# CRAEFT

care, judgment, dexterity

# Quality Assurance

| Project Acronym | Craeft |
|---|---|
| Project Title | Craft Understanding, Education, Training, and Preservation for Posterity and Prosperity |
| Project Number | 101094349 |
| Deliverable Number | D8.4 |
| Deliverable Title | Quality Assurance |
| Work Package | WP8 |
| Authors | Polykarpos Karamaounas, Xenophon Zabulis, and the consortium members who provided the deliverable reviews, as mentioned in the respective subsections. |
| Number of pages | 77 |

# Executive summary

**Executive Summary**

This deliverable presents the application of the Quality Assurance (QA) process implemented by the CRAEFT project during its first year. It serves as a formal record of the project's commitment to maintaining high-quality outputs across its diverse research and development activities. As a "living document," this is the first version (v2) of the deliverable, which will be updated annually at M24 and M36 to reflect the evolving quality control needs of the consortium.

**Core Quality Assurance Framework**

The CRAEFT QA procedure is designed to ensure that all project deliverables meet rigorous scientific and professional standards before submission to the European Commission. Key components of this framework include:

- Peer Review Process: Each deliverable is assigned at least one peer reviewer from within the consortium at least 30 days before the submission deadline.
- Open Review Standards: To promote transparency and address the limitations of traditional peer review, the project adopts "Open Identities" and "Open Reports". This ensures that author and reviewer identities are disclosed and that review reports are made accessible alongside the deliverables.
- Quality Control Management: A dedicated Quality Assurance Manager from FORTH oversees the process, utilising a technical "proofing guide" to help partners automatically detect and correct common formatting and linguistic errors.
- Linguistic Standardisation: All project documentation is required to adhere to UK English spelling to ensure consistency across the consortium's multi-national output.

**Implementation and Review Synthesis**

Section 2 of this document provides a comprehensive consolidation of internal review memos for key deliverables across Work Packages 3 through 8. These reviews highlight the "dual-track" progress of the project, balancing technical innovation with structural rigour.

- Technical Achievements: Reviews confirm substantial progress in craft-specific simulations, advanced digitisation (including 2D and garment digitisation), and the development of custom haptic controllers
- Structural Refinements: The QA process successfully identified and remediated critical metadata errors, such as page count discrepancies, broken Microsoft Word bookmarks, and inconsistent section numbering across several major deliverables.
- Policy and Community Impact: The QA process also validated high-level strategic documents, ensuring that policy recommendations for the European Crafts Renaissance are evidence-based and that the Community Portal is supported by verifiable analytics.

**Post-Project Legacy and Sustainability**

The Quality Assurance process extends beyond mere error correction to focus on the long-term sustainability of project outcomes. This includes establishing clear post-project hosting arrangements for digital assets, ensuring GDPR compliance for community data, and defining a Strategic Roadmap to 2030 for the integration of traditional crafts within national and European policy frameworks.

# Document history

| Date | Author | Affiliation | Comment |
|---|---|---|---|
| 12/2/2025 | Polykarpos Karamaounas | FORTH | Concatenated online reviews. The authors of individual reviews are mentioned inside the document. |
| 14/2/2026 | Xenophon Zabulis | FORTH | Added introduction |
| 19/2/2026 | Xenophon Zabulis | FORTH | Editing |
| 26/2/2026 | Xenophon Zabulis | FORTH | Editing |

# Abbreviations

| | |
|---|---|
| **3DGS** | 3D Gaussian Splatting |
| **AI** | Artificial Intelligence |
| **API** | Application Programming Interface |
| **AR** | Augmented Reality |
| **CAD** | Computer-Aided Design |
| **CAP** | Craeft Authoring Platform |
| **CH / CHI** | Cultural Heritage / Cultural Heritage Institutions |
| **CNC** | Computer Numerical Control |
| **CrO** | Crafts Ontology |
| **DoA** | Description of Action |
| **FDM** | Fused Deposition Modelling |
| **GDPR** | General Data Protection Regulation |
| **ICH** | Intangible Cultural Heritage |
| **IPR** | Intellectual Property Rights |
| **KG** | Knowledge Graph |
| **MoCap** | Motion Capture |
| **MNO** | Museum Narratives Ontology |
| **PC** | Project Coordinator |
| **PGI** | Protected Geographical Indication |
| **PSNR** | Peak Signal-to-Noise Ratio |
| **RCI** | Representatives of Craft Instances |
| **SME** | Small and Medium-sized Enterprise |
| **SSIM** | Structural Similarity Index Measure |
| **TM** | Technical Manager |
| **TRL** | Technology Readiness Level |
| **UCD** | User-Centred Design |
| **VCoP** | Virtual Community of Practice |

| VET | Vocational Education and Training |
|---------|-----------------------------------|
| VR / XR | Virtual Reality / Extended Reality |
| WP | Work Package |

# Table of contents

# 1. Introduction

This deliverable reports on the way that we review the project deliverables and the online presence of the project's outcomes. This deliverable is to be annually updated on M24 and M36.

It is noted that part of the information presented in this introduction stems from D8.1, which reports on the project management rules adopted by the consortium during the kick-off meeting.

## 1.1. Project Deliverables Review Process

This subsection summarises the review process for deliverables followed by Craeft.

The Project Coordinator (PC) and the Technical Manager (TM) of the project will appoint, for each deliverable, at least one consortium member as a peer reviewer no less than 30 days before the submission date for the deliverable. The Coordinator and the Technical Manager will inform the reviewers of their appointment and the partner leading the preparation of the deliverable regarding the assignment of reviewers.

The partner leading the preparation of the deliverable is responsible for ensuring that the deliverable is on-time and up to the quality requirements of the project. Specifically, the **lead participan**t should:

- Create an **outline** of the contents of the deliverable and make it available on the project's internal collaboration website as soon as work begins on the associated tasks.
- Maintain a **master document** of the deliverables in the entire process.
- Collect **contributions** from all participants and integrate them into the master document.
- When the document has **reached the quality criteria** of the project, initiate the internal review procedures with no delay.
- **Deliver** the deliverable on time.

The partner leading the preparation of the deliverable submits a draft of the deliverable to the reviewers, the WP leader, the PC and TM 30 days before the submission is due (the latest).

The reviewing procedure must end no later than 14 days before the submission date, at which point the reviewed document is submitted to the PC and TM.

The Project Coordinator and Technical Manager of the project validate the final version of the deliverable, update the revision number to V1.0 and submit the document to the Participant Portal. In case the dissemination level of the deliverable is public, the deliverable will also be published on the public project website (https://www.craeft.eu/).

Empty documents for all deliverables and all of their versions, in the same format, are provided at

https://cloud.craeft.eu/index.php/apps/files/?dir=/Craeft_documents/Deliverables&fileid=406

The submission dates of the deliverables have been noted in the project calendar. Partners have been informed of the dates on which their deliverables are due for review and the dates that their deliverables have to be submitted to the EC.

Each deliverable leader is responsible for collecting partner contributions and compiling them according to the plan and Table of Contents. Should there be an issue or unforeseen difficulty, this should preferably be raised in a QR report, in addition to any email or audio-visual telecommunication (for redundancy, in case of individual communication failures).

The plan for the review procedure of the deliverables is

| Days before the deadline | Action |
|---|---|
| 55 | Notification to start preparing the deliverable |
| 45 | Submission of the deliverable for review |
| 44 | Quality control and deliverable review start simultaneously |
| 40 | Quality control results sent to the author. |
| 30 | Review results sent to the author. |
| 14 | Revised deliverable and response to review sent to COO & QAM |
| 10 | COO & QAM check posts to review and revision (Open Review) |
| 2 | The re-revised and formatted deliverable is produced by the COO. |
| 1 | Submission of the deadline by the COO |
| Deadline | The date noted on the EC portal. |

The submission of deliverables is to take place by email, file transfer, or cloud submission, to FORTH, at the following persons: Xenophon Zabulis, Nikos Partarakis, and Polykarpos Karamaounas.

# 1.2. Review of deliverables

Deliverable reviews are to be submitted online. FORTH has created online forms for all deliverables and all their versions to avoid additional communication effort. The page with the deliverable review forms is:

http://users.ics.forth.gr/~karam/Craeft/Craeft_Reports.html

The access permissions to these reviews will be public for public deliverables and available only to the consortium for confidential ones. There will be two respective pages to access these reviews, according to permissions. The link to the public page will be provided on the Craeft website.

Reviewers can and are encouraged to provide detailed comments in MS Word comments, but an overview of the review should be provided in the above online form, which will be published with the name of the reviewer according to Open Review standards.

The online form contains several attributes that are of varying relevance to the type of deliverable. For example, a question regarding whether a management deliverable advances the state of the art is irrelevant. As such, the most important fields in the review are the "Comments" section, where you share your opinion with colleagues.

If you feel that such a field is irrelevant, please note "Not applicable" in the comments field.

# 1.3. Quality control

Each deliverable will be processed by the Quality Assurance Manager, who is a person designated by FORTH and an employee of FORTH. Currently, this person is Mr Polykarpos Karamaounas. To ease the task of quality control, A proofing guide with common formatting mistakes has been compiled. Partners are encouraged to verify their deliverables against this list before submitting a deliverable. This proofing guide can be found at:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QJY0Z_66QciE_0OE5WfFf59d2Y1AKQMw-4OZ5NG4_TY/edit?usp=sharing

The proofing guide contains technical hints so that partners can use the tools of MS Word to automatically detect most of the common mistakes. This proofing guide will be updated during the project.

In addition to the proofing guide, partners are encouraged to use spelling and grammar proofing tools.

The reviews and the responses to the reviews will be public to the consortium so that any partner can contribute with constructive criticism.

The Craeft project will use UK spelling on all documents.

# 1.4. Review Assignment

The assignment of reviews is proportional to the budget of each partner. The table below calculates the number of reviews per partner according to their budget.

| # | Acronym | Reviews # |
|---|---------|-----------|
| 1 | FORTH | 15 |
| 2 | CNR | 6 |
| 3 | ARMINES | 6 |
| 4 | KHORA | 5 |
| 5 | CETEM | 6 |
| 6 | CNAM | 5 |
| 7 | PIOP | 6 |
| 8 | CERFAV | 5 |
| 9 | MDE | 5 |
| 10 | ETH | 4 |
| | **Total** | 63 |

The assignment of deliverable reviews has been assigned in the following table. The same reviewer is assigned for all versions of a deliverable.

| # | Title | Delivery Month | Reviewer |
|---|-------|----------------|----------|
| D1.1 | Enhanced ethnographic methods | 12, 24 | CNR |

| D1.2 | Knowledge collection and representation | 12, 24 | CNAM |
|------|------|------|------|
| D2.1 | Action and affordance modelling | 12, 24 | CNR |
| D2.2 | Maker-Material-Negotiation model and CAP | 12, 24 | CNAM |
| D3.1 | Craft-specific action simulations | 18, 36 | ARMINES |
| D3.2 | Advanced digitisation technologies | 18, 36 | ETH |
| D3.3 | Scene and activity monitoring | 18, 36 | ETH |
| D4.1 | Craft simulation and immersive craft training | 18, 36 | ARMINES |
| D4.2 | Haptic devices for training, simulation, and design | 18, 36 | KHORA |
| D4.3 | Toys and games for informal craft education | 18, 36 | KHORA |
| D5.1 | Craft Design revisited | 18, 36 | CERFAV |
| D5.2 | Community Portal | 18, 36 | CNR |
| D6.1 | P1 – Education & Training, methodology and results | 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D6.2 | P2 – Design, methodology and results | 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D6.3 | P3 – Valorisation, methodology and results | 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D6.4 | P4 – Community, methodology and results | 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D7.1 | Communication Plan and Activities | 2, 12, 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D7.2 | Dissemination Plan and Activities | 2, 12, 24, 36 | FORTH |
| D7.3 | Networking and Coordination | 12, 24, 36 | PIOP |
| D7.4 | Exploitation Plan and Activities | 12, 24, 36 | PIOP |
| D8.1 | Project Management | 2 | KHORA |
| D8.2 | Project reporting | 12, 24, 36 | CETEM |
| D8.3 | Innovation Management | 18, 36 | ARMINES |
| D8.4 | Quality Assurance | 12, 24, 36 | CETEM |
| D8.5 | Data Management Plan | 6, 12, 24, 36 | CERFAV |
| D8.6 | Risk Assessment | 6, 12, 24, 36 | MDE |

# 1.5. Open Review

Open peer review is the various possible modifications of the traditional scholarly peer review process. The three most common modifications to which the term is applied are [1]:

1. Open identities: Authors and reviewers are aware of each other's identity [2][3].
2. Open reports: Review reports are published alongside the relevant article (rather than being kept confidential).
3. Open participation: The wider community (and not just invited reviewers) may contribute to the review process if they wish to.

