

Huuhka, S. & Pakarinen, S.
June 30 2021

Quality Assurance Plan for the ReCreate Project



The ReCreate project has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 958200.

Publisher / project Reusing precast concrete for a circular economy
Project acronym ReCreate

Deliverable D10.2 Quality assurance plan
Lead beneficiary Tampere University
Dissemination level Public

Cite this document Huuhka, S. & Pakarinen, S. (2021). Quality Assurance Plan for the ReCreate Project. The ReCreate project.

Disclaimer The content presented herein reflect the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information this publication contains.



Table of contents

1	Quality management in ReCreate.....	5
1.1	Management bodies	5
1.2	Roles and responsibilities	8
1.2.1	Steering Committee	8
1.2.2	Coordinator (and Project Manager).....	8
1.2.3	Core Group.....	8
1.2.4	Work packages.....	9
1.2.5	Country Clusters	9
1.2.6	Innovation Manager	9
1.3	Quality management in Work Packages	10
1.3.1	Changes to project plan	10
1.4	Reporting procedures	11
1.4.1	Official reporting.....	11
1.4.2	Internal reporting.....	12
2	Quality control for project milestones	13
2.1	Preparation and review.....	13
2.2	Distribution and use of milestones in the project.....	13
3	Quality control for project deliverables	15
3.1	Template for deliverables	15
3.2	Preparation and review.....	15
3.3	Distribution and use of deliverables intended for internal use	16
4	Quality control for scientific publications	19
4.1	Planning scientific publications	19
4.2	Rules for publication	20
4.3	Acknowledgement	20
4.4	Disclaimer.....	21
4.5	Open Access	21
4.6	Selecting publication channels.....	21
4.7	Depositing in a repository	21
4.8	Research data related to the publication.....	22
5	Quality control for other kind of publications	23
5.1	Rules for publication	23
5.2	Acknowledgement	24
5.3	Disclaimer.....	24



Abstract

This document is the Quality Assurance Plan for the ReCreate project. The document describes the procedures to be used throughout the project to coordinate the timely delivery of high-quality deliverables, other publications, and project outcomes. This plan will act as a guide for the project leadership to ensure that quality is assured in due course before deliverables and/or other publications are submitted. In addition, the plan will help all project partners to understand their responsibilities in terms of the quality of project processes, deliverables and outcomes. The plan defines the steps of quality assurance to make it easy for the responsible partners to identify the tasks that are important for ensuring high-quality outputs and sufficient communications between relevant partners. It helps to monitor the project's progress and to foresee difficulties that may result in delays, and defines actions to be undertaken in the occurrence of such situations.



1 Quality management in ReCreate

This document is the Quality Assurance Plan for the ReCreate project. The purpose of the document is to describe procedures for quality assurance throughout the project as well as the roles and tasks of different project members in this work.

Every partner participating in the ReCreate project is responsible for ensuring a high-quality for the project's outcomes. This concerns not only the outputs, such as publications, but also the process that leads to the outputs.

The current chapter describes ReCreate's management bodies and their roles, quality management in Work Packages, and the reporting procedures to be followed in the project. The following chapters define quality management processes for milestones, deliverables, scientific publications, and other publications.

1.1 Management bodies

ReCreate has the following management bodies and roles:

1. Steering Committee
2. Coordinator (and the Project Manager)
3. Core Group
4. Work Packages (with Work Package Leaders)
5. Country Clusters (with Country Cluster Leaders)
6. Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) Manager

Table 1 lists the member organizations and persons representing the organizations in the management bodies and roles.

The Steering Committee is the ultimate decision-making body of the project. Each partner organization has one representative in it.

The Coordinator oversees the implementation of the project and acts as an intermediary between the project and HaDEA – the EU funding authority financing the project. All communications concerning the project to and from HaDEA go through the Coordinator. The Coordinator has appointed a **Project Manager** to assist them.

The Core Group consists of the Coordinator, the Work Package Leaders, and the Country Cluster Leaders. It is responsible for the practical coordinator of activities. It reports and is accountable to the Steering Committee.

Work Packages consists of Work Package Leaders and Members. **Work Package Leaders** are responsible for ensuring the realisation of the Work Packages' objectives. **Work Package**



Members are responsible for implementing the Work Package work in the Country Clusters as described in the project plan (Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement). The Work Packages report to the Core Group through the Work Package Leaders.

Country Clusters in the piloting countries (Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, and Germany) consists of Country Cluster Leaders and Members. The practical implementation of the project work takes place in the Country Clusters. **Country Cluster Leaders** coordinate the implementation and ensure the practical pilots are implemented by the **Country Cluster Members** as described in the project plan (Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement). The Country Clusters report to the Core Group through the Country Cluster Leaders.

Note: In ReCreate, Country Cluster Leaders are also Work Package Leaders. Nevertheless, these are two distinctive roles, with differing duties.

