



StoRES

Promotion of higher penetration of Distributed PV through storage for all

Priority Axis 2: Fostering low-carbon strategies and energy efficiency in specific MED territories: cities, islands and remote areas

2.2: To increase the share of renewable local energy sources in energy mix strategies and plans in specific MED territories

Deliverable n°: **1.3.1**

Deliverable Name: **Interim Evaluation Report**

Disclaimer: This document reflects only the authors' view and the ERDF is not responsible for its contents or any use or exploitation of the information it contains.

1. Document info

Project Name	Promotion of higher penetration of Distributed PV through storage for all (StoRES)
Funding Scheme	ERDF
Work Package Number	WP1
Name of Work Package	Project Management
Number	D1.3.1
Title	Interim Evaluation Report
Dissemination Level	PU
Date	28.02.2018
Authors	A. Nousdilis, G. Papagiannis
Contributors / Reviewers	All partners have reviewed the document before finalised
Status	Final

2. Document History

Date	Author	Action	Status
25.02.2017	A. Nousdilis	1 st draft report	Draft
28.02.2017	G. Papagiannis	Final version	Final

3. Contents

1. Document info 2

2. Document History 2

3. Contents 3

4. Executive Summary 4

5. Internal Evaluation Report 4

6. Meetings Report11

7. Deliverable Reviews Findings11

8. Performance of Quality Management12

9. Files & Archives.....12

10. Conclusion13

4. Executive Summary

Interim evaluation report is delivered in the framework of Work Package 1 (WP1). The main scope of this report is to provide information about the Quality Management process during the first half of StoRES project. It describes the findings regarding the evaluation activities that have taken place up to the interim phase of the project. Specifically, it evaluates the compliance to quality requirements set by the Quality Management Plan (QMP) of all deliverables achieved by the interim phase of the project. In conclusion, the performance of evaluation activities is demonstrated with the use of quantitative and qualitative criteria, than have been defined in QMP.

5. Internal Evaluation Report

The internal evaluation of project outputs refers to the quality assurance of all project deliverables, classified either as Public or Restricted. According to the QMP procedures, one or two reviewers review each of the project deliverables once available by the deliverable responsible (WP leader). It has been ensured by the Quality Manager that within the first period of the project, at least one reviewer reviews each deliverable in its final version. Furthermore, a proper deliverable feedback form is produced following every project deliverable review, following the guidelines of the QMP.

The reviewers who participated in the deliverable review process until the interim phase of the project are all team members of StoRES project. Quality manager has assigned the review process of deliverables to specific members of each partner organization, as described in Table 1. This list of reviewers has been announced to all partners and agreed in the 1st project meeting.

Table 1: Reviewers for the project deliverables

<i>PARTNER</i>	
<i>UCY - University of Cyprus</i>	George Georghiou Stavros Afxentis Eliza Loucaidou
<i>AUTH - Aristotle University of Thessaloniki</i>	Grigoris Papagiannis Giorgos Christoforidis Dimitris Tampakis
<i>AREAL - Regional Energy and Environment Agency of Algarve</i>	José Martins de Oliveira Paulo Martins
<i>SARGA - Government of Aragon</i>	Javier Sancho
<i>MUN.BIS. - Municipality of Slovenska Bistrica</i>	Tomaž Pristovnik
<i>RAEE - Regional energy and environment agency in Rhône-Alpes</i>	Patrick Biard Noemie Poize
<i>EAC - Electricity Authority of Cyprus/DSO</i>	Ioannis Papageorgiou
<i>MUN.USS. - Municipality of Ussaramanna</i>	Marco Sideri Andrea Rubiu
<i>UNICA - University of Cagliari</i>	Susanna Mocci

Deliverables of the project are distinguished in two main categories, considering their type:

- a) Deliverables that are documents, reports, project plans, etc.
- b) All other deliverables, such as pilots, websites, press & media releases and other defined actions of each WP.

Deliverables of category (a) are subject to the deliverable review process as described in the QMP. On the other hand, the quality assurance of deliverables belonging in category (b) is verified by all partners participating in their accomplishment and the WP leaders.

