Deliverable 7.2

Interim Quality Assurance Report

Author(s):	Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
	Efthimios Tambouris (UOM)
	Maria Zotou (UOM)
Editor(s):	Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
Responsible Organisation:	UOM
Version-Status:	V1 Final
Submission date:	30/06/2017
Dissemination level:	PU

Deliverable factsheet

Project Number:	562236-EPP-1-2015-1-EL-EPPKA3-PI-FORWARD
Project Acronym:	PBL3.0
Project Title:	Integrating Learning Analytics and Semantics in Problem Based Learning

Title of Deliverable:	D7.2 – Interim Quality Assurance Report
Work package:	WP7 – Quality Assurance
Due date according to contract:	30/06/2017

Editor(s):	Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
Contributor(s):	All partners
Reviewer(s):	-
Approved by:	All Partners

Abstract:	This document documents the interim SWOT analysis and risk analysis performed by partners as well as the status of deliverables' peer reviews so far.
	Summing up interim SWOT analysis' results, 20 strengths and weaknesses were identified during the project's internal analysis, while the external analysis identified four opportunities and two threats.
	The interim risk analysis has identified 20 risks that should be taken into consideration during the 2nd half of the project.
Keyword List:	Risk, quality, SWOT, plan, monitoring

Consortium

	Role	Name	Short Name	Country
1.	Coordinator, academic partner	University of Macedonia	UOM	Greece
2.	Technology enhanced learning expert	Open University of the Netherlands	OUNL	Netherlands
3.	PBL expert	Aalborg University	AAU	Denmark
4.	Semantic and Learning analytics expert	University of Alcala	UAH	Spain
5.	IT partner	BOC	BOC	Austria

Revision History

Version	Date	Revised by	Reason
v01	05/05/2017	UOM	Circulation of first draft for contributions
V01	21/06/2017	UOM	Contributions received from partners
V02	28/06/2017	UOM	New version of deliverable with contributions
V1	28/06/2017	UOM	Final version ready for submission

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

Disclaimer:

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

The following table presents the acronyms used in the deliverable in alphabetical order.

Abbreviation	Description
CA	Consortium Agreement
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
IPR	Intelligence Property Rights
LA	Learning Analytics
LS	Learning Semantics
PBL	Problem Based Learning
SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

PBL3.0 project aims to enhance Problem Based Learning (PBL) with Learning Analytics (LA) and Learning Semantics (LS) in order to produce a new educational paradigm and pilot it to produce relevant policy recommendations.

WP7 is the Quality Assurance work package for PBL3.0. Its main aim is to provide quality monitoring mechanisms that will guarantee the results' superiority as well as the timely progress of the project.

The present deliverable is the second deliverable of WP7, D7.2 Interim Quality Assurance Report. Its purpose is to report all quality assurance mechanisms undertaken during the first half of the project and present an updated version of the SWOT analysis and risks registry.

More specific, this deliverable focuses on the following aspects and analyses:

- The interim SWOT analysis for the PBL3.0 project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The interim risk analysis for the PBL3.0 project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The presentation of performed peer reviewers for each technical deliverable of the PBL3.0 project as well as the plan for all future peer reviews.

The interim internal SWOT analysis identified a set of strengths, such as the collaboration and communication channels between partners, the decision making processes and exchange of information, the selection and integration of technologies and the application of the PBL approach in different course designs.

The external SWOT analysis identified opportunities such as the integration of PBL3.0 in MOOCs, which can open up a new research domain and market segment, the provision of semantic structure on educational objects and resources provided by the project results as well as the acceptable of the PBL_LA approach by multiple fields. On the other hand, possible threats that could hinder the project's impact include the non-transferability of the results into other educational contexts and the failure to attract the interest of the PBL community and the policy makers.

