



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

# Quality Plan

## Version 1.1

### Author(s)/Organisation(s):

Stefano Zanero / Polimi

Imre Lendak / UNS

Igor Tartalja / UB

### Date of final release:

June 2018

### Relevant Work Package(s):

WP5 – Quality Plan

### Short Description:

The Quality Plan (QP) describes the activities carried out during the lifetime of the project which will ensure that the project outputs reach maximum quality and impact on the different stakeholders involved.

### Keywords:

Project quality plan, Evaluation criteria, Evaluation procedures

*The European Commission support for the production of this publication does not constitute endorsement of the contents which reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.*



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

Revision History:				
Revision	Date	Author(s)	Status	Description
V0.1	Feb 20, 2018	Stefano Zanero Imre Lendak	Working draft	First edition
v0.3	Jun 11, 2018	Imre Lendak	Working draft	Minor modifications
V0.4	June, 2018	Imre Lendak	Working draft	Minor modifications
V1.0	Jan, 2020	Imre Lendak (UNS) Stevan Gostjic (UNS) Milan Gocic (UNI)	Release	Extended external review. Updated internal QA process.
V1.1	Feb, 2020	Igor Tartalja (UB) Imre Lendak (UNS)	Release	Plan aligned with outputs and outcomes in the original project proposal and plan.



## CONTENTS

1	Introduction.....	5
2	Project Summary .....	6
2.1	Project Goals.....	6
2.2	Stakeholders.....	6
2.3	Partners .....	6
2.4	Project Structure .....	6
2.5	Project Outputs .....	7
2.6	Project outcomes .....	8
2.6.1	Impacts on Higher Educational Institutions .....	8
2.6.2	Impacts on stakeholders (government and industry) .....	9
2.6.3	European added value .....	10
3	Quality Board.....	12
4	Internal evaluation .....	13
4.1	Responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables .....	13
4.2	Impact assessment of the project activities.....	13
4.3	Periodic and summative internal project quality evaluation report.....	14
5	External evaluation.....	15
5.1	Terms of reference for external evaluation .....	15
5.2	Criteria for the selection of external evaluator .....	16
5.2.1	Description of the external evaluation task .....	16
5.2.2	Profile of the external evaluator .....	17
5.2.3	Responsibilities of the external evaluator.....	17
5.2.4	Evaluation budget.....	17
5.3	Academic quality assurance .....	17
6	Corrective and Preventive Actions .....	18
7	Annex A: Annual partner self-assessment report .....	19
7.1	Partner details .....	19



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

7.2	Partner contributions .....	19
7.3	Changes .....	19
7.4	Financial matters .....	19
8	Annex B: Annual work package (WP) self-assessment report .....	21
8.1	Work package details .....	21
8.2	Activities and achievements.....	21
8.3	Problems encountered .....	21
8.4	Changes .....	21
8.5	Brief summary .....	22
9	Annex C: Internal deliverable assessment report .....	24
9.1	Deliverable details.....	24
9.2	Deliverable assessment form .....	24



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

## 1 Introduction

The goal of this Quality Plan (QP) is to ensure that the processes of the project produce the planned outputs and that the desired quality of project results and outcomes are achieved. The document defines a set of procedures, tools, templates, indicators, corrective and preventive actions.

The following terms and associated meanings are used in this deliverable:

- **Results** are tangible output of project activities (e.g. deliverables).
- **Outcomes** are intangible project effects, generally measured beyond the project life time.

This document is structured into the following eight sections: 1) Introduction; 2) Project Summary; 3) Quality Board; 4) Internal Evaluation; 5) External Evaluation; 6) Corrective and Preventive Actions; 7) Reporting; and 8) Summary.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

## 2 Project Summary

This section contains a short summary of the ISSES project. We specifically address the project goals, stakeholders, project outputs, partners involved, project structure and expected outcomes/impacts.

### 2.1 Project Goals

The overall goal of the project is to improve the Serbian higher education capacities in the field of cybersecurity. This overarching goal will be achieved by implementing and/or updating relevant study programs, course curricula and laboratories.

