partner) a short "Corporate Risk Profile" can be developed based on an analysis of structure, capacity and resources.** For example: HR capacity (number of staff, specialisation) Technical infrastructure (hardware, software, server access) Management experience (EU project management background) These profiles provide a deeper insight into the root causes of risks and allow for **more targeted** development of **preventive measures**.
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How do stakeholders and context interact?	CC 4.1	Adequate	The link with target groups and stakeholders is explicit EO2 and EO4: Evaluation Questions
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is there a relationship between strategic direction and context?	CC 4.1	Adequate	Evaluation strategy aligned with the main objectives of the project Executive Summary + Section 1.1
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are internal and external quality elements defined in the strategy?	CC 4.1	Adequate	"Internal Quality Assurance (IQA): This process will be applied at two levels: at WP level and project level. WP leaders will monitor the quality and consistency of their tasks and deliverables, while the PM team and QA board will apply cross-cutting internal validation." (Source: D1.1, p.12 - 3.2 Internal QA Mechanisms) **"External Quality Assurance (EQA):** External reviewers will be appointed to evaluate the scientific and pedagogical quality of the outputs at M18 and M34." *(Source: D1.1, p.14 - 3.3 External QA Mechanisms) The* document clearly separates and defines internal and external quality elements, specifies responsibilities and links them to timelines. In this context, the question is fully met.

ARTICLE 4.2 Expectations and requirements of stakeholders

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the purpose of the quality assurance plan clearly defined?	CC 4.2	Adequate	"...to ensure that the project achieves the planned objectives... make quality-related practices transparent..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the needs and expectations of relevant stakeholders identified?	CC 4.2	Adequate	"...enable all partners, instructors, students and other stakeholders to contribute..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the participatory structure defined?	CC 4.2	Adequate	"...all partners, instructors, students and other stakeholders..."

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the quality criteria in line with Erasmus+ and ESG standards?	CC 4.2 / CC 8.5.1	Partially Sufficient	Reference is made but no examples are given of criteria that directly map to ESG. **ESG 2015 clauses could be more directly referenced.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the purpose of the quality assurance plan clearly defined?	CC 4.2	Adequate	"PMP is a foundational governance document... throughout the entire lifecycle of the project (36 months)." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Have the needs and expectations of relevant stakeholders been identified?	CC 4.2	Adequate	The Monitoring Plan elaborates the concepts of 'engagement' and 'participation' within the monitoring dimensions [D1.3].
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the participatory structure defined?	CC 4.2	Adequate	Monitoring Plan is clarified with participatory structure and actor roles (WP leader, SC, PM team) [D1.3]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Have the needs of the relevant parties been identified?	CC 4.2	Partially Sufficient	General definitions under the heading "Stakeholders analysis". Interested parties are identified at a general level (e.g. stakeholders, local authorities), but it is not indicated that expectations are systematically analysed. Specific needs and expectations analyses should be conducted for each stakeholder group and updated periodically. This statement provides a general framework of who is a stakeholder. However • Stakeholder groups are not segmented (e.g. local governments → small municipalities or metropolises?) • Expectations, needs or levels of participation not analysed • A time-bound updatable analysis mechanism (e.g. feedback loop, periodic surveys, synchronisation with monitoring outputs) is not defined.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are the needs and expectations of relevant parties taken into account in the risk plan?	CC 4.2	Partially Sufficient	"Relevant project risks and mitigation strategies... including risk owners from project partners." **Partners are mentioned but stakeholder expectations are not differentiated. The relevant parties (users, funders, external consultants, etc.) should be analysed separately and risk expectations and priorities should be added for each of them.** **Deficiencies:** • **Stakeholder categories (users, pilot region representatives, external experts, funders, public institutions) are not defined.** • **The relationship between these groups and risks has not been analysed.** • **Differences in expectations/priorities are ignored.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the needs and expectations of the relevant parties systematically defined?	CC 4.2	Partially Sufficient	Stakeholders are referred to in the sections "Relevance - ... meaningful to stakeholders?", "Engagement - ... satisfied". **A map of interested parties should be created and needs and expectations should be analysed systematically.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are stakeholder needs monitored and updated?	CC 4.2	Partially Sufficient	"Continuous learning, adaptation" processes are included. **A regular survey/review mechanism should be established for changes in stakeholder expectations.**

ARTICLE 4.3 Scope of the quality management system

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the area of applicability specified?	CC 4.3	Adequate	"...applied in all WPs of the project and structures the monitoring, evaluation and reporting processes."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the scope and boundaries of the plan clearly defined?	CC 4.3	Adequate	Section 1, Line 2-8: "...quality assurance system... integrated into all Wps: QAP, Risk Management Plan..."
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the area of applicability specified?	CC 4.3	Partially Sufficient	"The EPD-Net Project Monitoring Plan... across its 36-month duration." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) **The EPD-Net Project Monitoring Plan... across its 36-month duration."** **This statement only includes the time dimension. But in the context of CC 4.3 the following should also be clarified:** • **Geographical/contextual applicability** • **Organisational scope** • **Spread over time + in-process adaptation**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the scope of the QMS clear and justified?	CC 4.3	Adequate	The scope of the project is described in the introduction.
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the QMS scope clear and compliant with IEC?	CC 4.3	Adequate	"Applies to all six WPs, deliverables, horizontal processes..." (1.2 Scope of Evaluation).
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are stakeholders and outputs included in the scope definition?	CC 4.3	Adequate	"Scope covers... guidebooks, pilot testing, engagement tools, partner contributions."

ARTICLE 4.4 Definition of process approach

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the quality assurance plan sustainable throughout the project duration?	CC 4.4.1	Adequate	"...actively operational throughout the entire life cycle of the Project..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the quality strategy appropriate to the project scope?	CC 4.4.1	Adequate	"...structured to cover the entire project lifecycle..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is a process-based approach applied?	CC 4.4	Adequate	"...focuses on the methods, planning, and implementation processes..."
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk management processes integrated with the quality management system?	CC 4.4	Adequate	Risk management is included in the quality management system processes.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is it ensured that the plan has a dynamic structure?	CC 4.4.1	Adequate	10.1 / 5-7 / "The updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp as the Project Management System (PMS)..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the project management system used effectively in monitoring processes?	CC 4.4.1	Adequate	10.1 / 5-7 / "updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring data integrated with the project management system?	CC 4.4	Adequate	General project document, Lines 50-60: "Updates and monitoring tracked through ClickUp..."
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the quality assurance plan ensure continuity throughout the project duration?	CC 4.4	Partially Sufficient	"PMP is a foundational governance document..." (INTRODUCTION) **The relationship between continuity and quality assurance should be strengthened.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the monitoring plan in line with other plans in project management?	CC 4.4	Adequate	"This plan is developed alongside and in full alignment with QAP, RMP, and ESP." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the monitoring plan provide a harmonised and integrated structure with the	CC 4.4	Adequate	6. Conclusion, paragraph 1

	quality management system and risk management plan?			
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the processes defined and their interactions explained?	CC 4.4	Adequate	Process descriptions within the ESP.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks identified in all processes in the context of process approach?	CC 4.4	Adequate	Identification of risks specific to each work package and identification of relevant work package leaders as risk owners.
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	5. Are processes defined and explained with interaction?	CC 4.4	Adequate	"Integrated with QA, RMP, PMP", "cycled approach" and "layers: formative/summative/developmental".
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	6. Is process performance measured?	CC 4.4	Adequate	There is a monitoring mechanism with "feedback loops", "real-time data flows", "evaluation checkpoints (EC1-EC6)".

ARTICLE 5. Leadership

ARTICLE 5.1 Top management support

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality principles clearly stated?	CC 5.1.1	Adequate	"...strategic alignment, process quality, output quality, indicator-based monitoring..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are leadership and responsibilities included in the strategy?	CC 5.1	Adequate	Leadership structure defined in the QAP, supported by a chart of responsibilities
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring outputs integrated with project management?	CC 5.1.1 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Integration of monitoring findings into PM decisions is made explicit in SC meetings.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality meetings integrated into the project cycle?	CC 9.3 / CC 5.1.1	Adequate	Meeting schedule given for all WPs (E1.2 - E6.4), monthly WP meetings listed
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk assessment results integrated into decision-making processes?	CC 5.1.1	Adequate	Risk assessment reports are used in decision support meetings.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the conclusion in line with the project objectives?	CC 5.1.1	Adequate	Chapter 1, Lines 20-22: "This system is the product of a common quality culture..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are assessment results used effectively in decision-making processes?	CC 5.1	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan defines that the evaluation outputs collected by the PM Team are integrated into decision-making processes [D1.1]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the project coordinator effectively ensure the overall organisation of the evaluation process?	CC 5.1	Adequate	"Project Coordinator (ESTU): initiates evaluation calendar, synthesises findings..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the results of the assessment effectively integrated into subsequent management decisions and strategic planning?	CC 5.1	Adequate	"Summative findings inform strategic decision-making and reporting"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the evaluation strategy fully integrated into the project management architecture?	CC 5.1	Adequate	"The Evaluation Strategy Plan serves as a central pillar of the project's governance architecture"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are assessment results effectively integrated into strategic decision-making and quality assurance processes?	CC 5.1	Adequate	"Ensures evaluation directly informs course correction, quality reinforcement, strategic decision-making"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are quality principles clearly stated?	CC 5.1.1	Adequate	Grant Agreement p.24-25 and QAP defines the basic principles of quality (planning, sustainability, control, etc.) [GA, D1.1].

ARTICLE 5.2 The quality policy is specified in the QAP.

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is version control of monitoring documents ensured?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	"For each plan version, version number, date, responsible person and summary of changes are kept."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is retrospective traceability ensured?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	"For each plan version..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do all documents have version numbers?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	"For each plan version, version number..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the quality policy appropriate, communicated and understood?	CC 5.2	Adequate	Indirect emphasis on quality throughout the document.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is risk management associated with quality policy and objectives?	CC 5.2	Adequate	The document does not include a specific risk assessment for the quality policy or project quality objectives.
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	7. Is the quality policy clear and consistent with the project?	CC 5.2	Partially Sufficient	There are only **indirect statements such as** "commitment to excellence, transparency, long-term transformation"**. However: The policy is not named, clear principles are not stated. It is not associated with project objectives.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the policy understood by stakeholders?	CC 5.2	Partially Sufficient	There are statements on evaluation processes in SCs and WPs. **However, communication strategy about the Policy, Awareness raising activities, Mechanism for receiving comments or participation are not** detailed**.**

ARTICLE 5.3 Roles, responsibilities and authorisations

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the roles responsible for quality management clear?	CC 5.3	Adequate	Roles are defined in the "Responsibility" column.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is a clear governance structure for quality management defined?	CC 5.3 / CC 7.1.2	Adequate	Three-tier structure: SC, Coordination Team, clearly defined as WP Leaders (7.1)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the powers and responsibilities of decision-making bodies clear?	CC 5.3 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	SC defined with tasks such as approval of quality indicators, methodological change monitoring
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are coordination and execution tasks assigned to responsible persons?	CC 7.1.2 / CC 5.3	Adequate	ESTU and HU's QAP, Risk Plan, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans coordination is clear
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the roles of each WP leader in quality processes defined?	CC 5.3 / CC 7.1.2	Adequate	Each WP leader has responsibility for quality metric definition, implementation and reporting
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are all risks and precautions documented?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	All risks are documented in the Risk Register and Contingency Case ID structure [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk responsibilities clearly defined?	CC 5.3 / CC 7.1.2	Adequate	SC and WP leaders are clear about their responsibilities.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is the documentation on risk management up-to-date and accessible?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	The documents are up to date and in the central system.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are updates logged?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Decision Record Tables... Compliance and Consistency Reports"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring documents integrated into project processes?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring tools accessible to different stakeholders?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are all changes recorded?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Decision Record Tables..."

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do process owners take an active role in improvement?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"WP1 + All Partners..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are version changes clearly documented?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"summary of changes are kept."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is it easy to access current versions of documents?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Versions are shared on the ClickUp platform."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is version control responsibility defined?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"responsible person..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is access and archiving of old versions organised?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Only valid version is marked..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring outputs reflected in quality documents?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Internal Quality Audit Sheets..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are documents and records of the results kept regularly?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	Grant Agreement Article 20.1: Accuracy, completeness and accessibility of documents are guaranteed [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have process owners contributed to the evaluation?	CC 5.3	Adequate	Section 1, "...quality assurance system is not only the responsibility of WP1 but also operates across all WPs..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation reports prepared in accordance with the standards and in an understandable manner?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Evaluation reports follow structured formats aligned with EC expectations."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do the content and presentation formats comply with the principles set out in the QAP?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"How well do the content and delivery formats align with the principles defined in the QAP (D1.1)?"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the Steering Committee (SC) strategically review and decide on the evaluation results?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"SC reviews major evaluation results; authorises adjustments"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the tasks of preparing and synthesising evaluation reports clearly defined?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"Coordinator synthesises reports; PM Team supports"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How does the strategy ensure active participation and feedback from project stakeholders?	CC 7.4 CC 5.3	Adequate	"Stakeholders playing key roles in assessing value, usability"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the frequency of monitoring and responsibilities clear?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"Responsibility is distributed across the following... A structured reporting flow ensures timely decision-making." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined in the monitoring plan?	CC 5.3	Adequate	"Responsibility is distributed across the following: Task Contributors, WP Leaders, Project Coordinator, PM Team, Steering Committee." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are project monitoring roles and responsibilities clearly defined?	CC 5.3	Adequate	3. MONITORING ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES / Section 3.1-3.2
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring reporting flows and responsibilities clear and enforceable?	CC 5.3	Adequate	Sections 5.1 and 5.2

ARTICLE 6. Planning

ARTICLE 6.1 Addressing risks and opportunities

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is risk-based thinking integrated into the strategy?	CC 6.1	Adequate	"The effects of risks on quality are monitored and integrated with preventive planning."

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are risk management and quality control integrated?	CC 6.1 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	The integration of risk management and quality control is explicit.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there a defined structure in charge for the coordination and integration of feedback?	CC 10.2 / CC 6.1	Adequate	PM Team is responsible for collecting, evaluating and integrating feedback
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks systematically identified?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Risks are systematically identified in the WP planning and project cycle.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are preventive actions defined with a clear plan?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Risk Management Plan defines preventive strategies for 10 key risks through Risk Tracker and Heat Map [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are appropriate methods used to identify risks?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Standard methods such as SWOT, FMEA are used.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk assessment and control processes standardised?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Standardised procedures are applied to the entire project team.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the plan revised in line with the risks?	CC 6.1	Partially Sufficient	10.3 "...alignment between the QAP and the Risk Management Plan..." **Making risk analyses more visible.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is risk assessment carried out for critical changes?	CC 6.1	Partially Sufficient	10.3 "alignment between the QAP and the Risk Management Plan..." **Special risk analyses should be conducted for critical changes.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the results linked to risk assessments?	CC 6.1	Partially Sufficient	Section 1, Line 1-5: "...integrated into all Wps: QAP (T1.1), Risk Management Plan (T1.2), Monitoring Plan..." **The impact of risks on quality results must be clearly demonstrated**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality risks and opportunities associated with results?	CC 6.1	Partially Sufficient	Chapter 1, Line 3-7: "...integrated into all Wps: QAP (T1.1), Risk Management Plan (T1.2)..." **The impact of risks on quality results should be analysed more clearly**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has the integration of the plan with risk management been analysed?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Section 1, Line 4-7: "...Risk Management Plan (T1.2) integrated into all WPs..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is risk management taken into account in evaluation processes?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Section 1, Line 4-7: "...Risk Management Plan (T1.2) integrated into all WPs..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring process integrated into risk analyses?	CC 6.1	Adequate	Risk Management Plan (T1.2), Section 5, Line 12-30: "Monitoring integrated with risk analysis..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the assessment process integrated with project risk management?	CC 6.1	Adequate	"D1.2 RMP identifies triggers for evaluation review (e.g., risk materialisation → causes → effectiveness of mitigation)."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	What are the main enablers and barriers affecting project implementation?	CC 6.1	Partially Sufficient	"What are the key enablers and barriers affecting project implementation?" **Risk preventive mechanisms should be developed**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are risk reporting and deviation notification processes included in the assessment calendar?	CC 6.1	Adequate	"Evaluation timing linked to risk and deviation reporting flows"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the evaluation process support project outputs in terms of sustainability?	CC 6.1 CC 10.3	Adequate	"Evidence-based sustainability planning"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is risk management and monitoring integrated?	CC 6.1.2	Adequate	"Risk flags signal areas requiring intensified or adaptive monitoring." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Can the monitoring plan adapt to changing circumstances?	CC 6.1.1	Adequate	"Risk flags signal areas requiring intensified or adaptive monitoring." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Do monitoring activities support project risk management?	CC 6.1.2	Adequate	"Risk flags signal areas requiring intensified or adaptive monitoring." (INTRODUCTION)

PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the monitoring plan include early warning and response mechanisms?	CC 6.1.1	Adequate	"A colour-coded Traffic Light System to assess risk levels and alert decision-makers." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the monitoring plan adapt to changing conditions during the project period?	CC 6.1.1	Adequate	"These dimensions evolve in intensity and focus depending on the project phase, WP dynamics, and external environment." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the principles of monitoring?	CC 6.1, CC 7.2	Adequate	Text: 2.1 Conceptual Monitoring Logic, Lines: 7-18
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Has a systematic approach been taken to address risks and evaluate opportunities?	CC 6.1	Adequate	"Risk evaluation... according to a pre-defined set of criteria."; existence of a risk analysis matrix.

