

Project N°: **FP7-231620**

Project Acronym: **HATS**

Project Title: **Highly Adaptable and Trustworthy Software using Formal Methods**

Instrument: **Integrated Project**

Scheme: **Information & Communication Technologies
Future and Emerging Technologies**

Deliverable D7.3

Project Quality Plan

Due date of deliverable: (Living Document)

Actual submission date: February 23, 2010

Revision date: March 22, 2010



Start date of the project: **1st March 2009**

Duration: **48 months**

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: **CTH**

March 22, 2010

Integrated Project supported by the 7th Framework Programme of the EC		
Dissemination level		
PU	Public	✓
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including Commission Services)	

Executive Summary:

Project Quality Plan

This document describes the project quality plan of project FP7-231 620 (HATS), an Integrated Project supported by the 7th Framework Programme of the EC within the FET (Future and Emerging Technologies) scheme. Full information on this project is available online at <http://www.hats-project.eu>.

The purpose of this project quality plan is to provide guidelines and principles that ensure a high scientific and organizational quality of the HATS project throughout its lifetime.

List of Authors

Reiner Hähnle (CTH)

Richard Bubel (CTH)

Contents

1 Project Quality Plan–Implementation	4
1.1 Introduction	4
1.2 Organisation and Leadership	4
1.3 Scientific Quality	5
1.4 Dissemination	5
A Deliverable Checklists	7

Chapter 1

Project Quality Plan–Implementation

1.1 Introduction

In Task 7.1 a project quality plan is developed and maintained during the whole project duration from PM0 to PM48. This document is the current version of the project quality plan. It is meant to be a living document that is updated regularly during the whole project duration but at least once in each reporting period. Over time, experiences in conducting the HATS project will prompt changes to the project quality plan. The project quality is maintained by CTH based on the input and feedback that is received from all consortium members on a regular basis.

1.2 Organisation and Leadership

The project is lead by a professional team with a clear-cut organizational structure.

- The scientific coordinator (SC) of HATS at CTH is Reiner Hähnle. He is ultimately responsible for all decisions and he answers to the European Commission. He delegates responsibility for certain areas as follows:
 - Per Waborg at CTH is responsible for all financial matters including reporting. He reports to the SC.
 - Richard Bubel at CTH is responsible for the IT infrastructure including the repository, mailing lists, and the web server. He reports to the SC.
 - The designated leaders of Work Packages 1–6 are responsible for timely and high quality delivery of the scientific work within their work package as laid down in the DoW. They report to the SC. The work package leaders (WPL) and the SC form the Scientific Committee of HATS which meets at least twice per year.

The WPL in turn delegate responsibility for timely and high quality delivery of the scientific work within each work task in their work package to a designated Work Task Leader (WTL). Each WTL reports to his or her WPL. The WTLs are responsible for timely and high quality project deliverables as stipulated in the DoW for each task.

- The structure of the project and all designated WPLs and WTLs are clearly advertised at the project website.

To avoid misunderstandings and delays as well as to ensure a high quality of deliverables a number of communication and reporting principles are laid down as follows:

- The SC is responsible for timely and transparent information on any decisions taken by him or the commission.

- The project website contains always complete and up-to-date information on upcoming activities. The project website is realized with a collaborative content management system that allows all project members to add suitable content.
- The project repository makes all organizational, legal, and scientific documents as well as software artifacts available to the project members. The project repository uses a version control system to permit simultaneous collaboration on software and texts, to guarantee traceability, and to admit recovery to defined states.
- There exists a general mailing list with all persons related to the project as well as dedicated mailing lists for each work package, for the Scientific Advisory Board (SAB), and for the End-User Panel (EUP). Additional mailing lists, for example, at the task-level are created on demand. The SC is a member of all mailing lists.
- Close to the starting time of each work task the WTL in charge calls for a meeting to plan the activities. Additionally, each active work task uses the annual project meetings to organize a work task meeting. Normally, each work task also organizes a meeting during the final months of its lifetime in order to coordinate the final deliverable.
- In addition to each end-of-project-year financial and resource usage report, each project site is asked to submit a mid-term report on resource usage in between annual reports. This helps to spot problems early on.

