|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D6.1 Quality Plan | Date: | 05/08/2022 |
| Work package: | Quality assurance | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The presentation of some of the content in the cover page is different from the other 13 deliverables. In this case, the authors email addresses have been included. The months for the work package and task have been indicated.  The summary section states need for the project which helps in connecting the different sections of this deliverable.  The introduction section provides a good overview of the project. The goals of the project have been well outlined. To avoid repetition of information, sections 1.1 and 1.2 should have been merged, 1.3 and 1.4 should have also been merged. Section 1.4 talks of purpose of the Quality plan and so does section 2.1. The aims of the quality plan should have been stated concisely as bullet points.  The project structure has also been well elaborated. There is lack of uniformity when listing the project aims for some work packages 4,6,7,8 the aims are not listed in bullet points like it has been done for the rest making it difficult to identify them.  Table 1 with information on quality and quantitative indicators is very informative and so is Table 3 with the list of deliverables and additional descriptions.  For section 4.1 with consortium members, it would be great to include a column stating the sectors represented by the partners whether academia, research, companies and so on.  The section on Risk Assessment is very thorough which is fantastic! How were the risks listed in the Table in section 5.3 identified? It would be interesting to see how many of them were encountered and how effective the proposed mitigation measures were. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| Very appropriate! The authors have done a great job presenting such a huge amount of information in a concise manner that fits in to 43 pages. The length of the chapters is good, neither too long nor too short. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| * Tables included in this deliverable have helped break the monotony of text. The bullets have also made it easier to identify the main points and read the deliverable. * The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names. * A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white. * The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos. * The size of the Gannt chat should have been increased so that it is legible. * Colours should have been added to the tables for example in Table 3 deliverables from the same work package could be presented by the same colour | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Very good. Only a few minor grammatical mistakes. Language check expert would have pointed out these mistakes.  There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: Summary section: (ESCO, EQAVET, ECVET), SSA, the names of project partners. Please include a list of acronyms and abbreviations. | | | | |
| 1. **Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:** | | | | |
| 1. **relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Many aspects of the projects have been addressed from organization, aims, partners in charge, expected outcomes, timeline and expected risks. Ways of achieving the project’s objectives of identifying global trends and skill gaps, designing a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills, providing training material and training pilot to implement these strategies, allowing transferability of the skills among EU countries following European frameworks (ESCO, EQAVET and so on) and provide sustainability and awareness of the project after the project ends, have been clearly stated.  The deliverable clearly describes how quality will be measured throughout the project in a very thorough manner. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| The deliverable is very comprehensive. All the relevant information has been provided. The why, how and who has been clearly elaborated. The expectations have been set well. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The deliverable is reliable because the project partners have provided input and they are all in agreement with the content therein. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The proposals are very useful. The assessment measure for the deliverables and dissemination events are applicable and if followed to the latter, they will result in high quality deliverables.  Assessing both qualitative and quantitative indicators is excellent.  The list of expected risks captures all the potential risks that may occur and the proposed mitigation measures make it easy to deal with them once they arise. | | | | |
| 1. **a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**   *\*only for Sustainability External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Digitalization External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert* | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| This was not clear. The authors should have included a section stating how the project would ensure that this domain is well covered in the project so that it is not side-lined as stated in R8.  Since bioeconomy is a relatively new field, many challenges are expected including confusing terms as stated in R4 and the challenge of mobilising stakeholders to participate in different activities of the project. The project should have highlighted how they will ensure that they are able to overcome these risks specifically for bioeconomy. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A  This question is not directly applicable to this deliverable | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| The methodology has been very well described in each chapter. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The recommendations on how to carry out assessments of different project outputs and actvties are also very relevant.  The deliverable has provided recommendations on how to deal with the anticipated risks that might arise during the course of the project which are realistic. The risks highlighted are very relevant and well thought through. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 89.55/100 | |
| Very good! The Quality Plan is very well drafted and clear. It provides very useful information needed for guiding the project activities. It is in itself a very quality document and I can understand why the deliverables form this project are of high quality. The emphasis on quality is commendable. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 05/08/2022 | |
| Signature/Name: A picture containing shape  Description automatically generated Juliet Achieng Owuor | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maximum number of points for a criterion** | **Range of scores** | | | |
|  | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Weak** |
| 100 | 76-100 | 51-75 | 26-50 | 0-25 |