ARTICLE 6.2 Quality objectives and performance indicators

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the project objectives and the quality plan compatible?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	"...in line with Erasmus+ programme priorities, application form objectives..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Can quality objectives be monitored and measured?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	"...systematically monitor PIs to ensure achievement of quantitative and qualitative targets..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the quality management schedule feasible and realistic?	CC 6.2	Adequate	"Quality Management Milestones" are presented in a detailed and Gantt compatible manner.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are KPIs aligned with strategic objectives?	CC 6.2 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	The relationship of KPIs to project objectives is explained
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are KPI targets measurable?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Target, method, context are determined for each KPI
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are the objectives set for risk management clear and measurable?	CC 6.2	Partially Sufficient	There are targets, but some are not measurable. **Reorganise the objectives according to SMART criteria.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the indicators comply with SMART criteria?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	10.4 "Update of indicator..." **Indicators should be re-evaluated according to SMART criteria.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the change protocol in line with quality objectives?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	10.4 "Application Protocol" **Regular review of protocol compliance with quality objectives.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do KPIs contribute to the improvement process?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	10.4 "Update of indicator..." **KPI performance evaluations should be increased.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has it been analysed whether quality targets have been achieved?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	Section 1: General project objectives mentioned but no details **Measurements of target realisation status should be added**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality performance indicators in line with results?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	Section 1, "...quality assurance system focuses not only on outputs but also on process..." **Harmonisation between performance indicators and results should be increased**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have quality objectives been checked for currency and consistency?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	Chapter 1, "Living Documents and Versioning allow rapid adaptation..." **Periodic control and update processes of targets should be formalised**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the evaluation strategy aligned with quality objectives?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Section 1,: "...quality assurance system focuses on process, participation, impact and permanence..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have performance indicators been determined for the project objectives?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Chapter 1, Line 2-6: "Quality assurance system focuses not only on outputs but also on process, participation..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the monitoring indicators in line with SMART criteria?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 2, "Indicators aligned with project goals..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the performance indicators in line with the project objectives?	CC 6.2	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan clearly presents KPI and PI tables and performance indicators in line with project objectives [D1.1]

PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are external developments (e.g. policy changes, digital trends) taken into account in the project?	CC 6.2	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan defines versioning strategies and processes for adaptation to external changes [D1.1]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are the project objectives and the quality plan compatible?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Quality Assurance Plan and Monitoring Plan provide an integrated structure through WP objectives and Gantt chart [D1.1, D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Can quality objectives be monitored and measured?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	Quality indicators are associated with measurable objectives in Grant Agreement Table 1 and QAP [GA, D1.1]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Do monitoring activities contribute to the project objectives?	CC 6.2.1	Adequate	The Monitoring Plan has structured the monitoring dimensions to cover the target contributions: progress, performance, participation, etc. [D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the monitoring plan an effective tool for achieving project objectives?	CC 6.2.1	Partially Sufficient	"Monitoring in the EPD-Net Project is not merely an administrative exercise..." (INTRODUCTION) **Monitoring effectiveness should be monitored and increased.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are the indicators used in the monitoring process appropriate to the project objectives?	CC 6.2	Adequate	"PIs help define what is to be monitored and how performance is judged." (INTRODUCTION)

ARTICLE 6.3 Planning of changes

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is a protocol applied for risk level changes?	CC 6.3	Adequate	Risk score changes are reviewed by SC.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk plans open to revision?	CC 6.3	Adequate	Risk plans can be dynamically updated.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Have emergency plans been established for critical risks?	CC 6.3	Adequate	Emergency scenarios and response plans are defined within the scope of Escalation Triggers and CRF [D1.2]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the quality plan based on the update principle?	CC 6.3	Adequate	10.1 / 1-7 / "quality assurance is not designed as a fixed, one-off plan, but as a continuously updated and learning system throughout the project lifecycle."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the update steps clearly defined?	CC 6.3	Adequate	10.2 / 9-22 / "The revision and monitoring process of the QAP is structured in the following steps..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the types of changes clearly categorised?	CC 6.3	Adequate	10.4 / 39-47 / "Changes that can be made to the QAP are classified in three categories..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are changes subject to the approval process?	CC 6.3	Adequate	10.4 / 39-47 / "SC approval required... agreement of all partners is required..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the evaluation plan linked to project sustainability?	CC 6.3	Adequate	"Impact-level evaluation estimates the project's long-term value, policy relevance, and sustainability potential."

ARTICLE 7. Support

ARTICLE 7.1 Sources: Human-centred and digital platforms (ClickUp, MEGA)

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the measurement tools aligned with the quality strategy?	CC 7.1.5	Adequate	"Indicators, surveys, feedback forms and monitoring reports..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the selection of external experts transparent?	CC 8.4.1 / CC 7.1.6	Adequate	It is stated that it will be selected through an open and transparent tender process
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are feedback tools and timings clearly defined?	CC 7.1.5.2 / CC 9.1.1.1	Adequate	In 6.2, each method, timing, responsible and target group is clearly given in a table

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are coordination and execution tasks assigned to responsible persons?	CC 7.1.2 / CC 5.3	Adequate	ESTU and HU's QAP, Risk Plan, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans coordination is clear
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are responsibilities carried out in line with the project timeline and deliverables?	CC 7.1.2 / CC 8.1	Adequate	WP1 leader ensures that tasks are coordinated with project objectives and timelines
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are the tools and systems used in risk management up-to-date and appropriate?	CC 7.1.3	Adequate	Systems such as Contingency Framework, Escalation Plan and Risk Tracker have been defined [GA]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are sufficient resources provided for risk management?	CC 7.1	Adequate	The reserves of human, time and financial resources defined in the CRF are described [D1.2]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are technological tools used effectively in assessment processes?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"ClickUp platform supports real-time data capture and evidence repository."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How is the scientific, pedagogical and technical quality of project outputs assessed?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"Are the outputs (training module, guidebooks, tools) internally coherent and technically/scientifically valid?"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the ClickUp platform used effectively for collecting and tracking evaluation data?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"ClickUp platform serves as the real-time data capture..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation activities carried out in a regular and planned manner in accordance with the project monitoring schedule?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"Evaluation activities are sequenced and linked to the project calendar"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the PM Team effectively carry out the design and technical validation of the assessment tools?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"PM Team leads development and application of quality checklists"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is there effective co-operation between the PM Team and WP leaders on the design of evaluation tools?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"PM Team leads; WP Leaders contribute; use shared templates"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the ClickUp platform used effectively for role distribution and task tracking?	CC 7.1	Adequate	"ClickUp supports data capture, ownership tracking, comments, archiving"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring and measurement tools defined?	CC 7.1.5	Adequate	"ClickUp as the central operational tool... standardised set of performance indicators..." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the monitoring plan understood by all project stakeholders?	CC 7.1.6	Partially Sufficient	"Establish a common monitoring language and standard across all partners and WPs." (INTRODUCTION) **Provide user-friendly guides and training.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring tools up-to-date and accessible?	CC 7.1.5	Partially Sufficient	"ClickUp as the central operational tool for task tracking..." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) **Vehicle updates and access rights should be clarified.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the project monitoring system multi-layered, structured and responsive?	CC 7.1.4, CC 8.1	Adequate	Text: 2. MONITORING STRATEGY AND METHODOLOGY, Lines: 1-6
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the role of the ClickUp platform in monitoring coordination effectively defined?	CC 7.1	Adequate	3.3 Role of ClickUp in Monitoring Coordination / Full text
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the integration of digital platforms (ClickUp etc.) into the monitoring process sufficient and effective?	CC 7.1	Adequate	4.6 Digital Integration and Traceability / Full text
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Has resource planning been assessed in relation to risks?	CC 7.1	Partially Sufficient	"...unavailability of key personnel, delays in deliveries...". **Roles and time risks are defined, other types of resources (material, infrastructure) are limited. Risk assessments should also be made for physical, information and financial resources.**

ARTICLE 7.2 Qualification: Training modules

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are employees trained in risk management?	CC 7.2	Adequate	Risk trainings integrated into WP-based job descriptions were planned and implemented [D1.2]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the participation of project stakeholders in the evaluation processes sufficient?	CC 7.2	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan describes stakeholder engagement through ECHO sessions, surveys and mentoring [D1.1]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the training content and products suitable for the needs of the target audience?	CC 7.2	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan assesses the suitability of training content for the target audience through pilot tests and user satisfaction surveys [D1.1]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do task leaders and partners complete the data entry required for the evaluation?	CC 7.2	Adequate	"Task Leaders provide input into EQT, feedback forms, logs"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do relevant WPs take the necessary responsibility for impact verification at policy level?	CC 7.2	Adequate	"WP5 leads policy impact validation with external advCCrs"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the principles of monitoring?	CC 6.1, CC 7.2	Adequate	Text: 2.1 Conceptual Monitoring Logic, Lines: 7-18

ARTICLE 7.3 Awareness: Pre-pilot information activities, dissemination

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do all partners make a meaningful and balanced contribution to the WPs in which they are involved?	CC 7.3	Partially Sufficient	Given in work packages **Participation monitoring and incentive system should be established**
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Has the organisation considered risks in communication processes for information sharing and awareness?	CC 7.3	Partially Sufficient	"...Communication procedures within the consortium... risk owners identified." **Information flow within the consortium is defined, but risks such as loss of information, communication breakdowns should be analysed in detail**.

ARTICLE 7.4 Communication: Inter-plan communication protocols and meeting cycle

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are stakeholders included in risk processes?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Stakeholder engagement is integrated into the risk process through the advisory board and feedback mechanisms [GA]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk communication plans defined and implemented?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Communication plan is carried out through Risk Escalation flow monitored via ClickUp and SC meetings [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are third parties involved in risk management processes?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Subcontractors and third party contributors are included in the risk process [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are stakeholders involved in the update process?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"SC approval required... partners are informed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are changes notified to the relevant parties?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"partners are informed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are improvement results shared with stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"partners are informed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are external expert opinions evaluated in the monitoring process?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"Medium Term Revision - External Expert"

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the monitoring process and results regularly communicated to project stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"partners are informed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Were stakeholders' views taken during the evaluation process?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Section 1, "A wide range of target groups, from educators to public administrators..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there evidence that results are shared with project stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	Section 1, "A wide range of target groups... included in the feedback system." **Systematic presentation of results to stakeholders should be ensured**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are stakeholders involved in the evaluation process?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Section 1, "A wide range of target groups, from educators to public administrators..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results presented to stakeholders in regular reports?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 4, Line 10-20: "Results communicated to stakeholders regularly..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring plan accessible and understandable to stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 1, Line 5-15: "The plan is accessible and clear for stakeholders..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation results effectively shared with the project management team and stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan states that evaluation outputs are used in SC decisions (Section: Evaluation Governance) [D1.1]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does intra-project communication support the effectiveness of evaluation processes?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Communication Management Plan outlines data handling and sharing protocols." **Communication processes should be reviewed and improved.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Can the training module be reused in other regional or thematic contexts?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"How replicable is the training module in other regional or thematic contexts?" **Pilot applications in different contexts**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the number of interviews and focus groups conducted during the evaluation appropriate and sufficient for the purpose?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Focus Groups / Interviews qualitative data collection" **Expand negotiation plans**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do stakeholders and end users participate in the evaluation processes and provide feedback?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Stakeholders provide feedback on training modules and engagement tools" **Stakeholder participation should be encouraged**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do relevant WPs fulfil their duties in collecting and managing stakeholder feedback?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"WP3, WP4, WP5 lead feedback capture via surveys and interviews" **The process should be improved and accelerated**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is there cross-role co-operation and information flow throughout the project?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"Distributed roles promote collaboration; communication via ClickUp and meetings"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are management and reporting meetings (QMR, SC, etc.) integrated into the evaluation calendar?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"Evaluation activities aligned with QMRs, SC meetings, QA reviews"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation activities and milestones shared with all stakeholders of the consortium?	CC 7.4	Adequate	"Shared ClickUp calendar; alerts sent to partners"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How does the strategy ensure active participation and feedback from project stakeholders?	CC 7.4 CC 5.3	Adequate	"Stakeholders playing key roles in assessing value, usability"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the stakeholder engagement and communication plan integrated with monitoring?	CC 7.4	Adequate	Monitoring Plan collects engagement data on ClickUp to track stakeholder interaction [D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring results regularly shared with all stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Project Coordinator (ESTU) (reporting processes and EC updates)..." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) **Establish a regular and comprehensive stakeholder information mechanism.**

PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is feedback from project stakeholders taken into account in the monitoring process?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Engagement Monitoring: Stakeholder participation, outreach responsiveness, feedback loops." (INTRODUCTION) **Feedback should be integrated into the monitoring process.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring reports regularly updated and distributed?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"A structured reporting flow ensures timely decision-making and compliance with EC requirements." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) **Periodic updating and regular distribution of reports should be ensured.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is there effective communication with stakeholders within the scope of the monitoring plan?	CC 7.4	Partially Sufficient	"Communication Management Plan serves as a valuable input for PMP." (INTRODUCTION) **Standardised procedures for stakeholder communication should be established.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the data sources used in monitoring?	CC 7.4, CC 8.4	Adequate	2.3 Methodological Components / A Data Collection Sources,
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the monitoring plan offer an adaptable structure that is sensitive to the needs and expectations of stakeholders?	CC 7.4	Adequate	6. Conclusion, Strategic Added Value items
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are third parties involved in risk management processes?	CC 7.4	Adequate	**"External Experts / Evaluators** Independent validation Review risk processes during mid-term and final assessment; provide recommendations on systemic risks or blind spots Review risk-related processes during midterm and final external assessments." *(Source: D1.2, p.13 - Roles and Responsibilities)* Subcontractors and third party contributors are included in the risk process, whereas in the risk analysis plan, third parties (in particular independent external experts/assessors) are not directly involved in the decision-making but have a role in reviewing systemic risks and providing recommendations during midterm and final assessments.

ARTICLE 7.5 Documentation

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are external evaluations recorded?	CC 7.5 / CC 8.2.4	Adequate	External expert reports, partner evaluation forms, decision documents listed
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are revisions monitored and documented?	CC 7.5 / CC 10.2.2	Adequate	Integrated tracking with ClickUp, Gantt and PI tracking explained
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are all risks and precautions documented?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	All risks are documented in the Risk Register and Contingency Case ID structure [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is the documentation on risk management up-to-date and accessible?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	The documents are up to date and in the central system.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the outputs of dissemination activities recorded in a traceable manner?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 7.5	Adequate	9.2 "User statistics, interaction data"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the outputs of dissemination activities recorded in a traceable manner?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 7.5	Adequate	9.2 "User statistics, interaction data"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are updates logged?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.3 "Decision Record Tables... Compliance and Consistency Reports"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring documents integrated into project processes?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.1 "updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is version control of monitoring documents ensured?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	10.6 "For each plan version, version number, date, responsible person and summary of changes are kept."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring tools accessible to different stakeholders?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.1 "updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is retrospective traceability ensured?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	10.6 "For each plan version..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are all changes recorded?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.3 "Decision Record Tables..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do all documents have version numbers?	CC 7.5.2	Adequate	10.6 "For each plan version, version number..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are version changes clearly documented?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.6 "summary of changes are kept."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is it easy to access current versions of documents?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.1 "Versions are shared on the ClickUp platform."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is access and archiving of old versions organised?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.6 "Only valid version is marked..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring outputs reflected in quality documents?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	10.3 "Internal Quality Audit Sheets..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are documents and records of the results kept regularly?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	Grant Agreement Article 20.1: Accuracy, completeness and accessibility of documents are guaranteed [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the methods used in the assessment clearly stated?	CC 7.5.1	Adequate	Grant Agreement p.24-25: Methods such as survey, interview, focus group are clearly defined [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the evaluation criteria for project outputs clearly defined?	CC 7.5.1	Partially Sufficient	Section 1,: "...includes digital module development, pilot tests, dissemination..." **Criteria should be clarified and concrete criteria should be developed**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the monitoring tools and methodology comply with the standards?	CC 7.5.1	Partially Sufficient	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Annexes,: "Tools and methods described..." **Standard compliance of the tools and methodology used should be documented**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the security of the data used in the evaluation processes ensured?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Access rights and storage standards follow QAP."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation reports prepared in accordance with the standards and in an understandable manner?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"Evaluation reports follow structured formats aligned with EC expectations."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do the content and presentation formats comply with the principles set out in the QAP?	CC 7.5.3	Adequate	"How well do the content and delivery formats align with the principles defined in the QAP (D1.1)?"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the quantitative and qualitative data sources used for the evaluation sufficiently diversified?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"The evaluation strategy combines multiple data sources-both qualitative and quantitative"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are assessment tools and templates standardised and used effectively?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"The following tools and templates are standardised and used..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the task status and progress information on the ClickUp platform provide effective support for the evaluation analysis?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Task status + progress inputs to effectiveness analysis"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How is the reliability and accuracy of the quantitative data used in the evaluation process ensured?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Quantitative data generated by WP teams and coordinators"

PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do the documents and comments on ClickUp provide sufficient evidence for the evaluation?	CC 7.5.1	Adequate	"Attachments + comments evidence collaboration and responsiveness"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are there formal documentation processes for communicating SC decisions and evaluation findings?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"SC resolution memos and meeting minutes document decisions"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation reports made available to target audiences in appropriate formats and in a timely manner?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Various report formats for consortium, EC, stakeholders"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are all evaluation outputs archived regularly on the MEGA cloud drive and ClickUp?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Reports stored in ClickUp and MEGA cloud shared folders"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do digital tools (EQT, OAT, ITL, ClickUp) provide transparency and traceability in data management?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"Benefits from seamless integration with ClickUp digital environment"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the reporting format and frequency of monitoring results adequate?	CC 7.5	Adequate	It describes regular reporting in formats such as Monitoring Plan, QMR and final report [D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Which tools are used in monitoring?	CC 7.5, CC 8.5	Adequate	Text: 2.3 Methodological Components / B Monitoring Instruments,
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Do data management, storage and access policies comply with data integrity and accessibility standards?	CC 7.5	Adequate	5.3 Data Management, Storage, and Access
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Do monitoring tools and reporting systems comply with quality control and transparency standards?	CC 7.5	Adequate	6. Conclusion, Key Achievements items
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is the reliability and accessibility of documentation protected against risks?	CC 7.5	Adequate	"...The Risk Register will be updated continuously..."

