



A project of the European Anti-Cybercrime Technology Development Association (EACTDA)



D1.3 Report on Quality Management Activities



Version:	1.0	
Delivery date:	December 2025	
Dissemination level:	PUBLIC	
Status	Final	
Nature:	Report	
Main author(s):	Juan Arraiza	EACTDA
Contributor(s):		

DOCUMENT CONTROL

Version	Date	Author(s)	Change(s)
0.1	10/12/2025	Juan Arraiza (EACTDA)	First version for all sections completed. Requested contributions from EACTDA members and key stakeholders.
1.0	19/12/2025	Juan Arraiza (EACTDA)	Final version, ready to be submitted

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	4
1.1.	Overview of the Tools4LEAs project.....	4
1.2.	Main objective of this document	4
1.3.	Relation to other deliverables	5
1.4.	Structure of the deliverable	5
2.	Quality Management Activities.....	6
2.1.	Quality Manager	6
2.2.	Quality Planning.....	6
2.3.	Quality Control	9
2.4.	Quality Assurance	12
2.5.	Deliverable Development Process.....	13
3.	Summary	14
3.1.	Conclusion	14
3.2.	Evaluation	14
3.3.	Future work	14

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview of the Tools4LEAs project

EACTDA is the acronym of the European Anti-Cybercrime Technology Development Association, which is a private non-profit association, established in San Sebastian, Spain. The members of the Association include European Union (EU) public entities fighting cybercrime, universities and research technology organisations, for-profit private companies, and other relevant actors in the field of the EU security research and innovation.

The Tools4LEAs projects are a series of projects that receive a Direct Award under the ISFP programme, and which main goal is to facilitate and promote the uptake of innovative technologies by EU public entities fighting cybercrime. EACTDA, via the Tools4LEAs projects, aims at further developing pre-existing assets, mainly from EU-funded security research and development projects, so that they are offered with no license cost and with access to the source code to EU public entities fighting cybercrime.

In the first Tools4LEAs project (v1; Jul'21 to Jun'23), the focus was on designing and setting up the infrastructures, processes, and governance / decision-making mechanisms, whilst delivering the first set of “fully-tested and operational-ready” tools via Europol’s Tool Repository. Though 11 tools were further developed in the v1 project, it is expected that 3 of them will not be released to their targeted audience as they do not pass the pre-established quality threshold of “operational-ready”. Also, an End-User Advisory Board (EUAB) composed as of Oct'25 by 24 members from 14 EU member states and co-chaired by two Europol units (EC3 and Innovation Lab) was established and it is the body responsible for identifying and prioritising end-user needs and which has veto right over the decisions done by EACTDA/Tools4LEAs with regard to the tool development roadmap.

In the second Tools4LEAs project (v2; Jul'23 to Jun'25), it is proposed to double the number of tools delivered. Also, the repository of tools implemented in v1, and currently used to host the results of the Tools4LEAs projects, will be enhanced and reused to host the results of EU-funded security research projects (when relevant in the field of cybercrime). EACTDA will play the role of custodian of these results, and the technical, IPR, and administrative aspects needed to create this new repository of security research results will be put in place. In addition, the v2 project will include a pilot to proof the concept of initial and limited support&maintenance periods for a selection of tools. Besides, a pilot of the concept of EACTDA national nodes will be included, with nodes planned in LT, FR, ES, and maybe one or two more. Also, a platform for end-users to evaluate online tools will be implemented. Finally, the v2 project will include activities to further build the community of Tools4LEAs stakeholders and to promote the creation and/or adoption of technical blueprints, and in general, of commonly accepted best practices.

1.2. Main objective of this document

This deliverable presents a concise summary of the quality management activities carried out withing the Tools4LEAs-v2 project.

1.3. Relation to other deliverables

This deliverable is closely related to the following deliverables:

- **D1.2. Quality Management handbook:** The quality management activities reported in D1.3 follow the procedures and recommendations provided in D1.2.

1.4. Structure of the deliverable

Section 2 presents a summary of the quality management activities carried out during the Tools4LEAs-v2 project.

Finally, section 3 summarises which is the goal and key aspects of this document, it acknowledges that there is still work to be done to improve the document, and it presents some of the areas of future work that have already been identified.

