

# Information Technology Governance for Tunisian Universities (ITG4TU)

*561614-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP*



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

## **EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT: PROJECT APPROACH**

*ITG4TU CONSORTIUM*



### ***AMENDMENT HISTORY***

<b>Version</b>	<b>Revision</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Author</b>	<b>Modification</b>
1	0	10 July 2018	Ricardo Colomo-Palacios	Initial Version
1	1	27 Sep 2018	AnySolution S. L.	External quality assessment
1	2	08 Oct 2018	AnySolution S. L.	Typo corrections



## ***CONTENTS***

<b>1. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. Expert Identification .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>3. Assessment .....</b>	<b>1</b>
3.1. Project Management.....	1
3.2. Consortium.....	3
3.3. Project design and implementation.....	4
3.4. Impact.....	5
<b>4. Your opinion about the project .....</b>	<b>7</b>



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



**Information Technology Governance for Tunisian Universities**

561614-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

External Assessment: Project Approach

Version 1.2

---

## ***TABLES***

**No table of figures entries found.**



## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to gather the opinion of a recognized expert in the field with regards to the developments made under the umbrella of ITG4TU.

This document reflects the opinion of an individual and can be considered as a supplementary material to assess the overall impact and of the project.

There are two kind of assessment forms for this project. The first one is devoted to assess the technical side of the project, namely the impact of IT Governance aspects and the second one, taken from an EU Erasmus+ perspective. This document is the report of one expert from the later viewpoint.

In what follows main aspects of this external assessment are presented to be filled by external assessor.

## 2. Expert Identification

Name:	Pierrick Le Guillou and M. Dolores Ordóñez
Affiliation:	AnySolution
Nationality:	Pierrick- French / Dolores- Spanish
Affiliation:	
Experience in EU Projects:	Pierrick: 7 years experience in EU project having submitted and participating in projects under FP7, H2020, Interreg (SUDOE and MED), ENI, ERASMUS+, etc. Dolores: 20 years' experience in EU projects and funds from FP4 to H2020, ERDF and ESF in the Balearics, Interreg, ENI, RE-ACT, LIFE, Progress and others. Evaluator for the European Commission from 2005

## 3. Assessment

### 3.1. Project Management

Is there a clear effective project management structure?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describe project management mechanisms implemented	There is a clear definition of the project management structure and of the role and tasks of each partner of the consortium. There are two types of partners: (i) the Europeans partners who provide knowledge, trainings and experiences; and (ii) the Tunisian partners that learn from the best practices of the European partners and who implement the results of the development



	<p>activities led by European partners.</p> <p>The project management structure counts with a Project Manager and a Project Coordinator (both from UIB) who lead the Steering Committee where all partners are represented. A Project Management Plan (deliverable D5.1) has been published at the beginning of the project in order to ensure clarity and consensus within the consortium regarding project phases description, deliverables, communication, roles and responsibilities, deadlines, risks and mitigation plans. Regular coordination meetings, online and face-to-face control meetings have been done by the members of the consortium so as to monitor the progresses of the work done, together with the budget and resources used, with the aim of ensuring the timely completion of the deliverables and objectives of the project.</p>
<p>Have partners developed the project with a division of tasks and effort as expressed in the project proposal?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Describe your main concerns about task division</p>	<p>There was from the beginning of the project a clear division of tasks and responsibilities. Even though there was an unbalance distribution of tasks (as usually occur with some partners having way more weight than others), based on the deliverables produced and available, it appears that tasks have been carried out satisfactorily by each members of the consortium. However, the main concern is that some deliverables attesting the work done are missing, like the deliverable D2.2 with the best practice report of UTM regarding their visit to Halden; deliverable D2.3 on the best practice validation; deliverable D2.6 on governance framework assessment; or deliverable D2.8 on training material validation. At the present stage of this assessment, it can't be told if these missing deliverables (mostly reports) are due to publication error (not released) or haven't been produced even though it can be demonstrated that the planned tasks have been undertaken and work has been delivered.</p>
<p>Is there a clear and effective problem-solving strategy?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>
<p>Describe problems occurred and mechanisms triggered</p>	<p>Several problems have occurred during the execution of the ITG4TU project. However, in each case, the consortium has been able to find a solution.</p> <p>First, the project has started three months later than initially planned due to a delay from the Agency with the first payment. This has generated a delay with the implementation of some planned activities of the</p>