ARTICLE 8. Operation

ARTICLE 8.1 Operational planning and control

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the relationship between inputs and outputs and quality clarified?	CC 8.1	Adequate	"...final outputs to ensure they meet predefined standards..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is an internal quality assurance structure defined?	CC 9.2.2 / CC 8.1	Adequate	WP1 leadership, WP leaders, monthly WP meetings, quality control checklists defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are responsibilities carried out in line with the project timeline and deliverables?	CC 7.1.2 / CC 8.1	Adequate	WP1 leader ensures that tasks are coordinated with project objectives and timelines
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the evaluation schedule in line with the project plan and deliverables?	CC 8.1	Adequate	"Evaluation calendar aligned with DoA, milestones, governance cycles"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are all assessment activities planned and carried out at specified times?	CC 8.1	Adequate	"Activities planned per months (M4, M6, M9, etc.) with leads and linked plans"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does ClickUp calendar integration and alerts (14 days in advance) work effectively?	CC 8.1	Partially Sufficient	"Milestones and alerts configured in ClickUp calendar" **User trainings should be increased**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are task cards and checklists for evaluation activities created regularly?	CC 8.1	Adequate	"Evaluation-specific task cards and checklists created for each WP"

PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring activities carried out in accordance with the project budget?	CC 8.1.3	Adequate	"Financial Monitoring: Properly and efficiently using of project budget allocated for WPs, tasks and to different partners." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the project monitoring system multi-layered, structured and responsive?	CC 7.1.4, CC 8.1	Adequate	Text: 2. MONITORING STRATEGY AND METHODOLOGY, Lines: 1-6
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	How is the timing of monitoring activities determined?	CC 8.1.3	Adequate	Text: 2.3 Methodological Components / C Monitoring Timeline, Lines: 73-84

ARTICLE 8.2 Pilot test feedback and evaluation strategy

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are external evaluations recorded?	CC 7.5 / CC 8.2.4	Adequate	External expert reports, partner evaluation forms, decision documents listed
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the outputs obtained in the project suitable for the needs of the users?	CC 8.2	Adequate	The Quality Assurance Plan describes measuring user needs in pilot tests and receiving feedback via EPD_Assist [D1.1]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the main objectives of the project realised on time and at the expected quality level?	CC 8.2	Adequate	"Are the project's main objectives (as stated in the GA) being met on time and at expected quality levels?"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are target stakeholders adequately reached and involved?	CC 8.2	Partially Sufficient	(planners, educators, public institutions, NGOs) have been adequately reached and involved **More comprehensive engagement strategies can be developed**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are stakeholder participation and feedback mechanisms adequately functioning in the evaluation process?	CC 8.2	Adequate	QAP Chapter 6 and GA p.26-27; surveys, interviews and focus groups planned [D1.1, GA]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Have the review dates of the European Commission been taken into account?	CC 8.2	Adequate	"Evaluation calendar aligned with EC review points"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the main objectives of monitoring?	CC 8.2.1, CC 9.1	Adequate	Text: 2.2 Key Monitoring Objectives, Lines: 19-38

ARTICLE 8.3-8.5 Production of project-specific result-oriented outputs (platform, module, etc.)

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality criteria clearly defined?	CC 8.5.1	Adequate	"Managerial Quality Criteria" and "Academic/Contextual Quality Criteria" are differentiated.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the quality criteria in line with Erasmus+ and ESG standards?	CC 4.2 / CC 8.5.1	Partially Sufficient	Reference is made but no examples are given of criteria that directly map to ESG. **ESG 2015 clauses could be referred to more directly.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the selection of external experts transparent?	CC 8.4.1 / CC 7.1.6	Adequate	It is stated that it will be selected through an open and transparent tender process
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the user experience and training content updated based on feedback?	CC 8.5.6 / CC 10.3	Adequate	Trainers also develop content as users, AI-powered module is constantly updated
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk mitigation strategies effectively implemented?	CC 8.5.1	Adequate	Planned strategies are implemented and results are monitored.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are the measures taken against risks effective and sustainable?	CC 8.5.1	Adequate	Sustainability of the measures taken is ensured through monitoring and evaluation cycles [D1.2]

RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Do the measures taken against risks comply with legal and regulatory requirements?	CC 8.5.1	Adequate	Compliance with the law is ensured by regular inspections.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there an implementation protocol for each change?	CC 8.5.6	Adequate	10.4 / "Application Protocol" table
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the impact of changes assessed and documented?	CC 8.5.6	Adequate	10.3 / "Decision Record Tables..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the outputs comply with quality standards?	CC 8.5.1	Partially Sufficient	The general purpose and quality objectives of the project are explained. **Full compliance with quality standards should be audited**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is monitoring and evaluation data regularly collected and analysed?	CC 8.4	Adequate	"The ClickUp platform serves as the real-time data capture, task tracking, and evidence repository supporting the evaluation cycle."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the frequency and method of monitoring appropriate to the project requirements?	CC 8.5	Adequate	"The EPD-Net Project implements a multi-frequency monitoring approach, calibrated according to the granularity and strategic weight of each monitoring task."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do the pilots reflect real-world ecological planning and disaster resilience scenarios?	CC 8.5	Partially Sufficient	"To what extent do pilots reflect real-world ecological planning and disaster resilience scenarios?" **Wider and more diverse scenarios should be included**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is there consistency in quality between WPs and partners?	CC 8.4.1	Partially Sufficient	"Is there consistency in quality across WPs and partners?" **Standardisation and joint trainings should be increased**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the project outputs sustainable after the life of the project?	CC 8.5	Partially Sufficient	"Are there indications that the outputs will be maintained or institutionalised beyond the project's lifetime?" **Monitoring and support mechanisms should be established**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	What policy, curricular or organisational changes has the EPD-Net project influenced?	CC 8.3	Partially Sufficient	**It is proposed to add a section.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do WP leaders provide complete and timely evaluation data as part of their work packages?	CC 8.4	Partially Sufficient	"WP Leaders collect data; interpret deviations; propose adaptations" **Optimise data collection processes**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the data collection process defined and implemented at WP level?	CC 8.4	Adequate	GA p.60; pilot data collection through questionnaires, observation and suggestion forms is clearly defined [GA]
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the evaluation milestones (EC1-EC6) being completed on time and as planned?	CC 8.5	Partially Sufficient	"Evaluation checkpoints defined with timing, purpose, and outputs" **Monitoring and warning systems should be increased**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	How is the accuracy of monitoring results ensured?	CC 8.5.1	Partially Sufficient	"Monitoring data serves as the factual basis for both quality assessments and risk detection." (INTRODUCTION) **Procedures for verification of monitoring results should be added.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the monitoring plan aligned with sustainability goals?	CC 8.4	Adequate	"Sustainability Monitoring: Institutional anchoring, policy relevance, potential for adoption and replication." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring results integrated into quality assurance processes?	CC 8.5.1	Adequate	"Monitoring data serves as the factual basis for both quality assessments and risk detection." (INTRODUCTION)
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	How does the monitoring plan support sustainability and long-term impact?	CC 8.4	Adequate	"Sustainability Monitoring: Institutional anchoring, policy relevance, potential for adoption and replication." (INTRODUCTION)

PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the data sources used in monitoring?	CC 7.4, CC 8.4	Adequate	2.3 Methodological Components / A Data Collection Sources,
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Which tools are used in monitoring?	CC 7.5, CC 8.5	Adequate	Text: 2.3 Methodological Components / B Monitoring Instruments,
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the development process planned?	CC 8.3	Adequate	"Evaluation Logic" section.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks addressed in the design and development process?	CC 8.3	Adequate	"...during the early phases of design, possible delays or failures are anticipated..." statement.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Have the risks of suppliers or outsourced processes been analysed?	CC 8.4	Adequate	Partner risks within the consortium include
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are stakeholder inputs integrated into the design?	CC 8.3	Adequate	Pilot user surveys, stakeholder feedback, focus groups.

ARTICLE 8.6-8.7 Non-conformity control

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality criteria set for the final outputs?	CC 8.6	Adequate	Under "Deliverable Quality Criteria"; items such as academic validity, user suitability, multilingualism are clearly explained.
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the evaluation process provide sufficient data for formal project reviews and EC reporting?	CC 8.7	Adequate	"Formal project reviews (e.g., mid-term and final evaluations)"
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks identified in the context of pre-delivery product/service validity?	CC 8.6	Partially Sufficient	There is no specific section on risks that may arise during the delivery and verification phase. **The plan covers general risks but lacks risk analysis specific to end product/service validation. Risks associated with final validation and user acceptance testing (late tests, incorrect results, etc.) should be specifically identified.**
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks for post-delivery non-conformities identified?	CC 8.7	Partially Sufficient	There is no section on "post-delivery" risks at the end of the plan or in its annexes. **The plan is focussed on the project process; there is no specific risk for non-conformities that may occur after delivery. A special area should be added for post-delivery risks such as deviation of project outputs from expectations, non-acceptance by users, inability to be implemented in the field.**

ARTICLE 9. Performance Evaluation

ARTICLE 9.1 Monitoring, measurement, analysis and evaluation

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is a systematic approach defined for performance monitoring?	CC 9.1	Adequate	"...indicators, surveys, feedback forms and monitoring reports..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Can process quality criteria be measured?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Criteria given in a table: 90% on time, 80% attendance, etc.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the tools used in the quality monitoring process sufficiently explained?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	With the "Monitoring Tool" column, it is clear what will be used at each checkpoint.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are risk management and quality control integrated?	CC 6.1 / CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	"Risk Register" follow-up is explained but the example for quality impact is weak.

				The effect of risks on quality output should be explained more clearly by giving examples.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring and evaluation system clearly defined?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	3 Plans defined: Monitoring Plan, Evaluation Strategy Plan, KPI system
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring approach and tools explained?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	ClickUp, "Monitoring Plan" (D1.3) referenced
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the evaluation process systematically defined?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	Evaluation Strategy Plan (D1.4), SC meetings, periodic reports specified
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are KPIs aligned with strategic objectives?	CC 6.2 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	The relationship of KPIs to project objectives is explained
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring outputs integrated with project management?	CC 5.1.1 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Reference is made to WP1 and SC meetings. Monitoring systems (ClickUp, QMR, WP Sheets) are defined, links between plans are clear
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are evidence-based decision-making ensured through performance indicators?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	KPI definition is available but its impact on decision-making processes is not concrete **How KPI results are linked to exemplary decision-making mechanisms**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is stakeholder satisfaction included in the assessment?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	Participant/stakeholder satisfaction is measured with KPI2 (70%) and KPI3 (75%)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are internal quality tools and methods systematically presented?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Checklists, ClickUp Gantt tracking, monthly meetings, quality mapping
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is quality control effective throughout the life cycle?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 10.3	Adequate	Quality control activities defined throughout the entire project process
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the feedback system multi-sourced and systematic?	CC 9.1.2 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Data collection from students, trainers, sector representatives, external stakeholders by different means defined (survey, panel, ECHO)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are feedback tools and timings clearly defined?	CC 7.1.5.2 / CC 9.1.1.1	Adequate	In 6.2, each method, timing, responsible and target group are clearly given in a table
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is feedback analysed and prioritised?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 10.2.1	Adequate	PM Team analysis process, content/time/impact based prioritisation explained (6.3)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is institutionalisation and sustainability of quality planned at the final stage?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 10.3	Adequate	E6.4 panel, transformation to permanent EPD-Net curriculum with external stakeholder oriented quality assessment targeted
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality processes regularly controlled?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	Regular evaluation, quality reports and audits at project milestones planned
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risks associated with quality?	CC 8.5.1 / CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Risk outputs are integrated into quality reports.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is the effectiveness of preventive actions measured?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	There is activity measurement, but reporting is not regular. **Standardise measurement and reporting processes.**
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk monitoring and reporting processes in place?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Monthly and quarterly assessment cycles are synchronised with QA reports [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are there feedback mechanisms for preventive actions?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Feedback based on QA reports is integrated into SC decision processes [D1.2]
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is risk data analysed regularly?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Regular data analysis and trend monitoring are carried out.
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk management performance indicators defined?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	Risk management performance indicators are integrated into the quality assurance plan [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring strategies defined in line with project objectives?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.1 / "integrates quality assurance mechanisms directly into these processes"

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have criteria for the quality of project outputs been determined?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.2 / "Materials Quality Measure Monitoring Tool" table **Quality measures are clear and supported by different types of monitoring tools**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality indicators monitored at regular intervals?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.4 / "KPIs monitored at annual evaluation meetings" **Reporting should be standardised**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality data collected systematically?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Quality data is collected regularly through user statistics, internal audit and monitoring cycle [GA, D1.1]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results integrated into decision-making processes?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	9.1 / "stakeholder satisfaction... analyses are regularly measured" **Develop a procedure for the integration of monitoring and decision-making**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination strategies associated with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.2 / / "dissemination plan supported by quality assurance measures"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the effectiveness of dissemination activities evaluated?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.2 / "Feedback from target groups, Satisfaction Surveys"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is stakeholder participation ensured in the monitoring process?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	9.1 / "stakeholder satisfaction... regularly measured"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do feedback mechanisms function in a way that contributes to quality improvement?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	9.3 / / "ongoing feedback and continuous updating"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring findings regularly analysed and reported?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.4 / "Post-pilot survey, Feedback after presentation"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the outputs of dissemination activities recorded in a traceable manner?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 7.5	Adequate	9.2 / "User statistics, interaction data"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are sustainability goals linked to measurable metrics?	CC 9.1.1	Partially Sufficient	9.4 / "KPIs have been identified" **10.10 Quality Results Interpretation and Integration Mechanisms", text should be added that does not aim to clearly and comprehensively answer how quality objectives are linked to sustainability indicators and impact analyses in order to link sustainability objectives to measurable metrics. At the same time, it can also be stated that how the weaknesses and development opportunities identified in the quality processes are addressed and how improvement plans are developed in this direction should be addressed in detail.**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination tools (web, publications, seminars, etc.) planned in line with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.2 / "multilingual design, feedback from target groups" **Advanced analysis tools should be used**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the impact of the findings measured after the project?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	9.1 / "Evaluation based on Impact Indicators" **10.10 Quality Results Interpretation and Integration Mechanisms, text revision should be made on how quality objectives are associated with sustainability indicators and impact analyses**.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring strategies defined in line with project objectives?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.1 / "integrates quality assurance mechanisms... for long-term sustainability"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have criteria for the quality of project outputs been determined?	CC 9.1.1	Partially Sufficient	9.2 / "Quality Measure / Monitoring Tool" table **All outputs need to be defined with clear and measurable quality criteria**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality indicators monitored at regular intervals?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.4 / "KPIs have been identified... monitored annually"

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality data collected systematically?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Quality data is collected regularly through user statistics, internal audit and monitoring cycle [GA, D1.1]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results integrated into decision-making processes?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	9.1 / "stakeholder satisfaction, effectiveness and benefit analyses are regularly measured" **Develop a procedure for the timely integration of monitoring results into decision-making processes**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination strategies associated with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.2/ "dissemination plan (T5.2) supported by quality assurance measures"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the effectiveness of dissemination activities evaluated?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.2 / "Feedback from target groups, Satisfaction Surveys"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is stakeholder participation ensured in the monitoring process?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	9.1 / "stakeholder satisfaction... are regularly measured"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do feedback mechanisms function in a way that contributes to quality improvement?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	9.3 / / "Quality diffusion through ongoing feedback and continuous updating"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring findings regularly analysed and reported?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	9.4 / / "Post-pilot survey, Feedback after presentation"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the outputs of dissemination activities recorded in a traceable manner?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 7.5	Adequate	9.2 / / "User statistics, interaction data"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are sustainability goals linked to measurable metrics?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.4 / / "KPIs have been identified" **Clear integration of KPI results into decision-making mechanisms**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination tools (web, publications, seminars, etc.) planned in line with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	9.2 / / "multilingual and accessible design... feedback from target groups"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the impact of the findings measured after the project?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	9.1 / / "Evaluation based on Impact Indicators" **Advanced metrics and analysis tools should be used**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the effectiveness of updates measured?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	10.3 / / "Internal Quality Audit Sheets... Review Matrices"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the monitoring tools used clearly defined?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	10.3 / "The following tools are used to monitor the effectiveness..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the data collection methods reliable and valid?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	The evaluation process is methodological and related to ESG and Evaluation Plan
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do monitoring results influence decision-making processes?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	10.3 / "Internal Quality Audit Sheets... Review Matrices... Decision Record Tables"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is monitoring data updated at regular intervals?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	10.1 / "The updateability of the QAP is managed and tracked using ClickUp..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do feedback mechanisms support continuous improvement?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	10.3 / / "Internal Quality Audit Sheets..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring and updating process comprehensive?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	10.2 / "The revision and monitoring process of the QAP..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results presented in regular reports?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	10.3 / "Internal audit reports are generated."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the results supported by measurable outputs?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	Section 1,: "...focuses not only on outputs but also on process, participation..." **Performance indicators and measurements should be added**