### 2.2 Stakeholders

The project stakeholders are defined in other project documents and come from the following fields in Serbia and abroad: higher education, non-government, government and private sector (i.e. companies).

### 2.3 Partners

The following partners will be involved in the implementation of the project:

- P1. University of Novi Sad (UNS)
- P2. University of Zagreb (UZG)
- P3. Budapest University of Technology and Economics (BME)
- P4. Politechnical University of Milano (Polimi)
- P5. University of Belgrade (UB) with two major faculties:
  - a. School of Electrical Engineering (ETF)
  - b. Faculty of Organizational Sciences (FON)
- P6. University of Nis (UNI)
- P7. Schneider Electric DMS NS Ltd (SEDMS)
- P8. Unicom-Telecom Ltd (UT)
- P9. Subotica Tech - College of Applied Sciences (VTS)
- P10. Innovation Center of the University of Nis (ICUN)

### 2.4 Project Structure

The project activities are structured into the following 7 work packages:

- WP1. Preparation: review the current state-of-the-art in information security education in Serbia, define a repository of relevant concepts, create course and laboratory development plans.
- WP2. Curriculum Development: develop new and upgrade existing courses.
- WP3. Laboratory Development: design and develop new laboratories.
- WP4. Education Programme Development: develop new MSc programmes in information security.
- WP5. Quality Plan: develop a quality plan and perform ongoing quality assessment.
- WP6. Dissemination and Exploitation: develop plans for disseminating and exploiting the project's results. Implement the planned dissemination and exploitation activities.



WP7. Management: coordinate the project, organize Steering Committee meetings and prepare the necessary reports.

## 2.5 Project Outputs

The project tasks will result in the following types of outputs:

- CUR = Curriculum based course material / Repository
- LAB = Deployed Laboratory
- PRG = Implemented Education Programme (e.g. new MSc programme)
- DOC = Documents / Reports / Plans / Guidelines / Specifications
- DIS = Dissemination material / Website
- EVE = Events, Trainings

The list of project tasks which will produce tangible outputs, together with their output types, responsible institution, institution leading the internal evaluation, as well as the expected dates of delivery (i.e. deadlines) are listed in the table below:

Code	Deliverable	Type	Owner	Deadline
1.1	Baseline Curricula Report	DOC	UNS	M3
1.2	Repository of Information Security Concepts	DOC	UNS	M4
1.3	Course Development Plan (CDP)	DOC	UB	M5
1.4	Laboratory Development Plan (LDP)	DOC	UNI	M6
2.1	Critical Infrastructure Security	CUR	UNS	M20
2.2	Secure Software Development	CUR	UNS UNI	M12
2.3	Cloud Security	CUR	UNS UB	M32
2.4	Security and privacy in the Internet of Things	CUR	VTS UNI	M24
2.5	Advanced Cryptography	CUR	UNS	M24
2.6	Advanced Network Security	CUR	UB VTS	M15
2.7	Cyber Security Strategies	CUR	UB	M15
2.8	Security in E-business Systems	CUR	UNS VTS	M28
2.9	Risk Analysis and Threat Modelling	CUR	UB UNS	M33
2.10	Cyber Incident Analysis and Response	CUR	UB UNS	M17
2.11	Data Mining in Digital Forensics	CUR	UB UNS	M24
2.12	Digital Forensics Tools and Techniques	CUR	UB UNI	M21
2.13	Mobile and Multimedia Forensics	CUR	UB UNI	M36
3.1	Lab Design: Critical Infrastructure Security Laboratory (CIS Lab)	DOC	UNS	M13