Innovation Manager for the project ensures that Intellectual Property Rights are managed throughout the project and the consortium in a timely manner to facilitate both commercial exploitation and Open Data Access.

Reference: Consortium Agreement article 6.1

Table 1. Management bodies, member organizations and persons representing the organization.

Management body	Organization
Coordinator (and Project Manager)	Tampere University / Satu Huuhka (Coordinator) & Soili Pakarinen (Project Manager)
Steering Committee	All project partners (short name in brackets): Tampere University (TAU) KTH Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) Eindhoven University of Technology (TU/e) Brandenburg Technical University Cottbus-Senftenberg (BTU) LIIKE Oy Arkkitehtistudio (Liike) Helsingborgshem AB (HBH) IMd Raadgevende Ingenieurs (IMd) ECOSOIL Ost GmbH (Ecosoil) Jochen Dreetz (Dreetz) City of Tampere (Tampere) Croatia Green Building Council (CGBC) Ramboll Finland Oy (Ramboll) Umacon Oy (Umacon) P. Jähne Ingenieurbüro GmbH (Jähne) Skanska Talonrakennus Oy (Skanska)
Core Group	The Coordinator and all Work Package Leaders (see above and below).



Work Packages	<p>WP 1: Analysis of concrete panel systems Leader (org): KTH / Erik Stenberg Member orgs: TAU, TU/e, BTU, IMd</p> <p>WP 2: Deconstruction Leader org: TU/e / Rijk Blok Member orgs: TAU, KTH, BTU, HBH, Ecosoil, Ramboll, Umacon, Skanska</p> <p>WP 3: Logistics and processing Leader org: KTH / Kjartan Gudmundsson Member orgs: TAU, TU/e, BTU, HBH, IMd, Ecosoil</p> <p>WP 4: Quality management Leader org: TAU / Jukka Lahdensivu Member orgs: KTH, TU/e, BTU, HBH, IMd, Ecosoil, Ramboll, Jähne</p> <p>WP 5: Redesign and reassembly Leader org: TU/e / Patrick Teuffel Member orgs: TAU, KTH, BTU, Liike, HBH, IMd, Ecosoil, Dreetz, Ramboll, Jähne, Skanska</p> <p>WP 6: Potential to reach energy and climate targets Leader org: BTU / Angelika Mettke & Viktoria Arnold Member orgs: TAU, KTH, TU/e, HBH, Ecosoil, Umacon, Skanska</p> <p>WP 7: Business model development and business case Leader org: TAU / Leena Aarikka-Stenroos Member orgs: all</p> <p>WP 8: Policy support and social acceptability Leader org: TAU / Paul Jonker-Hoffrén & Mikko Knuutinen Member orgs: all but CGBC</p> <p>WP 9: Knowledge sharing, training and dissemination Leader org: CGBC / Josipa Arapović Member orgs: all</p> <p>WP 10: Project management & coordination Leader org: TAU / Satu Huuhka & Soili Pakarinen Member orgs: all</p>
Country Clusters	<p>Finnish CC: Leader org: TAU / Satu Huuhka Member orgs: Skanska, Umacon, City of Tampere, Ramboll, Liike</p> <p>Swedish CC: Leader org: KTH / Erik Stenberg Member orgs: HBH</p>



	Dutch CC: Leader org: TU/e / Rijk Blok & Patrick Teuffel Member orgs: IMd German CC: Leader org: BTU / Angelika Mettke & Viktoria Arnold Member orgs: Ecosoil, Dreetz, Jähne
Innovation Manager	To be nominated in autumn 2021.

1.2 Roles and responsibilities

1.2.1 Steering Committee

The Steering Committee's role is to make decisions about the projects content, finances, intellectual property rights (including any IPR a partner has prior to the project and wants to protect, i.e. so-called 'background'), changes to consortium, and Core Group appointments. Any changes to the project plan and budget (Grant Agreement Annexes 1 and 2) to be proposed to the funder, the EU, must be accepted by the Steering Committee.

Reference: Consortium Agreement article 6.3.1.

1.2.2 Coordinator (and Project Manager)

The Coordinator's role is to facilitate the implementation of the project by monitoring the project's progress, keeping contact lists, collecting and reviewing the project's deliverables and submitting them to the EU through the EU portal, administering the funding payments from the EU to the partners, and by arranging Core Group meetings every two months. The Project Manager's role is to assist the coordinator in these duties. The Project Manager reports to the Coordinator and has no decision-making power of their own.

Reference: Consortium Agreement articles 6.4 and 6.5.

1.2.3 Core Group

The Core Group's role is to support the Coordinator's work by collecting information about the progress of the project and using it to monitor the progress, by building consensus among the partners, and by suggesting changes to the project plan (Grant Agreement Annexes 1 and 2) for the Steering Committee. In the occurrence of the need to change the project plan, the Core Group advises the Steering Committee how to rearrange tasks and budgets. In addition, the Core Group prepares the Steering Committee meetings, ensures that decisions made in the Steering Committee are implemented in the project, supports the Coordinator in preparing



meetings with the EU and in preparing related data and deliverables, and prepares the project's press releases and joint publications.