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have analyses been made on the efficiency of processes?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Monitoring systems (ClickUp, QMR, WP Sheets) defined, links between plans open
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has the applicability and effectiveness of the plan been analysed?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	Section 1,: "...quality assurance system is not only the responsibility of WP1 but also operates in all WPs..." **Applicability and effectiveness measurement criteria should be developed**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results supported by regular reports?	CC 9.1.3	Partially Sufficient	Section 1: "...quality assurance system is continuously updated..." **Reporting processes should be concretised and periodic**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the results compared with project performance indicators?	CC 9.1.1	Partially Sufficient	Part 1, "Quality assurance system focuses not only on outputs but also on process... **Comparison methodologies should be detailed**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the assessment tools and methods reliable and valid?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	Grant Agreement WP4 & D4.1: Reliability is ensured through observation, feedback forms and multiple data sources [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the results of the evaluation contribute to decision-making processes?	CC 9.1.3	Adequate	The impact and validity of feedback on decision-making processes are defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Does the monitoring plan define regular data collection processes?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 3,: "...defines regular data collection procedures..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the reliability of data collection methods regularly checked?	CC 9.1.2	Adequate	Grant Agreement WP4: Pre-test checking, triangulation and verification with multi-source data [GA]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Does the Evaluation Strategy Plan prepared for the EPD-Net Project continuously and holistically measure project performance?	CC 9.1	Adequate	"Evaluation in EPD-Net Project is understood not as a post-hoc review, but as a continuous process that supports learning, adaptation, accountability, and strategic foresight."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Which outputs contributed most to measurable outcomes?	CC 9.1	Adequate	
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	How useful do external participants find the project?	CC 9.1	Adequate	
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Is the feedback collected from stakeholders effectively reflected in the evaluation results?	CC 9.1	Partially Sufficient	The impact and validity of feedback on decision-making processes should be defined **Feedback implementation mechanism should be developed**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do assessment activities support formative (continuous) and summative (periodic) objectives?	CC 9.1	Adequate	"Formative insights support adaptive learning; summative findings support decisions"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the evaluation schedule effectively support learning cycles and adaptation in the project?	CC 9.1	Adequate	"Formative insights enable adaptive learning within evaluation timing"
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are formative, summative and developmental evaluation methods applied in accordance with the project cycle?	CC 9.1	Adequate	"Combines formative, summative, and developmental evaluation methods"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are the performance indicators appropriate to the project?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Monitoring Plan defines PI indicators and makes them traceable with ClickUp integration [D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are the performance indicators used for monitoring measurable?	CC 9.1.1	Adequate	Monitoring Plan defines PI indicators and makes them traceable with ClickUp integration [D1.3]
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	What are the main objectives of monitoring?	CC 8.2.1, CC 9.1	Adequate	Text: 2.2 Key Monitoring Objectives, Lines: 19-38
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are monitoring tools and indicators aligned with project dimensions (progress, quality, participation, sustainability)?	CC 9.1	Adequate	4. MONITORING TOOLS AND INDICATORS / Sections 4.1 and 4.5

PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the frequency of monitoring activities planned in accordance with project needs and risks?	CC 9.1	Adequate	5.1 Monitoring Schedule by Frequency and Scope
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the monitoring system able to track and analyse project performance at strategic and operational level?	CC 9.1	Adequate	6. Conclusion, Key Achievements items

ARTICLE 9.2 Internal audit

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is an internal quality assurance structure defined?	CC 9.2.2 / CC 8.1	Adequate	WP1 leadership, WP leaders, monthly WP meetings, quality control checklists defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are external quality control processes defined?	CC 9.2.2 / CC 9.3	Adequate	Independent experts, assessment areas, assessment schedule (inception/mid-term/final) clearly defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring activities supported by internal audits?	CC 9.2.1	Adequate	Internal audit mechanism and action recommendations are defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring activities supported by internal audits?	CC 9.2.1	Adequate	Internal audit mechanism and action recommendations are defined
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is risk assessment planned in the internal audit and review process?	CC 9.2	Adequate	"The Risk Management Plan is subject to review and updates by the consortium..." **but no systematic internal audit procedure is specified.** **mechanisms should be clearly integrated.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	11. Is a formal internal audit process defined?	CC 9.2	Partially Sufficient	Year-End, Mid-term review, formate checkpoints etc., but no definition of "internal audit". **Internal audit programme; audit methods and reporting mechanisms should be established at regular intervals.**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	12. Are audit findings translated into improvements?	CC 9.2	Adequate	The findings are included in the strategic decision cycle through "continuous learning, WP adjustments, QA validations".

ARTICLE 9.3 Management review

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are external quality control processes defined?	CC 9.2.2 / CC 9.3	Adequate	Independent experts, assessment areas, assessment schedule (inception/mid-term/final) clearly defined
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality meetings integrated into the project cycle?	CC 9.3 / CC 5.1.1	Adequate	Meeting schedule given for all WPs (E1.2 - E6.4), monthly WP meetings listed
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the powers and responsibilities of decision-making bodies clear?	CC 5.3 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	SC defined with tasks such as approval of quality indicators, methodological change monitoring
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality processes regularly controlled?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	Regular evaluation, quality reports and audits at project milestones planned
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk assessments carried out regularly?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Monthly and quarterly risk assessment meetings are held.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination strategies associated with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.2 / "dissemination plan supported by quality assurance measures"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are sustainability strategies included in quality assessment processes?	CC 9.3.2	Adequate	GA p.61; sustainability strategy with utilisation plan, business model and partner networks presented [GA]

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are roles and responsibilities for quality assurance clearly defined?	CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.3 / "monitored by KPI"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Does management review dissemination and sustainability issues?	CC 9.3.1	Adequate	9.5 / "annual evaluation meetings and public quality indicator disclosure"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are performance assessment outputs included in improvement plans?	CC 9.3.3	Adequate	9.4 / "indicators monitored and revised"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the results of previous evaluations guide subsequent strategies?	CC 9.3.3	Adequate	9.5 / "Conference and workshop evaluations publicly disclosed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are dissemination strategies associated with quality objectives?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.2 / "dissemination plan (T5.2) supported by quality assurance measures"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are sustainability strategies included in quality assessment processes?	CC 9.3.2	Adequate	GA p.61; sustainability strategy with utilisation plan, business model and partner networks presented [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are roles and responsibilities for quality assurance clearly defined?	CC 9.3.2	Adequate	9.3 / "monitored by KPI" and "inclusion of module in training programmes"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Does management review dissemination and sustainability issues?	CC 9.3.1	Adequate	9.5 / "annual evaluation meetings and public quality indicator disclosure"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are performance assessment outputs included in improvement plans?	CC 9.3.3	Adequate	9.4 / "All indicators will be monitored and revised"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do the results of previous evaluations guide subsequent strategies?	CC 9.3.3	Adequate	9.5 / "Conference and workshop evaluations publicly disclosed"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is a review timetable established?	CC 9.3	Adequate	10.2 / 9-22 / "Phase - Timing / Trigger" table
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are suggestions for improvement regularly reviewed?	CC 9.3	Adequate	10.2 / 9-22 / "Annual Review..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has an overall assessment of the quality assurance plan been made?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Chapter 1, Line 1-5: "...quality assurance system has been designed that focuses not only on outputs but also on process, participation..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has the impact of quality assurance on project outputs been assessed?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Chapter 1, Line 6-15: "...digital module development, pilot tests, dissemination and sustainability steps are directly related to quality."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are in-process audit results included in the results section?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Grant Agreement Article 25.1.3: Project review report is prepared in line with internal audit findings [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the evaluation process reviewed at regular intervals?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Chapter 1, Lines 11-15: "Living documents and versioning allow rapid adaptation..." **The review schedule is defined in stages in 10.2 (M10, M18, M22, M34)d1.1.EPD-NET quality as....**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Does the monitoring plan include update and revision processes?	CC 9.3	Adequate	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 6: "Plan revision procedures are clearly stated..."
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is the impact of monitoring results on decision-making processes sufficient?	CC 9.3	Partially Sufficient	"Steering Committee (SC) (strategic review and mitigation decisions)." (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY) **The impact of monitoring results on decision-making processes should be measured.**

ARTICLE 10. Remediation

ARTICLE 10.1 General improvement approach:

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the different layers of assessment (formative, summative, developmental) applied at the appropriate time and in the appropriate way?	CC 10.1	Adequate	"This approach is structured into three methodological layers"
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are continuous improvement processes associated with risk assessments?	CC 10.1	Partially Sufficient	"...is a living document, periodically updated." **The process of updating and re-evaluating the plan is specified, but the context of continuous improvement is limited. In accordance with the continuous improvement approach, titles such as frequency of reassessment of risks, lessons learnt, analysis of closed risks should be added.**

ARTICLE 10.2 Non-conformity and corrective actions

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are quality standards defined in such a way that they can be updated?	CC 10.2	Adequate	Under the title of "Updating Standards", it is handled as a learning system.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the monitoring and evaluation process associated with sustainability?	CC 10.2	Adequate	KPI5 (50% organisation should find the module useful) associated with WP6
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there a process for corrective action in case of quality deviations?	CC 10.2.1 / CC 10.2.2	Adequate	Explained the process of correction and follow-up integrated into the ClickUp system by WP leaders
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the follow-up of corrective actions systematic?	CC 10.2.2	Adequate	It is stated that recording and monitoring will be done via ClickUp
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is feedback analysed and prioritised?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 10.2.1	Adequate	PM Team analysis process, content/time/impact based prioritisation explained (6.3)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there a specific revision process based on feedback?	CC 10.2.2	Adequate	WP leader recommendation report -> Coordinator -> SC decision -> Implementation and monitoring steps open (6.3)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are revisions monitored and documented?	CC 7.5 / CC 10.2.2	Adequate	Integrated tracking with ClickUp, Gantt and PI tracking explained
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is there a defined structure in charge for the coordination and integration of feedback?	CC 10.2 / CC 6.1	Adequate	PM Team is responsible for collecting, evaluating and integrating feedback
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results translated into improvement actions?	CC 10.2	Adequate	10.5 "Feedback from the WP4 pilot implementations..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are improvement activities systematically documented?	CC 10.2.2	Adequate	10.5 "The QAP... plays a proactive role..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do critical findings translate into corrective action?	CC 10.2.1	Adequate	10.5 "Feedback from the WP4 pilot implementations..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are suggestions for improvement presented in a clear and feasible manner?	CC 10.2.1	Adequate	Section 1,: "...aims not only at 'achieving success' but also at 'securing and replicating success'..." **Non-conformity and corrective actions are clearly specified and the process is integrated into ClickUp**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are improvement processes systematically planned?	CC 10.2	Adequate	Integration of QA outputs into the improvement process is specified

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are corrective actions proposed after the quality plan?	CC 10.2.1	Adequate	Integration of QA outputs into the improvement process is specified
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Have improvement suggestions been prioritised?	CC 10.2.2	Adequate	Grant Agreement p.61-62 & WP4: It is stated that post pilot improvement suggestions will be analysed and prioritised [GA]
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the results of the evaluation integrated into improvement plans?	CC 10.2	Adequate	Chapter 1,: "...feedback system provides basis not only for evaluation but also for co-learning..." **The institutionalised, traceable structure of updates is clear**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results translated into improvement activities?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	Monitoring Plan (T1.3), Section 4,: "Results feed into improvement actions..." **Systematise the transfer of monitoring results into concrete improvement steps**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	To what extent is the evaluation methodology integrated into project decision-making processes?	CC 10.2	Adequate	"The evaluation methodology adopted in EPD-Net is structured, mixed-method, and deeply integrated..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are the results of the assessment used in updating project sustainability plans?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"Evaluation findings feed directly into dissemination and sustainability planning" **Sustainability actions should be monitored**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are appropriate pathways identified for monitoring and implementing corrective actions based on assessment findings?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"Escalation and accountability pathways are defined with triggers and actions" **Improve follow-up of corrective actions**
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are there predetermined corrective action plans for delays or deviations identified during the assessment process?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"Checkpoints trigger corrective actions, SC resolutions, risk updates" **Corrective follow-up systems should be developed**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are improvement processes defined?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"This PMP serves both formative and summative functions..." (INTRODUCTION) **Proactive improvement processes should be established.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are there learning and adaptation mechanisms in the monitoring process?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"Foster a culture of shared responsibility and adaptive learning within the EPD-Net consortium." (INTRODUCTION) **Learning and adaptation processes should be concretised.**
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Is there a mechanism for escalation of responsibilities according to increasing seriousness in the monitoring process?	CC 10.2	Adequate	3.4 Responsibility Escalation Logic / Table
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	How is the effectiveness of the traffic light system assessed in early detection and intervention of risks?	CC 10.2	Adequate	4.2 Traffic Light Monitoring System / Tables and descriptions
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Is risk prioritisation performed in determining corrective actions?	CC 10.2	Partially Sufficient	"Mitigation strategies are prioritised based on risk severity." **Measures and responsible persons are assigned according to their priority. It is recommended that the prioritisation and impact analysis of corrective actions to be implemented in case of realisation of risks should be more detailed.**

ARTICLE 10.3 Continuous improvement

PLAN NAME	Question	Evaluation Category (CC)	Appraisal	Evidence
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the strategy linked to continuous improvement?	CC 10.3	Adequate	"...monitoring, evaluation and feedback loops..."

QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is quality control effective throughout the life cycle?	CC 9.1.1 / CC 10.3	Adequate	Quality control activities defined throughout the entire project process
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the results of the quality audit reflected in future plans?	CC 10.3	Adequate	Continuous improvement is systematically defined in sections 10.3 and 10.5 of the QAP and integrated with other plans
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the continuous improvement logic systematically defined?	CC 10.3	Adequate	ECHO model, AI-supported EPD_Assist and transformation of feedback into functional improvement explained (6.4)
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the user experience and training content updated based on feedback?	CC 8.5.6 / CC 10.3	Adequate	Trainers also develop content as users, AI-powered module is constantly updated
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is institutionalisation and sustainability of quality planned at the final stage?	CC 9.1.3 / CC 10.3	Adequate	E6.4 panel, transformation to permanent EPD-Net curriculum with external stakeholder oriented quality assessment targeted
RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN	Are risk management processes continuously improved?	CC 10.3	Adequate	Improvement related documents and control mechanisms are defined.
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are updates reflected in quality processes?	CC 10.3	Adequate	10.3 "Internal Quality Audit Sheets... Compliance and Consistency Reports"
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are monitoring results used for continuous improvement?	CC 10.3	Adequate	10.5 "The QAP is not only a retrospective evaluation tool but also plays a proactive role..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the continuous improvement system institutionalised?	CC 10.3	Adequate	10.5 "The QAP is not only a retrospective evaluation tool but also plays a proactive role..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the strengths of the plan clearly stated?	CC 10.3	Adequate	Section 1,: "The greatest strengths of the project's quality management system are the following:..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Are the aspects of the plan that need to be improved identified?	CC 10.3	Partially Sufficient	Section 1,: "...aims not only at 'achieving success' but also at 'securing and replicating success'..." **Weaknesses should be clearly identified and improvement plans should be specified**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Has the sustainability and continuity of the plan been assessed?	CC 10.3	Adequate	Chapter 1: "Sustainability and Quality Link: Components such as the ECHO model, EPD_Assist..."
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Do quality assurance results guide subsequent project phases?	CC 10.3	Partially Sufficient	Section 1,: "...quality assurance framework is systematic, measurable, participatory..." **Concretise the impact of quality results on subsequent phases**
QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN	Is the evaluation strategy aligned with sustainability goals?	CC 10.3	Adequate	Chapter 1: "Sustainability and Quality Link: Components such as the ECHO model, EPD_Assist..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Do project evaluation processes comply with the principle of continuous improvement?	CC 10.3	Adequate	"Findings feed directly into WP adjustments, risk reclassifications, and quality improvements."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Are evaluation outputs regularly shared with project leaders and SC?	CC 10.3	Adequate	"Findings from evaluations feed directly into WP adjustments..."
PROJECT EVALUATION STRATEGY PLAN	Does the evaluation process support project outputs in terms of sustainability?	CC 6.1 CC 10.3	Adequate	"Evidence-based sustainability planning"
PROJECT MONITORING PLAN	Are process and system improvements regularly reviewed?	CC 10.3	Partially Sufficient	This is addressed in the PMP. **However, detailed A regular review plan should be established.**

4. Results

In this study, the four main management documents prepared within the scope of the EPD-NET project: Quality Assurance Plan, Risk Management Plan, Project Monitoring Plan and Project Development and Strategy Plan, have been analysed in comparison with each other.

The analyses were conducted in two stages. In the first stage, the content of each plan was mapped to the main headings such as understanding the context, leadership, planning, support, operations, performance evaluation and improvement, and each plan was evaluated in terms of relevance, adequacy and applicability. In this context, the plan sections corresponding to each relevant item were identified and categorised into four groups as **adequate, partially adequate, inadequate or unclear**.

In the second stage, the relevant sections were analysed comparatively among the four plans. In this way, both the systematic and contextual consistency of each document and the level of integrity and coherence of the plans with each other were evaluated. In particular, the overall integrity of the governance structure in the project was questioned by taking into account whether the quality management, risk management and performance monitoring mechanisms were designed to support each other. Thus, the extent to which the project management documents are strategically, structurally and functionally integrated has been revealed. In addition, this document has been guiding in terms of identifying strengths and developing suggestions for areas that need improvement.

4.1. General Evaluation Results

According to the evaluation results, 82.4% of the 455 questions analysed were found to be "Satisfactory". This shows that the project meets the quality standards to a great extent. The rate of 17.58%, which is evaluated as "Partially Satisfactory", indicates that there are areas that require improvement. There were no elements assessed as "Inadequate" or "Unclear".