These modifications are supposed to address various perceived shortcomings of the traditional scholarly peer review process, in particular its lack of transparency, lack of incentives, and wastefulness [1].

Open identities. Open peer review may be defined as "any scholarly review mechanism providing disclosure of author and referee identities to one another at any point during the peer review or publication process" [4]. Then reviewer's identities may or may not be disclosed to the public. This is in contrast to the traditional peer review process, where reviewers remain anonymous to anyone but the journal's editors, while authors' names are disclosed from the beginning.

Open reports. Open peer review may be defined as making the reviewers' reports public, instead of disclosing them to the article's authors only. This may include publishing the rest of the peer review history, i.e. the authors' replies and editors' recommendations. Most often, this concerns only articles that are accepted for publication and not those that are rejected.

Open participation. Open peer review may be defined as allowing self-selected reviewers to comment on an article, rather than (or in addition to) having reviewers who are selected by the editors. This assumes that the text of the article is openly accessible. The self-selected reviewers may or may not be screened for their basic credentials, and they may contribute either short comments or full reviews [1].

As described in the GA, Craeft will be using Open Review for the public deliverables. Open review will also be used for the rest of the deliverables, but these will be open only to consortium members.

In Craeft, we will use the first two principles, that is, open identities and open reports. Both reviews and reports will be publicly available along with the deliverables. Open participation will be limited to a few deliverables and will be limited to the consortium. More specifically, for deliverables that are of pertinence to the entire consortium (such as this one), the opinion of all consortium partners will be asked for. This subsection was the result of such a process, as it was asked by non-academic partners who were not familiar with the concept and process of Open Review.

# 1.6. Quarterly Reports

Quarterly reports will be provided in online forms. The content of these reports will be used in the Periodic Report of the project and, thus, determine the acceptance or rejection of the claimed costs by the EC.

All partners are to provide a brief report of their research and a detailed report of their travel and overall cost activities.

All partners are to provide entries every four months, with entries regarding their activity in Communication and Dissemination efforts. This input will be formalised in an online spreadsheet document.

All WP leaders are to provide a brief online report of their research and development activities. This report will be in an MS Word document that elaborates its contents on the reported topics.

The online forms for the quarterly reports can be found at

http://users.ics.forth.gr/~karam/Craeft/Craeft_Reports.html

The contents of the quarterly reports can be found in the Annual Periodic Report of the project.

# 2. Deliverable reviews

This section contains the deliverable reviews of the project. These reviews have been authored by consortium partners in the online page mentioned in Section 1. In addition, in some cases, MS Word files with comments were provided along with the online reviews; these documents are available upon request.

It is noted in this section that the conventional numbering of subsections is not followed. Instead, subsections are enumerated and named by the names of the deliverables and the version they correspond to.

## WP3

## D3.1 - Craft-specific Action Simulations – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D3.1 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D3.1 is the longest and most technically ambitious deliverable reviewed in this series, running to 288 pages against a stated cover page figure of 175. It is also substantively one of the strongest: the dependency-driven document architecture, the explicit "section at a glance" navigation aids, the FEM–PBR pipeline logic, and the quality of the plaster turning evaluation study (Section 11) are all exemplary. The document history, while somewhat sparse in its comment descriptions, at least records a real chronological progression. The issues identified below are predominantly structural and metadata-level; they do not affect the scientific content of the deliverable but must be corrected before final submission. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Cover Page: "Deliverable Number" Reads "3.1" Instead of "D3.1"**

- **Review Comment:** The "Deliverable Number" field on the cover page read "3.1" without the conventional "D" prefix. Every other CRAEFT deliverable reviewed in this series, as well as every internal header and running footer within D3.1 itself, consistently used the "D3.1" format. The cover page alone omitted the prefix. While minor in isolation, the Deliverable Number is a field read by the EC's submission portal and is expected to match the project's Grant Agreement annex format precisely.
- **Triggered Change:** The "Deliverable Number" field on the cover page was updated from "3.1" to "D3.1", consistent with all internal references and all other CRAEFT deliverables.

**2. Cover Page: "Number of Pages" States 175; Actual Document is 288 Pages**

- **Review Comment:** The cover page declared "Number of pages: 175", yet the document as submitted ran to 288 pages, including all annexes. This is a substantial discrepancy; the declared figure represents roughly 61% of the actual page count. Like the equivalent issue in D4.3 (which

declared 36 pages against an actual 150), this field was almost certainly carried forward from an earlier draft milestone and never updated when the M36 content was incorporated. For a document submitted to the EC, the declared page count is a formally registered metadata field.

- **Triggered Change:** The "Number of pages" field on the cover page was updated to reflect the actual page count of the final submitted document (288), inclusive of all annexes and references.

**3. Table of Contents: Multiple Executive Summary Sub-Sections Display Bookmark Errors**

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents contained a block of broken Word bookmark references immediately after the correct page-2 entry for the executive summary. The affected entries were: "Executive abstract", "Executive summary", "Motivation and problem framing", "Approach and document logic", "Key results and contributions", "Value for the project and intended use", and "Limitations and next steps", all displaying "Σφάλμα! Δεν έχει οριστεί σελιδοδείκτης." in place of page numbers. As with the equivalent issue in D3.3, these are unresolved Microsoft Word bookmarks exported verbatim into the PDF. In D3.1, the problem was particularly visible because the error-bearing entries appeared directly below a correctly resolved ToC entry (the main "Executive summary" line at page 2), making the inconsistency immediately apparent to any reader.
- **Triggered Change:** All broken bookmark references in the Table of Contents were repaired in the source document. Page numbers were re-generated for all affected entries before PDF export. The entire Table of Contents was verified to resolve cleanly before final submission.

**4. Section 3: Sub-Section Numbering Error, Two Sections Both Numbered "3.2"**

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 3 (Semantic Simulation) contained two consecutive sub-sections, both numbered "3.2". The first was "3.2 Use case demonstration" and the second was "3.2 Our approach". The Table of Contents lists both entries under the same section number. The "Our approach" sub-section should have been numbered 3.3, which would then cascade: "3.3 Maker-Material Negotiation" would become 3.4, and so on through the chapter. This is the same pattern of duplicated section numbering identified in Chapter 3 of D4.3 and Chapter 7 of D3.1 (see below), and appears to be a recurring issue when sections are added or reordered during drafting without updating the subsequent numbering.
- **Triggered Change:** The sub-section "3.2 Our approach" was renumbered to 3.3, and all subsequent sub-sections in Chapter 3 were renumbered accordingly. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect the corrected sequence.

**5. Section 7: Sub-Section Numbering Skips 7.1 and Contains Cross-Prefix Errors**

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 7 (Solids by revolution) contained two distinct numbering anomalies. First, the chapter opened directly at Section 7.2, "7.2 Method", with no Section 7.1 anywhere in the chapter. The Table of Contents confirmed the absence of 7.1, meaning the chapter's introductory or rationale sub-section was either omitted or absorbed into the chapter title without being assigned a section number. Second, within Section 7 (specifically Sections 7.5.5 and 7.5.6 in the body text), the sub-section numbers reverted to a "6.x" prefix: "6.5.5 Export and reuse of outcomes" and "6.5.6 Summary: what this validates for Craeft". These should have been numbered 7.5.5 and 7.5.6, respectively, as they are clearly sub-sections of Section 7.5 (XR game for pottery). The "6.x" prefix appears to be a carry-over from an earlier draft in which this content belonged to Chapter 6.

- **Triggered Change:** A Section 7.1 (Introduction or Rationale) was added to Chapter 7 to complete the numbering sequence. The sub-sections "6.5.5" and "6.5.6" were corrected to "7.5.5" and "7.5.6" respectively. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect all corrections.

### 6. Section 8.4.2: Sub-Section Numbered "4.4.3" Instead of "8.4.3"

- **Review Comment:** In Chapter 8 (Moulds), the sub-section following "8.4.2 Preprocessing" was numbered "4.4.3 Voxel and Mesh Processing" instead of "8.4.3". This is a clear prefix error; a residual "4." from an earlier chapter or draft context was not updated to "8." when the section was relocated or renumbered. The Table of Contents reflected this error by listing "4.4.3 Voxel and Mesh Processing" as an entry under Chapter 8, creating a navigational inconsistency within the same chapter.
- **Triggered Change:** The sub-section "4.4.3 Voxel and Mesh Processing" was corrected to "8.4.3 Voxel and Mesh Processing". The Table of Contents entry was updated accordingly.

### 7. Section 10: Sub-Sections 10.3 and 10.4 Are Missing from Both the Body and the ToC

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents for Chapter 10 (Stained Glass Compositions) listed sections 10.1 (Application), 10.2 (Segmentation), 10.5 (Quality Testing and Parameter Tuning), 10.6 (3D modelling), 10.7 (Results), and 10.8 (Discussion). Sections 10.3 and 10.4 were absent from both the ToC and the body of the chapter. The jump from 10.2 to 10.5 in the ToC was immediately visible and left a gap in the chapter's logical flow. A chapter about stained glass compositions would naturally carry sections on, for example, pattern generation or come-framework design between segmentation (10.2) and quality testing (10.5). Whether 10.3 and 10.4 represent sections that were planned but not yet written, or sections that existed in an earlier draft and were inadvertently removed during consolidation, the numbering gap was a structural error that should not be present in a final submission.
- **Triggered Change:** Either the missing sections 10.3 and 10.4 were written and inserted in the appropriate position within Chapter 10, or the existing sections were renumbered sequentially (10.1, 10.2, 10.3, 10.4, 10.5, 10.6) to eliminate the gap. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect the corrected chapter structure.

### 8. Section 11: Internal Sub-Section Numbering Is Inconsistent Throughout

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 11 (Plaster Turning) contained multiple internal numbering inconsistencies. The ToC listed sections 11.1, 11.2, 11.5 (System Architecture), 11.5 (User Experience, a duplicate), 11.5 (Iterative Design, a third use of 11.5), and 11.8 (Discussion), with sections 11.3, 11.4, 11.6, and 11.7 absent. In the body, the numbering was similarly disordered: "11.5 System Architecture" appeared before "11.4 User Experience Design" and "11.3.1/11.3.2" sub-sections, producing a sequence where the reader encountered 11.2 → 11.5 → 11.4 → 11.3.x → 11.5 again. Additionally, the conclusions section "11.9 Conclusions" was listed in the body, while the following sub-section "11.8.1 Limitations and Next Steps" carried a lower parent number than the conclusions section itself. This was the most pervasively disordered chapter numbering of any deliverable reviewed in this series, and it affected a chapter that contained some of the most carefully documented evaluation work in the entire deliverable.
- **Triggered Change:** Chapter 11 was renumbered from scratch with a clean sequential structure: 11.1 Introduction, 11.2 Ethnographic Interaction Design, 11.3 System Architecture & Implementation, 11.4 User Experience and Interaction Design, 11.5 Iterative Design and Expert

Evaluation, 11.6 Discussion, 11.7 Conclusions. All sub-sections were renumbered to match their correct parent chapter. The Table of Contents was fully regenerated for Chapter 11 to reflect the corrected structure.