3.2	Lab Design: Digital Forensics Laboratory (DF Lab)	DOC	UB UNI	M13
3.3	Lab Design: Network Security Laboratory (NS Lab)	DOC	UB	M13
3.4	Lab Design: Cloud Security Laboratory (CS Lab)	DOC	UNS VTS	M14
3.5	Hybrid CIS, CS and NS Lab implementation (P1)	LAB	UNS	M24
3.6	Hybrid NS and Crypto Lab Implementation (P5)	LAB	UB	M21
3.7	NS Lab implementation (P6)	LAB	UNI	M21
3.8	DF Lab Implementation (P5)	LAB	UB	M24
3.9	DF Lab Implementation (P6)	LAB	UNI	M30
3.10	DF Lab Implementation (P1)	LAB	UNS	M36
3.11	Hybrid CS and IoT Lab Implementation (P9)	LAB	VTS	M20
4.1	MSc Program: Information Security in Critical Infrastructures	PRG	UNS	M31
4.2	MSc Program: Information Security and Digital Forensics	PRG	UB	M27
4.3	Specialization Program: Security in the Cloud and Internet of Things	PRG	VTS	M31
5.1	Quality Plan	DOC	Polimi	M3
5.2	Annual Course Quality Report	DOC	Polimi BME UZG	M12, M24, M36
5.3	Annual Laboratory Build Report	DOC	Polimi BME UZG	M12, M24, M36
5.5	External Quality Assessment	DOC	Polimi	M16, M34
6.1	Dissemination Plan (DP)	DOC	UB	M2
6.2	Exploitation Plan (EP)	DOC	UB	M3
6.3	Annual Project Workshop	EVE	UB UNS UNI	M11, M23, M35
6.4	Mass Media Dissemination	DIS	UB	M1-M36
6.5	Security Services Roundtable	EVE	UB UNS UNI	M11, M23, M35
6.6	Web portal setup and maintenance	DIS	UB	M1-M36
7.5	Financial Plan	DOC	UNS	M3
7.6	Interim and Final Report	DOC	UNS	M18, M36

## 2.6 Project outcomes

The quality process of the ISSES project will ensure that the outcomes are aligned with the LFM and original project proposal. The internal and external quality reports will cover both project outputs and outcomes.

### 2.6.1 Impacts on Higher Educational Institutions





The following table lists the expected outcomes in the Serbian higher education sector, either on the HEIs involved in the project, Serbian HEIs outside the project consortium, or both.

Short/Long term	Impact description	Beneficiaries	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
Short	Educational Impact	Teaching Staff, Students	60 students enrolled in new and/or updated programmes	State-of-the-art course curricula built during the ISSES project
Short	Educational Impact	Teaching Staff, Students	500 students/year benefiting from improved curricula in BSc studies	Higher level of information security consciousness in Serbia
Short	Education Impact	Teaching Staff, HEIs		No duplication of effort in developing laboratories and curricula in Information Security
Short	Knowledge transfer	Teaching Staff, Students		The presence of the EU partners raises the overall Information Security maturity of the teaching staff and students at the Serbian HEIs
Long	Harmonized skillset of experts	Students, Project Partners, Public Institutions, Private Companies		Graduates at partner HEIs have interchangeable and comparable Information Security skills
Long	Research Impact	PhD Students, Professors, Associated Partners, EU Science	Number of published papers in conferences proceedings and journals, after development of the laboratories	Impact factor of journals where scientific results will be published.

### 2.6.2 Impacts on stakeholders (government and industry)

The following table lists the expected outcomes affecting relevant stakeholders outside higher education.

Short/Long term	Impact description	Beneficiaries	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
Short	Comparable and Measurable Training and Education in Information Security	Government, NGOs, companies	Repository of Information Security with at least 150 concepts. Course and Lab content mapped to concepts.	
Short	Education Impact	Teaching Staff, Students, Project Partners, Companies, Public	13 courses with aligned curricula in information security at four HEIs in Serbia	Graduates exiting HEIs in Serbia have comparable skills in Information Security



		Institutions		
Short	Economic impact	Students, Companies, Project Partners	60 students exiting the new and/or updated study programs	Higher level of information security capability in the private sector. Companies able to find highly skilled information security experts.
Short	Body of knowledge	Students, Teaching Staff, Project Partners, Press & Media	7 new laboratories built, 13 courses built or improved	Higher level of information security capability in the private sector
Long	Capability to reach the national cybersecurity objectives	Stakeholders, Private and Public Institutions, Information Security groups		The cybersecurity goals in the 2017 Serbian National Security Strategy are met
Long	No shortages of Information Security experts	Public Institutions, Private Companies, Students	Unfilled vacancies in Information Security lowered	Public and Private sector needs for experts
Long	Raised Awareness for Information Security	Students, Teaching Staff, Project Partners, Public Institutions, Private Companies	3 workshops and 3 roundtables organized	Both public and private institutions understand the relevance of information security and the benefit of applying proper security controls

