CRAEFT

care, judgment, dexterity

Project Management

Project Acronym	Craeft
Project Title	Craft Understanding, Education, Training, and Preservation for Posterity and Prosperity
Project Number	101094349
Deliverable Number	D8.1
Deliverable Title	Project Management
Work Package	8
Authors	Xenophon Zabulis
Version	1
Number of pages	15

Executive summary

In this document, the consortium states the rules of project operation and management. These rules have been negotiated among the partners of the Craeft consortium during the kick-off meeting. This document serves also as an index of information for consortium members, which will have access to it through a private link. Modifications and amendments to these rules negotiated between partners will be reflected in later versions of this deliverable.

Document history

Date	Author	Affiliation	Comment
12/12/2022	Xenophon Zabulis	FORTH	Initial draft
10/03/2023	Xenophon Zabulis	FORTH	Updated draft based on discussions in the kick-off meeting
11/03/2023	Polykarpos Karamaounas	FORTH	Quality Assurance review.
16/03/2023	Xenophon Zabulis	FORTH	Updated draft based on Quality Assurance review and Open Review across members of the consortium.

Abbreviations

CET	Central European Time
CH	Cultural Heritage
COO	Coordinator
EC	European Commission
GA	Grant agreement
MS	Milestone
PSB	Project Steering Board
QAM	Quality Assurance Management
QR	Quarterly Report
UK	United Kingdom
URL	Uniform Resource Locator
WP	Work Package

Table of contents

1. Introduction

This deliverable serves as a reference between partners for the timing and management of operations pertaining to the responsibilities and contributions of partners. The contents of this deliverable have been negotiated by all partners and they have been unanimously approved by the Project Steering Board.

The topics are the following:

- Partner communication
- Share storage space
- Deliverables
- Meetings
- Reporting

2. Communication

This section regards the infrastructure created for the facilitation of communication between consortium partners.

2.1. E-mail and telephone

A general mailing list was created by FORTH and hosted through its mail server. This list includes all persons working on the project. Used for notifications to the entire consortium. The alias for this list is craeft@ics.forth.gr. A separate mailing list was created for PSB members to facilitate only the PSB (Project Steering Board) decisions over email. The alias for this list is craeft_psb@ics.forth.gr. We expect some additional lists to be created either per specific WP or for horizontal reasons, such as a reading group, an installation team, or an ethnographic expedition. The need for separate lists will be assessed and new lists will be created, having in mind to keep the number of lists with the relevance of the emails received by the project in harmony. These decisions will be reported in later versions of this deliverable.

A telephone and email address directory was created and shared among partners, for individual communication.

Org.	Name	Telephone	E-mail
FORTH	Xenophon Zabulis, Nikolaos Partarakis	+302810391696, +306937129122	zabulis@ics.forth.gr partarak@ics.forth.gr
CNR	Carlo Meghini, Valentina Bartalesi	+300506212893, +393483972164	carlo.meghini@isti.cnr.it valentina.bartalesi@isti.cnr.it
ARMINES	Sotiris Manitsaris, Gavriela Senteri	+33650292765	sotiris.manitsaris@mines-paristech.fr gavriela.senteri@minesparis.psl.eu
KHORA	Matias Seidler Laura Werup	+4522332481, +4531169181	matias@khora.com laura@khora.com
CETEM	Gregorio Canavate	+34968752040	g.canavate@cetem.es
CNAM	Arnaud Dubois	+33687889703	arnaud.dubois@ensa-limoges.fr
PIOP	Chris Riggas	+302103256922, +302103256944	riggasch@piraeusbank.gr
CERFAV	David Arnaud	+33(0)383501840, +33(0)651259957	david.arnaud@cerfav.fr
MDE	Marie-Adelaide (Madina) Benvenuti	+32475837488	madina.benvenuti@madineurope.eu
ETH	Christian Holz	+41446328439 +41446328209	christian.holz@inf.ethz.ch

2.2. Calendar

An online calendar has been established and all consortium partners have been invited. Notifications on deliverables and report deadlines will be distributed through this calendar, via email. All meetings will be also registered to this calendar. The calendar can be found online at the following URL:

https://calendar.google.com/calendar/u/0?cid=YzYxZjM4ODY3M2M1ZGYwOTU4M2Y4MzE2NzJl
NmM3MTU3Y2RmNGE0ZGRmY2UzNDA2OTA2MTk3MjMwYWYwYTE2MEBncm91cC5jYWxlbmRh
ci5nb29nbGUuY29t

2.3. Shared File Spaces

As noted in Craeft deliverable D8.5, Section 8, a shared file system for partner collaboration is available to partners and hosted by FORTH, using the Open Cloud software platform. In addition, another, smaller online shared space is available to partners on Google Drive. The difference in usage between these two shared spaces is the following.