Additionally, the consortium performed an updated risk analysis by providing WP-specific risks based on the lessons learnt from the 1st half of the project's lifetime. In total, 20 risks were identified, the majority with limited possible impact. Some of the most important risks regarded that the tools selected for the community building platform will not meet match/suit purposes, possible difficulty to transform the project outcomes into policy recommendations and possible delays in delivering key milestones that could lead to the project falling behind schedule.

Finally, the report provided an overview of the peer-review process for the six deliverables that were submitted in the 1st half of the project, and included an updated allocation of reviewers for the deliverables to be submitted in the 2nd half of the project.

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

This deliverable presents the interim analysis of risk, SWOT and overall quality for PBL3.0. The methodology followed is not described in the present document but in the previously submitted D7.1 Quality Assurance Plan.

1.2 Audience

The intended audience for this document is the PBL3.0 consortium and the European Commission.

1.3 Structure

The structure of the document is as follows:

- Section 2 presents the interim SWOT analysis
- Section 3 presents the interim risk analysis
- Section 4 presents the status of the peer reviews of technical deliverables
- Section 5 concludes the document

2   SWOT Analysis

SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis is adopted as a suitable method for performing project self-evaluation (**Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**). SWOT analysis and the process for applying it in PBL3.0 is available in D7.1 Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we proceed directly to the results of our interim SWOT analysis.

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
INTERNAL	Strengths	Weaknesses
EXTERNAL	Opportunities	Threats

Figure 1. SWOT analysis concept

2.1   Interim SWOT analysis in PBL3.0

This section presents the results of the interim SWOT analysis as identified by all project partners.

2.1.1 Internal analysis

Internal analysis focuses on studying the strengths and weaknesses of the PBL3.0 project. The results of the internal SWOT analysis are depicted in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.** and are structured as follows:

- The first two columns denote the number and description of the item, i.e. the 17 items to be rated as strengths or weaknesses,

- The third and fourth columns denote the average rate allocated by the consortium partners in M2, as well as the characterisation assigned – either S for strength, W for Weakness, or N for Neutral,

- The fifth and sixth columns denote the average rate allocated by the consortium partners in M12, as well as the characterisation assigned – either S for strength, W for Weakness, or N for Neutral,

- The seventh column includes provided comments or suggestions.

Table 1. Internal SWOT analysis, Strengths / Weaknesses

No.	Item	Initial Rating		Interim Rating		Comment / Suggestion
1	Size of consortium	4,3	S	5,0	S	
2	Composition of consortium	5,0	S	5,0	S	

3	Collaboration between participating partners	4,3	S	4,0	S	
4	Communication between participating partners	4,3	S	4,0	S	
5	Consortium meetings	5,0	S	5,0	S	
6	Decision-making process / consensus-drawing process	4,3	S	5,0	S	
7	Allocation of work	4,0	S	4,0	S	
8	Coordination of work - synchronization of related tasks and processes	4,3	S	4,0	S	
9	Exchange of information - level of transparency between related WPs and involved partners	4,3	S	4,0	S	
10	Technological innovativeness	3,7	N	3,7	N	
11	Scientific/technical capacity of partners for the specific project	5,0	S	5,0	S	
12	Sufficiency of resources (budget, time)	4,0	S	4,7	S	
13	Existence of clear objectives and measurable results	3,3	N	3,7	S	
14	Existence of clear work plan to achieve project's objectives	4,3	S	4,3	S	
15	Existence of clear methods to measure project's success	3,7	N	4,3	S	
16	Sufficiency of risk management methods	4,3	S	4,7	S	
17	Existence and use of a clear Quality Assurance System	4	S	4,7	S	

No.							
18	Selection and integration of existing technological tools/platforms	4	S	5,0	S		
19	Integration of different local contexts to the new educational approach	4,3	S	4,0	S		
20	Application of the PBL approach in different course designs			4,3	S		

2.1.2 External analysis

From an external viewpoint the SWOT analysis focuses on the analysis of threats and opportunities in the project's environment. The results of the external SWOT analysis are depicted in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**.

