

Project Title:
THE FOF-DESIGNER:
DIGITAL DESIGN SKILLS FOR FACTORIES OF THE FUTURE

Project Acronym:
DigiFoF



Grant Agreement number:
2018-2553 / 001-001
Project Nr. 601089-EPP-1-2018-1-RO-EPPKA2-KA

Subject:
D7.1. Evaluating Industry Cases and Providing inputs for improvements in WP3¹

Dissemination Level:
Public


Lead Organization:
UNIBG

Project Coordinator:
ULBS

Contributors:
BOC, CONTI, CLEX, ULBS, UNIBG, EMSE, UNIBIAL

Reviewers:
CIMES

Revision	Preparation date	Period covered	Project start date	Project duration
V1	May 2020	Month 1-18	01/01/2019	36 Months

This project has received funding from the European Union's EACEA Erasmus+ Programme Key Action 2 - Knowledge Alliances under the Grant Agreement No 2018-2533 / 001-001 

¹ “Any communication or publication related to the action, made by the beneficiaries jointly or individually in any form and using any means, shall indicate that it reflects only the author's view and that the Agency and the Commission are not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.”

Index

1 Executive Summary 3

2 Methodology 3

 2.1 Evaluation Form 3

 2.2 Case Studies Distribution 5

3 Feedback Form Evaluation 6

 3.1 AFIL..... 6

 3.1.1 Internal Review: 6

 3.1.2 External Review:..... 9

 3.2 BOC..... 12

 3.2.1 Internal Review: 12

 3.2.2 External Review:..... 16

 3.3 EMSE..... 19

 3.3.1 Internal Review: 19

 3.3.2 External Review:..... 21

 3.4 CONTINENTAL 22

 3.4.1 Internal Review: 23

 3.4.2 External Review:..... 25

 3.5 IDPC..... 27

 3.5.1 Internal Review: 27

 3.5.2 External Review:..... 28

 3.6 PRELMET..... 29

 3.6.1 Internal Review: 29

 3.6.2 External Review:..... 31

 3.7 CIMES 32

 3.7.1 Internal Review: 32

 3.7.2 External Review:..... 36

 3.8 CIRIDD..... 39

 3.8.1 Internal Review: 40

 3.8.2 External Review:..... 44

 3.9 CLEXTRAL..... 47

 3.9.1 Internal Review: 47

 3.9.2 External Review:..... 49

4 Conclusion 52

1 Executive Summary

From a general perspective, WP7 aims to guarantee the good fit among the topical and competence need identified and the solutions provided by complementing the activities carried out in WP6 through peer and external evaluations. Improvement suggestions feed then back into WP3, WP4 and WP5.

In this regard, *D7.1 – Evaluating Industry Cases and providing inputs for improvements in WP3* is aimed to provide a peer and external evaluations of the industrial cases provided by partners in WP3.

The objective of D7.1 is to describe the developed scientific methodology applied for evaluation, the evaluation process as well as the results and recommendations collected.

2 Methodology

D7.1 formalizes the approach that will be followed by the DigiFoF consortium to ensure the best possible quality and provide suggestions in order to improve the Industrial Case studies collected by the Consortium members.

All the partners dealing with T3.4 have been involved and coordinated by AFIL – Associazione Fabbrica Intelligente Lombardia in performing this activity in line with their specific expertise and responsibilities.

From a general perspective, 21 Industrial Cases have been collected and equally distributed among the involved partners for peer and external review. Each industrial case has been reviewed by 1 expert internal to the Consortium and by 1 Expert External to the consortium.

2.1 Evaluation Form

The evaluation form - **Table 1 - Evaluation Form** (either for internal as well for external evaluation) has been created and shared with the DigiFoF consortium by AFIL and UNIBG.

Case Nr and Title:			
Partner:			
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)			
Date of Sending out the completed peer review			
Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		

objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Free Text		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Free Text		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Table 1 - Evaluation Form

As indicated in Table 1 - **Evaluation Form** the main section of the evaluation were aimed to evaluate the coherence among the content of the industrial case and the overall objectives of the DigiFoF project.

Feedback have been collected by AFIL and UNIBG and reported in D7.1 - Evaluating Industry Cases and providing inputs for improvements.