All partners have editor privileges in both spaces.

2.3.1. Google Drive

This is for collaborative working files, typically lightweight, such as notes, texts, spreadsheets (and calendars). Using them we can co-develop a piece of text, a list, a spreadsheet, etc., and can use tagging to notify a few persons about a specific matter, such as a specific location in a document. These files are usually of loose typesetting format and can be edited in a browser. Usually working documents when mature are passed on to the Open Cloud shared space.

2.3.2. Open Cloud

This is for large and static documents. Static documents can be the project presentation, project, templates/logos, past reports, a library of literature papers/links, recordings, datasets, etc. Large documents can/should be also stored in this cloud. These can be detailed comments on an MS Word deliverable, source of deliverables, presentations for a review meeting, etc. Currently, that is at the beginning of the project contains the following subfolders: Communication, Contracts, Deliverables, Info, Meetings, Proposal, Templates, and Visual Identity, with respective contents.

2.3.3. Notes

There is some duplication of files between the two shared spaces. This is because we wish to have some of the project's files handy in a local drive, rather than having to log in to the cloud.

A daily backup is kept in both spaces. Thus, if by accident one deletes or modifies a file against his/her intention we can retrieve it from the backup.

3. Meetings

All meetings will be announced via the email list and noted in the project calendar.

3.1. Plenary meetings

The plenary meetings will take place every four months. Each meeting will be accompanied by field research and, thus, the first meetings will prioritise the locations of heritage partners. The first meeting will be held at FORTH's premises. The first PSB will decide on the location of the next plenary meeting.

3.2. PSB meetings

A PSB meeting will take place in the context of each plenary meeting. PSB meetings taking place on a plenary meeting will identify the location of the next plenary meeting. Additional PSB meetings will be held using teleconference whenever requested by any partner.

The minutes of these will be kept by FORTH. A voice transcription software will be used to assist note taking for these meetings and its transcription will be thereafter corrected by FORTH. The result will be provided for review by all participants of the meeting.

3.3. Bi-monthly meetings

These meetings will include at least one representative from each WP leader. Their context will be technical to review the progress and set up upcoming technical goals.

Minutes will be kept in the form of shared online documents which will be synchronously edited by all partners during the meeting, or afterwards.

The meetings will take place every second Tuesday at 9:30 CET online.

In alternating turns, the first of the meetings will be a WP leader meeting and the second a workshop meeting to assist in focusing on technical aspects. The links for these meetings are the following.

1. Craeft formal online meeting

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89474596950?pwd=OXl0QUNtT2pnU2Q0YVVJcHBOVnFSZz09

2. Craeft workshop online meeting:

https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83249338609?pwd=WjhTUzRXRzJFaEgvUnZjS2FrT3lDZz09

For efficiency, these meetings are registered to the consortium calendar (see Section 2) and a direct link to the videoconference session is available in the calendar entry.

The meetings will be open to all consortium members.

FORTH will provide the audiovisual teleconference infrastructure for the meetings and provide notifications to the consortium.

4. Deliverables

This section elaborates on the deliverable review and submission process.

> Craeft GA.
> T8.4 **Quality Management [Lead** FORTH **Partners involved** All **(M1-M36)]**
> To support quality and review standards, deliverables will be submitted for internal review 45 calendar days before their submission date. Deliverables shall be reviewed according to Open Peer Review (open to the public, for public deliverables, and open to the consortium for confidential ones) and two simultaneous reviewers each.

4.1. Submission of deliverables

Empty documents for all deliverables and all of their versions, in the same format, are provided at

https://cloud.craeft.eu/index.php/apps/files/?dir=/Craeft_documents/Deliverables&fileid=406

The submission dates of the deliverables have been noted in the project calendar. Partners have been informed of the dates on which their deliverables are due for review and the dates that their deliverables have to be submitted to the EC.

Each deliverable leader is responsible for collecting partner contributions and compiling them according to the plan and Table of Contents. Should there be an issue or unforeseen difficulty this should be preferably raised in a QR report, in addition to any email or audiovisual telecommunication (for redundancy, in case of individual communication failures).