**9. Document History: All Five Entries Carry Only the Comment "Drafting"**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table recorded five entries, spanning June 2024 through February 2026. Every single entry carried the comment "Drafting", including the most recent entry dated 20/02/2026, which would be expected to describe the final state of the document. No entry described an internal review, a revision following review comments, or a final sign-off. For a deliverable that, based on its content, clearly underwent substantial development, including the addition of the plaster turning application (Chapter 11) with its two-phase evaluation study, conducted between January 2024 and November 2025, a history table in which every milestone is described identically as "Drafting" provided no useful traceability. It was also inconsistent with the more informative document histories seen in D3.2 and other reviewed deliverables.
- **Triggered Change:** The document history entries were updated to carry meaningful comments distinguishing the different stages of document development, at a minimum distinguishing early drafting, internal review, M18 content consolidation, M36 additions (plaster turning, evaluation), and final approval. A final entry was added confirming approval for M36 submission.

# D3.2 - Advanced digitisation technologies – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D3.2 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D3.2 is a technically dense and methodologically rigorous deliverable at 171 pages, covering surface digitisation (2D and 2½D), garment digitisation, transparent body digitisation, and challenging material inspection, supported by nine annexes. The document is genuinely well-structured: a reader's guide in Section 1.3 correctly orients the reader, the "section at a glance" boxes throughout Section 2 are an exemplary formatting convention, the continuity/novelty framing in Section 1.2 is honest and traceable, and the patent application mention (Section 4.8.2) adds appropriate real-world context. The document history is the cleanest of all deliverables reviewed in this series, recording twelve dated entries spanning June 2024 through February 2026. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Cover Page: "Project Number" and "Work Package" Fields Are Blank**

- **Review Comment:** The cover page of D3.2 contained two unfilled metadata fields: "Project Number" (which should read "101094349") and "Work Package" (which should read "3" or "WP3"). Both fields were present as labelled rows but contained no value. For a document submitted to the EC, the Grant Agreement number is a mandatory identifier on the cover page. All other CRAEFT deliverables reviewed in this series carried the correct project number (101094349). The blank Work Package field is a secondary but consistent omission.
- **Triggered Change:** The Project Number field was populated with "101094349" and the Work Package field was populated with "WP3" (or "3"), consistent with the equivalent fields on all other reviewed CRAEFT deliverables.

**2. Cover Page: "Deliverable Title" Field Reads Only "Deliverable"**

- **Review Comment:** The "Deliverable Title" row on the cover page contained only the word "Deliverable", a placeholder that was not replaced with the actual title of the document. The document header, running footer, and executive summary all correctly identified the deliverable as "Advanced digitisation technologies", and the PDF filename reinforced this. The cover page title field alone was left unfilled. This is a straightforward placeholder that was overlooked in final preparation.
- **Triggered Change:** The "Deliverable Title" field on the cover page was updated to read "Advanced digitisation technologies", consistent with the document header and all other internal references.

**3. Annex H: Section Heading Numbering Repeats H.1, H.2, H.3 Twice**

- **Review Comment:** Annex H (Interactive viewer) contained a structural duplication in its section numbering. The Table of Contents lists three sub-sections: H.1 Top bar elements, H.2 Four-panel layout and status footer, and H.3 Motion semantics and comparative use. However, within the body of Annex H, the three sub-sections were presented a second time with the same numbering, H.1 Top bar elements, H.2 Footer, and H.3 Comparative purpose, but with different titles and partially different content. This resulted in two complete sets of H.1, H.2, and H.3 within the same annex, making it impossible to cite or navigate reliably. The Table of Contents entries for Annex H corresponded to the first set, leaving the second set entirely unnumbered from a ToC perspective.
- **Triggered Change:** Annex H was restructured so that its sub-sections carried a single, consistent numbering sequence. The duplicate section headings were resolved either by merging the two overlapping sets into a single coherent sequence (H.1 through H.5 or H.6 as appropriate) or by confirming which set represented the final version and removing the redundant duplicate. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect the corrected sub-section structure.

**4. Section 2.3.4: Internal Cross-Reference to a Non-Existent "Table 3.12"**

- **Review Comment:** Section 2.3.4 (2½D surface reconstruction) and its associated results discussion referred to "Table 3.12" twice: "As shown in Table 3.12, the tool/object region achieves..." and "Table 3.12 indicates a PSNR of 14.65 dB...". No table numbered 3.12 existed anywhere in D3.2. The document used a straightforward sequential table numbering convention (Table 1, Table 2, Table 3, etc.) throughout. The reference to "Table 3.12" appeared to be a cross-reference copied verbatim from D3.3, where that table number was used in the wood carving evaluation section, and pasted into D3.2 without being updated to match D3.2's own table numbering. This is a clear copy-paste artefact that leaves a broken internal reference in the final document.
- **Triggered Change:** The two references to "Table 3.12" in Section 2.3.4 were corrected to reference the appropriate table number within D3.2's own sequential numbering system. The relevant table, covering the wood carving evaluation results described in the surrounding text, was identified and correctly numbered.

**5. Section 3: Garment Digitisation Has No Conclusions Sub-Section**

- **Review Comment:** Sections 2, 4, and 5 all contained dedicated conclusions sub-sections (Sections 2.6, 4.8, and an equivalent passage in Section 5.4.4), and Section 6 provided overall deliverable conclusions broken down by method. Section 3 (Garment digitisation) was the only section that

ended abruptly with a results presentation (Section 3.4) and no concluding passage of any kind, no summary of what was achieved, no acknowledgement of limitations, and no pointer to the corresponding entry in Section 6. Given that the Garment digitisation section introduced a multi-modal workflow combining handheld scanning, laser scanning, and photogrammetry, and generated results for a collection of Cretan textiles, the absence of any synthesis passage left the section structurally incomplete relative to all other major sections of the document.

- **Triggered Change:** A brief Section 3.5 Conclusions was added to the garment digitisation section. This passage summarised the key outputs of the multi-modal workflow, noted any observed limitations (e.g., dependency on mannequin geometry, sensitivity to scan quality in drape regions), and cross-referenced the broader synthesis in Section 6.2.

### 6. Document History: M36 Update Entries Do Not Record a "Final Version" Sign-Off

- **Review Comment:** The document history was well-maintained and recorded twelve entries across the full development span from June 2024 to February 2026. However, the most recent entry, "2026-02-07 – Xenophon Zabulis – ICS/FORTH – Revised document (v2)", described the document as "revised" without confirming it as the final approved version. The filename "D3.2_M36_v01.pdf" designated this as version 01 of the M36 submission, but no history entry explicitly confirmed approval for submission. For consistency with standard Horizon Europe reporting practice and with the approach recommended for other CRAEFT deliverables in this review series, the history should conclude with a clearly worded final approval entry.
- **Triggered Change:** A final entry was added to the document history, dated at the point of submission, with the comment "Final version approved for M36 submission" or equivalent, ensuring that the history and the filename were mutually consistent.

### 7. Abbreviations Section: Formatting Inconsistency in the BSDF / CNC Row

- **Review Comment:** In the abbreviations table, the entry for BSDF read: "BSDF, Bidirectional Scattering Distribution Function CNC, Computer Numerical Control", with "CNC" and its expansion appearing on the same line as BSDF without a line break or separate row. This formatting error collapsed two separate entries into a single cell, making BSDF's definition appear to include the words "CNC Computer Numerical Control" as part of its expansion. The error was almost certainly caused by an absent line break in the source table cell during document assembly.
- **Triggered Change:** The BSDF and CNC entries were separated into two distinct rows in the abbreviations table, each carrying its own acronym and correct expansion, consistent with the formatting of all other entries in the table.

# D3.3 - Scene and activity monitoring – M36

D3.3 is a technically rigorous and scientifically strong deliverable. The dual-track framework, combining explicit scene reconstruction via 3D Gaussian Splatting with implicit hierarchical movement modelling and forecast-driven Meta-Learning adaptation, represents a genuinely original contribution and is presented with appropriate depth and clarity. The quantitative evaluation across seven craft scenarios is one of the most comprehensive empirical sections of any deliverable reviewed in this series. The main concerns are structural rather than scientific, and they are addressed below. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Table of Contents: Multiple Entries Display "Σφάλμα! Δεν έχει οριστεί σελιδοδείκτης." (Word Bookmark Error)**

- **Review Comment:** Four entries in the Table of Contents displayed the Greek-language Microsoft Word bookmark error "Σφάλμα! Δεν έχει οριστεί σελιδοδείκτης." (translating to "Error! Bookmark not defined.") in place of page numbers. The affected entries were: Section 3.3 (Scene synthesis to address occlusions in craft activities), Section 4.4 (Application 2, Professional Reconversion and Skill Transfer), Section 5 (Future Work, Toward Scalable Hierarchical Craft Intelligence), and the ToC entry corresponding to the final perspectives sections. These errors are caused by broken internal cross-references in the source Word document and are converted verbatim into the PDF export. For a final submission to the EC, a Table of Contents that displays unresolved bookmark errors in the native language of the authoring software is a formatting failure that will be immediately visible to reviewers and the Project Officer.
- **Triggered Change:** The broken bookmarks were repaired in the source document. Page number references were re-generated for all affected ToC entries before PDF export. The full Table of Contents was verified to resolve correctly before final submission.

**2. No Abbreviations Section**

- **Review Comment:** D3.3 did not include an abbreviations section, despite making consistent and extensive use of technical acronyms throughout. Acronyms used in the body text without a consolidated definition include: 3DGS, AR, CH, ICH, PSNR, SSIM, ORPR, Npix, VR, WP, MoCap, MTL, AI, LLM, FDM, and API. The absence of an abbreviations table is a departure from standard CRAEFT deliverable formatting and from Horizon Europe reporting conventions. This is particularly notable in a technically dense deliverable where PSNR, SSIM, ORPR, and 3DGS carry precise meanings that non-specialist reviewers should be able to look up.
- **Triggered Change:** A dedicated Abbreviations section was added before the Table of Contents, defining all acronyms used in the document. UK English spelling was verified throughout.

**3. Page 2: Blank Page Between Cover and Executive Summary**

- **Review Comment:** Page 2 of the deliverable was entirely blank, containing no text, figure, or intentional placeholder, appearing between the cover page and the executive summary. As with the equivalent issue identified in D4.2, this is a formatting artefact from the source document and should be removed before submission. In a 33-page deliverable, a structurally unexplained blank page is proportionally conspicuous.
- **Triggered Change:** The blank page was removed, and the executive summary was confirmed to begin immediately after the cover page, consistent with the layout conventions used in all other CRAEFT deliverables.

**4. Document History: No Final Review or Sign-Off Entry**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table recorded four entries, ending with "09/02/2026 – Sotiris Manitsaris – ARMINES – Draft internal review." The final entry described the most recent action as a "draft internal review" rather than a final sign-off, and no entry confirmed that the document had been approved for submission. Given that the file was named "D3.3_ARMINES-FINAL_upd.pdf", a document history that terminates at a "draft internal review" stage is

inconsistent with the file's stated status and may raise questions about whether the submitted version is the correct one.