2.2 Case Studies Distribution

As previously mentioned, all the partners dealing with T3.4 have been involved and coordinated by AFIL – Associazione Fabbrica Intelligente Lombardia in performing this activity in line with their specific expertise and responsibilities. The 21 Industrial Cases have been collected and equally distributed among the involved partners for peer and external review according to **Table 2: Case studies distribution for review.**

Case Study #	Title	Author	Reviewer
1	Complete revamping of materials and product handling systems along the assembly line	AFIL	EMSE
2	Systems for complete traceability of assembled components and a guided pipeline in assembly operations	AFIL	EMSE
3	Distributed design, planning, monitoring, control and diagnostic system through the cross-application of the Industry 4.0 technology	AFIL	EMSE
4	Outsourcing of production processes.	BOC	AFIL
5	Automation of production processes for individual (retail) orders and specification.	BOC	AFIL
6	Sensor based maintenance of HVAC equipment in large office facilities.	BOC	AFIL
7	The final customer satisfaction of information transmission.	EMSE	UNIBG
8	Integrated design of a product service system and the associated economic model.	EMSE	UNIBG
9	AGV for modern Logistics in industrial companies.	CONTINENTAL	ULBS
10	Rapid implementation of Cobots in industrial environment.	CONTINENTAL	ULBS
11	Optimization of the orders flow process through solutions of the digital workflow of details and interactive warehouses in an additive manufacturing environment.	IDPC	CONTI
12	Industry 4.0, change of paradigm within the Company for a greener and sustainable economy using advanced technologies, automation and robotics.	PRELMET	CONTI
13	TIPCO – Intelligent traceability for complex products.	CIMES	UNIBIAL

14	USITRONIC – Self-adapting production island	CIMES	UNIBIAL
15	From e-spindle and e-machining projects to servitization.	CIMES	UNIBIAL
16	HALL 32 – New approach of the vocational trainings.	CIMES	UNIBIAL
17	A performing service system for the wood industry.	CIRIDD	CLEXTRAL
18	Improving performance thanks to the economy of functionality	CIRIDD	CLEXTRAL
19	Shaping light to gain new markets	CIRIDD	CLEXTRAL
20	Implementing a “Remote Assistance” service package	CLEXTRAL	BOC
21	Implementing a CRM – upside, resistance, and opportunities	CLEXTRAL	BOC

Table 2: Case studies distribution for review

3 Feedback Form Evaluation

3.1 AFIL

AFIL – Associazione Fabbrica Intelligente Lombardia – has provided 3 industrial cases that have been evaluated by EMSE.

3.1.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	1- Complete revamping of materials and product handling systems along the assembly line
Partner:	AFIL
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Elaheh MALEKI, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	10/06/2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

Major strength of the Case Studies	The solution is well explained and easy to understand.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	It would be more understandable if there is at least one schema visualising either the case or the solution.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		It could be more understandable if the problem/ challenge/ transformation motivations are clearly explained. The transformation section is too short.
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	This could be because of confidentiality issues.	To avoid this problem, adding some open references could be helpful.
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>2- Systems for the complete traceability of assembled components and a guided pipeline in assembly operations</i>
Partner:	AFIL
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Elaheh MALEKI, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	10/06/2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The solution is well explained and easy to understand.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	It would be more understandable if there is at least one schema visualising either the case or the solution.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations

Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		It could be more understandable if the problem/ challenge/ transformation motivations are clearly explained. The transformation section is too short.
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	This could be because of confidentiality issues.	To avoid this problem, adding some open references could be helpful.
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title: 3	<i>3- Implementation of a real time monitoring system of machine performance.</i>
Partner:	AFIL
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	N Dubruc. EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	It is a real digital transformation challenge.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Details are missing. For example, we can't see how workers reacted.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?			
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Missing	
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.1.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>1- Complete revamping of materials and product handling systems along the assembly line.</i>
Partner:	AFIL
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	J. De Benedettis, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The case fits perfectly with the topic of the industry of the future. It presents a company that has implemented advanced technologies to improve its productivity.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	The case does not have enough details and remains very superficial. No data is proposed concerning: the project temporality, the actors involved in the project, the nature of the new skills acquired by the employees and how they have been acquired, the organizational changes, the allocated budget, the difficulties the project team and the organization encountered.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	A lot of information are missing (see above)	

redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?			
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		I would suggest adding external information about the company to provide the readers with more details.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>2 - Systems for the complete traceability of assembled components and a guided pipeline in assembly operations</i>
Partner:	AFIL
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	P. Gianessi, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 10 th , 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Transformation of offer, through the added value of digital traceability		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Not very innovative version of factory of the future. Not clear if there is a transformation in the process, organisation, skills of the company, or just a new solution for its clients.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		<p>Section 2.1. We understand the general context. But what was innovative for the company? What were the difficulties? Was it a change for the company?</p> <p>Section 5 : Apart of the new system, were there other impacts on the</p>

			capabilities of the company, or on its future business ?
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Adequate</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>2 - Implementation of a real time monitoring system of machine performance</i>
Partner:	AFIL
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	P. Gianessi, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 10 th , 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Implementation of real time monitoring solution		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Could be more in depth described. Lack of views on difficulties, transformational issues, impact for future business or innovations.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Partially</u>		<p>Could be more in depth developed. Section 2.1 does not emphasize sufficiently what is the innovation for the company, and how it is linked to industry of the future.</p> <p>Section 2.2 : apart from the solution itself, were there technical impacts</p>

			for the customers and on the technical skills/collaborations of the Company C ? Section 5: the results and impacts, for one or several actors could be perhaps more developed? Section 6: do you have feedback on the satisfaction of the client, and on further impact on business development for company C?
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Adequate</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.2 BOC

BOC has provided 3 industrial cases that have been evaluated by AFIL.

3.2.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>4 - Sensor Based Maintenance of HVAC equipment</i>
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Andrea Mazzoleni – AFIL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

Major strength of the Case Studies	Major strength is the explanation of an industrial case related to the concept of servitization.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Maybe, the major weakness is the lack of numerical details, but it could be related to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		Maybe some more open reference can be added, e.g., regarding the concept of product-service.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The major strength is that the case provides an example of the concept of mass customization.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of numerical detail, but maybe it is due to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Partially		Maybe some theoretical concept can be added to explain more in the details the several

redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?			aspects related to mass-customization.
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> X Partially		Maybe some open references related to mass customization or design thinking can be added.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>5 - Automation of production processes for individual (retail) orders and specifications</i>
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Andrea Mazzoleni - AFIL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The major strength is that the case provides an example of the concept of mass customization.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of numerical detail, but maybe it is due to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Partially		Maybe some theoretical concept can be added to explain more in the details the several aspects related to mass-customization.
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Partially		Maybe some open references related to mass customization or design thinking can be added.

Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
--------------------------	--

Case Nr and Title:	6 - Conceptual case: batteries as a service
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Andrea Mazzoleni – AFIL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The major strength of the industrial case is that it explains the concept of product-service linked to Circular Economy. The industrial case shows how a digitalization can help a company in improve its performance related to sustainability being at same time customer – oriented.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of numerical data, but probably it is due to confidentiality issue.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Partially		The introduction of some theoretical concepts can be helpful to improve the readability of the document and to provide a context to the industrial case.
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		In this case, complementary information are missing. I would suggest to add some open reference e.g., dealing the recent EU policy concerning Circular Economy and batteries.

Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
--------------------------	---

3.2.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>4 - Sensor Based Maintenance of HVAC equipment</i>
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Valerio Pesenti – Consorzio Intellimech
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The industrial cases highlight the strength of digital technologies in moving toward the concept of product-service approach.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of data, but it could be related to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	5 - Automation of production processes for individual (retail) orders and specifications
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Valerio Pesenti – Consorzio Intellimech
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The case illustrates the concept of mass customization, one of the manufacturing trends in the near future.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of detail, but maybe it is due to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Partially	Lack of detail, but maybe it is due to confidentiality issues.	Maybe some open references related to mass customization or design thinking can be added.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>6- Conceptual case: batteries as a service</i>
Partner:	BOC
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Valerio Pesenti – Consorzio Intellimech
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Circular economy of batteries is relevant aspects to be explained also in line with the recent EU directives.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Lack of detail, but maybe it is due to confidentiality issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> X Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		Maybe some open reference can be added e.g., related to Batteries directives.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> X Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.3 EMSE

EMSE has provided 2 industrial cases that have been evaluated by UNIBG.