Reference: Consortium Agreement section 6.3.2.3

1.2.4 Work packages

The Work Packages' role is to structure the project work. The Work Package Leaders coordinate the work in their Work Package on a daily basis and to ensure the progress of the WP work and deliverables. This is best achieved by advising and directing partners in the WP work, by identifying and actively resolving any critical issues or conflicts that may arise, by engaging in communications towards other WP leaders where needed, and by identifying IPR matters that may emerge from the WP.

The Work Package Members responsibility is to implement the WP work as laid out in the project plan, through the Country Clusters and their pilots (see below).

Reference: Consortium Agreement section 6.6.1.

1.2.5 Country Clusters

The Country Clusters' role is to facilitate the practical cooperation to implement the pilots. The Country Cluster Leaders duty is to coordinate the pilots' implementation with the cluster's industry partners across the technical Work Packages on a daily basis, to organize Country Cluster meetings, and to report the progress of the Country Cluster work to the WP Leaders and the Coordinator in the Core Group. Country Cluster Members' role is to participate in Country Cluster meetings and in the pilots' implementation according to the project plan and more specific plans made in the Country Cluster. The Cluster meetings can be held in the local language unless otherwise agreed by the Country Cluster Members.

Reference: Consortium Agreement sections 6.3.3 and 6.7.

1.2.6 Innovation Manager

The Innovation Manager, working in collaboration with the leader of WP7 for business development, oversees and coordinates the following activities:

- review of appropriateness of the IPR principles; proposing any required changes to the Consortium Agreement pertaining to IPR for approval by the SC
- review, approval and follow-up of exploitation strategy and plan (Deliverable 7.6)
- coordination of exploitation activities in agreement with the project's open science policy
- acting as central contact for the Coordinator and all partners concerning inventions and exploitation options



- identification of inventions, including those generated during co-creation in the social innovation process, with potential for exploitation and emerging innovations related to the project results
- identification of new exploitation opportunities, both internal and external
- monitoring of competitors, markets, technologies, innovations, and IPR
- monitoring of stakeholders and lead-users, which could become licensing partners for exploitation
- monitoring and acting on funding and financing opportunities such as the Horizon Europe and EU finance for business plan development, to ensure development of the ReCreate concept towards Technology Readiness Level 9.

Reference: Grant Agreement Annex 1, Part B, Section 3.2.3.

1.3 Quality management in Work Packages

The Work Package Leaders must ensure Country Clusters implementing the work package work know what the objectives of the work is, are aware of the project plan (Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement), and are implementing it. The Work Package Leaders' task is to arrange **work package meetings when needed** to ensure the planning and implementation are ongoing in the Country Clusters and to capitalize on the collective intelligence of the partners for the benefit of this work. What is more, the Work Package Leaders' responsibility is to support the Country Clusters' work by studying and proposing solutions and by relaying learnings from one Country Cluster to another.

The Country Clusters are responsible for planning the practical implementation of the project within the boundaries set by the project plan (Annex 1 of the Grant Agreement), and eventually, implementing the work. **The Country Cluster Leaders'** task is to actively coordinate, lead, and facilitate this work. They must also ensure that each member (partner) in the Country Cluster knows what their role in the planning and implementation is. Similarly, if the roles and duties are unclear, **a Country Cluster Member's** responsibility is to actively engage in a discussion with the Country Cluster Leader and the other cluster members to clarify the matter. The Country Clusters Leaders' task is to arrange **Country Cluster meetings once a month** to ensure the Cluster's members are planning and implementing relevant tasks. Their responsibility is also to promote consensus and problem solving within the Cluster and ensure any conflicts and issues that may arise are handled and resolved without delay.

1.3.1 Changes to project plan

Should there be a need to change the project plan for any reason (practical, financial, etc.), the Country Cluster Member to identify this need must inform the Country Cluster Leader, who must bring the matter into the Core Group for a discussion with the relevant Work Package Leader(s)



and the Coordinator. The Coordinator will assess whether the proposed change would require a project plan change, i.e. a Grant Agreement Amendment and, if needed, the Coordinator will initiate this process.

As long as the work can be implemented as planned in the project plan (Grant Agreement Annex 1), minor changes, such as small budget transfers between budget categories or between partners do not require an amendment. However, the Coordinator must be notified of this plan. The Coordinator will take the redistribution of budget into account in any coming payments of EU funding.

Should a Country Cluster member leave the project or not be able to perform its duties, it is the Country Cluster Leader's responsibility to facilitate the discussions to reallocate the duties to other partners and/or to find a novel partner to replace the leaving partner.

1.4 Reporting procedures

There are two types of reporting in the ReCreate project: (1) official reporting, which is submitted to the EU and acts as a basis of funding payments, and (2) internal reporting, which helps to ensure the project is on track and to prepare the partners for the official reporting.

