



FP6-001917

EURON

European Robotics Network

Network of Excellence

Information Society Technologies

DR.17.3

Internal Evaluation Activities

Due date of deliverable: 31/12/2005

Actual submission date: 20/6/2006

Start date of project: May 1st, 2004

Duration: 48 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable:

KTH

Revision: V.1.

Dissemination Level: PU

1 Introduction

As a network of excellence EURON is required to have an internal quality assurance program in place. EURON involves a large number of activities and as such there is a need to monitor progress for each of the area.

For the external view of the activities a scientific advisory board has been appointed. The scientific advisors serves on the coordination committee and are invited to the annual meetings.

In addition a number of committees are in place for assurance of quality and delivery of expected results. The mechanism are briefly outlined in this paper.

2 Scientific Advisory Board

As part of the creation of EURON a scientific advisory board was setup with

- Prof. Hirochika Inoue, JSPS/AIST
- Prof. Lynne Parker, UTK

The scientific advisors have access to all information and are engaged in a dialogue on EURON and its activities. A briefing is organised each year as part of the EURON annual meeting.

The scientific advisors provide an outside view on the activities and provide valuable input on activities and overall organisation of the network.

By the end of 2006 Prof. Inoue has chosen to resign from his role as advisor and a new person from Asia is presently being recruited.

3 On-Going Activities

Each key-area has an associated committee for on-going discussion of the activities and for evaluation of progress. The committee is engaged at the discretion of the key-area coordinators. In addition the board is updated on progress for the entire network twice per year. Finally monthly updates are provided by email to ensure progress on key matters and for discussion on current activities. Overall the monitoring of progress is good. There are active discussions on all major activities and the wide representation within the board ensures awareness of activities and also a critical discussion on challenges when they arise.