A detailed report for the status of review progress of all deliverables is described in Table 2. More specifically, Table 2 presents the following aspects of each deliverable:

- **Due Date**
- **Responsible partner organization**
- **Accomplishment status** (Accomplished, In progress, etc.)

- **Review status** (Revised, Not revised, not applicable (n/a))
- **Reviewers** (Name of reviewers participating at the specific deliverable)
- **QMP Compliance** (Yes, No, n/a). This attribute indicates whether the specific deliverable complies with all quality requirements described in the QMP.
- **Files received**. This attribute lists the documents that have been received by the Quality Manager with regard to the specific deliverable, such as deliverable revised and final version and the feedback form. The feedback form is received and archived under the responsibility of Quality Manager.

It should be noted, that deliverables: *D1.1.2 - Project Management Plan*, *D1.2.1 - Kick-off meeting report*, *D1.3.2 - Quality Management Plan* and *D2.2.1 - Communication plan*, were finalized before the implementation of the QMP. Nevertheless, the quality of the content of these specific deliverables was assured by the review comments of all project members, during the deliverable development process. After the release of the QMP, any minor incompatibilities of above-mentioned deliverables with QMP were fixed by the Quality Manager. Furthermore, transnational meeting reports are regularly revised by all partners, therefore they do not participate in the QMP review process.

Table 2: Project deliverables review progress

Number of associated action	Name of the Deliverable	Due Date	Responsible	Accomplishment status	Review status	Reviewers	QMP Compliance	Files received
WP1								
1.1.1	Formation of Groups and Committees	31/01/2017	UCY	Accomplished	n/a		n/a	n/a
1.1.2	Project Management Plan	31/01/2017	UCY	Accomplished	Revised	All partners - Delivered before QMP	Yes	• Deliverable FINAL version
1.2.1	Steering and Technical committee meetings	31/03/2017	UCY	Accomplished	Revised	All partners - Delivered before QMP	Yes	• Kick-off meeting report FINAL • 2 nd meeting report FINAL • 3 rd meeting report FINAL
1.2.2	Progress Report	31/05/2017	UCY	Accomplished	Revised	Contribution by all partners, revised by the Lead Partner	n/a	n/a
1.2.3	Progress Report	30/11/2017	UCY	Accomplished	Revised	Contribution by all partners, revised by the Lead Partner	n/a	n/a
1.2.4	Progress Report	31/05/2018	UCY		n/a		n/a	n/a
1.2.5	Progress Report	30/11/2018	UCY		n/a		n/a	n/a
1.2.6	Final Report	30/04/2019	UCY		n/a		n/a	n/a
1.3.1	Interim evaluation report	28/02/2018	AUTH	In progress		Susanna Mocci (UNICA) George Georgiou (UCY)		
1.3.2	Quality Management Plan	31/01/2017	AUTH	Accomplished	Revised	All partners - Delivered before QMP	Yes	• Deliverable FINAL version
1.3.3	Final assessment	30/04/2019	AUTH		n/a			
WP2								
2.2.1	Communication plan	31/12/2016	UCY	Accomplished	Revised	All partners - Delivered before QMP	Yes	• Deliverable FINAL version
2.3.1	Flyer	30/04/2017 31/03/2019	UCY	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.2	Banners	28/02/2017	UCY	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.3	Publications	30/04/2017 31/10/2018	ALL	In Progress	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Interim Evaluation Report | StoRES Project

