

		Suggestion to the Lead Partner and additional information on this activity, if any									
WP4 - Turning training courses into e-learning courses and application to other partner Universities	Detailed description of the activities conducted and the achievements reached by the Lead partner and the partnership during this Quarter of the main WP achievements	PUT	POLIBA	LIU	RU UNIBA	VALUE	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
UPM	During this XI quarter the UPM was testing the modules and analysing the results found. End-up of the work, including feedback implementation and deliverable contributions.	Valuable improvment suggestions	No suggestions	No suggestions	No suggestions	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Any	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any
Expected start date	M21										
Expected end date	M35										
Actual start date	M19										
Actual end date	M35										
		Comments on the deviations, if any									
Deviation from the workplan?	Yes	PUT	POLIBA	LIU	RU UNIBA	VALUE	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
If yes, explain the reason	We have enlarged the end-up phase to accomodate all the module improvements and reporting details	No deviations	No deviations	No problems	No problems	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any	No deviation detected	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any	Please provide a feebdback, if any
		Comments on this information, if any									
		PUT	POLIBA	LIU	RU UNIBA	VALUE	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
What problems have you experienced when carrying out the activities within this WP? Did you overcome them? How? If not, how do you plan to solve the problem?	Some partners have found difficulties in providing enough students to validate the e-modules.	No technical problems	No problems	No problems	NO	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Any	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment
Do you expect any problems for the implementation of this WP in the next quarter? If yes, which are these problems and which solutions do you suggest?	We have extended the initial dates and additional efforts were carried out to motivate participation	No	No problems	No problems	NO	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Any	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment

[illegible]

[illegible]

		Suggestion to the Lead Partner and additional information on this activity, if any									
WP7 - Quality Assurance	Detailed description of the activities conducted and the achievements reached by the Lead partner and the partnership during this Quarter of the main WP achievements	POLIBA	LIU	UPM	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
VALUEDO	During the 12th quarter ValueDo kept on checking on the quality of processes, results and activities. ValueDo kept on checking partners financial documents and supporting Poliba for financial issues; furthermore, Valuedo kept updating the Quality Assurance Plan. ValueDo supported LIU for the organization of the meeting in Stockholm (preparation of the agenda, coordination with partners).	No suggestions	No further suggestions	No additional information was elaborated	No suggestions	No suggestions	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any
Expected start date	M1										
Expected end date	M36										
Actual start date	M1										
Actual end date	M40										
		Comments on the deviations, if any									
Deviation from the workplan?	No	POLIBA	LIU	UPM	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
If yes, explain the reason	//	No deviations	No problems	No deviations in this WP were experienced	No deviations	No deviations	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any
		Comments on this information, if any									
		POLIBA	LIU	UPM	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
What problems have you experienced when carrying out the activities within this WP? Did you overcome them? How? If not, how do you plan to solve the problem?	No problems occurred so far. Valuedo will be at partners' disposal for supporting them adopt the QA tools	NO problems	No problems	No problems found	NO problems	No problems identified	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment
Do you expect any problems for the implementation of this WP in the next quarter? If yes, which are these problems and which solutions do you suggest?	No problems are expected, as the tools are easy to adopt. If problems will have doubts or encounter problems, ValueDo is ready to support them	NO problems	No problems	No problems are expected	NO problems	No problems expected	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment

		Suggestion to the Lead Partner and additional information on this activity, if any									
WP6 - Project Evaluation	Detailed description of the activities conducted and the achievements reached by the Lead partner and the partnership during this Quarter of the main WP achievements	POLIBA	LIU	VALUE	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
UPM	Preparation plan for the assessment of the WP5 deliverable	No suggestions	No further suggestions	Please provide a feedback, if any	No suggestions	No suggestions	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any
Expected start date	M1										
Expected end date	M36										
Actual start date	M1										
Actual end date	M40										
		Comments on the deviations, if any									
Deviation from the workplan?	No	POLIBA	LIU	VALUE	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
If yes, explain the reason	-	No deviations	No	Please provide a feedback, if any	No deviations	No deviations	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any	Please provide a feedback, if any
		Comments on this information, if any									
		POLIBA	LIU	VALUE	RU UNIBA	PUT	INFO	TDIT	IMPLE	ARRUTI	ALCO
What problems have you experienced when carrying out the activities within this WP? Did you overcome them? How? If not, how do you plan to solve the problem?	-	NO problems	No problems	Compulsory section, please comment	NO problems	no problems experienced	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment
Do you expect any problems for the implementation of this WP in the next quarter? If yes, which are these problems and which solutions do you suggest?	No, as we have agreed to use the same external reviewers than for the BoK, therefore the methodology is already known.	NO problems	No problems	Compulsory section, please comment	NO problems	no problems expected	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	Compulsory section, please comment	No problems expected	Compulsory section, please comment

R4.4	Result Responsible		
IE3 - E-learning modules Implementation Action plan	UPM		
Expected start date	M28		
Expected end date	M31		
Actual start date	M28		
Actual end date	M31		
		Comments on result preparation	
Percentage of completion	100%	The result has been delivered and validate by all partners	
	Please provide here below your evaluation on this Result		
	PUT	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	POLIBA	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	LIU	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	Yes
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	Yes
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	No
	RU UNIBA	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	VALUE	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
		1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES

	INFO	2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	TDIT	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	IMPLE	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	ARRUTI	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO
	ALCO	1. Is the description on how the testing phase of the e-learning modules should be implemented clear?	YES
		2. Did you find the detailed workflows, information exchange methods and procedures well explained?	YES
		3. Would you suggest any improvements?	NO

R4.5	Result Responsible			
E-learning modules evaluation	UPM			
Expected start date	M31			
Expected end date	M32			
Actual start date	M31			
Actual end date	M35			
		Comments on result preparation		
Percentage of completion	100%	This document reports the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country. Each University analysed all the data and suggestions provided by participants (students and partner companies).		
	Please provide here below your evaluation on this Result			
	PUT	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	YES	If no, explain
	POLIBA	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	YES	If no, explain
	LIU	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes	If no, explain
	RU UNIBA	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	YES	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	YES	If no, explain
	VALUE	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain

		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
	INFO	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
	TDIT	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
	IMPLE	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
	ARRUTI	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
	ALCO	<i>Was R4.5 helpful for reporting the feedback concerning all Pilot Actions carried out in each partner country?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the analysis of the suggestions provided by participants clear?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain
		<i>Is the described methodology, according to the project proposal, fully operational and positive?</i>	Yes/No	If no, explain

R4.6	Result Responsible			
Final version of e-learning modules	UPM			
Expected start date	M33			
Expected end date	M35			
Actual start date	M33			
Actual end date	M36			
		Comments on result preparation		
Percentage of completion	100%	Final version of e-learning modules		
	Please provide here below your evaluation on this Result			
	PUT	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	POLIBA	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	LIU	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	RU UNIBA	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	VALUE	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain

	INFO	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	TDIT	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	IMPLE	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	ARRUTI	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain
	ALCO	Did UPM assemble the improved materials as described in T4.6, and did the companies ensure coherence of the overall output?	Yes	If no, explain
		Did each of the modules reflect the main features described in R4.2, in addition to the improved parts developed in T4.5?	Yes	If no, explain
		Was the result released online by UPM on the IE3 website platform for wide public access after ultimate validation by all partners, and was information spread to associated partners and relevant stakeholders, according to the Dissemination and Exploitation Plan?	Yes	If no, explain