### 2.6.3 European added value

The project will have the following expected outcomes on the European level:

Short/Long term	Impact description	Beneficiaries	Quantitative indicators	Qualitative indicators
Long	Harmonized skillset of experts	Students, Project Partners, Public Institutions, Private Companies		Graduates at partner HEIs have interchangeable and comparable Information Security skills
Long	Serbia exports Information Security as a Service	Global Information Security Market, Private Companies, Project	Number of companies exporting their services. Income from such projects and taxes paid.	Highly skilled Information Security experts remain in Serbia and collaborate with clients worldwide



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**ISSES** – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

		Partners, Students		
--	--	-----------------------	--	--



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

### 3 Quality Board

There will be two types of project quality evaluations: internal and external. The external quality assessment will be outsourced to a 3<sup>rd</sup> party expert individual or organization. The internal evaluation will be performed by the Quality Board (QB) which consists of the following ISSES project team members:

#	Name	Institution	QB Role
1	Stefano Zanero	Polimi	Coordinator
2	Stevan Gostojic	UNS	Deputy Coordinator
3	Robert Pinter	VTS	Member
4	Dragan Stojanovic	UNI	Member
5	Tamas Holczer	CrySys/BME	Member
6	Markus Schatten	FOI	Member
7	Viktor Varga	UT	Member
8	Pavle Vuletic	UB/ETF	Member
9	Dejan Simic	UB/FON	Member
10	Dejan Rancic	ICUN	Member

The activities of the QB will be coordinated by Stefano Zanero (P4). The deputy QB Coordinator will be Stefan Gostojic (P1).



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

## 4 Internal evaluation

The internal quality monitoring process covers all aspects of the ISSES project including financial and administrative, management, deliverables, dissemination, academic dimension, impact and relations with the EU. It involves teaching staff, administrative and technician staff, professionals from local bodies and representatives of agencies and other relevant government institutions. The internal quality monitoring process will be conducted by evaluation forms, questionnaires and evaluation reports.

All partners are responsible for regular internal monitoring and assessment of compliance with the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM), work plan and budget. The Project Coordinator will inform on regular basis partners about evaluation results and agree remedial actions.

Risk monitoring, as a part of internal quality management, which allows the project management team to anticipate and/or identify issues that could jeopardize successful project implementation (potential financial risks, project management risks, postponing of defined deadlines) and define controlling mechanism and solutions.

### 4.1 Responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables

The chain of responsibilities for internal monitoring of deliverables starts with the authors of deliverables, leaders of tasks and WPs, followed by reviewers of deliverables appointed by the Quality Board (QB), the Project Coordinator and Steering Committee (SC). The Task Leader appointed by the responsible partner leading the corresponding WP should guarantee the quality and timeliness of the deliverables. The deliverables should be in line with the ISSES LFM and the deliverable template. The Task Leader is responsible for assigning parts of the work to other partners involved in the activity and their coordination and also for the submission of the draft deliverable to the WP Leader, QB and the Project Coordinator. It should report to the WP Leader for any problems occurring during the implementation of the activity.

The QB assigns realized deliverable to appointed reviewer(s), who is/are not the author of the deliverables, nor representatives of the same partner/faculty. The reviewer prepares a review report with comments in accordance with the relevant project form(s) and send to the Task Leader. The Task Leader is responsible to implement the required quality-related modifications with the authors of the deliverable. The Task Leader notifies the reviewer(s) about the modifications, who then either accept them, or send additional comments and requests for change to the Task Leader. Once this iterative process is completed, the Task Leader submits the final deliverable to the WP Leader, the Project Coordinator and the SC. In extreme cases, the Coordinator or members of the SC may ask for additional modifications, which should be implemented by the Task Leader.

The Steering Committee accepts and officially approves the deliverables, which are subsequently published on the project website or other collaboration platforms.