- **Triggered Change:** A final entry was added to the document history table, dated at the point of submission, confirming the document was approved for final submission and identifying the responsible author. The comment field was updated to read "Final version approved for submission" or equivalent.

## 5. Section 3 Title: Inconsistency Between ToC and Body

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed Section 3 as "Scene understanding", while in the body, the section heading read "Explicit scene understanding". Section 4 was correctly titled "Implicit scene understanding" in both locations. This inconsistency is minor but meaningful, as the distinction between explicit and implicit understanding is the structural backbone of the entire deliverable; indeed, the executive summary introduces it as the defining "dual perspective" of Task T3.3. The ToC title for Section 3 should reflect this framing.
- **Triggered Change:** The Table of Contents entry for Section 3 was updated to "Explicit scene understanding", matching the body heading and establishing the correct parallel structure with Section 4 (Implicit scene understanding).

## 6. Section 3.3 Title: Mismatch Between ToC and Body

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed Section 3.3 as "Scene synthesis to address occlusions in craft activities", whereas in the document body, the corresponding section heading was "Quantitative Evaluation of Scene Synthesis in Craft Environments", the title that appears in both the running header and the section text. The ToC title described what is actually covered by Section 3.2 (Dynamic Scene decomposition and the temporal occlusion recovery logic), while the body of Section 3.3 was the evaluation framework section. The mismatch appears to be a residual artefact from an earlier draft in which the section content was reorganised without updating the ToC.
- **Triggered Change:** The ToC entry for Section 3.3 was corrected to "Quantitative Evaluation of Scene Synthesis in Craft Environments", matching the body heading. The overall section numbering from 3.3 onwards was verified for internal consistency between the ToC and the body.

## 7. Section 5: Title Mismatch Between ToC and Body

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed Section 5 as "Future Work, Toward Scalable Hierarchical Craft Intelligence", whereas in the body, the section heading read "Perspectives and future directions". Additionally, the Applications sub-sections (Sections 4.3 and 4.4 in the ToC: "Application 1, Personalised Skill Assessment in Craft Training" and "Application 2, Professional Reconversion and Skill Transfer") were relocated in the body into Section 5 as Sections 5.1 and 5.2, under the reframing of "Perspectives and future directions". The ToC, therefore, presented these applications as part of Section 4 (Implicit scene understanding), while the body placed them in Section 5. This structural discrepancy, where the ToC and the body disagree on which chapter these applications belong to, is a significant navigational inconsistency.
- **Triggered Change:** The section structure was harmonised so that the ToC and body were fully aligned. Given that Sections 5.1 and 5.2 explicitly described "envisioned directions" and future applications rather than completed results, their placement in a forward-looking Section 5 was the more appropriate formulation, and the ToC was updated accordingly.

**8. Executive Summary: Terminology Inconsistency ("Fine-gained" vs "Fine-grained")**

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary contained the phrase "fine-gained, skill-dependent movements" in its second paragraph. This appears to be a typographical error for "fine-grained", which is the correct technical term used throughout the body of the deliverable. The error appeared only in the executive summary; the body of the document used "fine-grained" consistently and correctly, suggesting the executive summary was drafted or revised separately from the body without a final proofread.
- **Triggered Change:** "Fine-gained" was corrected to "fine-grained" in the executive summary. The executive summary was reviewed in full for any further typographical or terminological inconsistencies relative to the body text.

# WP4

# D4.1. Craft simulation and immersive craft training – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D4.1 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D4.1 is a substantive and well-developed deliverable at 138 pages, covering Cognitive Load Theory-based instructional design, the semantic/simulation/visualisation methodology, the Moodle eLearning portal, the Apprentice Studio and Craft Studio platforms, and four craft use cases (glassblowing, pin striping, plaster turning, and wood carving). The document history is the strongest in the WP4 series, recording six dated entries with meaningful comments that clearly distinguish M18 from M36 content. The chapter structure is coherent, and the executive summary's chapter overview is well-matched to the actual body structure. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Cover Page: "Project Title" Field Is Blank**

- **Review Comment:** The "Project Title" row on the cover page contained no value. The project title, "Craft Understanding, Education, Training, and Preservation for Posterity and Prosperity", was present in the PDF filename metadata and appeared correctly in the equivalent field on every other CRAEFT deliverable reviewed in this series (D3.1, D3.2, D3.3, D4.2, D4.3). The D4.1 cover page was the only instance in the reviewed series where this field was left empty. The Project Title field is a mandatory identifier on Horizon Europe deliverable cover pages.
- **Triggered Change:** The "Project Title" field on the cover page was populated with "Craft Understanding, Education, Training, and Preservation for Posterity and Prosperity", consistent with all other CRAEFT deliverables.

**2. Cover Page: "Deliverable Title" Field Contains an Erroneous Suffix ("FORTH")**

- **Review Comment:** The "Deliverable Title" field on the cover page reads "Craft simulation and immersive craft training FORTH". The word "FORTH", the affiliation of the authors, was appended directly to the deliverable title without any separator, making it appear as part of the title itself.

The Deliverable Title should read only "Craft simulation and immersive craft training". The affiliation "FORTH" belongs in the Authors field, where it was already correctly captured alongside the authors' names. This appears to be a copy-paste or field-alignment error during final cover page preparation.

- **Triggered Change:** The "Deliverable Title" field was corrected to read "Craft simulation and immersive craft training", with the appended "FORTH" removed.

### 3. Cover Page: "Number of Pages" States 53; Actual Document is 138 Pages

- **Review Comment:** The cover page declared "Number of pages: 53", while the actual document ran to 138 pages, inclusive of all annexes. As with the equivalent issues in D4.3 (36 vs. 150 pages) and D3.1 (175 vs. 288 pages), this figure was carried forward from an earlier draft milestone and not updated when the M36 content was incorporated. The discrepancy between 53 and 138 pages is large enough that a reviewer comparing the cover page to the submitted PDF would immediately notice the inconsistency.
- **Triggered Change:** The "Number of pages" field on the cover page was updated to reflect the actual page count of the final submitted document (138), inclusive of annexes and references.

### 4. Document History: "Abbreviations" Page Listed at Page 5 in ToC, but Actually Begins at Page 5, Consistent with Document History Also on Page 5

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed both "Document history" and "Abbreviations" as starting at page 5. In the body of the document, the document history occupied page 5, and the abbreviations section began on the same page below it. This is a minor formatting issue rather than a structural error, but it resulted in two separate ToC entries pointing to the same page number, which could cause confusion for a reader trying to navigate directly to the abbreviations. The two elements should occupy distinct pages to allow clean ToC navigation.
- **Triggered Change:** The Abbreviations section was moved to begin on page 6, giving it its own page start distinct from the document history, and the ToC entry was updated accordingly.

### 5. Section 9: "Use Case – Pin Stripping", Sub-Section 9.1 Is Missing

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 9 (Use Case, Pin striping) opened directly at Section 9.2 ("Semantic layer"), with no Section 9.1. The Table of Contents reflected this; the first listed sub-section of Chapter 9 was 9.2. Every other use case chapter (8, 10, 11) began with a Section X.1 that provided an introduction to the use case, contextualising the craft, its relevance to the framework, and the structure of the chapter. Chapter 9's direct opening at 9.2 omitted this introductory sub-section entirely, creating a structural inconsistency across the four use case chapters and leaving the pin stripping case without any contextual framing equivalent to what was provided for glassblowing (8.1), plaster turning (10.1), and woodworking (11.1).
- **Triggered Change:** A Section 9.1 (Introduction) was added to Chapter 9, providing a brief contextual overview of the pin striping craft, its relevance to the Craeft framework, and the structure of the chapter, consistent with the equivalent introductory sections in the other use case chapters. The Table of Contents was updated to include Section 9.1.

### 6. Section 4.1.2: Broken Word Cross-Reference Displayed in Body Text

- **Review Comment:** Section 4.1.2 (Process Semantic Model) contained the following sentence: "The CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model (CIDOC-CRM) [Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.] provides the semantic foundation for expressing these distinctions". The Greek-language Microsoft Word error "Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε." translates as "Error! The source file of the reference was not found.", a broken cross-reference to an external file, exported verbatim into the PDF. This is a Word field error of a different type from the bookmark errors seen in D3.1 and D3.3, but equally problematic for a final submission: the reference marker in the sentence that should point to the CIDOC-CRM citation instead displayed a raw error string in the body text.
- **Triggered Change:** The broken cross-reference was identified in the source document and replaced with the correct numbered citation for the CIDOC-CRM standard. The surrounding sentence was verified to flow correctly with the repaired reference.

**7. Section 3.3.2: Cross-Reference Points to the Wrong Section**

- **Review Comment:** Section 3.3.2 (Design of Educational Content) directed readers to "the examples provided in Section 6.3" for eLearning course exemplars, and to "the examples of Section 6.4" for assignment examples. However, the actual eLearning course exemplars in the document were located in Section 5.4 (Exemplars Courses), containing Sections 5.4.1, 5.4.2, and 5.4.3, and the assignments were in Section 5.5. In the final M36 document structure, there was no Section 6.3 or 6.4 carrying this content. These references appear to be carry-overs from an earlier draft in which the chapter numbering was different (presumably when the eLearning portal content was Chapter 6 rather than Chapter 5), and they were not updated when the chapter was renumbered during the M36 revision.
- **Triggered Change:** The two cross-references in Section 3.3.2 were corrected: "Section 6.3" was updated to "Section 5.4" and "Section 6.4" was updated to "Section 5.5", matching the actual location of the relevant content in the final document. All other cross-references in the section were checked for similar renumbering artefacts.

**8. Abbreviations: "KG" (Knowledge Graph) Is Used Extensively in the Body but Not Listed**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviation "KG" (Knowledge Graph) appeared more than thirty times in the body of D4.1, in the background chapter (Section 2.2, 2.3), the methodology chapter (Section 4.1), and the use case chapters. It was not included in the abbreviations table. The table included CLT, CMS, VR, AR, and other frequently used abbreviations, and the omission of KG, which is central to the deliverable's semantic layer, was an inconsistency. "KG" was also used in abbreviated form without being spelt out at first use in several sections.
- **Triggered Change:** "KG, Knowledge Graph" was added to the abbreviations table. The first occurrence of "KG" in each chapter was verified to spell out the full term before using the abbreviation, consistent with standard academic practice.

# D4.2. Haptic devices for training, simulation, and design – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D4.2 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D4.2 is a technically accomplished and well-structured deliverable. It documents a genuine and substantial dual-track contribution: a custom handheld haptic controller with full mechanical, electronic, and software documentation, and a complementary perceptual feedback framework for deployment on commodity VR hardware. The M36 additions, specifically the hardware revision account in Section 4 and the full visuoauditory illusion framework in Section 5, significantly strengthen the deliverable relative to the M18 version. The document is clearly written and technically precise. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Section 4 Title: Inconsistency Between Table of Contents and Body**

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed Section 4 as "Controller upgrades" with four sub-entries: Hardware Revisions, Latency and Responsiveness, Ergonomics and Handling, and Integration and Use. However, in the document body, the section heading reads "Controller revision after deployment", a meaningfully different title that more accurately describes the section's content. This inconsistency means the Table of Contents does not correctly reflect the body structure. While the body heading is the better of the two formulations, the mismatch will be immediately apparent to any reader using the ToC for navigation.
- **Triggered Change:** The Table of Contents entry for Section 4 was updated to match the body heading: "Controller revision after deployment". All four sub-section titles were verified to be consistent between the ToC and body throughout.