3.3.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	7 - The final customer satisfaction of information transmission.
Partner:	EMSE
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Fabiana Pirola – UNIBG
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	11/06/2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	It shows an example of SME providing real time services to customers, mainly related to spare parts order		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Not clear, which are information available to dealers and manufacturer in real time		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		Add some more details on the solution
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

methodology, list of contacts) adequate?			
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>8- Integrated design of a product service system and the associated economic model.</i>
Partner:	Fabiana Pirola – UNIBG
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	11/06/2020
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	Fabiana Pirola – UNIBG

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	The industry case shows an example of technological innovation and business model change towards servitization in SMEs		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Not clear which is the final PSS offering of the company (and the business model implemented) and the network scenarios analysed and the one that has been selected.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		Solution section would need more details on scenarios analysed and selected
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.3.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>7 - The final customer satisfaction of information transmission.</i>
Partner:	EMSE
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Manuel Salvi – Vittur
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Major strength of the Case Studies	Interesting the new business model enabled by data integrated		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Some more detail on the solution implemented would be appreciated		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
--------------------------	---

Case Nr and Title:	<i>8- Integrated design of a product service system and the associated economic model.</i>
Partner:	Fabiana Pirola – UNIBG
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Manuel Salvi – Vittur
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Major strength of the Case Studies	Interesting the new business model of the company based on servitization		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Some more details on the alternative value chains studied to deliver the solution on the market would be appreciated.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.4 CONTINENTAL

Continental has provided 2 industrial cases that have been evaluated by ULBS.

3.4.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	9 - AGV for modern Logistics in industrial companies
Partner:	Continental
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Daniel Morariu/ ULBS
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	29.05.2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Presented an actual problem related to using the robots (AGV) in repetitive part of the technological process.	
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Was also translated in all languages of project partners.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	Discussed about using the Automated Guided Vehicles (AGV) in manufacturing process and the benefit of those. Presented all the resources needed for manage such devices and for which qualified personnel are needed.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies			
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		Some additional knowledge that employees must obtain in order to manipulate AGV can be obtained by attending several courses organized by DigiFoF
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	It presented a lot of knowledge and skills that can be achieved following this training.	
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	The bibliographic list is quite short	Can offer more bibliographic references.

Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> Poor

Case Nr and Title:	<i>10 - Rapid implementation of Cobots in industrial environment.</i>
Partner:	Continental
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Daniel Morariu/ ULBS
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	29.05.2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Presented a very actual problem related to Industry 4.0. Using the collaborative robots in technological process.	
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Was also translated in all languages of project partners.	Recommend specifying a title for this case study.
Major strength of the Case Studies		Presented the benefits of using cobots in technological process. Presented the knowledge that can be obtained by participant of this training. Presented separately the most important transformations that can be obtain by implementing collaborative robots. The case study has some expert aspects.	
Major weakness of the Case Studies		Sometime lack of clarity in presenting the benefit of main knowledge and skills that can be obtained.	
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

would need more explanation?			
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Document respects the template.	
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Contains a lot of bibliography references and web references.	
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.4.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	9 - AGV for modern Logistics in industrial companies
Partner:	ULBS
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Ing. Alin David SC Marquardt Schaltsysteme SCS Sibiu
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	04.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Study deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	AGVs are part of the Factory of the Future and are according to Industry 4.0 concept. The study is perfectly suitable for any factory that aims for digitalization and automation of processes.	Missing some ideas about error scenarios (power down, remote maintenance, etc.)
Major strength of the Case Study	The aim of the case study very well sustained by the existing and implemented solution.		
Major weakness of the Case Study	Not very clear what the role of the trainee. AGVs are meant to replace human workforce and the AGVs are self-operated and maintained remotely by experienced users.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations

Is the length of the Case Study justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Perfect length and interesting to read.	
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	Not too many references, small bibliography.	
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>10 - Rapid implementation of Cobots in industrial environment.</i>
Partner:	ULBS
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Ing. Alin David SC Marquardt Schaltsysteme SCS Sibiu
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	04.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Study deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Starting from Industry 4.0 Concept up to COBOTS usage in a Factory of the Future the ideas and concepts are very well exposed for a good understanding of the study case.	Should also be added that Industry 4.0 concept is not only using COBOTS for their great functions and usability. But also, should take into consideration PLM of processes, products and of course COBOTS.
Major strength of the Case Study	Very well documented and all ideas exposed are perfectly justified.		
Major weakness of the Case Study	PLM not mentioned regarding process, product and industrial tools.		

Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Study justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Good explanation of ideas and specific concept well described. Author perfectly grasps the essence of usability and benefits of the COBOTS	
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.5 IDPC

IDPC has provided 1 industrial case that has been reviewed by Continental.

3.5.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>11- Optimization of the orders flow process through solutions of the digital workflow of details and interactive warehouses in an additive manufacturing environment.</i>
Partner:	IDPC
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Cristian Mihutoiu/Conti
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	22.06.2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Presented a very actual problem related to Industry 4.0., business and	More detailed technical transformation needed.

		conceptual transformations clearly defined	
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	It was, also, translated in all languages of project partners.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	Presented the benefits of using integrated flow between manufacturer and client in ordering process. Presented the knowledge that can be obtained by participant of this training. Presented separately the most important transformations that can be obtain by implementing this flow of details.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Not identified		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	The document respect standard template.	
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		References need to be added, for the sources of the training materials to be developed.
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

3.5.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>11- Optimization of the orders flow process through solutions of the digital workflow of details and interactive warehouses in an additive manufacturing environment.</i>
--------------------	---

Partner:	IDPC
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Valerio Pesenti – Intellimech Consortium
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Study deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	It is related to digitalization and sw integration, so completely aligned with industry 4.0 topics	
Major strength of the Case Studies	It provides the benefits of digitalization		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Some more details on the solution should be provided		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		Add references
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

3.6 PRELMET

IDPC has provided 1 industrial case that has been reviewed by Continental.

3.6.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	12 - <i>Industry 4.0, change of paradigm within the Company for a greener and sustainable economy using advanced technologies, automation and robotics</i>
Partner:	PRELMET
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Cristian Mihutoiu/Conti
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	22.06.2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	Presented a very actual problem related to Industry 4.0. Business, conceptual and technical transformations clearly defined.	More details about technical transformation needed.
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	It was, also, translated in all languages of project partners.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	Results expected well defined. It is presented the knowledge that can be obtained by participant of this training. It is presented separately the most important transformations that can be obtain by implementing Industry 4.0 concepts.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Not identified		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	The document respect standard template.	
Are the complementary information (external	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>	All references are coming from Compa meetings with partners and from	External references need to be added

sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	assessing of actual situation regarding Industry 4.0 implementation.	for training material sources.
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

3.6.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	12 - Industry 4.0, change of paradigm within the Company for a greener and sustainable economy using advanced technologies, automation and robotics
Partner:	PRELMET
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Valerio Pesenti – Intellimech Consortium
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Study deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<i>X Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Major strength of the Case Studies	It shows the benefits and the new skills needed to implement advanced manufacturing solutions		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Some more details on the solution would provide more value to the case		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<i>X Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<i>X Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i>		

	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		References are related to company steps in the project, not external sources
Level of written English	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

3.7 CIMES

CIMES has provided 4 industrial case that have been reviewed by UNIBIAL

3.7.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>13 - TIPCO – Intelligent traceability for complex products.</i>
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Arkadiusz Jurczuk, UNIBIAL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>The case deals with the process designing and automatization issues.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	The context of the case study (p. 2.1-2.3) allows to analyse the presented solutions and technology and organisational problems.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Solution is described only in a general manner. It should be related to key-problem - tracing metallic high-temperated products evolving in a complex environment. Description in the P. 4 is not fully relevant with the its topic (keys kills and competences).		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		More detailed information about a solution related to key-problem is needed. <i>But, it may be fulfilled by given links to external sources.</i>

