Deliverable (Title):		D6.1 Quality Plan	Date:	28/08/2022
Work package:	Quality assurance			
External evaluator (Name):		Dimitrios Vlachos		

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

a) structure and content	Score: 90/100

- ➢ The document is very well structured and the information is well organised. However, the structure of the report is different than the other deliverables.
- ➢ The approach of the report is holistic including the following chapters: Introduction, Fields Quality Plan, Fields Structure, Project organisation and Risk Assessment.
- ➢ Table 1 (p. 9) is very helpful by providing the qualitative and quantitative indicators in each project's task.

b) length	Score: 95/100

- ➢ The length of the document is reasonable, and provides all the necessary information for the quality plan.

c) format	Score: 90/100

- ➢ The format is sufficient.
- ➢ A glossary of acronyms would be useful.

d) English language use	Score: 90/100

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

![fields logo]

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

> ➤ Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. A detailed proof-reading could improve the use of English.

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**: 90/100

> ➤ This deliverable is of critical importance for meeting the project's objectives, as it acts as a guideline throughout the project implementation.
> ➤ The quality plan is used to manage the execution of the project throughout its life cycle, to check the compliance to the defined objectives and to ensure the quality of the overall work done.
> ➤ Key issues of other tasks were considered such as ways to achieve the project's objectives, to identify global trends and skills shortages, design an EU and country strategy to improve skills, provide training materials and pilot training to implement these strategies, etc..

b) **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)**	**Score**: 95/100

> ➤ No missing information detected. Quality plan provides all the necessary information for the task.

c) **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)**	**Score**: 90/100

> ➤ The content is sufficient and reliable. The information of the report is based on international project management practices and tools

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

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	**Score**: 90/100

> The outcomes are fully applicable.
> Qualitative and quantitative indicators for the evaluation of tasks are very useful.
> The proposed risk assessment methodology is critical for project's implementation.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Sustainability External Expert*	**Score**: /100

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Digitalization External Expert*	**Score**: 80/100

> Quality plan is common for all domains, and it serves horizontally the whole project. The area of digitization was not considered separately.
> A good idea is to address risks and challenges for each domain separately.

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:

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

fields

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

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: /100
N/A	

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 90/100
➢ The proposed methodology is clearly described in each chapter.	

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

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	Score: 90/100

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

> ➢ Deliverable's recommendations are relevant and well presented.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 90/100
Very good! The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. Quality Plan can be used in order to monitor the project implementation.	
Date of external evaluation review:	28/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

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.