Table 2. External SWOT analysis, Opportunities

No.	Opportunity	Suggestion
1	Integration of PBL3.0 in MOOCs can open up a whole new research domain and market segment	
2	New instructional methods in PBL (e.g. the flipped classroom) provide information and structure regarding education material and resources	
3	The PBL_LA approach can tackle many problems faced at the time during PBL project work due to lack of online monitoring and feedback and thus can enhance the PBL pedagogy	
4	Acceptance of the PBL_LA approach for the use in different domains	

Table 3. External SWOT analysis, Threats

No.	Threat	Suggestion
1	Results of pilots are not transferable to other educational contexts	The pilots will cover different educational settings and their results shall be documented and analysed in order to provide for different settings
2	Failure to attract interest of the PBL community and policy makers	The interim dissemination and exploitation plans should cater for that

3   Risk Management

The overall process for managing risk in the PBL3.0 project has been described in detail in D7.1 - Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we proceed directly to the results of our interim risk analysis.

3.1   Interim Risk analysis

In the interim risk analysis, the consortium has identified 20 risks for the overall project. These are analysed in the risk registry in Table 4**Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**.

The most important risks identified are:

- The tools selected for the community building platform do not meet match/suit purposes.

- Difficulty to transform the project outcomes into policy recommendations.

- Delays in delivering key milestones leading to the project falling behind schedule.

Table 4 Interim Risk Registry

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
General Project Risks										
0.1	**Lack of effective performance of the consortium**	Project results of poorer quality.	3	9	27	The consortium has been carefully selected according to their particular abilities and liability for effectively accomplishing successful research technology development. Performance will be constantly monitored by both the Project Coordinator and the WP leaders.	1	9	9	The coordinator will be responsible for finding out the source of the problem and come up with a solution such as allocate or recruit new, more skilful staff or, in more extreme cases, replace the problematic partner with a different one, according to the provisions of the Consortium Agreement (CA).
0.2	**Retreat of a partner from the consortium**	Potential deviation in work plan.	2	8	16	The Project Coordinator will constantly monitor the level of partners' commitment to PBL3.0. The advanced payment process will be described in the CA.	1	8	8	Either distribution of the withdrawer's assigned work among the rest of the RTD partners or its replacement by a new, partner with similar expertise.
0.3	**Personnel alterations**	Potential effect on the work plan and partners' communication.	5	4	20	Partners will reduce probability by trying to keep the same employees assigned to the same roles in the project and build robust working	1	4	4	All partners will try to communicate knowledge of the project to the new team members in order to

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
						processes. Partner organisations will employ more than one person in this project and will ensure a smooth process for responsibilities' re-allocation in order to ensure continuation as much as possible.				familiarise them with the project work and integrate them smoothly in the project team. The online documentation in the website private area will also contribute to this.
WP1 Risks										
1.1										
WP2 Risks										
2.1										
WP3 Risks										
3.1	**Difficult to integrate BOC's tools and models to PBL3.0's technologies and activities**	Problems successfully designing models for course design, implementation and assessment.	2	8	16	The PBL3.0 consortium already conducted some discussions regarding the solutions provided by BOC and the ways in which the models and tools developed can enhance the PBL3.0 activities.	1	8	8	BOC is continuously providing comprehensive guidelines on the tools' and models' utilization.
3.2	**Failing to adapt the ECAAD for PBL_LA**	Problems in successfully integrating the ECAAD's concepts with PBL_LA.	2	8	16	WP3 work focuses on the adaptation and deployment of the currently existing version of ECAAD specifically for the PBL_LA approach. The ECAAD (Evidence Centred Activity and Assessment Design) is an already existing platform used by BOC, resulting from the EU Project NextTell which is being adapted as a result of	1	8	8	Possibly usage of another modelling toolkit and approach, however, this is highly unlikely to become necessary.