### 4.2 Impact assessment of the project activities

The term impact is used to assess intermediate and long-term effects of the ISSES project. The satisfaction of the different types of project beneficiaries and stakeholders will be investigated.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

The different project events (workshop, training of teaching staff, study visits, meetings) will be self-evaluated by the ISSES team and/or via Event evaluation forms filled in by relevant stakeholders participating in those events. The following project artefacts will be used to assess the impact of project activities:

- attendance lists,
- minutes of meetings, and
- questionnaires.

### **4.3 Periodic and summative internal project quality evaluation report**

Gathering information for measurements of all project performance during the project implementation i.e. tools for verification of project realization and results in line with the project work plan and LFM are defined through the different kind of evaluation and reporting documents.

Periodic internal quality control is ensured with:

- annual Partner self-assessment reports prepared by each project partner,
- annual Work Package self-assessment reports prepared by each WP Leader,
- internal Deliverable quality assessment reports prepared by project partners tasked by the QB.

The internal evaluation forms and methods are specified for each work package and deliverable type in the annexes of this document. They allow the QB to measure the quality process of the project and take corrective actions when necessary.

The entire evaluation process will take use the Logical Framework Matrix (LFM) included in the project proposal as a key input.

The tables are structured by work packages and tasks. The first column contains the title, the responsible organization, the type, the deadline and the evaluators. Project team members who are involved in working on the deliverable are excluded from the evaluation. The “Content summary” describes in short what was developed. The “Evaluation” contains the assessment of the developed content – if necessary, it contains guidance on how to improve the content.



## 5 External evaluation

Project activities and results will be evaluated by independent external expert(s) who will carry out independent comprehensive monitoring evaluations to review, and report upon, the progress of the project at M20 and M30. The evaluations will be made to make sure that the project is carried out according to plan and to provide advice to improve the quality of the project realization. Financial evaluation will take place during the final project year.

The external monitoring of the project includes assessment of various project aspects:

- relevance - is the project still relevant in terms of its goals and achievements,
- efficiency - are the activities within the work-packages done on time,
- effectiveness - how well are the project specific objectives met,
- impact - at the level of departments, faculty, university, and
- sustainability - what would stay after the project is finished.

The external monitoring performed by the National Erasmus Office (NEO) and EACEA comprises three types of monitoring, based on the deliverable achievement:

- preventive (in the first project year),
- advisory (after the first project year), and
- control (after the end of the project – sustainability check).

Considering all aspects and findings within the course of the three subsequent types of monitoring, the NEO will send a report to EACEA.

The external evaluation of the project aims to:

- Provide an outside critical view of the project approach and methodology and give suggestions for their improvement during and after the project implementation;
- Monitor the effectiveness of the project activities and the quality of the project results during and after the project implementation;
- Evaluate the project progress and overall satisfaction measurement of all partners involved with project management and financial handling;
- Evaluate the single phases of the project;
- Evaluate the milestones of the project (e.g. creation of the Guidelines and Plans);
- Measure the impact of the project activities.

### 5.1 Terms of reference for external evaluation

Polimi (P4) will coordinate the implementation of external evaluation. They will work out the Terms of reference (ToR) together with the Project Coordinator and communicate with the external evaluator throughout the implementation of the external evaluation. The Project Coordinator and P4 will support the external evaluator by the following means: provision of data and information, support to establishing of content and timeline of the evaluation.



The ToR includes the following sub-chapters:

- **Background and rationale:** provision of the context and summary of project description; any account of already proven challenges and risks;
- **Specific objectives of the evaluation and key questions:** description of objectives and key (main parameters) of the external evaluation which should be complementary to the internal quality assessment carried out by P4 and the Quality Board (QB) of the project;
- **Scope of the evaluation:** description of limits of the evaluation, focus areas; description of key activities/areas and related resources expected to be needed for the external evaluation;
- **Approach and methodology:** short description of key methodological approaches - if applicable: the consortium may decide to leave this open for the external evaluator to decide in his/her role as evaluation expert; he/she may make a suggestion for the methodological approach which will be discussed and agreed upon by the Project Coordinator and P4 as coordinator of WP5.
- **Guiding principles and values:** description of the guiding principles and core values to be respected throughout the external evaluation by the project consortium and the external evaluator;
- **Responsibilities:** full list of contact persons involved in the external evaluation and their expected roles, the main contact person with P1 as project coordinator and P4, as WP5 coordinator;
- **Professional qualifications:** short description of the necessary profile for carrying out of the external evaluation
- **Deliverables and schedule:** short description of expected deliverables of the external evaluation and the expected delivery dates;
- **Budget and payment:** breakdown of working days per activity within the external evaluation and budget overview including working days, travel resources and other resources if applicable. The external evaluator might initiate electronic or face-to-face meetings with the representatives of the ISSES consortium.
- **Existing references or resources:** the external evaluation will be built on quality assessment carried out to date. Any items already produced for quality review shall be made available to the external evaluator well on time.