1.4.1 Official reporting

The official reporting includes both the periodic reports and continuous reporting throughout the reporting periods.

The project duration is split into **three reporting periods** (RPs):

- 1st RP Apr 1 2021 – Sep 30 2022 (duration 18 months)
- 2nd RP Oct 1 2022 – Mar 31 2024 (duration 18 months)
- 3rd RP Apr 1 2024 – Mar 31 2025 (duration 12 months)

Official Periodic Reports are submitted to the EU after the end of each reporting period.

They will consist of a technical report about project achievements (one for the whole consortium) and each partner's individual Financial Statements:

- Partners must be sure that only eligible costs are recorded for the project.
- Each partner must keep adequate records and retain other supporting documentation to prove the costs declared for 5 years after the payment of balance (final payment).

More detailed info about reporting and cost categories can be found in the Project Handbook (Deliverable 10.1).

In addition to periodic reports, continuous reporting should be filled throughout the reporting periods. Deliverables and milestones should be sent according to the due dates, and



all other data updated at the latest **one month** before every periodic reporting. Continuous reporting in the EU portal includes:

- **Deliverables:** outputs (e.g. information, special report, a technical diagram, brochure of the project) that must be produced at a given moment during the action. See Chapter 3 for the quality control of deliverables.
- **Milestones:** control points in the project that help to chart progress. They may correspond to the completion of a key deliverable, allowing the next phase of the work to begin, or be needed at intermediary points. See Chapter 2 for the quality control for Milestones.
- **Critical risks:** recognized before the project started, updated during the project.
- **Publications:** information about scientific peer-reviewed publications will be added in EU portal. The authors of publication(s) must fill in the needed information in the Communications Tracker (in ReCreate Teams) after every publication, latest at the end of each reporting period.
- **Dissemination & Communication activities:** figures must be filled in the Communications Tracker (in ReCreate Teams) latest at the end of each reporting period.
- **Patents:** patents, trademarks, utility models etc. applied in the project, if any.
- **Innovation:** prototypes, demos etc., if any.
- **SME impact:** concerns only SME partners. They should report the turnover and number of employees before the end of every reporting period (the Coordinator collects the data).
- **Open Data:** reporting via the Communications Tracker (in ReCreate Teams), if any.
- **Gender:** gender balance should be reported before end of every reporting period (researchers and other staff in the workforce). The Communications Tracker will be used.

1.4.2 Internal reporting

The Coordinator will collect internal financial reporting from all partners every 6 months. The purpose of the internal reporting is to help ensure the project is on track and to prepare the partners for the official reporting by collecting the data in more continuous manner. A template (Excel sheet) will be provided in ReCreate Teams, and each partner must fill in:

- Every partner summarizes costs (€) and person months (PMs) per WP from the last 6 months and sends the file to the coordinator.
- Partners must be sure that only eligible costs are recorded for the project.



2 Quality control for project milestones

This chapter describes the procedures to be followed in the case of project milestones. Milestones are internal project deadlines intended to help the project consortium to ensure the project is on the right path and that project activities are carried out in a timely manner.

2.1 Preparation and review

The Work Package Leader responsible for the milestone must ensure the milestone is met by the due date (Table 2). If the milestone requires active input from other partners or Country Clusters, the Work Package Leader must be actively in contact with the relevant partners or Country Clusters to ensure timely progress is made.

For the milestones requiring Country Cluster input, i.e. MS4, MS7, and MS8, the Country Cluster Leaders shall actively monitor the progress of their Country Clusters and notify the responsible Work Package Leader of any difficulties that may occur in achieving the milestone in their cluster.

Should the responsible Work Package Leader foresee a chance of delay for completing a milestone, they must notify the Coordinator **immediately**. If needed, the Coordinator will take action to request for more time from the Project Advisor.

The statuses of upcoming milestones are reviewed in the Core Group. In addition, the responsible Work Package Leader must notify the Coordinator of the status of the milestone **one month** before its due date.

Once the milestone is met, the coordinator shall mark it as 'achieved' in the EU Funding and Tenders Portal.

2.2 Distribution and use of milestones in the project

It is the responsible Work Package Leader's duty to ensure the milestone's output (e.g. a data collection template, a fieldwork protocol, a common data environment, etc.) is made available, as soon as it is completed, to the partners and/or Country Clusters that will be needing it to perform their own work. Dissemination to Country Clusters takes place through Country Cluster Leaders, who are responsible for ensuring the relevant Country Cluster Members have an access. The partner who should use the milestone's output is responsible for ensuring they do so.



Table 2. Milestones, responsible partners, and due dates. Reference: Grant Agreement Annex 1, Part A, Section 1.3.4.