Category.	**Number of questions answered in the examination**	**Ratio**
Adequate	375	%82,4
Partially Sufficient	80	%17,58
Inadequate	0	%0
Uncertain	0	%0
Total	455	%100

Overall Evaluation Success Score: A (91,2 / 100)

Score Range	**Letter Grade**	**Description**
90 - 100	**A**	**Perfect**
80 - 89	**B**	**Good**
70 - 79	**C**	**Middle**
60 - 69	**D**	**Passes**
0 - 59	**F**	**Failed**

Overall Evaluation: Achievement Score and Assessment

As a result of the holistic analysis of the documents related to quality assurance, monitoring, evaluation and risk management activities carried out under the EPD-NET project, the overall success score was calculated as **91.2 out of 100**. This score corresponds **to an "A" level of adequacy** according to the assessment scale and indicates that the management documents provide a significant degree of consistency and quality standard.

Strengths

- In general, the documents show a high consistency of content and are structurally coherent without contradictions.
- Quality indicators, monitoring processes and audit procedures are defined in detail and clearly, and documented in a way that contributes to traceability.
- The mutual references and content support between the management plans are remarkable, and the reference relationship with the Grant Agreement document increases systematic credibility.
- The recording system was fully structured; no interpretation gaps were observed in the evaluated items that would create ambiguity.

Areas Open for Improvement

- The 80 items currently categorised as "Partially Satisfactory" can be upgraded to "Satisfactory", particularly by supporting them with examples of implementation, timelines and direct in-document references.
- The impact of performance indicators on decision-making processes should be documented in a more specific, exemplary and analytical manner.
- Especially in Risk Management and Quality Assurance documents, examples of scenario-based proactive interventions (e.g. risk trigger threshold, corrective steps to be taken when deviation is recognised) are missing.
- Although all of the documents have been prepared for internal stakeholders, it would be useful to format simplified versions with high visual narrative power for external stakeholders.

4.2. Examination of the Results of Plan-Based Evaluation and the Level of Consistency of the Plans

Plan Name	Adequate	Partially Sufficient	Score (%)	Level
Quality Assurance Plan (QAP)	203	31	86,8	B
Project Monitoring Plan (PMP)	51	14	78,5	C
Risk Management Plan (RMP)	42	9	82,4	B
Evaluation Strategy Plan (ESP)	79	26	75,2	C

4.2.1. Quality Assurance Plan (QAP)

According to the evaluation findings, the strategic structure of the QAP document is very strong. Its high level of alignment with the Grant Agreement (GA) is in line with the overall management approach of the project. The monitoring and evaluation logic is systematised and quality indicators are defined in a detailed and traceable manner. In addition, process control and sustainability strategies are addressed in a holistic approach within the document.

The Quality Assurance Plan addresses the main components of quality management processes in a holistic and systematic approach. The document provides a strong framework for defining quality metrics, monitoring performance, process audit and the operation of the continuous improvement cycle. Quality indicators (KPIs), reporting mechanisms and strategies for sustainability are clearly and measurably set out. However, the impact of some quality criteria on project decision support mechanisms is not sufficiently detailed through examples, and the aspect of linking with implementation scenarios and intervention steps is missing.

However, the diversity of implementation examples was limited, and especially cases where the impact of monitoring outputs on decision-making processes should be concretely demonstrated were identified. Furthermore, it was observed that the level of measurability in some performance indicators was low; therefore, metric-based improvement is recommended.

4.2.2. Project Monitoring Plan (PMP)

In the analysis made over a total of 60 evaluation items, it was determined that 65 items were sufficient and 14 items were partially sufficient. In this context, the PMP certificate exhibits a level C competence with a success score of 78.50%.

The evaluation results reveal that the PMP has achieved a high level of strategic alignment with the project objectives and structured the monitoring systematic with a holistic approach. The document is supported by performance indicators defined on the basis of work packages (WP), specific monitoring cycles and reporting schedules, and the continuity of operational monitoring is ensured through timelines. At the same time, the reference relationship established with the Grant Agreement (GA) ensures that monitoring outputs are meaningfully integrated into the project management framework.

On the other hand, the impact of monitoring outputs on strategic decision-making processes needs to be exemplified more clearly. Documenting the intervention mechanisms (e.g. corrective action plans or changes in responsibilities) for non-conformities that may be encountered in monitoring processes with concrete examples will increase the managerial effectiveness of the plan. Improvements in these areas will strengthen the decision support function of the PMP at the implementation level.

4.2.3. Risk Management Plan (RMP)

In the analysis of 48 evaluation items, it was determined that 42 items were sufficient and 9 items were partially sufficient. Accordingly, the RMP document was evaluated in the category of adequate implementation at level B with a success score of 82.4%.

The evaluation findings show that the RMP has achieved a high level of integration with the Grant Agreement. The tools used in the risk management processes - Contingency Framework, Escalation Plan and Risk Tracker - are described in detail and contribute significantly to the methodological integrity of the plan. In addition, approaches to both stakeholder engagement and the involvement of third party actors are clearly set out.

The structural set-up of the risk processes is consistent and the allocation of roles and responsibilities is clearly articulated.

However, the relationship between risk management and quality objectives is not sufficiently emphasised in the document. In particular, the potential effects of the probability of realisation of risks on quality indicators have not been analysed at an analytical level. Furthermore, documenting the impact of risks on project decision-making mechanisms and strategic orientations in a more quantifiable way would increase the managerial decision support capacity of the plan.

4.2.4. Project Evaluation Strategy Plan (ESP)

In the evaluation conducted over 101 items, it was determined that 79 items were sufficient and 26 items were partially sufficient. In this context, the ESP document has been placed at acceptable quality level C with a success score of 75.2%.

The ESP document is noteworthy for the diversity of evaluation tools and methodological approach. Data collection techniques such as questionnaires, interviews and observations are clearly defined and the timing of data collection and digital archiving system (ClickUp, MEGA) are structured. In particular, the introduction of a work package (WP) based evaluation methodology has increased the traceability of project outputs at the functional level.

However, the relationship of evaluation outputs with governance structures is defined to a limited extent. In particular, how the quality policy is integrated into the evaluation processes, how the rationale for scope is justified, and the impact of the collected feedback on decision-making processes are not sufficiently descriptive in the current document. Methodological depth and application examples in these areas will make the decision support capacity of ESP more holistic.

4.3. Items Supporting Each Other with Cross-Plan Citations

The interrelationships between the management plans developed within the scope of the EPD-NET project and the structural and functional consistency of the plans were evaluated with the methodology developed within the scope of the assessment within the framework of quality management. The table below presents examples representing the interaction between the plans and the items that support each other; this structure can be interpreted as an indicator of the horizontal integrity between the evaluation categories. Each item is designed based on the contextual synchronisation of the relevant plans and supported by multiple document references.

Plan	Evaluation Category	Question	Evidence Content
QAP	CC 5.3	Are the roles responsible for quality management clear?	Job description missing in QAP; integration with RMP and PMP proposed
QAP	CC 7.1.2 / 5.3	Are coordination tasks defined?	The relationship of ESTU and HU with QAP, Risk Plan, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans is emphasised
QAP	CC 6.3	Are the update steps defined?	Updates planned in connection with ESP and PMP plans

QAP	CC 4.4.1	Is it ensured that the plan has a dynamic structure?	Continuous updating of the QAP ensured synchronisation with other plans
QAP	CC 6.1	Is the plan revised in line with the risks?	Revision cycle in line with the Risk Management Plan is emphasised
QAP	CC 5.3	Clarity of quality roles	Role sharing with RMP, PMP
QAP	CC 9.1.1 / 9.1.3	Monitoring and evaluation system	Monitoring Plan, Evaluation Plan
QAP	CC 9.1.1	Are the monitoring tools explained?	Monitoring Plan (D1.3)
QAP	CC 9.1.2	Is the evaluation process systematic?	Evaluation Strategy Plan (D1.4)
QAP	CC 7.1.2 / 5.3	Are the coordination tasks clear?	Associated with QAP, Risk Plan, Monitoring & Evaluation

4.4. Structure of Inter-Plan References and Integration between Documents

The basic management documents (QAP, PMP, ESP, RMP) developed in the EPD-NET project have been found to show a high level of consistency not only in terms of their internal integrity but also in terms of their functional relationships with each other. The mutual references between these documents reveal that a synchronised management approach is adopted within the quality assurance system and document that subsystems such as monitoring, evaluation and risk management work in an integrated manner.

1. QAP's References to Other Plans

The Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) directly references three key documents in terms of tracking performance indicators, quality assessment and decision support systematics:

Monitoring Plan:

"For more detailed information on the monitoring process, please refer to the project's dedicated monitoring plan, which is deliverable No. 1.3 in the EPD-Net project."

"These indicators will be elaborated in the monitoring and evaluation plans to be defined under WP1..."

These statements reveal that the monitoring indicators and reporting processes are directly guided by the Monitoring Plan and that the QAP is synchronised with this structure.

Evaluation Strategy Plan:

"For more detailed information, please refer to the project's dedicated Evaluation Strategy Plan, which is deliverable No. 1.4..."

The methodological aspects of the evaluation approaches are summarised in the QAP; elaboration is left to the Evaluation Strategy Plan.

Risk Management Plan:

"...quality management is integrated within project management with other functions such as risk management, performance monitoring, and dissemination."

"To ensure the timely implementation of preventive and corrective actions by identifying quality risks..."

Risk management is defined as part of the quality cycle of the QAP and is structured to be integrated with the RMP.

Emphasis on Integration between Plans:

"This system creates a holistic quality cycle based on the following 3 basic plans: Project Monitoring Plan, Project Evaluation Strategy Plan, Performance Monitoring System with PIs"

This statement clearly shows that QAP together with Monitoring and Evaluation Plans form an integrated and holistic quality cycle.

2. References to the QAP in Other Documents

Risk Management Plan (RMP):

"This plan is updated regularly, embedded into the QAP, and ready to respond to emerging risks..."
"The RMP complements the Quality Assurance Plan (D1.1)..."
It is clearly stated that the RMP is structurally integrated into the QAP and provides risk-based flexibility to the quality management system.
Evaluation Strategy Plan (ESP):
"Fully aligned with the GA, QAP (D1.1), RMP (D1.2), and Monitoring Plan (D1.3)"
"Evaluation findings are... fed into: Quarterly Monitoring Reports (QMRs), WP adjustments and risk responses, Quality Assurance validations"
ESP is positioned as the analytical support point of the whole system and provides feedback to the quality, risk and monitoring loops with assessment outputs.
Project Monitoring Plan (PMP):
"Monitoring plan indicators are elaborated in QAP and evaluated through ESP checkpoints."
"The project's data collection, reporting, and evaluation cycles are synchronised via QAP and ESP."
PMP monitors the performance indicators defined in the QAP and the findings are transferred to decision-making processes through ESP.

5. Recommendations

5.1. Risk Management Plan - Partially Satisfactory Items Assessment

In the Risk Management plan, 8 items are marked as Partially Satisfactory.

CC Code	Rationale	Evaluation

CC 4.2	Risk expectations and priorities of relevant parties (funders, users, etc.) are not differentiated. Only partners are referred to.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 6.2	Adaptation to external changes is mentioned, but it is seen that uncertainties (such as policy, law changes) are not transformed into systematic risk scenarios.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 7.1	Focused only on personnel and time resources. The risk of physical, financial or digital resources has not been assessed.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 7.3	Information flow within the consortium is defined, but specific communication risks such as communication breakdown, version confusion, etc. are not explicitly addressed.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 8.4	No specific risk definition for external suppliers. Systematic risks related to non-partner actors are missing.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 8.5	No specific risk analysis of final product/service validity or user acceptance testing.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 9.2	The role assignment in the decision-making process for external experts is not clear; the consultation mechanism seems passive.	**Partially Sufficient**
CC 9.3	The impact of risks on project success is not analysed at a strategic level.	**Partially Sufficient**

5.1.1. Deficiency Assessment

During the documentation audit process conducted within the scope of the EPD-NET Project, some areas for improvement were identified to increase the level of compliance of the Risk Management Plan with the quality management principles and assessment categories (CC) standards. Accordingly, the recommendations regarding the deficiencies identified as a result of the multidimensional content analysis conducted by us were evaluated in co-operation with the project coordinators, and content and structural revision proposals were presented for these areas. These improvements focused on eliminating the deficiencies especially in CC 4.1 (Institutional Context) and CC 4.2 (Stakeholder Requirements) assessment items and resulted in revisions that deepen the internal context analysis of the project and address stakeholder needs more systematically. Detailed descriptions of the relevant revisions are provided below.

5.1.2. Revision Suggestions

A. In the current version of the Risk Management Plan, risks related to stakeholders are addressed under general headings, but the risk perceptions, priorities and specific impact areas of different stakeholder groups (e.g. users, local authorities, funders, external experts, etc.) are not analysed systematically. This is considered as an area requiring improvement, especially under Evaluation Categories CC 4.2 (Stakeholders' Expectations and Requirements) and CC 6.1 (Addressing Risks and Opportunities). In this context, the proposed sub-heading "**Stakeholder-Centric Risk Typology and Mapping**" aims to reveal the relationship of each stakeholder group with risk in a typological and analytical manner based on a stakeholder-based approach. In addition, the

"**Risk Response Strategy Matrix**" proposal, which will contribute to the process of prioritising risks and developing group-specific preventive strategies, will enable the risk management system to become more targeted, flexible and updatable. This structure ensures that risks can be monitored not only in the technical and organisational context but also at the social stakeholder level, thus strengthening the learning and adaptation capacity of the project.

Stakeholder-Centric Risk Typology and Mapping

In addition to the current risk categories, a stakeholder-centric risk typology will be introduced. This typology maps out distinct stakeholder groups-such as users, public authorities, funders, funders, and external consultants-and their specific risk expectations and impact domains. This mapping will be updated biannually based on survey results and engagement outcomes. A risk expectations matrix will be used to record the type of concern, priority level, and mitigation strategy per stakeholder group.

Risk Response Strategy Matrix

A detailed response matrix will be added to classify risk mitigation approaches into the following categories: avoidance, mitigation, transfer, and acceptance. This structure allows for a standardised response logic across different risk types.

Risk Type	Response Strategy	Example Action	Responsible	Timeline
Technical	Mitigation	Increase testing cycles	WP3, QA Team	Monthly
Stakeholder	Avoidance	Realign stakeholder expectations	WP6	Prior to pilot
Legal	Transfer	Outsource legal review	PM + External	Contract-based
Internal Staffing	Acceptance	Maintain backup personnel	WP Leaders	Ongoing

B. It has been observed that communication-based risks (e.g. information delays, document versioning errors, misunderstandings between work packages) are indirectly addressed in the Risk Management Plan; however, some deficiencies have been identified in terms of systematic monitoring and identification of these risks and clear structuring of resolution mechanisms. This situation reveals the need for revision especially under CC 7.4 (Communication) and CC 8.6-8.7 (Nonconformity Control). In this context, the proposed "Communication Risk Escalation Protocol" has been developed to structure the management of operational risks arising from communication and to accelerate the resolution of potential problems. The proposed "formal escalation ladder" approach defines a clear chain of intervention for risks such as communication delays or uncontrolled version changes in documents. For example, triggering situations such as communication delays exceeding 10 days will be managed through a specific hierarchical sequence (WP Leader → PM → SC) and technical measures such as version control (ClickUp + timestamped uploads) will be integrated into this protocol. This arrangement will contribute to strengthening intra-project coordination by ensuring that communication-based uncertainties are addressed in a transparent and accountable manner at organisational scale. A title "***Communication Risk Escalation Protocol***" is proposed under Guiding Principles**.**

Communication Risk Escalation Protocol

To enhance the timely coordination and prevent operational disruptions caused by communication-related risks, a formal Communication Risk Escalation Protocol will be established. This protocol specifically addresses risks such as prolonged response times, inconsistencies due to uncontrolled version updates, and misunderstandings across different work packages (WPs). The protocol will define:

- Alert Triggers: Risk alerts will be triggered when communication delays exceed 10 calendar days without a documented justification or when conflicting document versions are detected during collaborative tasks.
- Escalation Levels: A structured escalation ladder will be used to ensure timely intervention. The initial resolution attempt will be made at the WP Leader level. If unresolved within 3 days, the issue will be escalated to the Project Management (PM) team. If the issue persists or affects inter-WP operations, the final escalation will be directed to the Steering Committee (SC) for resolution and strategic intervention.
- Documentation and Version Tracking Tools: The protocol will be implemented using digital project management platforms such as ClickUp, where all communication threads, action items, and document uploads will be timestamped and archived. A version control mechanism will also be applied, using document coding (e.g., v01, v02) and upload logs to avoid conflicting versions and ensure traceability.
- Review Cycle: The effectiveness of this protocol will be reviewed semi-annually as part of the internal QA process. Lessons learnt from past escalations will be documented and used to refine communication strategies.

This structured mechanism is expected to enhance transparency, prevent workflow disruptions, and strengthen accountability across project actors. It also contributes directly to the quality assurance and risk mitigation framework by introducing a traceable and proactive communication management process.

C. Although the current Risk Management Plan includes general references to the risk capacity of partner organisations, it does not systematically analyse determinants such as the operational capacity, technical infrastructure and human resources of each organisation. This deficiency requires improvement, particularly in CC 4.1 (Organisational Context), CC 6.1 (Addressing Risks and Opportunities) and CC 5.3 (Roles, Responsibilities and Authorities). Failure to adequately set out the organisational context creates uncertainty, particularly in preventive risk planning, and makes it difficult to properly link the source and impact of risk. Therefore, with the Institutional Risk Profile from each project partner, risks can be assessed in a more realistic and targeted manner within the framework of the organisations' structural capacity and previous experiences. For this reason, it is suggested to add a sub-heading as *Institutional Risk Profiles* under the **Roles and Responsibilities** heading.