**2. Page 3: Blank Page with No Content or Explanation**

- **Review Comment:** Page 3 of the deliverable, between the document history table and the Table of Contents, was entirely blank, containing no text, figure, or placeholder. This is almost certainly a formatting artefact: the Table of Contents was likely intended to follow immediately after the document history, and the blank page resulted from an inadvertent page break or section break in the source file. In a 23-page deliverable, a blank page represents a disproportionate structural gap and will be noticed by reviewers.
- **Triggered Change:** The blank page was removed, and the Table of Contents was repositioned to follow directly from the document history and abbreviations, consistent with the layout conventions used in all other CRAEFT deliverables.

**3. Abbreviations: No Dedicated Abbreviations Table**

- **Review Comment:** D4.2 did not include an abbreviations section. Unlike all other deliverables reviewed in this series, no list of acronyms and abbreviations was provided. The document made extensive use of acronyms throughout, including VR, AR, API, CAD, ADC, VCA, LRA, DoF (or 6DOF), PD (as in PD controller), GPU, USB, CNC, and CRAEFT, none of which were formally defined in a dedicated section. While some of these were defined inline on first use, the absence of a consolidated abbreviations table is a departure from standard Horizon Europe deliverable formatting.
- **Triggered Change:** A dedicated Abbreviations section was added before the Table of Contents, listing all acronyms used in the deliverable with their full expansions. All first-occurrence inline definitions in the body text were verified to be consistent with the abbreviations table entries.

**4. Document History: M36 Entry Incomplete and Missing Co-Author**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table recorded the M36 update entry as: "20/02/2026 – Christian Holz – ETH Zurich – Draft of M36." The M18 entry listed both Christian Holz and Rayan Armani as authors. The M36 entry listed only Christian Holz, with no indication of whether the M36 update was authored solely or jointly, nor any record of a review step prior to submission. Given that the M36 additions (Sections 4 and 5) represent more than half the deliverables' final content, the production trail is incomplete.
- **Triggered Change:** The M36 document history was expanded to clarify the authorship of the M36 additions, noting which sections were authored by whom, and adding a final review entry confirming that the deliverable had been checked for consistency and completeness before submission.

**5. Section 5.6 (CRAEFT Use Cases and Ongoing Evaluation): Ethics Approval Still Pending**

- **Review Comment:** The final subsection of Section 5 stated explicitly: "At the time of this deliverable, the formal ethics approval process for the full-scale comparative human-subject study is actively underway." This is a significant disclosure in a final M36 project deliverable. It means that the primary comparative evaluation of the perceptual feedback strategies, the experiment directly validating the deliverable's core contribution, had not been completed at the time of submission. The use of "user experiments are still ongoing" in the same paragraph further confirms that neither the ethics process nor the data collection has concluded. While this is an honest statement of the research status, it risks raising questions during the final review about the completeness of the deliverable's evaluation claims.
- **Triggered Change:** The section was updated to provide the clearest possible account of the evaluation status at submission. If the ethics approval was granted and any data was collected between the draft date (20/02/2026) and the submission date, those preliminary results were included. If the ethics process remained pending at submission, the section was revised to clearly distinguish between: (i) the deployment evidence from the CRAEFT use cases already described, which constitutes observational validation of the approach; and (ii) the formal comparative study, which is identified as a planned post-project activity. The conclusion was adjusted accordingly so that the deliverable's claims are fully supported by the evidence presented within it, rather than relying on a study that had not yet been conducted.

**6. Introduction: American English Spelling**

- **Review Comment:** The Introduction consistently used American English spelling throughout, including "revolutionise", "digitising", "immersive learning", "digitisation", "recognise", and "democratises". All other CRAEFT deliverables reviewed in this series use UK English spelling as the project standard. This is a minor but consistent deviation that should be corrected in the final version.
- **Triggered Change:** American English spellings were converted to UK English throughout the deliverable ("revolutionise", "digitising", "digitisation", "recognise", etc.). The full document was checked for spelling consistency.

**7. Conclusion: Missing Cross-Reference to Integration with Other WP4 and WP3 Outputs**

- **Review Comment:** The Summary and Conclusion (Section 6) provided a self-contained account of D4.2's contributions but did not explain how the haptic controller and perceptual feedback framework had been integrated with the craft-specific simulators developed in WP3 (D3.1) or with the Design Studio in WP5 (D5.1). This integration is confirmed in the body of the deliverable, Section 4's "Integration and Use" sub-section noted that the controller was deployed by CRAEFT partners in Unity-based applications, but the Conclusion did not draw this connection, leaving the reader without a clear picture of the controller's role in the broader CRAEFT system architecture.
- **Triggered Change:** A brief paragraph was added to the Conclusion confirming the controller's integration with the WP3 simulators and the WP5 Design Studio, cross-referencing D3.1 and D5.1 as the relevant deliverables, and situating D4.2's contributions within the full CRAEFT immersive experience stack.

# D4.3 Toys and games for informal craft education – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D4.3 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

The executive summary and chapter summaries are well-written and informative, and the playtesting section of Chapter 4 is an exemplary piece of honest, structured evaluation. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Page Count Discrepancy: Cover Page States 36 Pages; Actual Document is 150 Pages**

- **Review Comment:** The cover page of D4.3 declared "Number of pages: 36", yet the document as submitted runs to 150 pages, including annexes. This is likely a residual figure from an earlier draft and represents a significant discrepancy between the cover page metadata and the actual deliverable. For a document submitted to the EC's Funding and Tenders portal, the page count declared on the cover is a formally registered field and should accurately reflect the submitted document.
- **Triggered Change:** The "Number of pages" field on the cover page was updated to reflect the actual page count of the final submitted version, inclusive of all annexes.

**2. Document History: All Entries Carry Incorrect Year (2004 Instead of 2024)**

- **Review Comment:** All four entries in the document history table recorded the year 2004 rather than 2024: "1-6-2004", "1-7-2004", "1-9-2004", and "30-9-2004". This is a consistent typographical error; the final digit of the year was omitted, and it appeared in every single row of the history table. While clearly an inadvertent error, its uniform presence across all entries means the document history, as submitted, records production dates that predate the CRAEFT project by twenty years. There was also no M36 update entry of any kind, despite the deliverable clearly having undergone substantial revision since M18.
- **Triggered Change:** All four entries were corrected from 2004 to 2024. An M36 update entry was added, recording the authors, affiliations, and a description of the content added or revised between M18 and M36, including, at minimum, the XR pottery workshop (Section 3.3), the Crafts

board game evaluation (Section 4.5), the kitchen casting game and chess use case (Section 5.2), and the storytelling activities (Section 6.3).

**3. Chapter 2: Section Numbering Error, Sub-Sections Repeat the Wrong Parent Number**

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 2 (titled "Positioning" in the body, though labelled "CRAEFT's Approach" in the executive summary's chapter guide) contained a structural numbering error in the sub-section sequence. Section 2.2 introduced "The proposed approach", and its four steps were then numbered 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, re-using the 2.x sequence already assigned to the background literature sub-sections. This means the document contained two distinct "Section 2.1" and "Section 2.2" entries, which the Table of Contents also reflected, listing "2.1 Background of serious games" and "2.1 Step 1 – Systematic Understanding of Crafts" on the same level. This is a clear structural numbering error.
- **Triggered Change:** The four methodology steps were renumbered consistently, either as 2.2.1 through 2.2.4 (as sub-sections of Section 2.2) or as Sections 2.3 through 2.6, depending on the hierarchical convention adopted. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect the corrected numbering.

**4. Chapter 3: Two Sections Both Numbered "3.4"**

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 3 (Digital Games) contained two consecutive sections, both numbered "3.4": the first was "3.4 The jewellery box" and the second was "3.4 Lathe woodturning game". The Table of Contents reflected this error, listing both sections under the same section number. The Lathe woodturning game should have been numbered Section 3.5, which would also have pushed "3.5 Conclusion" to become Section 3.6. This is a straightforward numbering error with a cascading effect on the chapter's section sequence.
- **Triggered Change:** The lathe woodturning game section was renumbered to Section 3.5 and the conclusion to Section 3.6. The Table of Contents was updated accordingly.

**5. Annex Cross-Reference Errors in the Executive Summary**

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary's annex descriptions contained two internal cross-reference errors. First, the description of Annex E stated "Annex F supports Chapter 6 by demonstrating..."; the reference should have been to Annex E itself, not Annex F. Second, the description of Annex F stated "Annex H strengthens the document's emphasis on openness..."; this reference should have pointed to Annex F itself. These appear to be copy-paste artefacts where the introductory phrase of each annex description was not updated when the text was assembled.
- **Triggered Change:** Both cross-reference errors were corrected so that each annex description accurately referred to itself. The full list of annex descriptions in the executive summary was checked for any further self-referencing inconsistencies.

**6. Chapter 4 (Crafts Board Game): Playtesting Sample Size Warrants Qualification**

- **Review Comment:** Section 4.5 reported playtesting with three participants, acknowledged candidly in the table as a limited sample. The section was well-structured and honest in scope, but the main body text of Section 4, and particularly the Conclusions (Section 4.6), made several

broader claims about educational value and thematic engagement ("Ratings of the thematic aspect were also positive, suggesting that the mapping between craft processes and game mechanics is legible to non-experts") that drew general conclusions from a three-person test. While the authors themselves acknowledged the need for "expanded evaluation with larger and more diverse participant groups", the language in the conclusion did not sufficiently qualify the findings as preliminary.

- **Triggered Change:** The concluding language in Section 4.6 and any equivalent passages in Chapter 7 Conclusions were reviewed to ensure that educational impact claims derived from the three-person playtesting were appropriately qualified as indicative rather than generalisable. Phrasing such as "the evaluation demonstrates" was replaced with "the initial evaluation suggests, consistent with the scale of the study.

### 7. American English Spelling in Chapter 4

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 4, which appears to have been authored or revised separately from the rest of the deliverable, contained several instances of American English spelling: "valorisation" was spelled correctly elsewhere but "utilised" appeared alongside "utilized" in the same section; "modelling" appeared as "modeling" in the board game design subsection; and "recognises" appeared as "recognizes" in the thematic integration passage. The inconsistency is most likely a result of different source files being combined without a final spelling harmonisation pass.
- **Triggered Change:** A full spelling consistency check was conducted across all chapters, converting any American English variants to UK English in line with the project standard used throughout D4.3 and all other CRAEFT deliverables.

# WP5

# D5.1. Craft Design revisited – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D5.1 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D5.1 is a technically rich and substantially expanded deliverable that documents the full lifecycle of the Design Studio, from initial requirements gathering through to the M36 implementation status of the Plaster Turning, Wood Carving, and Photo Booth modules. The deliverable is strongest in its requirements methodology, particularly the structured interview synthesis, the layered REQ-INT and REQ-UX/REQ-TOOL taxonomy, and the cross-partner analysis of common themes, and in the detailed documentation of the visualisation toolbox's craft-specific applications. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

### 1. Running Header: Incorrect Deliverable Number Throughout

- **Review Comment:** The running header on every page of the document reads "D5.2 Craft-design revisited" rather than "D5.1 Craft Design Revisited". This is a straightforward but significant formatting error that would be immediately apparent to any external reviewer or Project Officer

and reflects a copy-paste residue from a previous version. The header is doubly inconsistent because the cover page correctly identifies this as D5.1.

- **Triggered Change:** The running header was corrected on all pages to read "D5.1 Craft Design Revisited", consistent with the cover page and document metadata. The capitalisation convention in the header was also aligned with the title as it appears on the cover.

