ANNEX A: Quality Assurance Checklist for evaluation of the deliverables

Deliverable Nr and Title	D6.2 - Quality Assurance Report on Administrative Processes_PM32
Main Author/Editor:	UNIBG
Peer Reviewer (Institution, Person):	ULBS, Daniel Morariu
Date of Receipt of Deliverable:	26.08.2021
Date of Sending out the completed peer review:	30.08.2021

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the deliverable comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially	Proposes three main areas for evaluating the quality of the administrative processes. Was added all new information and problems that occurs in the last months.	
Does the deliverable comply with the WP objectives as specified in the WP description?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially	Provide a good overview about partners opinion in communication, management, and financial aspects.	
Does the Deliverable correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially	The proposals from the previous deliverables were put into practice which led to an increase in the satisfaction of the participants	
Major strengths of the deliverable	The deliverable is good for the management team of the DigiFoF project because it synthesizes the opinion of the partners so that the collaboration between the partners can be improved and propose some methods to improve the communication and management process and evaluated them. Established a plan for implementing the quality assurance of the administrative processes and results.		

Major weaknesses of the deliverable	Not all partners response to the questioners (only 18 researchers from 14 partners offer the responses) so that it is difficult to find out the opinion of those partners. It is difficult to make that some partners to respond faster and adequate.		
Section 2 – Deliverable structure and layout	**Evaluation**	**Comments**	**Recommendations**
Is the length of the deliverable justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	X Yes ☐ No	The commented results regarding the survey help the management to see where some communication problems are.	
Is the deliverable presented using the project deliverables template?	X Yes ☐ No		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	☐ Yes ☐ No	Not applicable.	
Level of written English	☐ Excellent X Adequate ☐ Poor		

Section 3 – Review Summary	**Evaluation**
The current version of the deliverable is:	X Applicable and ready to be submitted to the EC, if required; ☐ Applicable, but requires minor revisions ☐ Inapplicable and requires substantial revisions
Is it necessary for the revised deliverables to be reviewed again before submitting it to the EC?	☐ Yes X No