would need more explanation?			
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>The submitted bibliography provides access to the additional information required by a user.</i>	<i>It is recommended to complete the description of sources according to the referencing style/bibliographic standard (e.g. Harvard Style -BSI).</i>
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	14. USITRONIC – Self-adapting production island.
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Arkadiusz Jurczuk, UNIBIAL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	The case deals with the process engineering, monitoring and quality management issues as well. Those aspects are crucial towards business readiness for implementation of concept of Industry 4.0.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	Identification of triggers of business transformation (p. 2.1). Clarity of USITRONIC concept description.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Solution and results sections should be described with more details. It worth mentioning about project influence (p. 5) on process maturity (in relevance to Factory of the Future).		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant,	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?			
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially		It is recommended to complete the description of sources according to the referencing style/bibliographic standard (e.g. Harvard Style -BSI).
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>15. E-SPINDLE – From e-spindle and e-machining projects to servitization</i>
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Arkadiusz Jurczuk, UNIBIAL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	The case deals with a new business model – Industry Internet of Things as a part of FoF concept.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	The eSpindle case study refers to the transformation of a traditional business to Factory of the Future by implementing intelligent active processes. This case is a good example of the development of servitization using IIOT.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Innovative solutions should be described and emphasized in the section 2.3 (Technology transformations). Some phrases need additional comments (e.g. e-spindle is a tool).		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		

Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>The source materials are not completely described.</i>	It is recommended to complete the description of sources according to the referencing style/bibliographic standard (e.g. Harvard Style -BSI).
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	16. HALL 32 – New approach of the vocational trainings aiming at creating a program of excellence to train people for the industrial jobs
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Arkadiusz Jurczuk, UNIBIAL
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>Case deals with competency development of Factory of the Future employees.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>Demonstration of a role of digital competence development as crucial part of FoF implementation.</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>Key skills and competences should be revised (p. 4). FoF competency needs in the context of existing gaps could be pointed out in this part.</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>Some minor letter mistakes in the case description.</i>	<i>To review a case description.</i>
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>The source materials are not completely described.</i>	<i>It is recommended to complete the description of sources according to the referencing</i>

methodology, list of contacts) adequate?			<i>style/bibliographic standard (e.g. Harvard Style -BSI).</i>
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.7.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	13 - TIPCO – Intelligent traceability for complex products.
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Marcin Dębowski, Valeant Med Sp. z o.o.
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	26.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>Yes, in terms of design and process automation.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>The presented content indicates the essence of the solution and allows to analyse it from a technological and organizational perspective.</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>The adopted level of description is slightly too general. It would also be worth indicating on which processes implemented in the company and in what way the solution will influence. In the case of key competences, it would also be worthwhile to indicate more specific skills related to the presented solution.</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		<i>The description is quite short, but is supplemented by references to useful literature.</i>
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i>		

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor
--	---

Case Nr and Title:	14. USITRONIC – Self-adapting production island.
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Marcin Dębowski, Valeant Med Sp. z o.o.
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	26.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>Yes, in the context of process engineering and quality management.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>Description relating to the digital transition (especially business and technical) prepared clearly and in detail.</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>It would be worthwhile to specify in more detail the part concerning the solution and results (points 3 and 5), especially in terms of the impact on the company's processes.</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	<i>The literature presented is useful and broadens the description of the solution.</i>	
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	15. E-SPINDLE – From e-spindle and e-machining projects to servitization
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Daniel Tochwin, British American Tobacco
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	29.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>e-SPINDLE aims to develop a smart spindle for intelligent machining. The device is the IIoT bridge between the process and the machine.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>The proposed solution allows to reach some important objectives: to modify operating parameters in real time and to improve productivity and optimise tool life and workpiece quality. e-SPINDLE utilises the smart value-added machining. This case is a good example of utilizing Industrial Internet of Things.</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>e-SPINDLE as an innovative solutions should be more detailed described (section 2.3).</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>The source materials are to briefly described.</i>	<i>The source materials could be extended.</i>
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

Case Nr and Title:	16. HALL 32 – New approach of the vocational trainings aiming at creating a program of excellence to train people for the industrial jobs
Partner:	CIMES
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Daniel Tochwin, British American Tobacco
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	29.06.2020

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>This Case deals with the topic of design the FoF as skilled employees are very important assets of the Factory of the Future.</i>	
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>This case aims to train people with innovative educational programs and cutting-edge technologies. It is also adapted to the companies' needs and expectations.</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>Key skills and competences are only mentioned and should be more detailed described.</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>This case has been described comprehensively.</i>	<i>Please correct some minor letter mistakes in the case description.</i>
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>	<i>The source materials are not completely described.</i>	
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

3.8 CIRIDD

CIRIDD has provided 2 industrial case that have been reviewed by CLEXTRAL with the support of EMSE.