	<p>project (especially during the first and second year of the project). However, efficient work has been done and some activities have been merged (like the <i>best practices visits</i> that have coincided with the <i>management meetings</i>) so as to recover time.</p> <p>The main problem occurred at the beginning of 2016 when terrorist attacks occurred in Brussels and in some cities of Tunisia. As a result, the Spanish Ministry of Foreign Affairs (as well as other countries also joined) recommended not to travel to Tunisia. Being most some of participants public employees, this recommendation became mandatory since assurances would have not cover this assumed risk. In response to this, the consortium took the decision (with the consent of the Programme manager Office) to delay and relocate in Europe (Spain) the planned training activities. This modification had no effect on the cost of the project nor in the results of the planned activities.</p>
--	--

How satisfied are you with Project Management activity in the project?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

### 3.2. Consortium

Have all project partners participated in the project as intended?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
Describe overall implication of project partners	<p>From the European side, all partners have performed their respective tasks and work as planned. Their implication has been very good, with a high quality of the work and deliverables produced.</p> <p>From the Tunisian side, all partners have participated, as expected. However, the level of implication has been uneven between the different partners. Most have demonstrated a real commitment with the project, with a high level of implication and quality of their work (UGB, USS, UMA) while one of them (UTM) has shown a moderate/low level of implication (some deliverables/inputs are missing from their side and no</p>



	research visits were conducted) but still has carried out its obligations (role, tasks and work) as strictly expected.
--	--

How satisfied are you with Consortium activity in the project?

- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neither
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied

### 3.3. Project design and implementation

Rate the achievement of project objectives	
Perform specialized training modules for building ITG models in Tunisian universities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved
Perform training to employers in IT sector	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved
Build ITG frameworks adapted to each institution	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved
Build the skills and tools to ensure the sustainability of government IT project beyond	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved
Set the value chain of IT in HEI and its KPI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Partially achieved <input type="checkbox"/> Not achieved
General comments on objectives:	<p>The project has achieved all the objectives set. However, for some of them it is difficult to confidently assess its level of achievement.</p> <p>Regarding the building of ITG frameworks adapted to each Tunisian HEI implicated in the project, a generic framework has been developed and the specific characteristics of each HEI has been thoroughly analysed so as to develop specific frameworks. The individual reports of the Tunisian HEI on the deployment of their specific ITG is available (except the one from UTM that is currently missing).</p> <p>Regarding the skills and tools to ensure sustainability beyond completion of the project, it is hard to tell if the</p>





	<p>activities carried out will “ensure” the ITG sustainability. However, training activities have been successfully performed, increasing as such the ITG skills and knowledge of participants, and tools (web-platform, ITG framework, training material...) have been developed and implemented. All of this will certainly “contribute” to ensure the sustainability of ITG after the project’s end of life.</p> <p>Finally, the value chain of IT in the Tunisian HEI with their respective KPIs are described and implemented through specific ITG framework deployed in each HEIs.</p>
Has the project been managed according to planned project management methods?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
General comments on project management:	<p>As previously stipulated, the project has been correctly and efficiently managed, resulting in the achievement of the project’s objectives and in the completion of all tasks, work and activities in a timely and cost-effective way. Regular meetings have been held (whether online or face-to-face), a Project Management Plan has been published and quality monitoring and control procedures have been implemented.</p>
Has the project been managed according to planned quality management methods?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
General comments on quality management:	<p>A full WP has been dedicated to the quality management of the project. A Quality Management Plan has been produced (deliverable D3.1) and quality monitoring and control procedures have been implemented. Quality review and validation of the training and training material have been performed. In general, there is a high quality of work in the deliverables produced.</p>

