Deliverable D1.2.5

Fifth six-monthly QM Report

Author 1: Marie-Luise Neitz (TUM)

Version 3
Delivery date: 05.07.2016

Date	Name	Changes/Comments
31.03.2016	Marie-Luise Neitz	Assessment of strategic KPIs
02.05.2016	Marie-Luise Neitz	Inclusion of acceptance of Cost Claim 2 to assess strategic KPI on “payment discipline” in this report; Update of the entire strategic KPI table
05.07.2016	Marie-Luise Neitz	Inclusion of the dissemination of outreach KPIs for Janaury 2016 – June 2016, as evaluation is done every six months, not synchronized with submission of QM report

1 ECHORD++ Report on Performance Indicators (KPIs)

While the umbrella document of the QM deliverable (D1.2.3._a) outlines the methodology used to track / assess the performance of the different instruments of ECHORD++, this second part of the deliverable reports on the results of this assessment and will be updated every six months.

1.1 Strategic Performance Indicators

The Strategic Performance Indicators have to reflect those aspects which are important to make E++ a success. The target values are based on the lessons learned from ECHORD and are geared to the expectations of the different target groups. Important to note: These indicators were fixed from the perspective of the users – irrespective of the fact if the members of the core consortium are able to influence them to full extent. Only if the cooperation of all stakeholders works – core consortium, external users and European Commission – the target values can be met.

Indicator	Assessment	Instrument	**Target value**	**De-facto M28 – M33**	
Time-to-grant	The time span between call deadlines and the accepted Grant Agreement	No Amendment done during the period	9 months	n.a.	n.a.
Payment discipline	Time span between the submission of a Periodic Report and actual payments	Cost Claim II: Core, Experiments, public bodies (PDTI)	6 months	Submission of the Periodic Report: 02.09.2015 Submission of the Cost Claim: 28.09.2015 Acceptance of Cost Claim by EC: 25.04.2016 **Result: 7 months (instead of 6 months**	
Planning security	Amendments: time span between Amendment session opened in the NEF and signed Amendment	No Amendment done during the period	6 months between opening of the Amendment Session and signed Amendment request	n.a.	n.a.
No of SMEs involved	Number of Small and Medium Sized companies involved in the project for all instruments	No Call and no Amendment during the period	Experiments & PDTI: 25% of the applicants; RIF targets as outlined in the RIF handbook	n.a.	n.a.
No of newcomers without any	Number of newcomers	No Call and no	Experiments &	n.a.	n.a.

former participation in EU-funded projects	involved in the project for all instruments plus dissemination activities!	Amendment during the period	PDTI: 25% of the applicants; RIF targets as outlined in the RIF handbook		
Strengthening the collaboration between industry and academia	Projects in which industrial partners and academic partners work together (during the runtime of E++ and afterwards)	Experiments, RIFs, PDTI: Willingness to participate with new partners in future academia-industry projects	Experiments: 90% of the mixed consortia	13 out of 15 consortia of Call I experiments were mixed	
			PDTI: 90% of the mixed consortia	Not relevant yet: Will be evaluated first time after Phase II of PDTI ended.	
Networking: Motive new contacts which offer the potential for future collaboration in research projects or business leads	Number of new contacts gained by working on one of the instruments of ECHORD++.	Experiments PDTI RIFs	Experiments: 75% of the experimenting partners gained at least one new contact.	Not relevant yet. Will be evaluated first time at the end of Call I experiments.	
			PDTI: 75% of the PDTI partners gained at least one new contact	Not relevant yet. Will be evaluated first time after Phase II of PDTI ended.	
Contribution to advancing the state-of-the art (technological progress)	The technological / scientific targets are outlined in the proposals	Experiments Call I (PDTI is not relevant yet as Phase I had not been reviewed, yet)	Experiments: 80 % of all experiments selected for funding meet the technological targets outlined in their KPI documents.	Out of 11 experiments with technical KPIs during the period, 7 met their objectives (64%)	
Impact achieved by	The impact targets are	Experiments	**Experiments:** 80	3 out of 6 experiments	