3.8.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	17. A performing service system for the wood industry
Partner:	CIRIDD
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	N Dubruc EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	No more digital oriented	
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	This case is on a typical business model change		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	No more details about organizational impact and digital changes		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Only one reference	
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	18 - Improving performance thanks to the economy of functionality
Partner:	CIRIDD
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	X.Boucher, Mines Saint Etienne
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	2020, June 10th

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		The link with industry of the future could be better emphasized (see below)
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Interesting case of Business Models transformation, with impacts at all levels of the company		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	It could be more in depth described to highlight many interests of the case study.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		<p>Could be increased, nearly on each of the sections. Section 2.1 could underline that functional economy is part of Factory of the Future, as a new business model requiring also technical transformation. Section 2.1 could try to explain why it is a challenge and a transformation for the company.</p> <p>Section 2.2 could develop a bit, what is different with this new way of functioning, with regards to the older one. You could also underline that, starting with a new way of selling, the</p>

			<p><i>company has finally developed a new offer including reduction of energy consumption, by heat recovery.</i></p> <p><i>4. New skills: new customer relationship management and commercial skills? Enlarged offer (not only compressed air but also heat recovery and perhaps energy diagnosis) thus enlargement of the fields of competencies of the company? Enrichment of the work for the staff?</i></p> <p><i>5. Recommendation: several was to develop this section, for instance : risk of the transition? financial difficulties? Change management? Do you need pilot project?</i></p>
<i>Is the Case Study presented according to the template?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<i>Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
<i>Level of written English</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Adequate</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		
Case Nr and Title:	19 - Shaping light to gain new markets		
Partner:	CIRIDD		
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	X.Boucher, Mines Saint Etienne		
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 10 th , 2020		

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	But the link with Industry of the Future should be better highlighted	Section 2.1 should emphasize how this change of BM is part of industry of the future
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Interesting case of Business Models transformation, with impacts at all levels of the company		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	It could be more in depth described to highlight many interests of the case study.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		The description of the case could be re-inforced. Section 2.1: to be able to re-use the case, the issues for the company should be more precisely described. The need of a 'new strategy' remains a problem too general. You could be more specific, and underline that the company addressed her problems through the design of a new BM based on servitization. Section 2.2 :could be a bit expanded, for instance by introducing which aspects of the company internal organisation and processes had to be transformed because of the change of BM, and by explaining if a transition program/project was

			structured and managed to implement the conceptual transformation. Section 3: Could you give some insights to emphasize if the company effectively followed the progressive transformation of its offer and business after the relief program, and if the transition had positive impacts ? 6. Eventually, re-inforce a bit this section, for instance by highlighting the added value of help by external expertise (Relief) and the need of transition or change management for SMEs. Some conclusions on the fact that the change of BM is adapted or not to SMES would be interesting.
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Adequate</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.8.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	17- A performing service system for the wood industry
Partner:	CIRRID
External Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	J. De Benedettis, EMSE
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	I do not think that CRM can be considered as tools of the industry of the future.	
Major strength of the Case Studies	Easy to read		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Too easy to read... Far too much information is missing for the reader to get an idea of the scope of the project (duration, budget, team).		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	Each part of the case would need more explanations.	More details would be required as mentioned above.
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partially	I do not see the point of the proposed link: I expected a link to resources related to the company, not a regional program that has no real interest to understand the company's project.	
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	18 - Improving performance thanks to the economy of functionality
Partner:	CIRIDD
Externa Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	G.Neubert, EmLyon
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	2020, June 19th

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		It can be linked, but it should be better explained
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>Free Text Company Transformation, with a variety of impacts</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>Free Text Provide more detailed information or argumentation</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		Provide more information in the various sections
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Yes</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>No</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Partially</i>		
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