1.3 Scientific Quality

The following measures are in place to ensure high quality of the scientific results and the project deliverables:

- WTLs are experienced researchers and normally at least at the post-doctoral or senior engineering level. All WPLs are senior researchers with a strong scientific track record in the field of their work package and ample organisational experience. WPLs are suggested by the SC and ratified by the General Assembly. WTLs are suggested by the coordinating site of each work task and ratified by the WTL in charge and by the SC.
- Each scientific deliverable is reviewed internally before its release by at least two project members who were not involved in its creation. Scientific deliverables in text form are expected to be of a quality that allows peer-reviewed, international publication. Such publication is explicitly encouraged. Checklists for task leaders, authors and internal reviewers have been established to ensure a high quality standard and timely delivery of the reports. The checklists are included in App. A.
- The WPL responsible for Evaluation (WP5) monitors the active work tasks and ensures that the evaluation criteria laid down in the DoW are addressed in the deliverables.
- The WPLs organize “tracks” relating to their work package during the annual project meetings with presentations on the scientific progress. These are followed by critical discussions in which all project members, the SAB, and EUP participates.

1.4 Dissemination

- The project website at www.hats-project.eu is highly visible,¹ attractively designed, and easy to navigate. It contains summaries, news, events, as well as all public project results including software.

¹Using the search term “hats project” on google.com returned the HATS project website in first position a few months after project start.

-
- The main scientific results of the project are published in highly regarded, international, peer-reviewed venues.
 - All deliverables and the scientific publications associated with the project are continually published on the project website.
 - WP6 on Dissemination is lead by FRG who is a world-leader in technology transfer from academia to industry.
 - The HATS project is collaborating with a large number of related projects, including COST Actions IC0701 and IC0901, the Coordination Action FP7-ICT 247 758 ETERNALS, the FP6 STREP CREDO, etc.
 - The HATS project members, in particular the WPLs, are encouraged to present the project at suitable opportunities such as invited talks, workshops, industry days, etc.

Appendix A

Deliverable Checklists

Checklist for Task Leaders

The following list shall help task leaders to prepare the deliverables. The task leader should also read the checklist for the internal reviewers.

Description	Weeks before delivery	Explanation
<input type="checkbox"/> Assignment internal reviewers	10 – 8	each deliverable has to be reviewed by 2 project members not involved in its creation
<input type="checkbox"/> Creation	8	setup skeleton of deliverable in the repository
<input type="checkbox"/> Contact coordinator & WP leader	8	inform the coordinator & WP leader who the internal reviewers are and where to find the deliverable skeleton
<input type="checkbox"/> Send deliverable to internal reviewers, WP leader & coordinator	4	
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporate feedback from internal reviewers	2	
<input type="checkbox"/> Send final version to coordinator & WP leader	1	

Please check and update the status of the deliverable regularly at

<http://www.cse.chalmers.se/research/hats/?q=node/115>

Checklist for Authors and Internal Reviewers

When preparing/reviewing a HATS deliverable, please make sure that the following issues are addressed in addition to the quality criteria you apply for conference or journal papers

- Does the deliverable address explicitly and in sufficient depth the objectives as described in the “Description of Work”? If there are deviations, are they sufficiently motivated and explained?
- Does the deliverable point out and explain the importance of the work for the project? Is the work put into relation with the ABS language, the HATS methodology, and the HATS tool chain?
- Is related work cited and discussed sufficiently?
- If the results of the deliverable were gained in a collaboration among different HATS sites, please point out what the benefits were.
- Are items referred to in other/later deliverables (e.g., requirements) traceable (e.g., by a numbering schema)?
- Is the deliverable consistent with previous deliverables?
- Is everything spell-checked?
- Please add a glossary of acronyms and main terms.
- When sending feedback to the task leader, please include the WP leader and coordinator in the cc.