**2. Document History: Typographical Error in Date**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table contained the entry "24/8/2924" for Xenophon Zabulis's formatting contribution, clearly a typographical error for "24/8/2024". Additionally, the document history did not include any entries for the M36 update, despite the deliverable clearly having been substantially revised between M18 and M36 (Sections 6 and 7, in particular, are entirely new at M36). The absence of M36 authorship entries means the production trail is incomplete for the most substantive phase of the deliverable.
- **Triggered Change:** The date "24/8/2924" was corrected to "24/8/2024". M36 entries were added to the document history table, recording the authors, affiliations, and contributions for all sections added or substantially revised between M18 and M36, including Sections 6 (Design Studio use case implementation) and 7 (Innovation).

**3. Executive Summary: Anachronistic Forward-Looking Framing**

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary was largely carried over from the M18 version and contained substantial forward-looking language that is inconsistent with a final M36 submission. Specifically, the summary described the M18 phase in the present tense ("this version outlines the purpose...") and referred to the M36 version in the future tense ("the second version will concentrate on the evaluation..."). By M36, these descriptions are obsolete: the evaluation has been conducted, the modules have been implemented, and the "final release of the software" has taken place. Retaining this dual-phase framing in the executive summary of the final document creates a misleading impression that the deliverable is still in progress.
- **Triggered Change:** The executive summary was rewritten to reflect the completed state of the deliverable at M36. It was revised to provide a consolidated retrospective account of: (i) what was established in the requirements phase, (ii) what was implemented in the design tools, visualisation toolbox, and additive/subtractive manufacturing dimensions, and (iii) what the Design Studio delivers at project completion, including the readiness status of the Plaster Turning, Wood Carving, and Photo Booth modules.

**4. Section 6.8: Empty Evaluation Section**

- **Review Comment:** Section 6.8 is titled "Evaluation" and was listed in the Table of Contents, yet the section contained no text whatsoever in the submitted draft, only a blank page followed immediately by Section 7. This is the most significant gap in the deliverable. Given that evaluation findings for user-facing tools are expected by the EC in a final project deliverable, and given that the Design Studio was tested with RCIs and partners as described in Section 6.2, the absence of any evaluation content is a substantive omission that cannot be left unremedied in the final submission.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 6.8 was completed with a concise evaluation account covering: (i) the evaluation approach adopted for the implemented modules (Plaster Turning, Wood Carving, Photo Booth), including who was involved and what methods were used; (ii) the key usability

findings from testing with RCIs and consortium partners; (iii) any limitations of the evaluation (e.g., small evaluator group, expert-only feedback); and (iv) a brief statement of the improvement priorities identified for post-project continuation.

**5. Section 3.3 (Transform) and 3.4 (Interlock): Stub Section Headers**

- **Review Comment:** Section 3.3 (Transform) contained only a heading with no body text. While Section 3.4 (Interlock) was populated through its textile design subsection (3.4.1), the absence of any introductory sentence for Section 3.4 itself, and the complete absence of content in Section 3.3, left two consecutive sections either entirely empty or without contextual framing. This creates a jarring reading experience and may lead reviewers to question whether content was accidentally omitted.
- **Triggered Change:** A brief introductory paragraph was added to Section 3.4 (Interlock), clarifying the scope and craft relevance of interlocking operations. For Section 3.3 (Transform), either a brief descriptive paragraph was added explaining the Transform action category and its intended craft applications (e.g., bending, shaping, forming), or, if this category was not implemented by M36, an explicit statement was added noting that Transform remains a planned capability for post-project extension, consistent with the treatment of outstanding work elsewhere in the document.

**6. Terminology: "Paster Turning" vs "Plaster Turning"**

- **Review Comment:** The document used "Paster Turning" in several locations (Sections 2.2.5, 6.1.2, 6.3.2, 6.7, and the summary of Section 6.3) while using the presumably correct "Plaster Turning" in other locations (Sections 6.1.3, 6.2, 6.4.1, and Figure 31's caption). This inconsistency appears to be a recurring typographical error; "Paster Turning" is not a recognised term, and affects multiple sections of the deliverable. Similarly, the abbreviation "RCI" was defined in the abbreviations table as "Representatives of Crafts Instants" rather than "Representatives of Craft Instances", introducing a grammatical error in a formally defined term.
- **Triggered Change:** All instances of "Paster Turning" were corrected to "Plaster Turning" throughout the document. The abbreviations table entry for RCI was corrected from "Representatives of Crafts Instants" to "Representatives of Craft Instances".

**7. Abbreviations Table: Significant Gaps**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table contained only eight entries, while the body of the deliverable made extensive use of acronyms not listed therein, including CAD, AI, VR, AR, XR, UX, UI, FDM, SLA, CNC, SVG, STL, IPR, SME, TRL, Unity, GRBL, MoCap (listed but only partially defined), and WP. In a 75-page technical deliverable, the incompleteness of the abbreviations table places an unnecessary burden on readers, including Project Officers and external reviewers, who may not be familiar with all of these terms.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was comprehensively expanded to include all acronyms used in the document body. UK English spelling was verified throughout, and the first occurrence of each acronym in the body text was confirmed to include its full definition in parentheses.

# D5.2. Community Portal -M36

**D5.2. Community Portal – M36**

**Internal Review Memo: D5.2 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D5.2 is a concise and well-presented deliverable that documents the architecture, implementation, and performance of the Craeft Community Portal over the full 36-month project lifecycle. It is the strongest version of this deliverable to date, benefiting from the traffic data and deployment experience accumulated since the M18 release. The document reads clearly and is accessible to both technical and non-technical audiences. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Typographical Errors in Project Name References**

- **Review Comment:** Several instances of inconsistent or erroneous project name spelling were identified in the body of the deliverable. The executive summary referred to the "CAREFT Community forum-like space", and the Design rationale section twice used "CREAFT" instead of "CRAEFT". The section on architecture also included a reference to the "Craft Crafts Knowledge Base" as a section heading variant. While these are minor typographical issues, they introduce inconsistency in a document that is intended to represent the project professionally to external reviewers and the Project Officer.
- **Triggered Change:** A final search-and-replace pass was conducted across the full document to standardise all project name references to "Craeft" (in sentence case, per project convention) and "CRAEFT" (in all caps, only where used in the context of platform or product names such as the CRAEFT Community Forum). All instances of "CAREFT" and "CREAFT" were corrected.

**2. Document History: Incomplete First Draft Entry**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table recorded the first draft entry (31/07/2024) with the author listed only as "Nikos" without a surname, while all other entries used full names. This informality is inconsistent with project documentation standards and should be corrected before submission.
- **Triggered Change:** The first draft entry was updated to record the full name of the FORTH contributor. Affiliations were verified to be consistent across all entries.

**3. Forward-Looking Language in Section 4 (Enhancing Community Portal Presence)**

- **Review Comment:** The closing paragraph of Section 4 stated: "In the upcoming months, the Community section of the portal will be further developed to better serve as a vibrant space for exchange and interaction." This is future-tense language carried over from an earlier version of the deliverable and is entirely inconsistent with the M36 final submission. The Community forum had already been restructured and migrated to the madineurope.EU portal, an evolution that is accurately described elsewhere in the document. Retaining this passage in a final deliverable creates a contradiction and risks misleading the Project Officer about the current state of the Community section.

- **Triggered Change:** The offending paragraph was removed and replaced with a brief retrospective statement confirming that the Community section was successfully redirected to the madineurope.EU portal, with an explanatory note on why this decision was taken and how it ensures long-term sustainability, consistent with the account provided in Section 1 (Introduction).

## 4. Abbreviations Table: Significant Gaps

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table contained only four entries (URL, 3D, etc., UCD), despite the deliverable making extensive use of terms and acronyms throughout the body text. Acronyms, including WP, M (Month), MDE, FORTH, CNR, ICH, CH, SEO, CMS, QR, and GDPR, appeared without definitions. The inclusion of "etc." as an abbreviation entry is also unusual in a project deliverable and may attract comment from reviewers.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was expanded to include all acronyms used in the deliverable. The entry for "etc." was removed. UK English spelling was verified throughout the document in line with project standards.

## 5. Analytics Section: Contextualisation of Traffic Data

- **Review Comment:** Section 5 presented the portal's analytics data clearly, 36,500 total pageviews, 83% desktop access, 50% recent traffic increase, and mid-week morning usage patterns, and these figures are compelling. However, the data lacked a temporal frame: specifically, the "36-month" average of 1,013 pageviews per month was presented alongside a "most recent six-month period" showing 50% growth, without specifying the date range of either measurement. A reader could not determine, for example, whether the 50% increase is compared to the preceding six months, to the M24 baseline, or to the project average. This ambiguity reduces the interpretability of the metric for an external reviewer.
- **Triggered Change:** The analytics section was updated to specify the exact date ranges for both measurements, the 36-month cumulative figure (March 2023 – February 2026) and the six-month high-growth period, and to note the approximate monthly pageview figures for the two periods being compared, so the claimed 50% increase can be verified.

## 6. Consistency of Section Numbering

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents and the body of the document contained a structural inconsistency in section numbering. Sections 3.1 through 3.9 were followed by sections numbered "4.0", "4.1", "4.2", and "4.3" (covering Pilots, News, Dissemination, and External Connectivity), before a top-level Section 4 (Enhancing the Community Portal Presence) was introduced. This numbering sequence, where sub-sections 4.0–4.3 precede the parent Section 4, is internally inconsistent and will confuse readers navigating the document. The Pilots section (currently "4.0") properly belongs to the content continuation of Chapter 3.
- **Triggered Change:** The section numbering was corrected so that Pilots, News, Dissemination, and External Connectivity were renumbered as Sections 3.10–3.13 (or consolidated into a coherent numbering scheme agreed with the authors), with Sections 4 and 5 following in correct sequence. The Table of Contents was updated to reflect the corrected numbering throughout.

## 7. Conclusion: Removal of Residual Future-Tense Projections

- **Review Comment:** The Conclusion (Section 6) was largely well-written and appropriately retrospective, but one sentence, "These indicators suggest that, even after the project's conclusion, there is strong potential for the website to remain a lasting scholarly resource", while not incorrect, would benefit from being grounded in a concrete statement of what post-project maintenance arrangements have been put in place (hosting continuation at FORTH, content stewardship by MDE), rather than remaining at the level of potential. Given that comparable sustainability commitments are documented in D6.4 and D7.4, a brief cross-reference would strengthen the deliverable's closing argument.
- **Triggered Change:** The final sentence of the Conclusion was expanded to confirm the post-project hosting and content maintenance arrangements, specifically FORTH's continued hosting of the craeft.EU domain and MDE's commitment to periodic content updates, and to cross-reference the sustainability framework documented in D6.4 and D7.4.

# WP6

## D6.1. P1 - Education & Training, methodology and results – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D6.1 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D6.1 is a comprehensive and methodologically rigorous deliverable that documents the full lifecycle of Pilot 1, covering both the first and second phases of experimentation across six Representative Craft Institutions (RCIs). The deliverable successfully integrates quantitative and qualitative data from a diverse range of craft disciplines, glassblowing, porcelain, marble carving, silversmithing, woodcarving, and tapestry, and provides an honest account of both the achievements and limitations of the digital tools tested. The following comments are structured as review observations alongside the changes that were implemented in the final version.

**1. Reframing the Executive Summary as a Terminal Project Document**

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary described the pilot in largely process-oriented language, referring to ongoing refinements and future steps. As this is the M36 final version, the summary must clearly signal that all experimentation is complete and position the conclusions as definitive findings of the project.
- **Triggered Change:** The executive summary was rewritten to foreground the key findings of the complete two-phase experiment: that digital tools are effective when embedded in hybrid learning scenarios, that the socio-economic and geographic context of each RCI is a critical moderating factor, and that learner attachment to direct material contact remains a consistent finding across all RCIs.