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
						WP1 and 2.				
3.3	**Difficulty in choosing and adapting modelling tools for PBL_LA, continuous learning assessment**	Problems in successfully assessing stakeholders through the application of the PBL_LA approach.	2	9	18	ADOxx being the metamodeling platform developed by BOC, several relevant modelling toolkits are available that can be used and adapted for the current project. BOC Innovation Group having high expertise in using them allows professional deployment and adaptation of currently existing modelling tools.	1	9	9	UOM and AAU also using LMS technologies extensively allows collaboration in order to choose the right tools for the PBL_LA, learning assessment and adapting them appropriately.
WP4 Risks										
4.1	**University students and / or private and public employees do not participate in the trials**	Difficulty to test the validity of the project's results.	2	9	18	Each partner will make sure to gather members of their target groups in order to participate in the trials.	1	9	9	All partners will reinforce their efforts in gathering stakeholders to participate in the trials by using their organization's networks.
4.2	**Evaluation mechanisms different for each organization**	Difficulty to draw homogenous conclusions.	2	7	14	The consortium will study all available assessment methods and agree on a template that covers all partners' contexts.	1	7	7	Partners will perform additional analysis of the evaluation data to draw high quality conclusions.
WP5 Risks										
5.1	**Selection of tools for CoP Do not meet match/suit purposes**	Problems in building a PBL3.0 community	5	8	40	Creative ways will be sought in order to gather content and individuals to visit the CoP and perform knowledge transfer and content exchange activities.	2	8	16	Partners will reach their networks and promote the CoP platform for increased interactions and content.

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
5.2	**Project outcomes are beyond expectations making difficult to form policy recommendations**	Low number and quality of policy recommendations	4	9	36	The PBL3.0 consortium will consult with stakeholders from the public sector for guidance in forming policy recommendations that could have an impact on future policy reforms in education and training.	2	9	18	WP leader based on their experience & presumably that project outcomes are delivered as promised will formulate policy recommendations
WP6 Risks										
6.1	**Conflict arises over potential IPR issues for future exploitation**	Created knowledge during project cannot be utilized and/or existing tools cannot be employed	3	9	27	IPR management was covered in the Consortium Agreement before the start of the project. IPR for all newly created knowledge is shared by the Consortium. The Dashboard tools will be created using open source software where possible.	1	9	9	Issues connected with IPR will be solved by discussions within the consortium and will be addressed in the updated exploitation plans.
6.2	**Solution fails to find new adopters before the project end**	The project results fail to have an impact on educational practice	4	4	16	Exploitation activities began from Month 1 of the project. All partners are involved in the promotion of PBL3.0 and its results as well as coming up with an appropriate business plan to ensure sustainability. All partners have experience in spinning off successful products from EU projects which helps to minimise risk.	2	4	8	Failure to find new adopters will be identified and dealt with before the end of the project. Moreover, further dissemination activities may be planned.
6.3	**Outdated website**	Reflect poorly on the project as a whole or discourage potential interest in the project	2	9	18	Channels of communication are established between all project partners, to ensure that any new information can be uploaded to the	1	9	9	Other dissemination channels (a facebook page and a twitter acount) are also employed in order to

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
		from external sources				website the soonest possible. If the project partners do not volunteer news updates, the website developer is responsible for retrieving updates periodically.				overcome problems with the website
6.4	**Solution fails to approach policy makers**	The project results fail to have an impact on educational policies	5	4	20	The project target results are in accordance to the main goals of the European policy agendas. This will enable and facilitate the dialogue between the consortium and the policy makers as well as their transfer to actual policy development.	2	4	8	The PBL3.0 consortium has its own network and contacs in the policy making field, which will be exploited to advance the dialogue with policy makers.
6.5	**Solution fails to target the market needs**	Low exploitation	4	7	28	One of the main objectives of this WP is to investigate market needs. Moreover, the consortium contains partners from the industry, which will help to produce results in accordance with market needs.	1	7	7	The constant updates in the exploitation plan will help to alleviate the effects of this threat.
WP8 Risks										
8.1	**Partners fail to meet key delivery milestones leading to the project falling behind schedule**	Deviation in work plan and possibly in results' quality.	7	9	63	Use of PRINCE2 project management principles, regular calls, meetings and a shared document repository, will help the experienced UoM Project Managers coordinate the project. A small consortium facilitates closer relationships between the partners. Risk monitoring will ensure any	5	7	35	The consortium will decide appropriate corrective actions, e.g. release of draft versions of the late outputs in order for the next tasks to be able to progress although the final output was not yet