Institutional Risk Profiles
To enhance the precision of risk identification and ensure the relevance of preventive measures, a dedicated section titled "Institutional Risk Profiles" will be introduced under the Roles and Responsibilities section. Each partner institution will be required to submit and annually update a

concise but structured institutional risk profile. This profile will help capture the organisational context, technical readiness, and human resource stability of each institution. It will include the following components:

1. Human Resource Capacity:
    - Number of full-time equivalents (FTEs) directly allocated to the project
    - Staff expertise relevant to the WP tasks
    - Availability of substitute personnel and cross-trained staff
2. Technical Infrastructure:
    - Access to digital tools and platforms (e.g., cloud systems, GIS tools, server capacity)
    - Cybersecurity protocols
    - Remote work capabilities
3. Institutional Experience:
    - Past participation in EU-funded projects (e.g., Horizon, Erasmus+)
    - Role in previous consortia (coordinator, partner, external expert)
    - Internal QA and reporting systems in place
4. Risk Governance:
    - Assigned risk owners per WP
    - Escalation chain and substitution plan in case of absenteeism
    - Internal protocols for risk flagging and mitigation

Each profile will be submitted during project month M3 as part of the consortium alignment process and updated annually thereafter (M12, M24). These profiles will be reviewed by the Project Management Team and will directly inform risk typologies, escalation strategies, and QA monitoring tools.

D. While the current Risk Management Plan provides a comprehensive structure in terms of risk categorisation and response strategies, it does not include a systematic structure on how these risks are monitored over time and how the impact of the measures taken is verified. This deficiency has been identified as an area for improvement, particularly under CC 9.1 (Monitoring, Measurement, Analysis and Evaluation) and CC 10.3 (Continuous Improvement). In this context, the proposed "**Risk Monitoring and Validation Matrix**" defines indicators, sources of validation and regular review cycles for specific risk categories, making it possible to objectively monitor not only whether risk responses are implemented as planned, but also whether they are effective. This structure integrates with the quality assurance system, providing a data-driven contribution to the continuous improvement cycle. A title as Risk Monitoring and Validation Matrix is suggested.

Risk Monitoring and Validation Matrix

To strengthen the traceability and accountability of the risk mitigation process, a dedicated **Risk Monitoring and Validation Matrix** will be embedded in the Risk Management Plan. This matrix operationalises the verification of risk response effectiveness by linking each major risk category to:

- Quantifiable indicators (KPI-aligned)
- Specific verification sources (e.g., internal tools, QA reports)
- Assigned review frequency

By doing so, the matrix serves as a dynamic control instrument aligned with both the Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) and the Project Monitoring Plan (PMP). The matrix will be reviewed regularly by the PM and QA teams to detect deviations, update risk statuses, and trigger escalation when necessary.

Matrix Structure:

Risk Category	Monitoring Indicator	Verification Source	Review Frequency	Responsible Unit
Content Misalignment	% of aligned deliverables with WP3/ESP	Internal QA checklist + WP3 validation	Quarterly	QA Team + WP3
Low Pilot Participation	Participation rate across test sites	Event attendance logs, post-pilot surveys	After each pilot cycle	WP4 + Local Partners
Budget Overspend	% deviation from allocated budget	WP-level financial reports, variance logs	Monthly	WP Leaders + PM Team
Coordination Delays	Average task delay per WP (days)	ClickUp timeline metrics	Monthly	WP Leaders + PM Team
Stakeholder Complaints	No. of unresolved stakeholder issues	Helpdesk log + stakeholder survey	Bi-Monthly	WP6 + PM + QA
IT/System Instability	Platform downtime (hours/month)	Server logs + user complaints	Monthly	WP3 Technical Team

Each risk indicator will be plotted on a traffic-light reporting system (green: within acceptable range, yellow: cautionary, red: requires escalation), enabling early intervention and proactive management. The matrix will also serve as a foundation for the **Mid-Term Review** (M18) and **Final Risk Wrap-up** (M30) reports.

E. The Risk Management Plan should comprehensively analyse the risks associated with all project inputs, including not only human resources but also physical, digital, financial and knowledge-based resources; include scenarios such as information delays, version confusion and access problems due to communication processes; and support the effectiveness of preventive actions against these risks with monitoring mechanisms. It is also recommended that risks that may arise during the verification of project outputs (e.g. user acceptance tests, late deliveries) and post-delivery period (e.g. failure to implement the output in the field, unexpected reactions of users) should be specifically identified and recorded. In this context, it is recommended to add "**6.3 Integrated Risk Governance and Continuous Improvement Framework**" to the Risk Management Plan in order to prioritise corrective actions, determine effectiveness criteria, analyse lessons learned and institutionalise continuous improvement processes. This section will make it possible to associate the plan with systematic internal audit mechanisms, to integrate risks with quality objectives and decision-making processes, and to structure preventive-corrective actions based on impact analysis.

6.3 Integrated Risk Governance and Continuous Improvement Framework
To strengthen the EPD-Net project's risk governance structure, several refinements are introduced to address operational, informational, and post-delivery risks, and to enhance the traceability and effectiveness of risk prevention actions:
Resource-Linked Risk Categorisation:
In addition to human resource risks (e.g. key personnel unavailability), risk assessments will explicitly include material, infrastructural, financial, and digital resources. Each WP will document potential constraints or vulnerabilities related to these resources in a shared register to improve preventive capacity.
Communication-Related Risk Scenarios:

The communication framework will be enhanced with specific risk scenarios such as version control errors, delayed information circulation, platform inaccessibility, or miscommunication across partner organisations. Each risk entry will be linked to a mitigation action such as backup tools, secondary contacts, and clear channel designation (e.g. for critical updates).

Validation and Acceptance Risks:

Risks associated with the validation of project outputs before delivery will be separately assessed. This includes late-stage usability tests, system malfunctions during final checks, or gaps in user acceptance criteria. Additional testing phases and "readiness verification" checkpoints will be introduced for key deliverables.

Post-Delivery Risk Analysis:

Post-delivery risks-such as user rejection, field implementation failure, or divergence from intended outcomes-will be assessed and logged in a dedicated "post-delivery risk register". A follow-up validation loop will be applied six months after each major output, supported by user surveys and pilot feedback data.

Effectiveness Monitoring of Preventive Actions:

All risk prevention measures will include an effectiveness score, reviewed quarterly via SC meetings. This score will be based on recurrence frequency, time-to-resolution, and residual risk reduction, and will feed into an internal audit dashboard.

Integrated Internal Audit and Risk Review Procedures:

The internal audit calendar will be directly linked with risk review cycles. A dual reporting format will be applied: (1) standard QA audit and (2) risk status validation. Lessons learnt from each round will be archived and reviewed for alignment with corrective or preventive actions.

Continuous Improvement Logic:

To foster continuous improvement, each closed risk item will be analysed to identify root causes, system-level gaps, and transferable lessons. A quarterly "Risk Learning Report" will be added as an annex to the Risk Register, summarising new risks, closed risks, and adjustments to the monitoring or mitigation logic.

Corrective Action Prioritisation:

Corrective actions triggered by risk materialisation will be prioritised based on impact severity and probability, following an updated prioritisation matrix. Each corrective measure will include a response lead, escalation timeline, and follow-up traceability checkpoint to ensure resolution.

5.2. Monitoring Plan - Partially Sufficient Substances Assessment

In the monitoring system analysis carried out within the scope of the EPD-NET Project, it was assessed that the existing structures are generally defined in the theoretical framework, but further development of some practical components would support traceability, transparency and integrated work with quality assurance processes. In this context, a clear systematisation of example tools, data collection schedules and user roles for how monitoring tools will reflect project progress would improve clarity at the implementation level (CC 4.3). Similarly, in order to make reporting processes more functional, it would be useful to detail the frequency, responsible units, report formats and distribution mechanisms (CC 4.4). While the contribution of monitoring activities to strategic objectives has been defined in general terms, it is recommended to develop criteria, thresholds and analysis structures to show the level of achievement of objectives in order to monitor this contribution more strongly (CC 6.2.1).

The elaboration of technical definitions for ClickUp, the digital monitoring tool used in the project, including user manual, update frequency and access roles will be valuable in terms of standardising its use (CC 7.1.5). Developing simplification mechanisms, sample templates and user-oriented training content to enable all

stakeholders to easily participate in the monitoring process will strengthen the level of participation (CC 7.1.6). Clearly defining the data collection method, frequency of analysis and responsible work packages will provide clarity to the monitoring system so that feedback mechanisms can be operated more visibly and effectively in the process (CC 7.4).

A more systematic structure is proposed on how monitoring outputs will be evaluated and how these data will contribute to project management processes, and in this context, it would be appropriate to develop analysis mechanisms that will provide input to decision-making processes (CC 7.5). In order to integrate monitoring results with project management decisions, defining sample scenarios, threshold values and trigger mechanisms will support managerial decision-making processes (CC 7.6). In addition, defining cross-checking mechanisms and quality verification processes that can be applied to ensure the accuracy and reliability of monitoring data will be useful for quality assurance (CC 8.5.1).

While the relationship of the monitoring system to the quality assurance plan has been established at a general level, it is recommended to develop flow diagrams showing the integration points and mutual feedback structures to make this relationship more concrete (CC 9.1). Similarly, clarifying the methods of how monitoring outputs are transferred to decision-making bodies (e.g. Steering Committee) and how these data are used in decision-making processes will increase managerial impact (CC 9.3). In order to ensure that improvement processes can be carried out systematically, it would be appropriate to strengthen the operational structures under which these processes will be carried out, under what conditions, how often and by whom (CC 10.2). In order to enhance the impact of monitoring outputs on learning and adaptation processes, it is recommended to define a structural framework for this linkage (CC 10.3). Finally, the inclusion of policies or strategic recommendations to ensure the sustainability of the monitoring system beyond the project will contribute to long-term impact (CC 10.4).

In line with these observations, recommendations for strengthening the monitoring system components have been prepared and are presented below to be integrated into the relevant management plans. These recommendations are intended to reinforce the project's traceability, accountability and integration with quality assurance.

5.2.1. Revision Recommendations

A. Although the current monitoring systematic of the project is defined at the level of general principles, the establishment of a stronger and more integrated structure at the implementation level will increase the compliance of the system with the principles of transparency, consistency and learning orientation. In this respect, the proposed "**Monitoring Enhancement and Integration Framework**" aims to integrate monitoring processes more effectively with project management, quality assurance and strategic decision-making mechanisms. The proposed framework includes structuring reporting processes in terms of type, responsibility, format and means of dissemination, systematic processing of feedback from both internal and external stakeholders, increasing the reliability of monitoring data through multi-source verification methods, using monitoring outputs as direct input to project management decisions, and triggering learning processes through monitoring. This holistic approach corresponds in particular to assessment categories CC 4.3 (clarity of use of monitoring tools), CC 4.4 (clarity of reporting structure), CC 7.4 (functioning of feedback mechanism), CC 8.5.1 (data accuracy and reliability), CC 9.1 (integration of monitoring and quality assurance), CC 9.3 (guiding management with monitoring outputs) and CC 10.3 (structuring the learning cycle), and aims to ensure that the monitoring system contributes more effectively to the quality-oriented management structure.

5.4 Monitoring Enhancement and Integration Framework

To address identified gaps in the monitoring strategy and strengthen its connection to project management, stakeholder engagement, and quality improvement, the following integrated mechanisms will be implemented:

1. Structured Reporting Schedule and Delivery

A unified reporting calendar will be developed to define:

- **Types** of reports (Monthly Progress Briefs, Quarterly Monitoring Reports, Annual Evaluation Summaries)
- **Responsible Units** (e.g., WP Leaders, Project Coordinator, QA Board)
- **Distribution Channels** (ClickUp, email loops, EC portal)
- **Templates and Tools** aligned with EC requirements

Report Type	Frequency	Responsible Party	Format	Target Audience
Progress Brief	Monthly	WP Leaders	Dashboard/PDF	QA Team, PM
Monitoring Report	Quarterly	Project Coordinator	ClickUp Report	Steering Committee, EC
Improvement Summary	Quarterly	QA Board	Written Memo	Consortium + SC

2. Stakeholder-Centred Feedback Loop

- Feedback channels (surveys, interviews) will be systematically implemented each quarter for external and internal stakeholders.
- All collected feedback will be reviewed during QA review cycles and integrated into WP activities.

3. Verification and Data Quality Assurance

To enhance reliability of monitoring data:

- A data triangulation method will be applied (e.g., task tracking via ClickUp + survey data + deliverable submissions)
- WP1 and PM Team will validate reports before QA consolidation.

4. Strategic Decision Integration

Monitoring results will directly feed into strategic project management decisions through:

- SC meetings informed by "traffic-light" summaries,
- Action triggers if KPIs fall below predefined thresholds (e.g., 70% participation),
- Timeline and resource allocation updates.

5. Adaptive Learning and Continuous Improvement

An embedded learning structure will be implemented:

- Each WP will submit a **monthly reflection memo** on encountered barriers and lessons learnt.
- These logs will guide mid-course corrections and improvements in the PMP itself.
- An **Annual Learning Workshop** will synthesise insights and align strategies for the following year.

B. In the Executive Summary, it is recommended to include the following text in the Monitoring Plan in order to strengthen the emphasis on geographical/contextual applicability, organisational scope, time span and in-process adaptation and to clarify the relationship between Monitoring Plan ↔ Quality Assurance Plan and to emphasise how monitoring outputs feed into quality assurance and contribute to continuous improvement.

The Monitoring Plan is applicable across all partner institutions and pilot regions, covering technical, pedagogical, and administrative dimensions. It will be implemented across the full 36-month project cycle and adapted to the specific operational contexts of each work package. Monitoring applies at institutional, inter-partner, and stakeholder engagement levels.

C. In order to increase the strategic value of the monitoring plan and to ensure that the process is not limited to operational monitoring but integrated with quality assurance, risk management, stakeholder feedback and decision-making processes, it is proposed to add the following content under the heading "4.7 Monitoring Performance and Systematic Improvements". With this addition, it is aimed to increase the effectiveness of the monitoring system and to respond directly to the evaluation criteria. In this context, it is aimed to provide systematic and clear answers to basic questions such as whether the monitoring process is regularly reviewed, whether proactive improvement and adaptation mechanisms are defined, the impact of monitoring results on project decision-making processes, methods to ensure data accuracy, integration of stakeholder feedback into the process, periodic sharing of reports with all stakeholders, and whether monitoring tools are up-to-date, accessible and user-friendly.

4.7 Monitoring Performance and Systematic Improvements

To ensure that the monitoring process functions not only as a reporting mechanism but also as a strategic tool for learning, adaptation, and decision-making, a comprehensive performance enhancement system will be integrated into the PMP. This system addresses the accuracy, usefulness, and inclusiveness of monitoring across all phases and stakeholders.

Scheduled Review and Continuous Improvement

All monitoring procedures will undergo structured reviews every six months, aligned with Steering Committee (SC) meetings. A set of formative reflection tools, including partner feedback synthesis and delay pattern analyses, will be used to detect emerging inefficiencies and adapt workflows accordingly. This formal review process will be documented in a shared "Improvement Tracker" to support transparency and institutional memory.

Proactive Adaptation and Learning Mechanisms

The PMP embeds adaptive learning loops by leveraging quarterly reflection notes from WP leaders, feedback scoring summaries from stakeholders, and on-demand revisions to monitoring formats. These inputs will feed into periodic updates of the monitoring templates and indicator definitions. A "What We Learned" section will be added to each QMR (Quarterly Monitoring Report) to formalise collective learning.

Decision-Making Integration and Traceability

To reinforce strategic use of monitoring results, a **Decision Traceability Matrix (DTM)** will be introduced. This table will map key SC decisions to specific monitoring findings, risks, or deviations. The DTM will help evaluate how monitoring directly informs change actions, risk responses, or WP realignments.

Data Validation and Accuracy Assurance

A tri-level validation process will be implemented for all key monitoring outputs:

1. **WP-level validation** by task leads
2. **Cross-checking** by the QA team
3. **Spot audits** by external reviewers

All validated outputs will be logged with versioning in the ClickUp system and summarised in internal audit sheets.

Stakeholder Feedback and Communication Procedures

Stakeholder feedback will be systematically collected via digital forms, focus groups, and project events. Each feedback round will be logged, categorised, and analysed for integration into updated performance indicators or WP action plans. A dedicated feedback dashboard and quarterly digest will ensure this input is visible across the consortium.

Timely Distribution and Access to Reports

Monitoring reports will be updated quarterly and stored in a dedicated repository. All partners will be notified through automated alerts in ClickUp and via email with access links. Each report will include a version control table and summary of updates since the previous release.

Clarity and Accessibility of Monitoring Tools

To support full engagement, a set of user-friendly guides (e.g., QuickStart sheets, video explainers) will be shared with all partners. Periodic virtual training sessions and FAQ updates will also be organised. Access rights and edit/view permissions in ClickUp will be centrally managed and updated quarterly in coordination with the SC.

5.3. Evaluation Strategy Plan - Partially Satisfactory Items Evaluation

While the Evaluation Strategy Plan document provides a methodological basis for the evaluation activities carried out within the scope of the EPD-NET project, various areas of improvement were also observed to support the plan to be more applicable, traceable and integrated into the quality management system. In this context, during the independent audit process carried out by us, different sections of the plan were analysed in line with the evaluation criteria and constructive suggestions and content revisions were developed for the areas that were evaluated as partially sufficient. The suggestions made to improve these areas are presented below to be integrated into the Evaluation Strategy Plan document.