Milestone No	WP No	Responsible partner / person(s)	Milestone name	Due	Means of verification
MS1	WP 6	BTU / Angelika & Viktoria	Protocol and template for LCA data collection completed	Oct 31 2021	Ready for data input
MS2	WP 8	TAU / Paul	Fieldwork protocol for studying work processes completed	Nov 30 2021	Ready for use in fieldwork
MS3	WP 3	KTH / Kjartan	Common data environment and its structure established	Mar 31 2022	Up and running
MS4	WP 2	TU/e / Rijk With input from CC leaders	Demolition permits for deconstruction pilots acquired	Sep 30 2022	Valid permits
MS5	WP 7	TAU / Leena	Initial ecosystem mapping & business model analyses completed	Mar 31 2023	Ready for verification
MS6	WP 1	KTH / Erik	Structures established for the digital map, element typologies, taxonomic tree of relations and open access digital database	Mar 31 2023	Ready for data input
MS7	WP 4	TAU / Jukka With input from CC leaders	Quality of deconstructed elements of pilots determined	Sep 30 2023	Reports delivered to WP 5
MS8	WP 5	TU/e / Patrick With input from CC leaders	Building permits for reuse pilots acquired	Dec 31 2023	Valid permits
MS9	WP 9	CGBC / Josipa	Final conference	Mar 31 2025	Event completed successfully



3 Quality control for project deliverables

This chapter describes the procedures to be followed in the case of project deliverables. Deliverables are project reports, lab experiments, physical pilots, webpages, software, procedures, or other kinds of tangible outputs that have been identified in the Grant Agreement to be completed in the course of the project (see Table 3).

3.1 Template for deliverables

A ready-made template will be available for project deliverables after summer 2021. The template follows the project's visual identity and contains the EU emblem and funding details (programme name and grant number) as required by the funding body.

All deliverables made after summer 2021 must use the template for deliverables.

The partner responsible for the deliverable must ensure that the template is used. The template is available for download on the project's Teams.

3.2 Preparation and review

The coordinator shall submit all deliverables through the EU Funding and Tenders Portal. The partner responsible for the deliverable must ensure the deliverable can be submitted by the due date (Table 3).

For any deliverables requiring input from the other partners (e.g. D7.6, D7.7, D9.4, D10.4, D11.1, D11.2, in addition to deliverables linking to pilots listed below), it is the responsible partner's task to coordinate and collect this input and ensure it can be received in a timely manner.

For the deliverables linking to pilots and thus requiring direct Country Cluster input (e.g. D2.3, D3.2, D3.3, D4.2, D5.2, D5.3, D5.4, D6.1, D6.3), the Country Cluster Leaders must also actively monitor the progress of their cluster and notify the responsible partner of any difficulties that may occur in completing the steps necessary to produce the deliverable in their cluster.

For the deliverables that are not listed as reports in Table 3 but physical or virtual outputs (e.g. deconstructed elements, common data environment, etc.), a one-pager must be written on the deliverable template as the proof of completion.

The statuses of upcoming deliverables are reviewed in the Core Group. In addition, the responsible partner must notify the Coordinator of the status of the deliverable **two months** before its due date. The final version of the deliverable must be submitted to the Coordinator for quality review **one month** before its due date, unless otherwise agreed **in advance**. The Coordinator may nominate another project member (one that did not contribute to the



deliverable) as a reviewer by agreeing with the intended member at least one month in advance. The Coordinator may return the deliverable to the Work Package Leader for revisions **two weeks** before the due date. The Work Package Leader must submit the final revised version to the Coordinator **the day before the due date** at the latest.

Should the responsible Work Package Leader foresee a chance of delay for completing the deliverable, they must notify the Coordinator **immediately**. If needed, the Coordinator will take action to request for more time from the Project Advisor.

Should the responsible Work Package Leader identify a need to change the level of openness of the deliverable from public to confidential to protect commercial exploitation interests, they must notify the Coordinator **immediately**. The Coordinator may contact the Project Advisor to discuss whether such change can be acceptable. The alternative is to leave some details out of the deliverable and only publish content that does not preclude commercial exploitation.

3.3 Distribution and use of deliverables intended for internal use

It is the responsible partner's duty to ensure any deliverable intended for internal use (e.g. this Quality Assurance Plan, the Project Handbook, Dissemination and Communication Strategy, etc.) is made available, as soon as it is completed, to the partners and/or Country Clusters that will be needing it to perform their own work. Dissemination to Country Clusters takes place through Country Cluster Leaders, who are responsible for ensuring the relevant Country Cluster Members have an access. The partner who should use the deliverable is responsible for ensuring they do so.

Table 3. Deliverables, responsible partners, and due dates (in chronological order). Reference: Grant Agreement Annex 1, Part A, Section 1.3.2. (please note: in the GA, the deliverables are in the number order, unlike here).