## 5.2 Criteria for the selection of external evaluator

### 5.2.1 Description of the external evaluation task

The external evaluator (person not involved in the ISSES project Consortium) will have access to the internal reports from the partnership and will receive all required versions of the project outputs. He/she will also be included in e-mail correspondences for monitoring of partnership activity and will have access to the collaboration platform, e.g. Google Drives, Dropbox folders.

Two external Quality Assurance Reports will be delivered by the external quality evaluator at M20 and M30 of the project funded period. One interim external evaluation report to be used for the project's

This involvement of the external evaluator will take place from M20 until M36.





Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

## 5.2.2 Profile of the external evaluator

The potential candidate external evaluator should have a strong background in project related topics and objectives such as capacity development in the field of higher education. He/she should demonstrate in his/her application that he/she has sound knowledge and understanding of the project topic and field of activity. Prior involvement into the implementation of EU-funded projects connected to the topic of the ISSES project as coordinator or partner, past experiences in projects with the partner countries (Serbia, Croatia, Hungary, Italy) as well as involvement with National Authorities responsible for Higher Education are highly appreciated.

Experience conducting external evaluation or as reviewer is an asset. The candidate should also have excellent knowledge of English language (both verbal and written).

## 5.2.3 Responsibilities of the external evaluator

The main responsibilities of the external evaluator of the project will be to:

- Prepare an external evaluation plan along with the necessary questionnaires and documents, needed for the plan implementation;
- Consult the internal evaluation reports;
- Prepare the evaluation reports, including recommendations to the partners for improvement of performance and overall assessment of the project implementation and impact.

## 5.2.4 Evaluation budget

P4 will subcontract the external audit agency(ies) (bodies not involved in the ISSES project Consortium) for the purpose of external review of the project and for external financial control. The ISSES project allows for a maximum contract price defined by the project budget (inclusive of all related costs) for the external quality evaluation. The tender procedure will be transparent, fair and based on principles of equal treatment, which also means candidates are able to propose different financial offers according to their own estimated costs. All candidates are expected to specify at least the following items in their offer planned working days for (1) interim external evaluation report, (2) final external evaluation report, (3) (virtual) meetings with coordination team.

Candidates will be requested to specify their VAT status. The contract will be awarded to the bid offering best value for money (best price-quality ratio).

## 5.3 Academic quality assurance

The external quality evaluator is not responsible for quality assurance of the academic content of project outcomes (new master curricula). WP2, WP3 and WP4 Leaders will ensure that the quality standards defined in the Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (2015), established by ENQA will be met.

The NEAQA of the Republic of Serbia will carry out external quality assurance of new master curricula and make approval decision for their future exploitation.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

## 6 Corrective and Preventive Actions

Corrective actions and preventive actions will be taken when new risks are identified during project execution. The responsible Work Package leader or person responsible for an activity in risk will communicate the risk and propose corrective actions to the project coordinator. The coordinator will notify the Steering Committee about each such event.

The risks shall be communicated in the following template.

<b>Unique Identifier</b>	
<b>Risk date</b>	
<b>Risk description</b>	
<b>Proposed corrective and preventive actions</b>	
<b>Next revision date</b>	

The effectiveness of the proposed corrective and preventive actions will be evaluated at the next revision date, which shall not be more than one month later than the date of risk identification, i.e. the 'Risk date' in the above table.