the individual technological instruments of E++	outlined in the KPI documents (experiments, PDTI); impact for RIF takes time to materialize, outcome will be qualified at a later stage., and in RIFs proposals).	PDTI RIFs	% of all experiments selected for funding achieve the impact outlined in their KPI documents	with impact KPIs during the period met their targets	
Performant, strong proposals received: - **For the experiments** - **For PDTI** **For the RIFs**	The potential scientific / technological success of E++ heavily depends on the quality of the proposals submitted. They form the pool from which the independent experts can select.	No calls for experiments or PDTI were reviewed during the period.	Experiments 80% of the KPIs target values achieved. .	n.a.	n.a.

1.2 Experiments

The strategic KPIs for Call I experiemnts have been included in the above table. The assessment of KPIs against target values is done in the bi-monthly monitoring session budied by the monitoring platform of ECHORD++. The relvant KPIs will be reported on in each QM report (taking account of the KPIs of the experiment which are relevant for the individual periods. The tracking of KPIs wil be included in the stable of Strategic KPIs ("Contributions to advancing state-of-the-art" and "impact"). A fully analysis will be done the end of Call I experiments (sixth QM report). The same applies to the ieconomical mpact on innovation. And the impact on innovation will be tracked via a survey at the end of the runtime of the experiments and beyond.

1.3 RIFs

An analysis of the performance of the RIFs against targets will be done first time in QM Report no. 6 as the RIFs have to be in the operational phase for a certain time in order to be able to collect and provide data. Also given to the fact that they are embedded in very different ecosystems and with very different starting points.

1.4 PDTI

The same approach is chosen as for the experiments. Nevertheless, the bi-monthly monitoring starts with Phase II of PDTI. First results are likely to be available for QM report no. 7.

1.5 Outreach and dissemination

Indicator	**Assessment**	**Target values**	**De-facto M28 – M33**	
Online-communication	Clicks website	1000 per month	●	From 1st Nov 2014 (start of tracking) – 31st March 2016: Average of 1,500 visitors per month
	YouTube channel	Average of more than 500 views per video	●	6 videos, 684 views per average (31st March2016)
	LinkedIn Group	More than 250 members	●	297 members (31st March 2016)
Media coverage	References in trade press	50 per year	●	43 trade press
	References in consumer press	10 per year	●	47 consumer press (both total until 31st March 2016)

Event audience	Estimated number of people from target audience reached at the various events	1000 per year	●	
Direct contacts	Direct contacts in contact database	More than 4.000 active contacts at the end of E++	●	4191 contacts in total (31st March 2016)
		More than 70 % new contacts (without login from old ECHORD)	●	62 % new contacts
Scientific publications	Number of scientific publications	At least one per experiment	●	Scientific publications to be expected in later phases of the experiments
Customer satisfaction	Specific questions on communication/dissemination in customer satisfaction surveys	Rating of at least good to excellent	**Based on Input from Call 2 evaluators)**	
	Overall content of E++ evaluation platform	●	1,9 (good)	
	Overall usability of the E++ evaluation platform	●	2,4 (good-average)	
	Questions answered within two business days	●	1,1 (excellent)	
	Did the E++ team give competent answers to your questions?	●	1 (excellent)	
	How would you rate the general assistance via the E++ team during the evaluation process?	●	1,2 (excellent)	

2 Risk Contingency Plan

We can classify the risks for E++ into three categories: (i) risks arising from the internal organization, (ii) risks related to the acceptance of and interest in the different instruments, and (iii) risks during the execution phase of the instruments. The following table lists the risks associated with the implementation of E++.