While the overall scope of the plan provides a holistic framework for project traceability and quality assurance, strengthening certain components in a more functional and practical way will increase the effectiveness of the evaluation processes. Internal structural capacity (CC 4.1) could be addressed in more detail, while stakeholder expectations (CC 4.2) could be diversified through more in-depth analyses. It would also be appropriate to more systematise the relationship between SC decisions and performance monitoring outputs (CC 5.2). Balanced monitoring and documentation of partner contributions (CC 7.3) and more structured and reusable definition of communication, feedback, focus group discussions and participation processes (CC 7.4)

will increase the plan's applicability. Reviewing the effectiveness of alert systems associated with digital tools (e.g. ClickUp) (CC 8.1), strengthening outreach to target stakeholders (CC 8.2) and integrating policy/curriculum impact into the evaluation system (CC 8.3) will reinforce the plan's widespread impact. More explicit tracking of data collection and management responsibilities at the level of WP leaders (CC 8.4), increased quality consistency across WPs (CC 8.4.1), clarification of evaluation milestones and timing of EC processes (CC 8.5) are recommended. Revisions in areas such as developing systematic evaluation mechanisms to monitor project impact (CC 9.1), strengthening the follow-up structure for the internal audit process (CC 9.2), and integrating improvement outputs more effectively into future phases (CC 10.3) will strengthen the effectiveness and strategic direction of the plan.

5.3.1. Deficiency Assessment

Within the scope of the EPD-NET project, it is seen that many components for communication, quality assurance, stakeholder participation and evaluation processes are included in the plans and implementations. However, further clarification of the structures in some topics, strengthening their practical aspects and integrating them more holistically into the monitoring and evaluation system will increase the strategic impact and institutionalisation capacity of the project. In particular, there is room for improvement in areas such as defining communication mechanisms more systematically, reflecting stakeholder contributions more visibly in the evaluation process, structuring how feedback and audit outputs are linked to managerial decisions, and applying quality templates consistently across all work packages. Furthermore, the relationship between the contextual diversity of the pilots and the translation of evaluation findings into strategic decisions could be more clearly established. In this context, additional steps are suggested to build on existing structures to enrich the implementation examples, to support stakeholder interactions with stronger documentation, and to systematically monitor and integrate internal audit and evaluation findings into governance processes across the project.

5.3.2. Revision Suggestions

A. In order to demonstrate that the monitoring system is not only limited to the follow-up of project activities, but also functions as a strategic tool for assessing the level of achievement of objectives and how key enablers and barriers affecting project implementation are managed, it is proposed to add the following text to the Executive Summary. In this way, it will be systematically explained how monitoring outputs are integrated with quality assurance mechanisms, what kind of preventive approaches are developed against risks and obstacles that may arise during the implementation process, and how the effectiveness of the monitoring system will be evaluated and improved.

The Monitoring Plan ensures continuity by systematically integrating data flows into the Quality Assurance framework throughout the entire 36-month project cycle. Monitoring outputs-such as performance indicators, partner-level progress, and stakeholder feedback loops-are directly aligned with QA mechanisms to support ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement. This plan is applicable across all partner institutions and pilot regions, covering technical, pedagogical, and administrative dimensions. It is further adapted to the specific operational contexts of each work package and functions across multiple levels, including institutional implementation, inter-partner coordination, and stakeholder engagement. To ensure that monitoring remains a strategically effective tool for achieving project goals, a dedicated performance review mechanism will be introduced. This will include quarterly reviews of monitoring outputs, alignment scoring between performance indicators and project objectives, and targeted

improvements to reporting or partner engagement where gaps are observed. The insights gained from this process will be used to continuously refine the monitoring framework and enhance its strategic value throughout the project lifecycle.

B. Overall, the Evaluation Strategy Plan sets out the basic framework guiding the monitoring and evaluation processes of the project and contributes to quality assurance. However, given the complexity and multi-stakeholder nature of the project, it is recommended that the evaluation system be strengthened with a more strategically aligned, operationally structured and quality consistent structure. In this respect, the sub-structures proposed under the heading "**Evaluation Enhancements for Strategic Alignment and Quality Cohesion"** are expected to both expand the scope of the evaluation system and increase the integrity of its implementation. Content proposals include a **"Partner Risk-Capacity Matrix**" (CC 4.1) that will allow analysing the organisational structure, technical capacity and experience of the institutions, an interaction mechanism (CC 4.2, CC 7.4), integration of a "Contribution Equity Dashboard" through ClickUp to transparently monitor the balanced distribution of contributions across work packages and partners (CC 7.3, CC 8.1), development of data protocols to standardise data collection processes in terms of role, frequency, format and harmonisation across WPs (CC 8.4, CC 8.4.1), diversification and systematisation of focus group and user interviews (CC 7.4), development of an evaluation-focused training module to coordinate quality understanding among WPs (CC 8.4.1, CC 10.3), the development of a "Policy Impact Log" to enable monitoring of evaluation outputs in terms of sustainability and policy impact (CC 8.3, CC 8.5), and the definition of automatic alert systems to facilitate timely intervention in EC1-EC6 processes (CC 8.5). The inclusion of these recommendations as a new sub-heading immediately following the 5th heading of the Evaluation Strategy Plan will provide a holistic contribution to enhance the strategic alignment capacity, quality integrity and applicability of evaluation processes.

Evaluation Enhancements for Strategic Alignment and Quality Cohesion

- **Internal Context Mapping:** Introduce a "Partner Risk-Capacity Matrix" detailing each institution's organisational structure, technical capacity, staffing, and prior project experience. This would allow better interpretation of risk emergence and mitigation.
- **Stakeholder Alignment:** Expand stakeholder analysis by segmenting into typologies (academic, policy, learner, tech) and specifying expectations, feedback loops, and adaptation responses.
- **Partner Contribution Tracking:** Embed a real-time "Contribution Equity Dashboard" in ClickUp, auto-generating monthly metrics per WP and partner.
- **WP-Level Data Protocols:** Develop a standardised Data Collection Protocol to ensure timely, accurate, and usable data flows, including roles, frequency, formats, and cross-WP consistency.
- **Feedback Mechanisms:** Extend focus groups and user interviews across multiple regions/themes, and institutionalise a bi-annual feedback cycle with visual summaries shared consortium-wide.
- **Quality Coherence Actions:** Launch a cross-WP training module on evaluation standards and QA metrics to ensure uniform interpretation and execution.
- **Sustainability Impact Tracker:** Develop a "Policy Impact Log" per WP, documenting uptake potential, formal interest, or legislative traction.
- **Evaluation Milestone Alerts:** Automate reminders 14 days before EC1-EC6 events and link all outputs to a central compliance dashboard.

C. Although the Evaluation Strategy Plan is a basic document that frames the overall evaluation approach of the project, it is suggested to add the heading "**Evaluation Gaps and Integration Improvements**" under 5.7 in order to address some gaps that have emerged at the implementation level and to integrate evaluation outputs more effectively with quality assurance, sustainability, stakeholder engagement and governance mechanisms. The recommendations presented in this section include interventions to improve areas that were assessed as partially adequate during the audit process. In particular, establishing a dashboard (e.g. heatmaps via ClickUp) to ensure balanced tracking of partner contributions (CC 7.3, CC 8.1), improving the documentation of stakeholder engagement and structured interview scheduling (CC 4.2, CC 7.4), expanding the pilot scenarios to include more diverse regional and institutional contexts (CC 8.5), clarifying the timing of evaluation milestones (EC1-EC6), responsible actors and alert mechanisms (CC 8.5, CC 9.2), linking sustainability indicators to assessment outputs and turning them into trackable actions (CC 8.3), adding a specific impact assessment matrix to monitor the interaction between outputs and changes at policy and institutional level (CC 9.1), structuring internal audit cycles with corrective feedback lines (CC 9.2) and contributing to the continuous learning process by integrating quality assurance outputs into WP-level adaptations (CC 10.3) will enhance the strategic impact of the plan. Furthermore, through the proposed stakeholder mapping exercise (CC 4.2, CC 8.2), meaningful and up-to-date stakeholder expectations for the project will be identified and updated through regular surveys and targeted interaction tools, contributing to strengthening the evaluation criteria. With the addition of this heading, gaps in the evaluation systematics will be addressed and the interaction between monitoring, evaluation and quality management within the project will be more consistent and traceable.

5.7 Evaluation Gaps and Integration Improvements

- Establish a balanced partner contribution tracking system via a dynamic dashboard (e.g., ClickUp heatmaps).
- Implement stakeholder engagement logs and structured interview planning to ensure data representativeness.
- Expand pilot testing scenarios to include diverse regional and institutional contexts.
- Formalise evaluation checkpoints (EC1-EC6) with clearer timing, responsible actors, and alert integration.
- Integrate sustainability metrics into evaluation outputs with follow-up actions.
- Add a dedicated impact assessment matrix to trace links between outputs and policy/institutional changes.
- Clarify internal audit loops with corrective action feedback lines.
- Link QA outcomes to WP adaptation cycles for continuous learning.
- A stakeholder mapping exercise will be conducted to identify and categorise relevant groups (e.g., institutional staff, students, local authorities, NGOs), followed by a structured analysis of their expectations and concerns. These insights will inform the evaluation criteria and will be regularly updated through periodic surveys and targeted engagement mechanisms.

D. The outputs of the EPD-NET project have the potential not only to support pedagogical innovations, but also to make a structural contribution to policy-making processes and institutional strategic planning. In order to integrate this multi-layered impact into the evaluation system in a clear and systematic way, it is proposed to add the heading "**2.1.1 Strategic Integration of Project Outputs into Policy and Institutional Frameworks**" under Section 2.2. This new sub-heading aims to make visible the alignment of the project outputs with the European Commission's **Digital Education Action Plan (2021-2027)**, the **European Education Area**, the **European Green**

Deal and relevant national strategies, while also concretising their reflections and sustainable impacts at local and institutional level. The structure of the training modules is designed to be in line with micro-qualification systems and structured for integration into higher education curricula. Furthermore, the feedback received from local stakeholders contributes to disaster management and resilience policies and it is observed that some institutional partners have taken steps to include EPD-NET modules in their strategic plans.

Incorporating this framework into the evaluation system will ensure that project outputs are traceable not only in terms of content but also in terms of **policy impact**, **institutional dissemination potential** and **long-term sustainability**. In addition, it is recommended to segment stakeholder groups (e.g. types of municipalities, institutional hierarchies) in more detail, periodically monitoring their changing needs and analysing them through focus group discussions and surveys. This approach is supported by a defined evaluation policy to reinforce the quality and accountability of the project, and the policy principles are communicated to all partners through structured guidance tools, coordination meetings and internal documentation. This structure is integrated into WP-level monitoring and reporting routines in full alignment with the project's vision, and stakeholder feedback is used to validate common understanding.

The structure presented under this heading contributes to several quality assessment categories, in particular **CC 8.3 (Policy Impact and Sustainability)**, **CC 9.1 (Systematic Assessment Structure)**, **CC 10.3 (Learning Cycle and Feedback Integration)** and **CC 4.2 (Stakeholder Expectations).**

2.1.1 Strategic Integration of Project Outputs into Policy and Institutional Frameworks

The EPD-NET project aims not only to contribute to pedagogical innovation through its modules, platforms, and tools, but also to strategically influence policy frameworks and institutional planning. Its outcomes demonstrate strong alignment with both EU-wide and national strategies across multiple dimensions:

1. European Education Area & Digital Education Strategy
   The project supports the European Commission's *Digital Education Action Plan (2021-2027)* by enhancing digital skills, integrating AI-based evaluation modules, and aligning with micro-credentialing approaches. These outcomes enable personalised learning and quality assurance at scale.
2. European Green Deal and Sustainability Goals
   Project content promotes nature-based solutions, climate resilience, and sustainable urbanism, thereby contributing to the educational dimension of the Green Deal. The learning modules serve as awareness-raising tools, particularly in climate action and disaster risk reduction.
3. National Educational Strategies & Curricular Integration
   The design of the modules is consistent with national vocational qualification frameworks and is structured for integration into higher education curricula in partner countries. Pilot implementations ensure feedback-based alignment with existing educational systems.
4. Institutional and Local Policy Impact
   Through stakeholder engagement and feedback loops, the project informs disaster management and resilience strategies of local authorities, NGOs, and educational institutions. Several institutional partners have already initiated steps to incorporate EPD-NET modules into their strategic plans.

In addition, stakeholder groups will be further segmented (e.g., municipal typologies, institutional levels) and their evolving needs systematically assessed and periodically reviewed through targeted surveys, monitoring reports, and focus group feedback.

These efforts not only strengthen institutional and policy integration, but also reinforce the project's internal commitment to quality and accountability through a clearly defined evaluation policy.
The evaluation policy of the EPD-Net project is built upon principles of excellence, transparency, inclusiveness, and long-term impact. These principles are communicated to all partners and stakeholders through structured guidance, coordination meetings, and internal documentation. Alignment with the overall project vision is ensured by embedding the policy into each WP's monitoring and reporting routines, and stakeholder feedback is actively integrated to validate shared understanding.

E. It is suggested to add the following text under the heading "**2.1.2 Evaluation System Operational Enhancements**" in order to transform the evaluation system of the EPD-Net project from a structure focusing only on outputs to a multidimensional structure covering aspects such as participation monitoring, evaluation of communication processes, generalisability of the training module to different contexts, monitoring of stakeholder contributions, internal audit practices, monitoring of corrective actions and effectiveness of sustainability mechanisms. This section provides clear and direct answers to CC questions 7.3, 7.4, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4, 8.5, 9.1, 9.2 and 10.2, and provides comprehensive coverage of evaluation criteria such as the level of balanced contribution of partners to WPs, effectiveness of evaluation processes, functionality of feedback mechanisms and traceability of sustainability outputs. In this respect, the added chapter increases the operational capacity of the evaluation strategy and strengthens its strategic governance capability.

2.1.2 Evaluation System Operational Enhancements
To strengthen the operational capacity and strategic value of the EPD-Net Project Evaluation Strategy, the following mechanisms will be implemented across WP evaluation cycles:

- **Participation Monitoring and Incentive System:**
  A partner contribution heatmap and WP participation logs will be maintained quarterly to ensure balanced engagement across tasks. Underperforming areas will be identified through comparative analytics, and corrective support actions will be initiated by the Project Management Team.
- **Communication Process Review:**
  The internal communication protocols defined in the Communication Management Plan will be reviewed biannually. Specific attention will be given to identifying gaps in partner response times, documentation versioning, and data access barriers. Improvements will be formalised through updated communication templates and feedback loops.
- **Replicability Testing of the Training Module:**
  To enhance the broader applicability of the training modules, new pilot use cases will be designed in alternative thematic (e.g., climate adaptation) and regional (e.g., non-urban) settings. Results will be evaluated with stakeholder-specific performance metrics and user satisfaction scores.
- **Expanded Interview and Focus Group Planning:**
  The qualitative evaluation protocol will be updated to include additional stakeholder interviews and focus groups across new pilot regions. A structured sampling plan and thematic coding framework will guide the expanded data collection.
- **Stakeholder Engagement Enhancements:**
  Dedicated stakeholder participation dashboards will track engagement depth, feedback return rates, and co-creation contributions. Periodic outreach campaigns and feedback collection sprints will be embedded into WP3-WP5 timelines.
- **ClickUp Alerts and Calendar Use Optimisation:**
  To maximise milestone tracking efficiency, ClickUp alerts (14-day pre-deadline reminders) will be reviewed for compliance and clarity. Partners will be offered micro-trainings to improve usage consistency.

- **Evaluation Checkpoint (EC) Follow-Up System:**
  All six EC milestones will be monitored through a revised alert and action log system, linked to the main ClickUp calendar. A checklist will ensure WP leaders record progress, deviations, and proposed solutions.
- **Internal Audit and Review Integration:**
  A structured internal audit schedule will be established, with defined methods (interviews, file reviews, partner logs) and reporting templates. Findings will be stored in the Evaluation Quality Folder and linked to Steering Committee escalation actions.
- **Corrective Action Tracking System:**
  Deviations identified through evaluation will be recorded in a Corrective Action Tracker. Each item will include a timeline, responsible actor, verification step, and resolution evidence log.
- **Sustainability Feedback Loop:**
  Evaluation outputs will be directly cross-referenced in the updated Sustainability Action Tracker. This will include indicators of institutional uptake, post-project support plans, and long-term resource commitments.

5.4. QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN - EVALUATION OF PARTIALLY SUFFICIENT ITEMS

The Quality Assurance Plan prepared within the scope of EPD-NET project is considered as an important document framing the general quality understanding. As a result of the audit work carried out by us in this direction, it was assessed that the functionality of the plan would increase significantly if its various components were made more measurable, applicable and integrated with decision support mechanisms. In particular, more clearly defining the evaluation metrics for monitoring process efficiency (CC 9.1.1) and clarifying the comparison methodology based on criteria such as time, cost and output quality will increase the monitoring power of the plan. The measurable indicators to be developed on the applicability and effectiveness of the quality plan will ensure that the document is not only definitional but also traceable and evaluable. Furthermore, a more structured presentation of the relationship between project outputs and quality outcomes (CC 9.1.3) will strengthen impact assessment. While existing definitions of data reliability include basic principles, data quality can be more strongly assured when quality control procedures are supported by technical mechanisms such as fault tolerance and cross-validation (CC 9.1.2). In addition, making exemplary mechanisms to demonstrate the contribution of monitoring outputs to project management decisions (e.g. minutes of decisions, corrective actions implemented) visible in the plan (CC 9.1.3) will support transparency and accountability. It is envisaged that the revision proposals developed in line with these observations obtained as a result of the audit will significantly strengthen the level of effectiveness and sustainability of the Quality Assurance Plan.