The plan for the review procedure of the deliverables is

Days before the deadline	Action
55	Notification to start preparing the deliverable
45	Submission of the deliverable for review
44	Quality control and deliverable review start simultaneously
40	Quality control results sent to the author
30	Review results sent to the author
14	Revised deliverable and response to review sent to COO & QAM
10	COO & QAM check posts to review and revision (Open Review)
2	Re-revised and formatted deliverable is produced by the COO
1	Submission of the deadline by the COO
Deadline	The date noted on the EC portal

The submission of deliverables is to take place by email, file transfer, or cloud submission, to FORTH, at the following persons: Xenophon Zabulis, Nikos Partarakis, and Polykarpos Karamaounas.

4.2. Review of deliverables

Deliverable reviews are to be submitted online. FORTH has created online forms for all deliverables and all their versions to avoid additional communication effort. The page with the deliverable review forms is:

http://users.ics.forth.gr/~karam/Craeft/Craeft_Reports.html

The access permissions to these reviews will be public for public deliverables and available only to the consortium for confidential ones. There will be two respective pages to access these reviews, according to permissions. The link to the public page will be provided on the Craeft website.

Reviewers can and are encouraged to provide detailed comments in MS Word comments, but an overview of the review should be provided in the above online form, which will be published with the name of the reviewer according to Open Review standards.

The online form contains several attributes that are of varying relevance to the type of deliverable. For example, a question regarding if a management deliverable advances the state of the art is irrelevant. As such, the most important fields in the review, are the "Comments" section, where you share your opinion with colleagues.

If you feel that such a field is irrelevant, please note "Not applicable", in the comments field.

4.3. Quality control

Each deliverable will be processed by the Quality Assurance Manager, which is a person designated by FORTH and an employee of FORTH. Currently, this person is Mr Polykarpos Karamaounas. To ease the task of quality control, a proofing guide with common formatting mistakes has been complied with. Partners are encouraged to verify their deliverable against this list, before submitting a deliverable. This proofing guide can be found at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QJY0Z_66QciE_0OE5WfFf59d2Y1AKQMw-4OZ5NG4_TY/edit?usp=sharing

The proofing guide contains technical hints so that partners can use tools of MS Word to automatically detect most of the common mistakes. This proofing guide will be updated during the project.

In addition to the proofing guide, partners are encouraged to use spelling and grammar proofing tools.

The reviews and the responses to the reviews will be public to the consortium so that any partner can contribute with constructive criticism.

The Craeft project will use UK spelling on all documents.

4.4. Review Assignment

The assignment of reviews is proportional to the budget of each partner. The table below calculated the number of reviews per partner according to their budget.

#	Acronym	Reviews #
1	FORTH	15
2	CNR	6
3	ARMINES	6
4	KHORA	5
5	CETEM	6
6	CNAM	5
7	PIOP	6
8	CERFAV	5
9	MDE	5
10	ETH	4
	Total	63

The assignment of deliverable reviews has been assigned in the following table. The same reviewer is assigned for all versions of a deliverable.

#	Title	Delivery Date	Reviewer
D1.1	Enhanced ethnographic methods	M12, 24	CNR
D1.2	Knowledge collection and representation	M12, 24	CNAM
D2.1	Action and affordance modelling	M12, 24	CNR
D2.2	Maker-Material-Negotiation model and CAP	M12, 24	CNAM
D3.1	Craft-specific action simulations	M18, 36	ARMINES
D3.2	Advanced digitisation technologies	M18, 36	ETH
D3.3	Scene and activity monitoring	M18, 36	ETH
D4.1	Craft simulation and immersive craft training	M18, 36	ARMINES
D4.2	Haptic devices for training, simulation, and design	M18, 36	KHORA
D4.3	Toys and games for informal craft education	M18, 36	KHORA
D5.1	Craft Design revisited	M18, 36	CERFAV

D5.2	Community Portal	M18, 36	CNR
D6.1	P1 – Education & Training, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.2	P2 – Design, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.3	P3 – Valorisation, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.4	P4 – Community, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D7.1	Communication Plan and Activities	M2, 12, 24, 36	FORTH
D7.2	Dissemination Plan and Activities	M2, 12, 24, 36	FORTH
D7.3	Networking and Coordination	M12, 24, 36	PIOP
D7.4	Exploitation Plan and Activities	M12, 24, 36	PIOP
D8.1	Project Management	M2	KHORA
D8.2	Project reporting	M12, 24, 36	CETEM
D8.3	Innovation Management	M18, 36	ARMINES
D8.4	Quality Assurance	M12, 24, 36	CETEM
D8.5	Data Management Plan	M6, 12, 24, 36	CERFAV
D8.6	Risk Assessment	M6, 12, 24, 36	MDE

4.5. Open Review

Open peer review is the various possible modifications of the traditional scholarly peer review process. The three most common modifications to which the term is applied are [1]:

1. Open identities: Authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity [2][3].
2. Open reports: Review reports are published alongside the relevant article (rather than being kept confidential).
3. Open participation: The wider community (and not just invited reviewers) may contribute to the review process if they wish to.