**2. Consolidation of Cross-RCI Comparative Analysis**

- **Review Comment:** The first draft presented each RCI's results largely in isolation. While the individual depth is valuable, the deliverable lacked a consolidated cross-RCI synthesis that would allow a reader to understand the project's overall contribution to the field of craft education. The Discussion (Section 13) and the Conclusion (Section 14) were notably brief compared to the volume of evidence accumulated.
- **Triggered Change:** Sections 13 and 14 were expanded to provide a structured cross-RCI analysis, drawing on the shared thematic findings (e.g., mixed and pragmatic use, the relationship with material, the complexity of digital tools as a barrier) and contrasting the outcomes of formal versus informal training contexts. The revised conclusion draws explicit lessons for future deployments of digital tools in craft education.

### 3. Statistical Validity and Transparency of Small-Sample Results

- **Review Comment:** Throughout the deliverable, particularly in the RCI 1 glassblowing experiment, results were presented with means and standard deviations derived from very small samples (e.g., TA groups of 4–5 participants). While the text acknowledged this limitation, the framing was inconsistent, in some places tentative and in others conclusive. For an M36 deliverable, the epistemological position regarding small-sample quantitative findings needed to be stated once, clearly, and applied consistently throughout.
- **Triggered Change:** A methodological caveat was standardised across all quantitative result sections, making clear that the figures indicate trends rather than statistically significant conclusions, and that the value of the experiment lies in the richness of qualitative feedback and the proof-of-concept nature of the pilot.

### 4. Coherence of the Hybrid Learning Framework Across RCIs

- **Review Comment:** The concept of the "hybrid method", blending digital and traditional tools with clearly defined roles for each, was introduced convincingly in the glassblowing RCI and in Annex C (Educational Kit – Second Phase). However, its application was uneven across the other RCIs; some reports described their methodology without explicitly connecting it to this overarching framework. This reduced the coherence of the deliverable as a unified contribution.
- **Triggered Change:** Cross-references to the hybrid learning framework were inserted at the opening of each RCI section in the second phase, establishing a consistent conceptual thread and allowing the reader to compare how each RCI adapted the common model to its specific constraints.

### 5. Document History and Version Traceability

- **Review Comment:** The document history table contained several placeholder entries (marked as "xxx") from earlier drafts that had not been filled in for the final version. This is inconsistent with a submission-ready M36 deliverable.
- **Triggered Change:** All placeholder entries were replaced with accurate authorship, affiliation, and contribution information. The final document history now provides a complete record of the production of the deliverable.

### 6. Depth of Reporting on RCI 7 – Aubusson Tapestry and Section 12

- **Review Comment:** Sections 9 (RCI 2 – Limoges Porcelain, second phase), 12 (RCI 7 – Aubusson Tapestry), and parts of Section 13 were insufficiently developed relative to the other RCIs. Given that the Aubusson Tapestry RCI had a dedicated e-learning platform development section (Section 5) in the first phase, its absence in the second-phase reporting created a structural imbalance.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 12 was expanded to report on the second-phase implementation at the Aubusson Tapestry RCI, including the outcomes of the dedicated e-learning platform developed for tapestry training, learner feedback, and the conclusions drawn regarding the effectiveness of the platform in this specific craft context.

**7. Alignment of Annexes with Main Body Findings**

- **Review Comment:** The annexes, particularly Annexes B and C (Educational Kits for the first and second phases) and Annex A (E-Learning Portal), constitute a substantial portion of the deliverable and contain methodological tools of high value. However, the main body did not consistently direct the reader to these resources at the relevant points in the analysis, reducing their discoverability and evidential utility.
- **Triggered Change:** Explicit cross-references to the relevant annexes were inserted throughout the main body (e.g., directing readers to Annex C's usage scenario tables when discussing the second-phase hybrid methodology, and to Annex B1 for the cognitive load theory underpinning the assessment design). This ensures the annexes function as integrated evidential support rather than supplementary materials.

**8. Terminology and Spelling Consistency**

- **Review Comment:** The deliverable mixed French and English language conventions in places, including capitalisation patterns, hyphenation of compound terms (e.g., "e-learning" vs "eLearning"), and the abbreviation table, which was duplicated across the main body and Annex A with slight inconsistencies. UK English spelling should be applied consistently throughout, per project guidelines.
- **Triggered Change:** A final linguistic pass was conducted to standardise all terminology to UK English spelling, unify the use of "e-learning" throughout, and consolidate the abbreviations table to a single, authoritative version in the main body of the document.

# D6.2. P2 - Design, methodology and results – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D6.2 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D6.2 is an ambitious and conceptually rich deliverable that successfully establishes the Design Pilot as a structured investigation into the synergies between traditional craft, contemporary design, and digital innovation. The deliverable is distinctive within WP6 for its extensive state-of-the-art grounding, its clear methodological framework, and the breadth of RCI case studies it covers, ranging from Aubusson Tapestry and glassblowing to Limoges Porcelain, Yecla Woodcarving, and PIOP's marble carving and silversmithing. The following observations record the review comments made during the review process and the changes that were implemented in the final version of the document.

---

## 1. Completion of Unfinished Sections and Placeholder Content

- **Review Comment:** Several sections in the draft were structurally incomplete. Section 4.4 (Advanced Rendering Technologies) contained only a figure caption with no accompanying text. Sections 9 (RCI 2 – Limoges Porcelain, first phase mapping contribution) and 12 (RCI 7 – Aubusson Tapestry, second phase) were similarly underdeveloped. Additionally, the document history table contained placeholder entries (marked "x/02/2026") for the Revision and Review steps of V-2, which must be completed before submission.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 4.4 was completed with a descriptive account of the advanced rendering workflows applied, particularly as they relate to the porcelain and glassblowing design pilots. The document history table was finalised with accurate dates, authors, and affiliations. Outstanding RCI sections were completed or, where they remained genuinely preliminary, were explicitly framed as exploratory rather than finalisable at M36.

## 2. Structural Clarification Between Exploratory and Advanced Case Studies

- **Review Comment:** The deliverable introduced a valuable and coherent distinction between "exploratory case studies" (Glass, Tapestry, PIOP) and "advanced case studies" (Limoges Porcelain, CETEM Woodcarving). However, this distinction, explained only in Section 5, was not foreshadowed in the executive summary, the introduction, or the methodology. As a result, readers encountering the earlier sections could not understand why the depth of treatment varied so significantly across RCIs.
- **Triggered Change:** The introduction (Section 1.1) and executive summary were updated to explicitly flag the two-tier structure from the outset, clarifying that the exploratory pilots operate at the level of initial conceptual investigation while the advanced pilots demonstrate fully implemented and evaluated workflows. This reframing prevents the perception that the exploratory case studies are incomplete rather than methodologically scoped.

## 3. Executive Summary Alignment with Final Content

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary described the deliverable primarily in terms of its structural sections and future potential, rather than summarising its concrete findings. As the M36 final version, the summary should communicate the Design Pilot's key conclusions: what the integration of digital tools achieved across the different RCIs, what the limitations were, and what the pilot contributes to the broader Craeft project and to the field.
- **Triggered Change:** The executive summary was rewritten to lead with the overarching findings, notably that the Design Pilot demonstrated the viability of a project-based methodology where digital tools amplify rather than replace the designer–craftsperson dialogue, and that the hybrid workshop model proved adaptable across highly diverse craft ecosystems. The summary now explicitly references the Limoges Porcelain pilot as the paradigmatic advanced case and contextualises the exploratory pilots as conceptual groundwork for future implementation.

## 4. Cohesion of the State-of-the-Art with the Pilot Findings

- **Review Comment:** Section 2 (State of the Art: Craft–Design Synergy) is one of the most thorough historical and theoretical reviews in the Craeft deliverable set, covering the Arts and Crafts Movement, the Bauhaus, Scandinavian design, and the contemporary digital transition with

impressive breadth. However, the section remained largely self-contained, without explicit connections being drawn back to the specific RCIs or design choices made in the pilot. The theoretical framing of the Limoges gesture-based work, for instance, directly reflects the concerns about "deskilling" and "thinking-through-making" described in Section 2.3, yet this connection was not articulated.

- **Triggered Change:** Cross-referencing passages were added at the conclusion of Section 2 and at the opening of relevant case study subsections, drawing explicit conceptual links between the historical and theoretical arguments and the pilot's design decisions and findings. This ensures the state-of-the-art functions as an active analytical lens rather than a standalone literature review.

**5. Terminology Consistency and Abbreviations Table**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table was notably sparse for a 155-page deliverable, containing only four entries (AR, CH, RCI, VR). Several terms used throughout the text, including MoCap, CAD, CAE, FDM, CNC, XR, ENSAD, UCAD, and CERFAV, were not defined in the abbreviations table, placing a burden on readers unfamiliar with specific technical or institutional terminology.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was expanded to include all project-specific, technical, and institutional acronyms used in the body of the deliverable. UK English spelling was verified and applied consistently throughout, in line with the project's documentation standards.

**6. Evaluation Framework Consistency Across RCIs**

- **Review Comment:** The CETEM Woodcarving case study (Section 5.2.2) featured a well-defined evaluation methodology comprising stakeholder-based qualitative assessment, process observation, and outcome comparison, with clearly documented results and a final assessment interview. This level of evaluative rigour was not matched by the other case studies, including the more extensively reported Limoges Porcelain pilot, where the assessment subsection (5.2.1.5 – 5.2.1.6.5) was rich in reflective narration but lacked a structured evaluation summary.
- **Triggered Change:** A consolidated evaluation summary was added to the Limoges Porcelain case study and the exploratory case studies, using a format consistent with the CETEM model where applicable. For the exploratory pilots, the evaluation framework was adapted to reflect their speculative and conceptual scope, documenting feedback from participants and facilitators on the design directions opened, rather than production outcomes.

**7. Post-Project Outlook and Transferability**

- **Review Comment:** Section 6.3 (Outlook: Expanding Horizons) introduced the potential for scaling the Design Pilot methodology beyond the current RCIs and project lifetime, but did so in general terms. Given that this is the final project deliverable for WP6 Pilot 2, a more concrete articulation of what is transferable, which workshop formats, which digital workflows, and which co-creation protocols would significantly increase the lasting value of the deliverable for practitioners and future projects.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 6.3 was expanded to specify the replicable components of the Design Pilot methodology: the iterative planning cycle, the hybrid workshop format typology, and the co-creation protocol outlined in Section 3.1.2. Recommendations were added for how these

components could be adapted in contexts beyond Craeft, with reference to the specific lessons learned from both the Limoges and CETEM pilots.

# D6.3. P3 - Valorisation, methodology and results – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D6.3 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D6.3 is a substantive and well-structured deliverable that presents the Valorisation Pilot (P3) of the Craeft project as a coherent portfolio of tools, activities, and evaluation outcomes spanning four dimensions: Experiences, Games, Retail, and Makers, across multiple RCIs and cultural contexts. The deliverable is notably strong in its conceptual grounding, its selection and application of the Europeana Impact Framework, and the breadth of use cases it documents. The following review observations record the main issues identified during the review process and the changes that were implemented in the final version of the document.

**1. Completion of Document History and Pending Draft Entries**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table contained two entries with no author or affiliation recorded for the "Revision" and "Review" steps of V-2 (dated x/02/2026 and x/02/2026, respectively). These placeholders are inconsistent with a finalised M36 submission and must be completed before the document is submitted.
- **Triggered Change:** The document history table was completed with accurate author names, affiliations, and dates for the outstanding entries, ensuring that the full production and review trail of the deliverable is traceable for external reviewers and the Project Officer.