5.4.1. Revision Proposal

A. As a result of the quality management audit conducted within the scope of the EPD-NET project, it has been assessed that although the scope and general structure of the Quality Assurance Plan provides a strong basis, it would be useful to develop some measurable mechanisms in order to more systematically monitor the applicability, effectiveness and alignment of the plan with project performance. In this framework, it is proposed to add a new structure under the title of "**10.7 Enhanced Quality Effectiveness Assessment and Process Metrics**" to Section 10 of the plan. The components proposed under this heading are; defining metrics such as timing, feedback integration and resource utilisation that can monitor process efficiency (CC 9.1.1), developing a structured matrix to analyse the applicability of the quality plan in different work packages (CC 9.1.1), establishing a benchmarking methodology to analyse the results obtained by comparing them with

predetermined performance indicators (CC 9.1.1.1), ensuring the validity of the data through a three-stage verification mechanism (internal WP verification, QA cross-checking, external expert audit) (CC 9.1.2), and defining a decision-recording system to ensure that monitoring and evaluation outputs are directly integrated into project decision-making mechanisms (CC 9.1.3). Through this structure, the Quality Assurance Plan will be strengthened not only at the strategic level but also at the operational and analytical level, and the traceability of quality management throughout the project will be more transparent and accountable on a quantitative basis. This structure is proposed as a holistic improvement step that directly responds to the improvement areas identified by the audit and aims to increase the effectiveness of the quality assurance system.

10.7 Enhanced Quality Effectiveness Assessment and Process Metrics

To enhance the applicability, operational clarity, and performance alignment of the Quality Assurance Plan (QAP), a comprehensive set of quality effectiveness measures and data structures has been introduced. These mechanisms aim to ensure that QA processes are not only systematically applied across all work packages (WPs), but also continuously evaluated for impact, adaptability, and decision-making utility.

Efficiency Metrics: A defined set of process-level efficiency indicators has been established to monitor the timeliness, consistency, and responsiveness of quality-related activities. Key indicators include (i) *Delivery Punctuality*, measured as the percentage of deliverables submitted within defined deadlines; (ii) *Feedback Incorporation Rate*, capturing the proportion of QA feedback integrated into subsequent outputs; and (iii) *Resource Utilisation Accuracy*, assessing whether allocated human and technical resources were used as planned. These metrics will be automatically collected via ClickUp reports and reviewed on a quarterly basis by the QA Board and Steering Committee to identify patterns and initiate adjustments.

Applicability and Impact Evaluation: To assess the operational relevance of QAP components across diverse project contexts, a structured *Applicability Matrix* will be applied. This matrix will capture implementation ease, uptake rate, and alignment with WP-level workflows. In addition, an *Impact Scoring Model* will be deployed using stakeholder feedback collected through post-review surveys, scoring rubrics, and qualitative interviews. These insights will be cross-verified with actual usage logs to ensure that the quality instruments are not only adopted but meaningfully applied in practice.

Comparative Methodology: All quality data will be benchmarked against predefined Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and Project Indicators (PIs). An *Alignment Index* will be calculated per WP to quantify the deviation between expected outcomes (as set in initial planning documents) and actual results. This comparison will be visualised using variance charts and interpreted jointly by the QA Team and WP Leaders during semi-annual performance reviews. The goal is to ensure analytical depth in understanding quality outcomes beyond compliance-level reporting.

Data Validity Procedures: To safeguard the integrity of quality-related data, a three-tiered verification protocol will be applied. First, *Internal Validation* will be carried out by WP Leaders at the point of data entry. Second, *Cross-Validation* will be performed by the QA Team through random audits and consistency checks across sources (e.g., ClickUp logs, EPD_Assist entries, feedback forms). Third, *External Spot-Checks* will be conducted by designated external experts or Advisory Board members at key milestones (e.g., after EC3 and EC5) to independently verify sample outputs and assess systemic robustness.

Decision-Making Integration: In order to establish a tangible link between quality monitoring outcomes and project governance, all QA results will be systematically reviewed during Steering Committee (SC) meetings. Each documented decision in the SC log will be tagged to its relevant quality input-such as evaluation scores, feedback summaries, or indicator trends. Where applicable, corrective actions will be traced back to quality findings, thereby ensuring a closed-loop system of evidence-informed decision-making. A shared decision-quality dashboard will be developed to visually track these linkages, fostering transparency and accountability.

B. In line with the quality management audit conducted within the scope of the EPD-NET project, it was assessed that although the structural level of the existing Quality Assurance Plan provides an adequate framework, stronger implementation tools are needed in areas such as traceability in operational functioning, concretisation of quality control standards and structuring feedback mechanisms. In this context, the proposed "**10.8 Quality System Operational Enhancement**" aims to increase the consistency, accountability and updateability of the quality system at the operational level based on stakeholder interaction. The proposed structure directly responds to the areas that were assessed as partially sufficient during the audit process, particularly CC 9.1.1 (clarity of process efficiency and applicability criteria), CC 9.1.2 (data accuracy and monitoring systematics), CC 9.1.3 (integration of outputs with quality and decision processes) and CC 10.3 (feedback-based learning and adaptation processes).

The first component of the proposal, *Output-Specific Quality Criteria*, will make the quality assessment homogenous and comparable by identifying quality criteria specific to each type of output (e.g. training module, digital platform, policy document) and documenting these criteria with checklists. *The Stakeholder Feedback Integration Mechanism* component will support co-production, in particular by ensuring that the views of pilot users and community stakeholders are digitally captured through structured forms and ClickUp, and that this data is directly integrated into WP3-WP4 processes. *Internal Audit Traceability and Centralisation* will strengthen both internal traceability and timely response capacity by collecting internal audit records digitally in a centralised system with version control and visualising these data on the "Quality Dashboard". The KPI Matrix to be created within the scope of *WP-Specific Quality Indicators* will clarify the responsible actors and monitoring frequencies by defining quality indicators specific to each work package, thus creating an accountability mechanism at work package level in quality assessment. Finally, *Corrective Action Responsibility Framework* will provide a systematic responsibility map defining how possible deviations (delay, poor quality, non-compliance, etc.) will be handled by which unit and the timing of corrective steps.

The contents proposed under this sub-heading will ensure that the Quality Assurance Plan is strengthened at the operational level in line with the strategic governance structure, and will contribute to a more consistent, traceable and sustainable structure of quality outputs.

10.8 Quality System Operational Enhancement

To address the remaining operational gaps identified in the Quality Assurance Plan, the following refinements are proposed to reinforce traceability, stakeholder responsiveness, WP-level accountability, and structured quality control across all deliverable types:

1. **Output-Specific Quality Criteria:**
   A detailed annex (Annex 2) will be introduced to define quality criteria tailored to each output category, including but not limited to: training modules, evaluation reports, policy briefs, and digital platforms. Dimensions such as scientific validity, user accessibility, linguistic clarity, and reusability will be standardised and assessed through deliverable-specific checklists.
2. **Stakeholder Feedback Integration Mechanism:**
   To support co-creation and responsiveness, a formal mechanism will be established for capturing and integrating feedback from external stakeholders (e.g. pilot users, advisory boards, community partners). This mechanism will include structured consultation events and digital forms integrated via ClickUp, with summaries feeding into WP3 and WP4 adjustments.
3. **Internal Audit Traceability and Centralisation:**
   All internal audit forms will be digitally archived with version control in a secure ClickUp workspace. Quarterly reviews of audit results will be summarised in a "Quality Dashboard" and

deviations will trigger immediate logging and follow-up procedures by the QA Team and relevant WP leads.

4. **WP-Specific Quality Indicators:**
   A KPI Matrix (Annex 5) will be developed to allocate specific quality indicators to each WP, along with with responsible actors and review frequency. These indicators will be updated monthly and validated during biannual SC meetings.
5. **Corrective Action Responsibility Framework:**
   To ensure accountability in quality adjustments, a Corrective Action Responsibility Table (Annex 6) will map each type of deviation (e.g. non-compliance, delay, quality failure) to a responsible entity (WP Lead, QA Team, SC) along with procedural escalation steps and correction deadlines.

C. The quality assurance approach of the EPD-NET project is based not only on monitoring quality indicators but also on proactively responding to uncertainties and risks that may arise during the project. In this context, it is aimed to dynamically synchronise the Quality Assurance Plan with the Risk Management Plan in a holistic and adaptable manner. Accordingly, it is proposed to add the following text under **10.9 "Risk Alignment and Adaptive Quality Measures**". With this addition, it will be possible to clearly and systematically demonstrate how quality processes will be updated in line with possible risks, what kind of special evaluation and intervention mechanisms will be operated in the face of critical changes, how to analyse the effects of risks on quality outputs, how to identify and evaluate both risks and opportunities through quality indicators, and how to institutionalise a continuous improvement culture in this direction.

10.9 Risk Alignment and Adaptive Quality Measures

The Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) is dynamically aligned with the evolving risk landscape of the EPD-Net project. Periodic risk assessments, as documented in the Risk Management Plan, serve as formal triggers for the revision of QA procedures and tools. In cases of critical project changes-such as partner withdrawal, pilot site failure, or unforeseen legal or technical disruptions-a dedicated risk impact assessment will be conducted to evaluate the implications for quality objectives and processes.

Furthermore, evaluation results are interpreted in conjunction with risk data to detect potential causal links between quality deviations and risk events. This dual-track approach ensures that quality deficiencies are addressed promptly and systematically.

Importantly, the QAP incorporates both risks and opportunities into its monitoring logic: delayed feedback engagement or low participation may indicate emerging risks, while high satisfaction levels or innovative partner practices are treated as strategic opportunities for amplification. This integrated approach supports a culture of continuous improvement, transparency, and risk-aware quality governance throughout the 36-month project lifecycle.

To strengthen the link between quality targets, risk mitigation, and project performance, all quality objectives and risk-related indicators will be revised in alignment with the SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound). Each KPI will be explicitly linked to corresponding quality goals and evaluation outcomes to ensure analytical traceability. Furthermore, a formal review protocol will be established for the periodic assessment and updating of indicators, ensuring their continued relevance and alignment with evolving project needs. This protocol will be integrated into the QA system and monitored through ClickUp dashboards, audit logs, and oversight by the Steering Committee to ensure continuous quality improvement.

D. Although the quality assurance systematic carried out within the scope of the EPD-NET project includes basic mechanisms to support the applicability and sustainability of the project outputs, as a result of the audit, it was evaluated that emphasising the relationship of the quality approach with the European Higher Education Area Quality Assurance Standards and Guidelines (ESG 2015) in a more explicit and direct way would strengthen both the international reference level and the methodological integrity of the plan. Accordingly, it is proposed to add the title "**3.6 Alignment with Erasmus+ and ESG Quality Frameworks**" to the Quality Assurance Plan. This sub-heading aims to make clear how the EPD-NET quality system responds not only to the basic quality expectations of the Erasmus+ programme, but also to the principles of ESG 2015, in particular ESG 1.1 (Quality Assurance Policy), ESG 1.3 (Student-Centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment) and ESG 1.7 (Knowledge Management). In this context, the principles of validation of learning outcomes, stakeholder feedback, transparency in assessment processes and continuous improvement have been systematically integrated into the project quality system. Practices such as student-centred learning design, data-based assessment tools and external expert input ensure that quality management is not only internally but also externally monitored. The addition of this chapter will not only concretise the alignment of the quality policy with European standards, but also contribute to making the quality assurance system more credible and explainable for policy makers, academic actors and external observers. Furthermore, this content is directly related to assessment categories such as CC 9.1.1 (applicability of quality processes), CC 9.1.3 (integration of outputs with assessment systems) and CC 10.3 (continuous improvement mechanisms).

3.6 Alignment with Erasmus+ and ESG Quality Frameworks

The EPD-Net quality assurance system is designed to comply with the quality expectations of the Erasmus+ programme and aligns with the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG 2015). Although the QA approach is tailored to the specific needs of this partnership, it incorporates essential elements such as learning outcome validation, stakeholder feedback, transparency of evaluation processes, and continuous improvement mechanisms.

Internal and external quality assurance procedures follow principles of relevance, usability, inclusiveness, and impact, as emphasised by both Erasmus+ and ESG. Pilot testing, peer review, and external expert validation are among the measures implemented to ensure quality at all stages.

The EPD-Net quality assurance system is designed to comply with the quality expectations of the Erasmus+ programme and aligns with the ESG 2015 standards, particularly ESG 1.1 (Policy for Quality Assurance), ESG 1.3 (Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment), and ESG 1.7 (Information management), by incorporating transparent quality policies, learner-focused design principles, and systematic data collection mechanisms to ensure relevance, usability, inclusiveness, and impact across all project activities.

E. It is proposed to add a new section under the heading "**10.10 Quality Results Interpretation and Integration Mechanisms**" in order to ensure that the Quality Assurance Plan is not only a descriptive document, but also that the monitoring and evaluation outputs obtained at different stages of the project effectively guide decision making, improvement and sustainability plans. With this addition, it will be possible to respond directly to many critical elements assessed as "Partially Satisfactory" in the Quality Assurance Plan. In particular, how quality findings guide subsequent project phases (CC 10.3), identification of weaknesses of the plan and formulation of improvement plans (CC 10.3), systematic transformation of monitoring results into concrete improvement activities (CC 10.2), integration of performance indicators into decision-making processes (CC 9.1.3), regularity of reporting on these outputs (CC 9.1.3, CC 7.4), auditing of project outputs for compliance with quality standards (CC 8.5.1) and linking quality objectives with sustainability metrics (CC 9.1.1, CC 9.1.3). Practical aspects such

as the integration of quality and risk management processes (CC 6.1, CC 9.1.3) and the use of KPIs and assessment findings in decision-making processes will also be explained with examples. In this way, the applicability, effectiveness, impact on outputs and sharing with stakeholders of the quality assurance system will be revealed more clearly and holistically.

10.10 Quality Results Interpretation and Integration Mechanisms

To ensure that quality assurance outputs not only verify current performance but actively shape future project decisions, a structured system for interpreting, integrating, and acting on quality findings is introduced. This mechanism reinforces the link between evaluation results, monitoring data, and strategic project steering.

Translation of Monitoring Results into Improvement Actions: All outputs from monitoring reports (e.g. Quarterly Monitoring Reports, WP-level summaries) will be analysed with respect to deviations and performance gaps. These will be linked to specific improvement actions, recorded in a shared Improvement Tracker, and monitored for implementation status during SC meetings.

2. Decision Support via Performance Indicators (KPI/PI): Performance indicators will not only be monitored but directly tied to project decisions. For each KPI, a sample decision trace (e.g. timeline revision, WP adjustment, risk escalation) will be logged in the Decision Traceability Matrix (DTM), thereby enabling evidence-based decision-making.

3. Risk and Quality Integration: The interaction between risk management and quality outputs will be systematically reviewed. Each significant quality deviation will be cross-checked against the Risk Register to determine if the deviation is linked to a known or new risk. Mitigation strategies will be adapted accordingly.

4. Quality Reporting and Sharing Procedures: All quality-related outputs, including internal audits, satisfaction metrics, and quality assessments, will be compiled quarterly and shared with relevant stakeholders. A structured reporting schedule will be added to ClickUp, and version-controlled reports will be archived in the shared QA repository.

5. Quality Criteria Verification for All Deliverables: Each deliverable will be assessed against predefined quality criteria (scientific validity, clarity, user accessibility, etc.). A deliverable-specific QA Checklist will be completed upon submission, and outputs failing to meet standards will trigger corrective feedback loops.

6. Continuous Improvement through Lessons Learned: Quality outcomes will feed into a lessons-learned framework, where closed issues are analysed for root causes and systemic improvement. These will be summarised in quarterly "Quality Reflection Notes" and discussed in Steering Committee meetings for integration into upcoming cycles.

7. Post-Project Quality Impact and Sustainability: Long-term quality impact will be assessed through post-project surveys and institutional follow-ups. Indicators such as uptake of modules, integration into curricula, and stakeholder satisfaction will inform a post-project quality impact report.

6. Result

A comprehensive content and structure audit of the Quality Assurance Plan, Monitoring Plan, Evaluation Strategy Plan and Risk Management Plan developed within the scope of the EPD-NET Project was carried out during the project process. This audit process ensured that the plans were systematically analysed in terms of quality standards, implementation integrity, stakeholder engagement, sustainability strategies and monitoring and evaluation integration.

All items that were assessed as "Partially Satisfactory" as a result of the audit were revisited with contextual, methodological and operational revisions made separately for each item and all of them were raised to "Satisfactory" level. The revisions developed aimed not only to eliminate deficiencies, but also to

strengthen the internal consistency of the quality management system, its alignment with project objectives and its sustainability capacity.

The quality policy was restructured in a way to directly overlap with the project vision and basic principles, and communicated to all partners in a clear, understandable and guiding manner. The policy has been integrated into work packages and its relationship with evaluation mechanisms has been strengthened.

Stakeholder identification and engagement has been more systematised based on quantitative and qualitative data sources and supported by surveys, focus group discussions, feedback panels and digital monitoring tools. In this way, stakeholder needs can be regularly monitored and integrated into evaluation processes.

The integration of monitoring outputs into decision-making processes has been strengthened through dashboards, warning systems and EC1-EC6 checkpoints set up through ClickUp, thus supporting project management decisions directly with monitoring data.

Sustainability is structured to ensure long-term systemic impact, not just the transience of the pilots. Institutional integration, policy references, user feedback and evaluation outputs are linked to sustainability plans.

Corrective and preventive action mechanisms were defined within the project process, responsibilities were allocated and integrated into the monitoring system. This structure has increased the flexibility and response capacity of the project.

In line with the findings obtained during the audit process, justified and clear revision suggestions were prepared for each item marked as "Partially Satisfactory", and these suggestions were fully integrated into the final versions of the project documents. All contents have been reorganised to meet the evaluation criteria and the quality management system has been given a holistic strength.

Thus, the quality management approach of the EPD-NET Project has reached a sustainable, traceable and strategic structure that meets the quality expectations of the European Commission, together with revisions, audit outputs and integration between plans.