Deliverable No	WP No	Responsible partner / person	Deliverable name	Type	Dissemination level	Due date
D10.2	WP 10	TAU / Satu & Soili	Quality assurance plan (this document)	Report	Public	June 30 2021
D10.1	WP 10	TAU / Satu & Soili	Project handbook	Report	Public	June 30 2021
D9.1	WP 9	CGBC / Josipa	Dissemination and communication strategy	Report	Confidential	June 30 2021
D9.2	WP 9	CGBC / Josipa	Project logo, visual identity and website	Logo, visual identity, website	Public	June 30 2021
D10.3	WP 10	TAU / Satu & Soili	Risk management plan	Report	Confidential	Sep 30 2021
D10.4	WP 10	TAU / Satu With input from WP Leaders	Data management plan	Report	Public	Sep 30 2021



D11.1	WP 11	TAU / Paul With inputs from Leena & Mikko	H – Requirement No. 2 [Humans]	Report	Confidential	Sep 30 2021
D11.2	WP 11	TAU / Paul With inputs from Leena & Mikko	POPD – Requirement No. 3 [Protection of Personal Data]	Report	Confidential	Sep 30 2021
D7.6	WP 7	CGBC / Josipa With input from all partners	Exploitation plan	Report	Confidential	Sep 30 2021
D8.1	WP 8	TAU / Paul	Guide for coalition building	Report	Public	Mar 31 2022
D2.1	WP 2	TU/e / Rijk	BIM-Based pre-deconstruction audit process	Report	Public	Sep 30 2022
D2.3	WP 2	TU/e / Rijk With input from CCs	Real-life deconstruction pilots	De- construction experiments, deconstructed elements	Public	Mar 31 2023
D3.1	WP 3	KTH / Kjartan	Common data environment	Data environment	Confidential	Mar 31 2023
D7.1	WP 7	TAU / Leena	Actor identification and visualized actor maps on critical actors of concrete rebuilding	Report	Public	Mar 31 2023
D7.2	WP 7	TAU / Leena	Identified, analysed and developed business model canvases for concrete rebuild businesses	Report	Public	Mar 31 2023
D8.2	WP 8	TAU / Mikko	Document on legal and technical requirements for reuse planning and building permits	Report	Public	Mar 31 2023
D9.3	WP 9	CGBC / Josipa	Presentation video and animations	Videos	Public	Mar 31 2023
D6.3	WP 6	BTU / Angelika & Viktoria With input from CCs	Environmental product declarations (EPDs) for reused concrete components	Report	Public	Sep 30 2023
D5.2	WP 5	TU/e / Patrick With input from CCs	Retrofit connectors developed and manufactured for the pilots	Connectors	Confidential	Sep 30 2023
D1.2	WP 1	KTH / Erik	Diagram of building, component and connector typologies	Diagrams	Public	Mar 31 2024
D1.4	WP 1	KTH / Erik	Database with digital models of precast concrete elements	Database	Public	Mar 31 2024
D2.2	WP 2	TU/e / Rijk	Best Practice Guidelines and recommendations deconstruction to optimised reuse	Report	Public	Mar 31 2024
D3.3	WP 3	KTH / Kjartan With input from CCs	Deconstructed components processed and delivered	Components on site	Public	Mar 31 2024
D4.2	WP 4	Ramboll / Jukka With input from CCs	Properties and quality of deconstructed components for pilot projects ensured	Report	Public	Mar 31 2024



D5.3	WP 5	TU/e / Patrick With input from CCs	Design for real-life pilots out of deconstructed components	Design documents	Public	Mar 31 2024
D6.1	WP 6	BTU / Angelika & Viktoria With input from CCs	Comparative LCA & LCC scenario analysis	Report	Public	Mar 31 2024
D6.2	WP 6	BTU / Angelika & Viktoria	Reaching sustainability and climate goals of the EU by reuse of concrete components	Report	Public	Mar 31 2024
D4.1	WP 4	TAU / Jukka	Procedure for quality management	Report	Public	Jul 31 2024
D6.4	WP 6	BTU / Angelika & Viktoria	Tool for exact LCA and LCC including environmental impact of transportation of components in each specific situation	LCA and LCC tool	Public	Sep 30 2024
D3.2	WP 3	KTH / Kjartan With input from CCs	RFID-aided logistics in pilot projects	Logistics	Public	Sep 30 2024
D8.3	WP 8	TAU / Mikko	Guide to national implementation differences of norms applicable to reuse	Report	Public	Nov 30 2024
D8.4	WP 8	TAU / Paul	Work processes practice change checklist	Report	Public	Nov 30 2024
D8.5	WP 8	TAU / Paul	Roadmap for educational needs	Report	Public	Nov 30 2024
D1.3	WP 1	KTH / Erik	Taxonomy for urban mining of precast concrete	Taxonomy	Public	Dec 31 2024
D1.1	WP 1	KTH / Erik	Digital map of precast concrete systems	Digital map	Public	Dec 31 2024
D5.4	WP 5	TU/e / Patrick With input from CCs	Real-life pilots constructed out of deconstructed components	Pilot buildings	Public	Jan 31 2025
D4.3	WP 4	TAU / Jukka	Best practice proposal for the quality management process	Report	Public	Jan 31 2025
D5.1	WP 5	TU/e / Patrick	Design manual	Report	Public	Jan 31 2025
D7.3	WP 7	TAU / Leena	Identified critical determinants of profitability and scalability	Report	Public	Feb 28 2025
D7.4	WP 7	TAU / Leena	Identified interactions between economy, technology and societal/regulative aspects in different regional contexts	Report	Public	Feb 28 2025
D7.5	WP 7	TAU / Leena	A roadmap for implementation and increasing scalability in concrete rebuilding comprising identified best practises and easiest improvements to achieve economic benefits	Report	Public	Feb 28 2025
D7.7	WP 7	CGBC / Josipa With input from all partners	Transferability and replicability plan	Report	Public	Feb 28 2025
D9.4	WP 9	CGBC / Josipa With input from WP Leaders	Final conference	Event	Public	Mar 31 2025