		30/04/2019						
2.3.4	Articles <u>Press Releases Completed:</u> <u>Total 5</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - UCY-CY: 1 press release featured in 4 portals - MoB-SL: 1 press release featured in 3 portals - MoU-IT: 2 press releases featured in 2 portals - AUTH-GR: 1 press release featured in 18 portals 	31/01/2017 30/04/2017 31/05/2017 31/07/2017 31/10/2017 – All pilot partners 28/02/2018 - UCY 31/05/2018 - MoU 30/11/2018 - MoB 31/01/2019 - RAEE 31/03/2019 - UCY	ALL WP LEADERS	In progress	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.5	Infographics	30/04/2017 31/07/2018	UCY	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.6	Newsletters	31/07/2017 31/12/2017 31/07/2018 31/12/2018 31/03/2019	UCY	Accomplished Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.7	Project videos with animations	31/03/2019	UCY		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.8	Creation of Social media Accounts (Facebook, LinkedIn, Twitter)	30/01/2017	ALL	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.3.9	Living Lab	30/04/2019	UCY		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2.4.1	EUSEW event/workshop in Brussels	31/08/2018	UCY	To be co-organised with HP (Greencap)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

2.4.2	International Conference in a MED venue	30/04/2019	UCY & PARTNER	Preparation started	n/a		n/a	n/a
2.4.3	Policy recommendations	28/02/2019	UCY			Noemie Poize (RAEE) Andrea Rubiu (MUN.USS.)		
WP3								
3.2.1	Study of existing situation, policies, framework and barriers	28/2/2018	SARGA	Accomplished	Revised	Susanna Mocci (UNICA) Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverable FINAL version • Deliverable revised version • Feedback form
3.3.1	Expression of interest and selection of pilot locations	28/02/2017	DSO (UCY) & PILOT PARTNERS	Accomplished	Revised	Noémie Poize (RAEE)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverable FINAL version • Deliverable revised version • Feedback form
3.3.2	Design of joint technical solution	30/9/2017	DSO (CY)	Accomplished	Revised	Noémie Poize (RAEE) Dimitris Tampakis (AUTH)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverable FINAL version • Deliverable revised version • Feedback form
3.4.1	Tender preparation and purchase of equipment	30/9/2017	SARGA & PILOT PARTNERS	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.4.2	Implementation, commissioning and troubleshooting of pilot sites in 5 countries	31/3/2018	SARGA & PILOT PARTNERS	In progress	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.4.3	Preparation of infrastructure, server and database for data acquisition, collection, validation	31/3/2018	UCY	In progress	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.4.4	Data collection, monitoring and validation	30/04/2019	UCY			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) Andrea Rubiu (MUN.USS.)		
3.5.1	Tender preparation and purchase of equipment	30/9/2017	UCY	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.5.2	Implementation, commissioning and troubleshooting of Pilot CY	31/12/2017	UCY	Accomplished	n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.5.3	Data collection, monitoring and validation	30/04/2019	UCY			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) Susanna Mocci (UNICA)		

Interim Evaluation Report | StoRES Project

3.6.1	Data analysis - Summary report	31/10/2018	RAEE			José Martins de Oliveira (AREAL) Susanna Mocci (UNICA)		
3.6.2	Simulations of future scenarios	31/10/2018	RAEE			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) José Martins de Oliveira (AREAL)		
3.7.1	Cost & Benefit Analysis	30/01/2019	MECIT			Javier Sancho (SARGA) Tomaž Pristovnik (MUN.BIS.)		
3.7.2	Technical solution	30/01/2019	MECIT			Ioannis Papageorgiou (EAC) Dimitris Tampakis (AUTH)		
3.7.3	Tariff, policy, and market rules recommendation	30/01/2019	MECIT			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) Andrea Rubiu (MUN.USS.)		
3.8.1	Online Storage optimisation tool	30/01/2019	AUTH		n/a	n/a	n/a	
3.9.1	Evaluation report for WP4	30/01/2019	AUTH			José Martins de Oliveira (AREAL) George Georghiou (UCY)		
WP4								
4.2.1	Lessons learnt for systems with PV and storage	30/11/2018	MUN. OF SL.			Patrick Biard (RAEE) Susanna Mocci (UNICA)		
4.2.2	Plan for transferring	31/09/2018	SARGA			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) Eliza Loucaidou (UCY)		
4.3.1	Organization of workshops in each participating country	31/01/2019	ALL		n/a	n/a	n/a	
4.3.2	Consolidated report from workshops and international conference	30/04/2019	UCY			Giorgos Christoforidis (AUTH) Susanna Mocci (UNICA)		
4.4.1	Design and Circulation of a PV+Storage Monitor	28/02/2019	AUTH			Paulo Martins (AREAL) George Georghiou (UCY)		
4.5.1	Preparation of Training	31/10/2018	MUN.USS		n/a		n/a	
4.5.2	Delivery of Trainings	28/02/2019	ALL		n/a		n/a	
4.5.3	Training reports	31/03/2019	ALL			Paulo Martins (AREAL) Tomaž Pristovnik (MUN.BIS.)		