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
						potential issues/risks are identified and corrected asap.				delivered.
8.2	**Inadequate partners' coordination**	Potential work plan deviations.	2	7	14	Project management will be responsible for efficiently managing the consortium and ensuring that each partner will be acting according to his assigned responsibilities and roles.	1	6	6	The consortium plans to consider replacing the project coordinator with a new, more skilled person, according to the provisions of the CA.
8.3	**Conflicts over financial issues**	Potential deviation in work plan and objectives' accomplishment .	3	7	21	PBL3.0 consortium, having the coordinator as a leader, will be responsible for assessing and examining costs, spending, and excess issues on budget for ensuring the appropriate distributing of the project's budget.	2	4	8	If conflicts over financial issues do occur, the consortium plans to confront them by organizing a meeting for partners to negotiate having the coordinator as a leader. Standard voting procedures will be followed according to the provisions of the CA. In case, however, of extreme financial issues, the consortium will follow the appropriate, European legal procedure.
8.4	**Failure in partners' communication**	Potential deviation in work plan and results' quality.	5	6	30	In order to ensure succesful communication channels between partners, PBL3.0 plans to organise	3	6	18	In case of serious problems in the communication of the partners, the

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
						teleconferences as well as plenary meetings at short uniform intervals.				coordinator will be responsible for organising a meeting to find out and confront the communication problems. Standard voting procedures will also be followed according to the provisions of the CA.
8.5	**Delay of reporting to the European Commission**	Project's accountability and financing is endangered.	3	7	21	The Project Coordinator will ensure that management reports' preparation starts timely and will provide detailed information to the partners on what is expected from them to contribute and by when. A dedicated session in a meeting or telco will also be organised before each report deadline.	2	6	12	Coordinator will draw the attention of all partners to the importance of these reports for the overall project and will request immediate actions for all organisations (including the coordinator's organisation), such as dedication of more personnel etc., in order to complete this task.

4 Peer Review of Deliverables

Being committed to delivering results of outmost quality, the consortium adopted and followed a peer review process for all deliverables of the project. The detailed procedure for deliverables' review as well as the review report template have been described in D7.1 - Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we directly report the progress of peer reviews during the first reporting period.

During the first reporting period 11 reviews of technical deliverables were performed. For objectivity reasons, the review partners were always different than the leading partner of the deliverable. The reviews have been performed by personnel of the partner organisations and relevant review reports have been filled in the designated template and are available in the project's knowledge repository.

In all of these cases the reviews were timely performed allowing for deliverables' revision before submission to the European Commission (EC). In general, the consortium follows an open, collaborative process of deliverable creation and review since all working versions of the deliverables are being uploaded in the knowledge repository (Google Drive) and are constantly monitored and commented upon by all consortium partners.

The list of all deliverables that were subjected to peer review in the first period of the project is available in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**, while Table 5 depicts the reviews planned for the second reporting period.

4.1 Allocation of reviewers

All implementation deliverables of PBL3.0 will be peer reviewed, which essentially means that only management deliverables (deliverables of WP7 and WP8) will be excluded from the peer review process. The list of all deliverables that were subjected to peer review in the first 18 months of the project is available in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**, while Table 5 depicts the reviews planned for the second reporting period.