These modifications are supposed to address various perceived shortcomings of the traditional scholarly peer review process, in particular its lack of transparency, lack of incentives, and wastefulness [1].

Open identities. Open peer review may be defined as "any scholarly review mechanism providing disclosure of author and referee identities to one another at any point during the peer review or publication process" [4]. Then reviewer's identities may or may not be disclosed to the public. This is in contrast to the traditional peer review process where reviewers remain anonymous to anyone but the journal's editors, while authors' names are disclosed from the beginning.

Open reports. Open peer review may be defined as making the reviewers' reports public, instead of disclosing them to the article's authors only. This may include publishing the rest of the peer review history, i.e. the authors' replies and editors' recommendations. Most often, this concerns only articles that are accepted for publication and not those that are rejected.

Open participation. Open peer review may be defined as allowing self-selected reviewers to comment on an article, rather than (or in addition to) having reviewers who are selected by the editors. This assumes that the text of the article is openly accessible. The self-selected reviewers may or may not be screened for their basic credentials, and they may contribute either short comments or full reviews [1].

As described in the GA, Craeft will be using Open Review for the public deliverables. Open review will be also used for the rest of the deliverables, but these will be open only to consortium members.

In Craeft we will use the first two principles, that is open identities and open reports. Both reviews and reports will be publicly available along with the deliverables. Open participation will be limited to a few deliverables and will regard only the consortium. More specifically, for deliverables that are of pertinence to the entire consortium (such as this one), the opinion of all consortium partners will be asked for. This subsection was the result of such a process as it was asked by non-academic partners who were not familiar with the concept and process of Open Review.

5. Quarterly Reports

Quarterly reports will be provided in online forms. The content of these reports will be used in the Periodic Report of the project and, thus, determine the acceptance or not of the claimed costs by the EC.

All partners are to provide every four months with a brief report of their research and a detailed report of their travel and overall cost activities.

All partners are to provide every four months with entries regarding their activity in Communication and Dissemination efforts. This input will be formalised in an online spreadsheet document.

All WP leaders are to provide every four months with a brief online report of their research and development activities. This report will be in an MS Word document that elaborates its contents on the reported topics.

The online forms for the quarterly reports can be found at

http://users.ics.forth.gr/~karam/Craeft/Craeft_Reports.html

6. Conclusion

This deliverable serves the purpose of formally establishing project management rules and motivating the consortium to report early these arrangements in the course of project life. Some of the details of the above may be updated in the course of the project. The important fact is that all of the rules mentioned in this deliverable have been unanimously approved by the consortium in the kick-off meeting of the project, from the 7th to the 9th of March 2023, held at the premises of FORTH at Heraklion, Crete.

It ought to be noted that this deliverable brings two novelties that we consider important in the implementation and culture of implementing funded research projects. These are

1. Implementation. Craeft introduces quarterly reporting and deliverable reviews using online forms. This significantly improves the efficiency of the times of partners of the consortium, because of the elimination of e-mail messages concerning the submission of said documents. Additionally, because the content of quarterly reports is formatted, the composition of the project's periodic report is simplified, because the inputs of the forms are automatically aggregated in a digital spreadsheet.
2. Project Culture. We have borrowed the discipline of Open Review from the academic community. The reason we have adopted it is the accountability of the reviewer. In other words, by making the reviewer's name public (for public deliverables) we intend to raise the motivation of reviewers towards providing elaborate, meaningful, and just reviews.

References

1. Ross-Hellauer, Tony (2017-08-31). "What is open peer review? A systematic review". F1000Research. F1000 Research Ltd. 6: 588. doi:10.12688/f1000research.11369.2. ISSN 2046-1402.
2. Walsh E, Rooney M, Appleby L, Wilkinson G (January 2000). "Open peer review: a randomised controlled trial". The British Journal of Psychiatry. 176 (1): 47–51. doi:10.1192/bjp.176.1.47.
3. van Rooyen S, Godlee F, Evans S, Black N, Smith R (January 1999). "Effect of open peer review on quality of reviews and on reviewers' recommendations: a randomised trial". BMJ. 318 (7175): 23–7. doi:10.1136/bmj.318.7175.23.
4. Ford E (2015-07-20). "Open peer review at four STEM journals: an observational overview". F1000Research. 4: 6. doi:10.12688/f1000research.6005.2.