2. Quality Management Activities

2.1. Quality Manager

Quality Management in the Tools4LEAs v2 project is the responsibility of EACTDA Secretariat. A Quality Manager has been appointed to lead this work, Mrs Amaya Iglesias, Office Administrator at EACTDA Secretariat, who has played this role in the Tools4LEAs-v2 project.

2.2. Quality Planning

Quality planning in this project is reflected in this document as it specifies quality policies on the topics that have been identified as most important for this project, namely Communication, Reporting, Documents, Deliverables, and Dissemination.

In this document, for each of the aforementioned topics quality goals are set and the process to control and assure that those goals are met are defined.

As there is always a need to find the appropriate balance between cost and benefit, in this project the quality goals (and therefore the metrics associated to them) have been identified taking into account among other things risks and expected benefits.

The goals and associated metrics that have been chosen for the topics listed before are:

- **Communication (COMM),**
 - Goal1: *Having efficient and well managed project **meetings**.*
 - Metric(s):
 - COMM-G1-M1: all formal meetings should have an agenda prepared and distributed with sufficient time in advance so that all invited people know what the goal of the meeting is, what the expected output of the meeting is (e.g., decision, plan, information exchange), what is expected from them and so that they can be able to prepare the meeting appropriately.
 - COMM-G1-M2: all formal meetings should have the minutes prepared and submitted within 24 labour hours, using the approved template for minutes, and uploaded to the collaboration tool.

In Tools4LEAs-v2 project, the following meetings have all followed the above-mentioned goal and metric(s):

- “Last-mile” development project tracking monthly meetings.
- Six-monthly Dem&Eval events.

- Goal2: *Establishing and maintaining good communications with other **related projects***
 - Metric(s):

- COMM-G2-M1: Number of related projects contacted.
- COMM-G2-M2: Frequency of the coordination meetings between Tools4LEAs and other related projects.

In Tools4LEAs-v2 project, regular as well as ad hoc meetings have taken place with the following projects:

- ECTEG
- CYCLOPES

In addition, the Capability Manager has contacted more than 40 projects, including among them:

- STARLIGHT
- EMPOWER
- LAGO
- MULTIRATE
- CITADEL
- ULTRA
- EU-DAMA
- ...

- Goal3: *Setting up and maintaining efficient and easy-to-use **collaboration tools***

- Metric(s):

- COMM-G3-M1: To have private collaboration tools set up and ready to be used before M2.
- COMM-G3-M2: Number of complaints from team members with regard to the appropriateness of the collaboration tools.

In Tools4LEAs-v2, the main collaboration tools used have been:

- Microsoft OneDrive
- Microsoft Teams
- BOX
- Gitlab

Note: it is worth noting that MS OneDrive's access/permissions have caused trouble in several cases, and that though it has never been a major issues, it is suboptimal and alternative solutions might be considered for future Tools4LEAs projects.

- **Reporting (REP),**

- Goal1: *Meeting **EC related reporting requirements** on time and with no issues.*

- Metric(s):

- REP-G1-M1: Number of issues that have been identified related to reporting to the EC.

Formal reporting via the submission of deliverables has been good, though there has been one occasion in which there was a delay in the submission of the deliverable.

Informal reporting to DG HOME has also been carried out with monthly tracking meetings in which the status of the project was presented and feedback from DG HOME was obtained, ensuring alignment and coordination of actions.

- Goal2: Meeting **internal reporting policy** on time and with no issues.

- Metric(s):

- REP-G2-M1: Number of issues that have been identified related to internal reporting.

No issues have been identified in relation to internal reporting.

- **Documents (DOC),**

- Goal1: To follow agreed upon **standards for formats** and tools to be used in document editing and exchange.

- Metric(s):

- DOC-G1-M1: 6 monthly audits of a sample of the documents generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan.

The Quality Manager has conducted six-monthly audits as planned and no major issues were identified.

- **Deliverables (DEL),**

- Goal1: to assure that the **deliverables** produced in the project are of high quality and that they have followed the deliverables preparation policy.

- Metric(s):

- DEL-G1-M1: 6 monthly audits of a sample of the deliverables generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan.