6. Meetings Report

Besides the quality assessment of project deliverables, the participation of partners in project meetings is the key to the quality assurance of the project outcomes. Three project meetings took place within the first half of the project:

- a) Kick-off meeting in Limassol, Cyprus (19-20 December 2016)
- b) 2nd transnational meeting in Thessaloniki, Greece (10-11 May 2017)
- c) 3rd transnational meeting in Maribor, Slovenia (29-30 November 2017)

A report of each meeting (*meeting minutes report*) was successfully created and revised by all partners. Afterwards, the final version of meeting reports was archived by Quality Manager and can be accessed by all partners through the internal documentation platform (i.e. google drive platform).

7. Deliverable Reviews Findings

According to the QMP, the quality assessment of the deliverables is classified by the following qualitative levels that characterize the attention needed after the review:

- 1. Critical: Issues that would result in rejection or crucial divergences from specifications. Need to re-write or revise major parts of the document.
- 2. Major: Issues that could result in rejection or significant divergences from specification. Need to revise significant parts of the documents.
- 3. Minor: The deviations from specifications most probably will not lead to rejection or no significant failure in performance.
- 4. Low: Accepted with no changes or with only minor, rather aesthetic changes with no further impact.

In the framework of deliverable review process until the interim phase of the project, all foreseen deliverable review feedback forms have been received and archived. These forms contain the comments of the reviewers along with the overall evaluation of the deliverable contents and format. In all feedback forms received by now, the following rankings occurred: 3: Minor and 4: Low, indicating the high quality of the deliverables produced by the partners so far.

8. Performance of Quality Management

Quality activities initiated by the QMP to the partners of StoRES project, were evaluated and recorded by the Quality Manager. The indicators regarding the evaluation of the quality management performance can be found in Table 3.

Table 3: Performance Indicators of Quality Management

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR		
1.	Effectiveness of risk response strategies in mitigating risks	High
2.	Extent of rework in connection to intellectual outputs	1
3.	Severity of defects identified during the deliverable review process	Low
4.	Number of completed key milestones (vs. missed milestones)	100%
5.	Number of deliverable reviews made	WP1: 3 WP2: 1 WP3: 3 WP4: 0
6.	Number of deliverable feedback forms completed (analysis per WP)	WP1: 1 WP2: 0 WP3: 3 WP4: 0
7.	Partners' satisfaction with quality management processes (using a 5-point scale, where 1=very dissatisfied and 5=very satisfied)	5
8.	Number of reports completed as per proposal	4

9. Files & Archives

The following aspects with respect to the format of all deliverables were confirmed by Quality Manager control, up to the interim phase of the project:

- Deliverables have been composed in Microsoft Word or other compatible software, whereas the final version of the deliverable is archived mainly as pdf.
- Deliverables have a common cover sheet and structure based on the template described in section 9.1 and the Appendix of the QMP.

- All pages are numbered. Deliverable identification number has been included in the footer.
- All logos of StoRES and Interreg Mediterranean program have been properly included in the header.

The final version of deliverables documents (in pdf format) along with the revised versions of the documents and the review feedback forms are successfully archived by the Quality Manager in the internal documentation platform used by StoRES project.

10. Conclusion

This document provides a report about the activities related to the quality assurance of project deliverables. Detailed information about evaluation progress of all deliverables until the interim phase of the project is presented, showing that a high quality of deliverables is achieved by now. The performance of quality management is also reported, proving that all quality targets set by QMP were successfully accomplished.