Table 5. Reviewers and deadlines for PBL3.0 deliverables of the 1st period

Deliverable	Leader	Nature	Diss Lev	Reviewer	Indicative dates due		Submission to EACEA
					To Reviewer	Reviewed	
D1.1 – PBL analysis	AAU	R	PU	UOM	29/02/2016	05/03/2016	M3 31/03/2016
D1.2 - LA analysis	UOM	R	PU	OUNL	29/02/2016	05/03/2016	M3 31/03/2016
D6.1 - Dissemination plan and material	AAU	R&O	PU	UAH	31/03/2016	08/04/2016	M4 30/04/2016
D1.3 - PBL_LA educational approach	UOM	R	PU	AAU	30/05/2016	10/06/2016	M6 30/06/2016
D2.1 - Semantic model design	UAH	R	PU	BOC	30/05/2016	10/06/2016	M6 30/06/2016

D2.2 - Semantic annotation tool	UOM	R,S	PU	UAH	30/11/2016	09/12/2016	M12 31/12/2016
D3.1 - PBL modules analysis and configuration	BOC	R,S	PU	UOM	02/06/2017	09/06/0217	M18 30/06/2017
D4.1 - Courses design and materials	UOM	R	PU	AAU	02/06/2017	09/06/0217	M18 30/06/2017
D5.1 - Community building platform v.1	OUNL	R,S	PU	BOC	02/06/2017	09/06/0217	M18 30/06/2017
D6.2 - Dissemination activities Report	AAU	R	PU	OUNL	02/06/2017	09/06/0217	M18 30/06/2017
D6.4 - Interim Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	BOC	R	RE	AAU	02/06/2017	09/06/0217	M18 30/06/2017

Table 6. Reviewers and deadlines for PBL3.0 deliverables of the 2nd half of the project

					Indicative dates due		
Deliverable	**Leader**	**Nature**	**Diss Lev**	**Reviewer**	**To Reviewer**	**Reviewed**	**Submission to EACEA**
D3.2 - LA modules analysis and configuration	BOC	R,S	PU	UAH	08/12/2018	09/06/0218	M36 31/12/2018
D4.2 - Trials report	UOM	R	PU	AAU	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D4.3 - Trials evaluation report	UOM	R	PU	OUNL	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D5.2 - Community building platform final version	OUNL	S	PU	UOM	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D5.3 - Policy recommendations	OUNL	R	PU	AAU	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D6.3 – Final Dissemination activities Report	AAU	R	PU	OUNL	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D6.5 - Final Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	BOC	R	RE	AAU	08/12/2018	15/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018

5 Conclusion

The purpose of this deliverable is to present the interim risk analysis and quality assurance for the project.

- The interim SWOT analysis for the PBL3.0 project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The interim risk analysis for the PBL3.0 project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The presentation of performed peer reviewers for each technical deliverable of the PBL3.0 project as well as the plan for all future peer reviews.

The interim internal SWOT analysis identified a set of strengths, such as the collaboration and communication channels between partners, the decision making processes and exchange of information, the selection and integration of technologies and the application of the PBL approach in different course designs.

The external SWOT analysis identified opportunities such as the integration of PBL3.0 in MOOCs, which can open up a new research domain and market segment, the provision of semantic structure on educational objects and resources provided by the project results as well as the acceptable of the PBL_LA approach by multiple fields. On the other hand, possible threats that could hinder the project's impact include the non-transferability of the results into other educational contexts and the failure to attract the interest of the PBL community and the policy makers.

Additionally, the consortium performed an updated risk analysis by providing WP-specific risks based on the lessons learnt from the 1st half of the project's lifetime. In total, 20 risks were identified, the majority with limited possible impact. Some of the most important risks regarded that the tools selected for the community building platform will not meet match/suit purposes, possible difficulty to transform the project outcomes into policy recommendations and possible delays in delivering key milestones that could lead to the project falling behind schedule.

Finally, the report provided an overview of the peer-review process for the six deliverables that were submitted in the 1st half of the project, and included an updated allocation of reviewers for the deliverables to be submitted in the 2nd half of the project.