The Quality Manager has conducted six-monthly audits as planned and no major issues were identified.

- **Dissemination (DISS).**

- Goal1: To have the project's **website** up and running before M2 and updated on a regular basis.

- Metric(s):
 - DISS-G1-M1: To have the public website up and running before M2.
 - DISS-G1-M2: Audits every 3 months to check that the public website is updated with the relevant information.

The website¹ has been regularly updated.

In addition, since November 2025, a new web portal has been released. This EACTA Portal² offers different content/services to the registered users depending on their assigned/approved roles.

- Goal2: *To organise at least two **end-user workshops** and, if possible, more in which to successfully engage end-users of different profiles (LEA, public transport infrastructures operators, shop owners, security companies, etc.).*

- Metric(s):
 - DISS-G2-M1: workshop minutes and conclusions reports.

EACTDA conducts six-monthly Dem&Eval events at which different groups of stakeholders are invited to participate. Within Tools4LEAs-v2, the following Dem&Eval events took place:

- 2024-03 in Lisbon
- 2024-10 in Mallorca
- 2025-04 in Vienna
- 2025-11 in Athens

In addition, EACTDA co-organised a joint-event with ECTEG and CYCLOES in Warsaw in June 2025.

2.3. Quality Control

The Project Management Team of the project is responsible to put in place and run the quality control mechanisms needed for the project.

The quality control mechanisms that will be put in place are as follows:

- **Communication (COMM),**
 - Goal1: *Having efficient and well managed project **meetings**.*
 - Metric(s):
 - COMM-G1-M1: all formal meetings should have an agenda prepared and distributed with sufficient time in advance so that all invited

¹ <https://tools4Leas.eu>

² <https://portal.eactda.eu>

people know what the goal of the meeting is, what is expected from them and so that they can be able to prepare the meeting appropriately.

- [Quality control mechanism](#): 6 monthly audits run by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator.
- COMM-G1-M2: all formal meetings should have the minutes prepared and submitted within 24 labour hours, using the approved template for minutes, and uploaded to the collaboration tool.
 - [Quality control mechanism](#): 6 monthly audits run by the Quality Manager and the Project Coordinator.

The six-monthly audits have taken place as planned, with no major issues found, as the procedures and best practices established were followed as planned.

- Goal2: *Establishing and maintaining good communications with other **related projects***

- Metric(s):

- COMM-G2-M1: Number of related projects contacted.
 - [Quality control mechanism](#): Verification of the existence of minutes or formal documents that reflect the contacts that have taken place.
- COMM-G2-M2: Frequency of the coordination meetings between the Tools4LEAs v2 project and other related projects.
 - [Quality control mechanism](#): Verification of the existence of minutes or formal documents that reflect the contacts that have taken place.

The Quality Manager has confirmed that the minutes or other type of documents that prove that the meetings took place exist.

- Goal3: *Setting up and maintaining efficient and easy-to-use **collaboration tools***

- Metric(s):

- COMM-G3-M1: To have private collaboration tools set up and ready to be used before M2.
 - [Quality control mechanism](#): Email from the Project Coordinator announcing the opening of the collaboration tools to all team members.
- COMM-G3-M2: Number of complaints from team members with regard to the appropriateness of the collaboration tools.
 - [Quality control mechanism](#): Emails or notes in meeting minutes reflecting those complaints.

The collaboration tools have been used as planned. Some issues with OneDrive have been identified and, though no major

complaints have been raised, better alternative options will be explored for Tools4LEAs-v3 project.

- **Reporting (REP),**

- Goal1: *Meeting **EC related reporting** requirements in time and with no issues.*
 - Metric(s):
 - REP-G1-M1: Number of issues related to reporting to the EC
 - [Quality control mechanism: Emails with the submission of the reports and/or with issues raised by the EC.](#)
- Goal2: *Meeting **internal reporting policy** in time and with no issues.*
 - Metric(s):
 - REP-G2-M1: Number of issues related to internal reporting
 - [Quality control mechanism: Emails or notes in meeting minutes reflecting those issues.](#)

No issues have been raised by the EC in relation to the reporting of the project.

Also, no issues have been identified in relation to internal reporting.