### 3.4. Impact

Has the project reached its impact objectives?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
General comments on project impact (Long term and Short Term):	<p>Regarding the training part of the project, the objectives and impacts have been fully met. Attendance has been as expected and the attendees (researchers, managers) were globally satisfied with the training received, resulting in an increase in their skills</p>



	<p>and knowledge on ITG.</p> <p>Regarding the implementation of specific IT governance framework, the real impact of the project on the Tunisian HEIs still need to be assessed. However, it has to be highlighted the usefulness (for Tunisian HEI) of the best practices and experiences learnt from the European partners.</p> <p>The performed research visits done by Tunisian partners to the European ones are a good indicator of the cooperation impact of the project.</p>
Is there an established and shared dissemination and exploitation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
General comments on dissemination and exploitation plan:	<p>There are several Dissemination and Exploitation Plans available: one for each Tunisian HEI of the project. Somehow, a general and common dissemination and exploitation plan for the whole project and consortium is missing. Therefore, even though it seems to exist an established and shared line of action for the dissemination and communication activities of the project, there is currently no solid document that can give proof of it. However, available reports and materials demonstrate that dissemination and communication activities have been regularly performed by all partners.</p>
Is there an established and shared sustainability plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> To some extent <input type="checkbox"/> No
General comments on sustainability plan:	<p>As it happens with the Dissemination and Communication Plan, there is not a consolidated and unique Sustainability Plan for the project. Instead, there are individual plans for each Tunisian HEI, that are not encompassing the European partners. However, sustainability is one of the important aspects of the project and is directly mentioned as one of the main objectives of the project.</p>



## 4. Your opinion about the project

Having taken in consideration all the information available about ITG4TU, it results that the project has fully achieved its objective. The efforts and resources employed have been efficiently managed and distributed so as to ensure cost-effectiveness and timely results.

There is a great transparency and detailed presentation of the activities carried out, demonstrating the achievement of the set-up objectives and the quality of the work done.

Whenever a problem has surged, the consortium has been able to quickly and swiftly find a solution, implementing effective correction measures. As a good example and as well described in the *“Online Extraordinary Meeting – Initial Training Managers postponement and rescheduling”* document, some of the project’s activities started with several months of delay due to international terrorism events that occurred at the beginning of 2016. These changes from the initial plan, which have been fully informed to and consented by the Program Manager Office, reflect the capacity of the consortium to overcome obstacles without jeopardizing the planned activities, objectives and allocated budget of the project.

The activities, development and results of the project have been very well received by the Tunisian HEIs, who have positively assessed the trainings received. They have indicated that the lessons learnt from the experience of the European partners regarding ITG, jointly with the identification of the best practices and the development of specific ITG frameworks for each HEI would definitely contribute to improve the ITG of their respective institutions, but also at local level with the improvement of governance model in the IT sector.

In addition, for 3 of the 4 partners of the consortium, this project has been an opportunity to develop networking activities with European HEIs as several research visits have been carried out. This also demonstrate the uneven level of implication of Tunisian partners in the project. By the level of commitment and quality of the work performed, it can be seen that one of the partners had a low level of implication in the project, and, even though they comply with their expected work, a few more efforts would have been expected.

On the downside, the performed dissemination and communication activities have been minimum regarding the duration of the project and the number of partners involved. Some more efforts should/could have been done by the whole consortium and its individual partners to further improve the dissemination and communication impacts of the project. A shared and common dissemination and exploitation plan in an earlier phase of the project would have contribute to manage and improve the dissemination aspects of the project.

Even though few things could have been done better, the ITG4TU project can be considered a success story and an example of good practice for knowledge transfer and networking between European and South Mediterranean countries.