4 Quality control for scientific publications

This chapter describes the procedures to be followed in the case of peer-reviewed scientific publications, such as scientific journal articles, conference publications, or book chapters.

The quality of peer-reviewed scientific publications is best ensured by following Responsible Conduct of Research¹ and by selecting respectable publication channels that follow rigorous peer-review processes.

4.1 Planning scientific publications

The themes or topics of scientific publications have not been specified in the Grant Agreement, so they are subject to more flexibility than other project deliverables. However, the target number of such publications has been set at 30. This means on average 3–4 scientific publications per Work Package, i.e. one per WP task.

All partners participating in the scientific work, but university partners in particular, are responsible for identifying findings that can potentially be published as scientific publications. Potential topics may include but are not limited to: project concept and its theoretical frameworks; findings from laboratory testing; findings from practical pilots; comparison of findings on the same issue acquired by different methods at different phases of the project (e.g. comparison of calculated/simulated and measured/observed findings); comparison of results from the four piloting countries; descriptions of processes developed; policy briefs; or research roadmaps forwards.

The Work Package Leaders should facilitate the identification of potential publications in their WPs, with special attention to given to studies comparing results between piloting countries, and collect information about scientific publications arising from the Work Package for reporting purposes.

The partner(s) authoring the scientific publication must ensure that Responsible Conduct of Research¹ is followed. They must also agree on authorship: who is listed as an author and in which order are the authors' names listed. Moreover, they must ensure that no commercial exploitation interests are jeopardized as a result of the publication.

In case of conflicts in the aforementioned issues, the Work Package Leader in question acts as a mediator and must promote consensus building among the partners.

¹ Please see e.g. <https://tenk.fi/en/research-misconduct/responsible-conduct-research-rcr>



4.2 Rules for publication

A partner must disseminate its scientific results that have been created during the project through Open Access **without a delay**, unless commercial and/or industrial exploitation interest, confidentiality and/or personal data protection requirements pertain to them.

The partner submitting scientific results for publication must communicate actively with the relevant other partners to agree on the rules of participation in the scientific research and to review the commercial interests that may arise well **before** the manuscript containing the results is submitted to publication and **during** the peer-review process, in the case that significant changes to the manuscript are made in its course.

Once the manuscript has been **accepted for publication** by the publication channel to which it has been submitted to (e.g. scientific journal or conference), the partner must **notify all consortium partners** about the intent to publish. This notification must include the **accepted manuscript** (including any figures, tables, and data). At least 30 days should be left between the notification and the planned publication. The partner authoring the work must notify the publisher (e.g. journal or conference) about this condition.

Any other partner may object to the publication within 15 days but **only** if it can show that the publication would legitimately hurt its interests (e.g. contain confidential information or jeopardize the commercial exploitation potential of the results).

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 29.1., Consortium Agreement Article 8.4.2.

4.3 Acknowledgement

The partner authoring the peer-reviewed scientific publication must ensure that the following acknowledgement to the EU funding is made and that the EU emblem is displayed on the publication:



This project has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 958200.

The emblem is available at: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/flag_en

In case the publication has an external scientific publisher that uses a standard layout and does not accept the use of images (the EU emblem) in the Acknowledgements section, at the very minimum, the aforementioned text detailing the funding programme and the grant number must be displayed.

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 29.4.



The ReCreate project has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 958200.

4.4 Disclaimer

The partner authoring the peer-reviewed scientific publication must ensure it includes the following disclaimer:

The content presented herein reflect the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information this publication contains.

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 29.5.

4.5 Open Access

The partner authoring the peer-reviewed scientific publication must ensure an Open Access, that is, a free-of-charge online access for any user.

The Open Access can be provided through the so-called *Gold Open Access*, which means that the partner pays an Open Access fee for the publisher to make the publication openly accessible upon publication. Such fees are eligible as project costs.

Green Open Access, that is, Open Access through a scientific repository after an embargo period, during which the access to the publication requires a paid subscription, can also be acceptable. The maximum acceptable embargo periods are **six months** for most disciplines but **twelve months** for social sciences and humanities.

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 29.2.