Case Nr and Title:	19 - Shaping light to gain new markets
Partner:	CIRIDD
Externa Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	G.Neubert, EmLyon
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	2020, June 19th

Section 1 – Case study content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Partially</u>		It can be linked, but it should be better explained
Major strength of the Case Studies	<i>Impacts at all levels of the company</i>		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<i>Give more details on the structure of the change program, and a structure vision of the different processes or dimensions of the company affected by the project.</i>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Partially</u>		Follow my recommendation above, by developing in a more structure way the content.
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Yes</u> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Partially</u>		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> <u>No</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Partially</u>		<i>Too general, no direct link with the case study. Seems to be publicity ?</i>
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Excellent</u> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Adequate</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.9 CLEXTRAL

CLEXTRAL has provided 2 industrial case that has been reviewed by BOC.

3.9.1 Internal Review:

Case Nr and Title:	20 - Implementing a "Remote Assistance" service package
Partner:	Clextral

Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Zbigniew Misiak (BOC)
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15/06/2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Easy to understand and interesting description. Although Covid-19 section at the very end does not fit the overall structure, it is a very interesting addition showing benefits from different perspective.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	Some minor English language issues.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	References are missing	If possible, references should be added
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>21 - Implementing a CRM – upside, resistance and opportunities</i>
Partner:	Clextral
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Zbigniew Misiak (BOC)

Date of Sending out the completed peer review	15/06/2020
---	------------

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies comply with the major objective of the DigiFoF project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Does the case studies correspond with the activity description as specified in the application form?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Valuable lessons for any company offering industrial equipment which needs to implement CRM.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	As the case study describes the implementation of an IT system, it would be beneficial to present some aspects of this case in a graphical form which is common in such descriptions, e.g. AS-IS and TO-BE architecture or project phases		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	References are missing	If possible, references should be added
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Poor		

3.9.2 External Review:

Case Nr and Title:	<i>20 - Implementing a "Remote Assistance" service package</i>
Partner:	Clextral
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Krzysztof Dziekonski (UWE Bristol)
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Good reference to COVID restrictions.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	<p>Some major language errors. Proofreading is advised.</p> <p>Abbreviations shall be explained (such as PLC).</p> <p>A reference to figure/workflow should have been made. It is not clear what is shown on a diagram.</p> <p>Some technical jargon not properly introduced in the case study. “(...) VPN when the hotline is ‘on’” relates to company that sells equipment for food processing industry. A more careful introduction to case study is needed.</p> <p>What are “connected glasses”? Are these some kind of VR goggles?</p>		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	References are missing	If possible, references should be added
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> <i>Excellent</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Adequate</i> <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Poor</i>		

Case Nr and Title:	<i>21 - Implementing a CRM – upside, resistance and opportunities</i>
Partner:	Clextral
Internal Peer Reviewer (Person, Institutions)	Krzysztof Dziekonski (UWE Bristol)
Date of Sending out the completed peer review	June 2020

Section 1 – Deliverable content and objective	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
---	------------	----------	-----------------

Does the Case Studies deal with the topic of design the Factory of the Future?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Major strength of the Case Studies	Good overview of a project manager role.		
Major weakness of the Case Studies	A proofreading is required. CMR is used in section 6 instead of CRM. All abbreviations should be explained in the text.		
Section 2 – Case Study structure and Layout	Evaluation	Comments	Recommendations
Is the length of the Case Studies justified? If no, please specify by e.g. indicating parts that are superfluous, irrelevant, redundant, unspecific or would need more explanation?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Is the Case Study presented according to the template?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially		
Are the complementary information (external sources, bibliography, methodology, list of contacts) adequate?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Partially	References are missing	If possible, references should be added
Level of written English	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Poor		

4 Conclusion

D7.1 – Evaluating Industry Cases and providing inputs for improvements in WP3 has been coordinated by AFIL with the support of UNIBG. The objective of D7.1 is to carry out peer and external evaluations to industrial case studies in order to provide feedback for improvement into WP3. A methodology applied for evaluation has been defined and the evaluation process performed.

All the suggestions will be into account - considering confidentiality issues related to each case - in order to improve the quality of the collected industrial case studies.