- **Documents (DOC),**

- Goal1: *To follow agreed **standards for formats** and tools to be used in document editing and exchange.*
 - Metric(s):
 - DOC-G1-M1: 6 monthly audits of a sample of the documents generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan.
 - [Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.](#)

The Quality Manager has conducted six-monthly audits as planned and no major issues were identified.

- **Deliverables (DEL),**

- Goal1: *to assure that the **deliverables** produced in the project are of high quality and that they have followed the deliverables preparation policy.*
 - Metric(s):
 - DEL-G1-M1: 6 monthly audits of a sample of the deliverables generated by the project to check if they have followed the Quality Management Plan.

- Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.

The Quality Manager has conducted six-monthly audits as planned and no major issues were identified.

- Dissemination (DISS).

- Goal1: To have the project's website up and running before M2 and updated on a regular basis.

- Metric(s):

- DISS-G1-M1: To have the public website up and running before M2.
 - Quality control mechanism: Email from the Project Coordinator to the Project Officer announcing the existence of the project website.
- DISS-G1-M2: Audits every 3 months to check that the public website is updated with the relevant information.
 - Quality control mechanism: verification that audit reports are uploaded to the collaboration tool.

The website was available from the beginning of the project and it has been updated regularly (as needed).

It is worth noting that EACTDA has reported about multiple events and Tools4LEAs-v2 project related activities using it's social networks, primarily LinkedIn, X, and Facebook.

- Goal2: To organise at least two end-user workshops and, if possible, more in which to successfully engage end-users of different profiles (LEA, public transport infrastructures operators, show owners, security companies, ...).

- Metric(s):

- DISS-G2-M1: workshop minutes and conclusions reports
 - Quality control mechanism: Verification that workshop minutes and conclusion reports are generated and uploaded to the collaboration tool.

The Quality Manager has confirmed that the workshops related documentation is available at the collaboration platform (MS OneDrive).

2.4. Quality Assurance

In order to assure that quality goals are met and that a continuous improvement philosophy is followed the Project Management Team has included in their meetings a session to review quality control outputs and to assess whether quality goals are being met or not and whether mitigation or contingency plans needed to be put in place to tackle some quality aspects.

The Tools4LEAs-v2 Quality Manager has been responsible for preparing facilitating the quality management related sessions of the Project Management Team meetings.

2.5. Deliverable Development Process

The Deliverable Development Process was established as follows:

*The first step in the preparation of a deliverable will be responsibility of the Deliverable Leader, who will start with the deliverable template available in the project's intranet (see **Error! Reference source not found.** below) and who will produce the first draft (v0.1) including the document structure and the contributions expected from each contributor.*

Upon receiving the inputs from different contributors for the deliverable, the Deliverable Leader will merge them into a single document. This second draft will then be circulated to a group of reviewers and asked for comments. Each reviewer will check its consistency with the plans and give their feedback and approval. This iterative procedure will continue until all involved contributors give approval. There will be at minimum 2 reviewers per deliverable. The reviewers cannot have taken part in the preparation of the deliverable.

In general terms, and in the majority of cases, the procedure has been followed as expected. However, the Quality Manager of the project has identified a couple of incidents in which there were no (or less than 2) reviewers providing inputs and feedback to the deliverable prepared by the Deliverable Leader. When this has happened, an assessment of the deliverables has been made and the deliverable has been reviewed by 2 persons to ensure that no major quality issue occurred due to this cause.

3. Summary

3.1. Conclusion

In this document we have presented a summary of the quality management activities carried out during the Tools4LEAs-v2 project. In short, the procedures and best practices identified during the Tools4LEAs-v1 project and refined at the beginning of Tools4LEAs-v2 (presented in deliverable D1.2) have been followed without any major issue or deviation.

3.2. Evaluation

The quality management procedures and best practices established in D1.2 have been sufficient to ensure an appropriate level of quality management within the Tools4LEAs-v2 project. No major changes or improvements have been identified.

3.3. Future work

As part of the continuous improvement process, at the beginning of ToolsLEAs-v3, the set to quality management procedures and best practices established for Tools4LEAs-v2 (and presented in D1.2) will be reviewed and adjusted as/if necessary.