4.6 Selecting publication channels

If the partner plans to publish in Green Open Access instead of Gold, it must select a journal in which the maximum acceptable embargo period (see above) is not exceeded.

If the partner plans to publish in Gold Open Access publication channel, that is, Open Access against a fee, the partner is advised to pay close attention to the quality of the publication channel. We must be wary of predatory publishers and aim to publish in established, respectable scientific journals with rigorous peer-review processes. When in doubt, please consult journal rankings maintained by the scientific community (e.g. Publication Forum²) or the Coordinator.

4.7 Depositing in a repository

The partner authoring the peer-reviewed scientific publication must ensure that the publication is deposited on a repository for scientific publications **upon publication**. The university partners

² Please see <https://www.julkaisufoorumi.fi/en>



should use their own institutional repositories for this. In case a partner does not have an institutional repository of its own, Zenodo³ shall be used as the repository.

The deposited version must be a machine-readable electronic copy of the published version (so-called Version of Record) or the final peer-reviewed manuscript accepted for publication (so-called Author Accepted Manuscript). Also the publication's metadata must be deposited, but please note that **it is not enough to deposit only the metadata**.

If the deposited publication is a *Gold Open Access* publication, the access through the repository must be made open **upon publication**. If the deposited publication is a *Green Open Access* publication, the access through the repository must be made open **after the embargo period of max. six months** (twelve months in the case of social sciences and humanities).

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 29.2.

4.8 Research data related to the publication

The partner authoring the peer-reviewed scientific publication must **aim** to deposit in a scientific repository, **at the same time with the scientific publication**, the research data underlying the published research results and to make it Open Access for third parties to utilize free-of-charge.

However, the partner must not provide Open Access to data which one of the other partners expects to exploit commercially or industrially and the protection of which is possible, reasonable and justified. Secondly, no data that is provided confidentially by another partner for the implementation of the project shall be openly shared. Thirdly, the partner depositing the research data must ensure that, in case the data contains any personal data, that the personal data is duly protected. The appropriate procedures to protect personal data are described in the Ethics deliverable D11.2 (available at the end of September 2021). With regard to confidentiality and commercial exploitation possibilities, The Data Management Plan (D10.4) and the Exploitation Plan (D7.6) must also be consulted before the data is submitted.

References: Grant Agreement Articles 29.2 and 29.3.

³ Please see zenodo.org



5 Quality control for other kind of publications

This chapter describes the quality control procedures for any other kind of publications, which are neither project deliverables nor peer-reviewed scientific publications. These may entail e.g. industry or trade journal articles, presentation materials (posters, flyers, slides) for industry conferences or other kinds of meetings, newsletters, news articles, blog posts in the project's or a partner's own channels, policy briefs, info-packs, etc.

5.1 Rules for publication

A partner must promote the project and its results by providing targeted information to different kinds of relevant audiences in a strategic and effective manner, **unless** commercial and/or industrial exploitation interest, confidentiality and/or personal data protection requirements pertain to the results. The target audiences as well as types and timing of communications are defined in the Dissemination and Communication Strategy (D9.1, available after June 2021).

Before launching any communication activities that are expected to have a major media impact, we must inform our Project Advisor. This takes place **through the Coordinator**. A partner foreseeing such communication activities must inform the Coordinator **as soon as possible**.

As a rule, partners can openly share the basic concept of the project as well as their own role in its implementation. All partners should note that parts of the project, in particular the local pilots, may encompass matters that are **business-sensitive** to other partners. We should be mindful of **not sharing information on other partners' roles or plans** before they feel comfortable to do so themselves. We should also be aware that the way the pilots are described (what is focused on, choices of words, etc.) may influence the chances of their success (e.g. in the form of public support, support from authorities, etc.). For these purposes, the Country Clusters may set up their own rules and task forces for communications. It is a good practice to reflect if a planned publication may influence another partner and consult them before undertaking the action.

The partner authoring the publication is responsible for collecting and providing the data on the publication needed for reporting as advised by WP 9 leadership (Communications Tracker).

Reference: Grant Agreement Article 38.1.1.



5.2 Acknowledgement

The partner authoring the publication must ensure that the following acknowledgement to the EU funding is made and that the EU emblem is displayed on the publication:



This project has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 958200.

The emblem is available at: https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/symbols/flag_en

In case the publication has an external publisher that uses a standard layout and does not accept the use of images (the EU emblem) in the Acknowledgements section, at the very minimum, the aforementioned text detailing the funding programme and the grant number must be displayed.

The acknowledgement is not required from news articles or the like, authored by third parties, for which the partner has been interviewed.

References: Grant Agreement Article 38.1.2.

5.3 Disclaimer

The partner authoring the publication must ensure it includes the following disclaimer:

The content presented herein reflect the authors' views. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information this publication contains.

The disclaimer is not required from news articles or the like, authored by third parties, for which the partner has been interviewed.

References: Grant Agreement Article 38.1.3.