Risk (DOW)	Potential Impact	Corrective Action	Comments on current state
Type (i) Unclear work / task responsibilities	Impact high, Risk low Specific tasks and – in case of core tasks – the whole project may be delayed	The DOW of E++ shows clear responsibilities of Work Packages and tasks. Different escalation levels for different delays. Retain payments to beneficiaries, payments are linked to timely Delivery. Regular meetings (Video, Skype, phone and in person) to discuss the workflow openly.	---
Type (ii) E++'s visibility too low, profile unclear	Impact High, Risk low ECHORD has achieved very high visibility and credibility with clearly defined goals and means. In ECHORD, the interaction with the classical community and other projects was very strong. However, the new instruments, RIFs and PCP activities could cause a risk.	A clear communication plan including presentations at broad-spectrum and specific events will likely resolve this problem – just as we did very successfully within ECHORD. Outreach to new potential robotics community members will be achieved by (i) a strong focus on dissemination events of various types, by (ii) bringing experiments into the "real world" by on-site testing the demonstrators in the RIFs, by (iii) directly contacting new user groups, and by (iv) creating sustainable structures with the PCP activities.	---
Type (ii) Lack of acceptance by stakeholders	Impact High, Risk low The classical experiments as in ECHORD are widely accepted, but the new instruments RIF and PCP rely on involvement of all stakeholders, especially robot users and customers.	Special information events and targeted campaigns at the beginning of the project and involvement of the industry in all phases, especially in case of the PCP activities, will minimize this risk. In addition, as a result of the structured dialogue, not only can the content of all activities be adapted, but their administration aspects as well	----
Type (ii) Lack of acceptance of the	Impact Low, Risk medium Being pilots for new R&D instruments,	The interaction with all possible stakeholder groups in instrument- specific ways will lead to a good a priori estimation of the	----

new instruments RIF and PCP	there is a certain risk that they will not be accepted as anticipated	needs and acceptance criteria. This systematic approach will minimize the risk. An adjustment of the concepts in the structured dialogue will also be possible. Finally, it is always possible to adjust the budget so that resources can be shifted into the experiments and their number can be increased if needed.	
Type (iii) Beneficiary bankruptcy	Impact Medium, Risk Low Potential risk of a failure of a specific experiment	Rapid alert system due to additional reporting duties for beneficiaries with weak financial validation. Replace beneficiary Financial risk is safeguarded by guarantee fund	---
Type (iii) Delayed start of experiments and other instruments	Impact High, Risk Medium-High No sound planning of resources and timeline possible for beneficiaries Experiments cannot deliver the intended results on time Project duration likely to be extended (cost-neutral) Bad image of the project and demotivation of SMEs to participate in future EU-funded projects	Realistic timetable with enough time between the Calls to realize the Amendments Timetable which avoids conflict between Cost Claims and Amendments Communication of this timetable to the beneficiaries. Beneficiaries that do not meet start deadlines will be postponed to the next batch or replaced Beneficiaries with complete documentation can start their experiments without prior signature of Amendment.	Call I experiments have been offered alternative start dates in order to buffer the delay of the Amendment II. The picture was balanced.
Additional risks identified since DOW was written		Corrective Action	
Cooperation between core beneficiaries does not work well (lessons learned	*Impact: High, Risk: Medium*	Preventive measures taken: Regular specific group updates (every two weeks) for PCP, RIFs, Experiments and ExC Committee. Appointment of a facilitator to tackle issues which require in-	---

ECHORD)		depth communication between different instruments OR different beneficiaries involved in one instrument to achieve consensus with the best results.	
Problems with recruitment of evaluators	*Impact: High, Risk: High*	Intensive contact making with stakeholder groups not originally involved with the project (also by activating clusters and associations)	----
Experiment reviews do not provide sufficient input to make an informed funding decision.	*Impact: High, Risk: Medium / Low*	Calibration of the proposal evaluations during the panel meeting	---
Evaluators give high scores to proposals which do not provide a clear trackable target.	*Impact: High, Risk: High*	Analysis of the weaknesses of the proposals selected for funding and addressing these issues during the negotiations.	---
Tracking of take-up of results of all instruments reported by the partners / users	*Impact: High (for follow-up projects or second rounds); Risk: Medium*	Automated alarm system with deadlines for long-term tracking; implementation of the instruments for tracking (for instance questionnaires).	---