## 7 Annex A: Annual partner self-assessment report

### 7.1 Partner details

<b>Partner name</b>	
<b>Acronym</b>	
<b>Contact person</b>	
<b>Report period</b>	
<b>Report date</b>	

### 7.2 Partner contributions

Please describe shortly your contribution to the project within each of activities defined by LFM and comment if necessary. If it is not foreseen to take part in some of activities, please mark it with n/a. If some activity was not started in a timely manner, please indicate that. If your team didn't accomplish some task, please give the reasons.

<b>Activities – LFM code</b>	<b>Achieved to date</b>	<b>Comment</b>

### 7.3 Changes

Please indicate any changes in project realisation from the partner institution during the report period and comment on any likely impact on the project and suggest remedial actions

<b>Changes to the planned contributions to the project</b>	<b>Likely implication for WP activities and suggested actions</b>	<b>Date of notification to project coordinator</b>

### 7.4 Financial matters

I hereby certify that the amounts of received instalments, expenditure within budget lines and status of financial reporting is entered into the Financial Statements document (Excel) defined by the EACEA.



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**ISSES** – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*

Location, date

---

Partner representative (signature)

---



## 8 Annex B: Annual work package (WP) self-assessment report

### 8.1 Work package details

<b>Work Package reference number and title</b>	
<b>Work Package Lead Partner</b>	
<b>Name of the responsible person</b>	
<b>Report period</b>	
<b>Report date</b>	

### 8.2 Activities and achievements

Fill in the outputs/outcomes and indicators as per the Logical Framework Matrix of the WP during the review period. In the column “Achieved to date” describe all activities done in order to achieve the indicated output/outcome. Provide a short comment if necessary.

<b>Outputs/ outcomes – LFM code</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Achieved to date</b>	<b>Comment</b>

### 8.3 Problems encountered

Describe the main problems encountered and recommend a solution if possible

<b>Outputs/outcomes</b>	<b>Description of problem</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>

### 8.4 Changes

Present all changes to WP plans including postponing implementation deadlines

<b>Outputs/outcomes</b>	<b>Change of plan and likely implication for WP activities</b>	<b>Suggested actions</b>	<b>Date of notification to project coordinator</b>



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**ISSES** – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*


## 8.5 Brief summary

Summarize progress of activities against the implementation schedule (up to 100 words)

Summarize progress against specific objective indicators from the logical framework matrix (up to 200 words)

Summarize main problems encountered and recommendations (up to 200 words)

Location, date

\_\_\_\_\_

Work Package Leader signature

\_\_\_\_\_



Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



**ISSES** – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

*Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*



## 9 Annex C: Internal deliverable assessment report

### 9.1 Deliverable details

<b>Deliverable title</b>	
<b>Work package</b>	
<b>Deliverable author(s)</b>	
<b>Deliverable reviewer(s)</b>	
<b>Deliverable deadline (project month)</b>	
<b>Report date</b>	

### 9.2 Deliverable assessment form

Assurance point	Issues to be addressed	Assessment	Comments	Recommendations
<b>Compliance with the project objectives</b>	<i>Does the deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<b>Compliance with the specific objectives of the WP</b>	<i>Does the deliverable comply with the WP Objectives as specified in the WP description?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<b>Correspondence with the description of work of the relevant activity</b>	<i>Does the deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the Application Form?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<b>Compliance with the deliverables format</b>	<i>Is the deliverable presented using the Project's deliverable format – Annex A?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<b>Adequacy of complementary information</b>	<i>Examples of complementary info:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		





Co-funded by the  
Erasmus+ Programme  
of the European Union



ISSES – Information Security Services  
Education in Serbia

Supported by the Erasmus+ Capacity Building in  
the field of Higher Education (CBHE) grant  
N° 586474-EPP-1-2017-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

	- Sources used, - Bibliography, - List of contacts, - Methodology used.	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<b>Adequacy of written language</b>	<i>Level of written English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		
<b>Overall assessment and suggestions for improvement</b>				
<b>Deadline for submission of amended version of the deliverable</b>				

Location, date:

\_\_\_\_\_

Internal reviewer<sup>1</sup>:

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> If necessary, add multiple names and signatures