ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):	Deliverable 6.1. Quality Plan	Date:	30/09/2022
Work package:	Quality assurance		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		

1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:

a) structure and content	**Score**: 80/100

Comments:

The deliverable reads well. However, it has too much content. It explains the Quality Plan, but also the project itself. This makes the Quality Plan a bit diluted. Part of the document looks like the project proposal. The verb tense used in almost the whole document (future) contributes to this appearance.

The deliverable presents a fairly standard Quality Plan for projects.

b) length	**Score**: 75/100

Comments:

The document is too long. More focus on the Quality Plan would have been preferable, avoiding detailed description of the project (e.g. work packages). Even tables such as the one on risks are too long.

c) format	**Score**: 90/100

Comments:
The format is appropriate. In fact, the deliverable reads quite well.

d) English language use	**Score**: 95/100

Comments:
Good

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	**Score**: 95/100
Comments: The deliverable presents a fairly standard Quality Plan for projects. The importance of these plans does not derive from how they meet project objectives, but how they help management to make the project flow and meet its objectives.	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	**Score**: 80/100
Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive. However, it is formulated as a proposal. It would have been interesting to know how the proposed mechanisms, committees, etc. are actually working, how well they are operating, how effective they are, how efficiently they are fulfilling their functions.	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	**Score**: 85/100
Comments: As commented above, it would have been interesting to know how the proposed mechanisms are fulfilling their functions. That would be a probe of its reliability. Because the nature of this deliverable, it does not proceed evaluating whether its information is based on literature/field research or not.	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	**Score**: 100/100
Comments: A quality plan is a must for the management of a project of this type.	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Sustainability External Expert*	**Score**: /100

Comments: The deliverable does not address (and it should no be expected to address) sustainability.	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Digitalization External Expert*	**Score**: /100
Comments:	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*	**Score**: /100
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	**Score**: 80/100
Comments: The Quality Plan seems to be derived directly from the project proposal, i.e. it is the coordinator and the people who undertook the formulation who have probably also formulated this Plan. Therefore, it is not clear that stakeholders were involved.	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	**Score**: /100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	**Score**: 80/100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, a conclusion reporting on how the proposed mechanisms are working would have been very useful.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	**Score**: 80/100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, recommendations derived from how the proposed mechanisms are working would have been very useful.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	**Overall Score**: 80/100

Comments:
Good

Date of external evaluation review:	03/10/2022
Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos	

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

* Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.