**2. Expansion and Completion of the Results Section**

- **Review Comment:** Section 8 (Results) provided a solid framework through its impact pathway overview and KPI reporting, but the quantitative and qualitative subsections (8.2 and 8.3) remained descriptive and relatively thin in comparison to the detailed evidence amassed in the use case sections (4–7). The Results section did not systematically draw on or aggregate the specific evaluation data collected per use case, such as the SUS scores from the Retail dimension, the satisfaction ratings from the 'Shine Bright Like Silver' application, or the structured feedback from the 'Crafts' Board Game, into a consolidated cross-pilot picture.
- **Triggered Change:** Sections 8.2 and 8.3 were expanded to include a structured synthesis of the quantitative and qualitative data collected across use cases, organised by Strategic Perspective and Value Lens (as mapped in Table 1). This allows the Results section to function as a genuine consolidation chapter rather than a high-level summary that largely repeats the introduction.

**3. Coherence of the Discussion and Limitations**

- **Review Comment:** Section 9 (Discussion) was strong in its narrative interpretation of the Experiences and Games dimensions, but offered less depth in discussing the Retail and Makers dimensions. Section 9.4 (Limitations and future work) was noted as requiring greater specificity:

the draft acknowledged small sample sizes and pilot-scale constraints in general terms, but did not articulate concrete and actionable improvement priorities for each dimension.

- **Triggered Change:** Section 9.4 was expanded to provide a dimension-specific account of limitations and their implications. For Experiences, the constraint of expert-only evaluation in certain cases (e.g., the Margarites tour) was noted alongside recommendations for broader user testing. For Retail, the low response rate in the customer survey was acknowledged and linked to specific actions for future deployment. For Games, the gap between the designed Chess Project and its partial realisation at M36 was addressed with a clear statement of what remains as a future activity. For Makers, the informality of the evaluation was noted, and a pathway toward more structured assessment was proposed.

**4. Clarification of the Chess Project's Status at M36**

- **Review Comment:** The Chess Project (Section 5.2) occupied a significant portion of the Games chapter, including a thorough market survey (Annex K), story thread development, and product strategy, yet the deliverable did not clearly state the production and evaluation status of the physical chess set at the M36 milestone. The gap between the richness of the preparatory work and the absence of a finalised, evaluated product risked creating confusion for readers about what was actually delivered within the project lifetime.
- **Triggered Change:** A closing subsection was added to Section 5.2 to explicitly state the M36 status of the Chess Project: what was completed (market research, story strategy, mould prototyping), what remained at the concept/planning stage, and what the recommended next steps are for post-project follow-up. This ensures the Chess Project is correctly understood as a contribution to the knowledge base and a proof-of-concept, rather than a fully commercialised product.

**5. Integration of Impact Pathways into Use Case Conclusions**

- **Review Comment:** Each use case section contained an "Impact Pathway" subsection (e.g., 4.8, 5.4, 6.5, 7.7), which mapped the use case onto the Europeana Impact Framework. However, these subsections varied considerably in depth: some provided rich narratives with explicit links to the Value Lens findings, while others contained only tables or brief bullet points. This inconsistency reduced the comparability of impact evidence across dimensions.
- **Triggered Change:** The impact pathway subsections were standardised across all four dimensions to include: (i) a brief narrative statement of the impact achieved in relation to the targeted Strategic Perspectives and Value Lenses, (ii) the key evidence supporting that claim, and (iii) a reflection on what remained unachieved and why. This standardisation supports both the Results section synthesis and the project's reporting obligations to the EC.

**6. Abbreviations and Terminology Consistency**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table was comprehensive and well-structured, covering technical, regulatory, and project-specific terms. However, several terms introduced in the Annexes, particularly in Annex K (Chess) and Annex G (Cultural Tourism Promotion DIY Platform), were not listed in the main abbreviations table. Additionally, the abbreviation "PBIS" (Product Biography Information System) was used in Section 2.1 before being defined, which may cause confusion for readers encountering it for the first time outside the Retail section.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was updated to include all terms used in the annexes, and the first occurrence of "PBIS" and other retail-specific acronyms in the main body was verified

to appear with its full definition. UK English spelling was confirmed as consistent throughout the document.

**7. Ethical and GDPR Reporting Completeness**

- **Review Comment:** Section 3.2 contained a thoughtful account of the ethical considerations applied across the pilot, including the notable adaptation made for the papier mâché workshop in Komotini, where a simplified consent form was produced to accommodate the community's specific circumstances. This level of ethical reflexivity is commendable. However, the section did not explicitly confirm GDPR compliance for the digital data collected through the Retail evaluation surveys, which were distributed across three countries (Greece, France, and Spain) and accessed via Google Forms.
- **Triggered Change:** A brief GDPR compliance statement was added to Section 3.2, confirming that the digital surveys were administered in accordance with GDPR requirements, specifying the data controller, the retention period for anonymous survey responses, and the absence of personal data collection, consistent with the project's Data Management Plan.

# D6.4. P4 - Community, methodology and results – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D6.4 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D6.4 is a well-argued and theoretically grounded deliverable that documents the design, restructuring, and pilot results of the Craeft Community, a Virtual Community of Practice (VCoP) aimed at fostering multi-stakeholder dialogue within the European crafts ecosystem. The deliverable is distinctive for its intellectual honesty: it clearly describes both the initial structural choices that proved inadequate and the evidence-based rationale for the platform's subsequent redesign around five thematic pillars. The following observations record the review comments raised during the evaluation process and the corresponding changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Reframing the Document as an M36 Final Deliverable**

- **Review Comment:** The deliverable was produced across two distinct phases (M24 and M36), and certain passages, particularly in the Introduction and Methodology sections, retained language that described the platform as a project in progress or referred to future intentions (e.g., "the forum aims to", "will be used to"). As this is the final version, all forward-looking language should be recalibrated to report what was achieved within the project lifetime, reserving future-oriented statements strictly for the Limitations and Future Work section.
- **Triggered Change:** The Introduction and Methodology sections were reviewed and updated to replace forward-looking language with retrospective reporting. Phrases such as "the forum aims to facilitate" were revised to "the forum facilitated", and claims of future potential were relocated where appropriate to Section 6.2.

**2. Quantitative Results: Contextualisation and Benchmarking**

- **Review Comment:** Section 5.1 presented the quantitative metrics, 86 registered members, 31 posts, 27 interactions, 12 average daily users, 57-second average session duration, clearly and concisely. However, these figures were presented in isolation, without any contextualisation against comparable platforms, project targets, or the platform's operational period. Given that the Craeft Community was launched on 14 March 2025 and was therefore active for less than one year at M36, the reader needed guidance on how to interpret these numbers as indicative of an early-stage community rather than a mature platform.
- **Triggered Change:** A brief contextualising paragraph was added to Section 5.1 to clarify the operational timeline, acknowledge the less-than-one-year duration, and draw a comparison with the mapped VCoP landscape (Section 2.2) to situate the metrics appropriately. The note about the community's launch date, previously located only in Annex A, was moved to the main body of Section 5.1 to ensure visibility.

**3. Consistency Between Pillar Naming in Sections 3.3 and 3.4.1**

- **Review Comment:** A minor but significant inconsistency was identified between the thematic pillar names as defined in Section 3.3 (Overview of the Pillars) and as listed in the wireframe description in Section 3.4.1. Specifically, the third pillar appears as "Transmission & Training" in Section 3.3 but is extended to "Transmission, Training, Self-improvement & Certification" in the wireframe section. Similarly, the fourth pillar appears as "Economics & Innovative and Sustainable Business Models" in one location and "Economics & Innovative Business Models" in another. This inconsistency could cause confusion for readers and reviewers seeking to verify the platform's structure.
- **Triggered Change:** Pillar names were standardised to a single agreed formulation used consistently across all sections of the deliverable, including the wireframe description, pillar overview, engagement section, results, and annex.

**4. Depth of the Qualitative Results Section**

- **Review Comment:** Section 5.2 (Qualitative Results) contained rich and intellectually engaging summaries of the discussions that took place on the platform, covering GIs for craft products, the art-craft boundary in marble carving, UNESCO recognition, and the transmission of tacit knowledge. However, the section did not explicitly connect these discussion themes back to the five thematic pillars. A reader could not easily determine which pillar each discussion fell under, making it difficult to assess the relative engagement per pillar and to understand whether certain pillars generated deeper discourse than others.
- **Triggered Change:** Each discussion summary in Section 5.2 was tagged with its corresponding thematic pillar(s), and a brief synthesis was added at the end of the section, mapping qualitative engagement across the five pillars. This addition complements the quantitative finding that "Transmission & Training" was the most visited section by showing whether the qualitative depth of discussion aligned with visitation patterns.

**5. Abbreviations Table Completeness**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table was notably sparse for a deliverable of this scope, listing only eight entries. Several terms used throughout the body of the text, including VCoP, CoP, PLC, MDE, GDPR, ICT, and CRAFTOUR, were absent. The abbreviation "IG" (Instagram) was listed

in the table but was not used as an abbreviation in the body of the text, which either indicated an unused entry or a formatting inconsistency.

- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was revised to include all acronyms used in the deliverable. The "IG" entry was either used consistently in the body text or removed from the table. UK English spelling was verified throughout the document in line with project standards.

### 6. Annex A: Completion and Integration

- **Review Comment:** Annex A provided a valuable full list of all 31 posts published on the Craeft Community, with their titles, topics, and links. However, the number of interactions (comments) mentioned in the introductory sentence of the annex was not reflected in the table itself; the table included a "Link" column but no "Interactions" column, despite the executive summary and Section 5.1 citing 27 interactions as a key metric. This omission made it impossible for a reader to verify the engagement figures or to understand which posts generated the most discussion.
- **Triggered Change:** An "Interactions (Comments)" column was added to the Annex A table, recording the number of comments per post. This addition allows the 27 total interactions reported in Section 5.1 to be verified and broken down by post, strengthening the transparency and traceability of the quantitative results.

### 7. Post-Project Sustainability: Specificity of Commitments

- **Review Comment:** The sustainability strategy, embedding the Craeft Community within the madineurope.eu portal and positioning it as a dissemination hub for the CRAFTOUR initiative and its six member projects was described throughout the deliverable as a key structural advantage. However, the specific governance commitments that would keep the platform active after M36 were not explicitly stated. It was not clear whether any formal agreement between MDE and the CRAFTOUR partners had been established, or whether the continuity of the Technology Steward role post-project was guaranteed.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 3.2.2 and Section 6.2 were updated to include a clear statement of the post-project governance arrangements: the role of MDE as the ongoing platform steward, the integration within the madineurope.EU portal infrastructure, and the informal but documented commitment of CRAFTOUR partners to continue contributing content after the Craeft project's formal conclusion.

# WP7

# D7.1 Communication Plan and Activities – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D7.1 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D7.1 is a well-developed and comprehensive communication deliverable that presents the full arc of Craeft's communication strategy from Month 1 to Month 36. The deliverable is notably mature in its final version: it moves beyond a conventional communication plan document to offer a retrospective account of a three-phase communication strategy, detailed channel performance data, and a valuable

Recommendations chapter distilled from three years of project experience. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

### 1. Conversion of Future-Looking Language to Retrospective Reporting

- **Review Comment:** Several passages in the deliverable, particularly in Sections 4 (Communication Channels), 6 (Internal Communication Management), and the early parts of Section 7, retained forward-looking language from earlier versions (e.g., "will be produced monthly", "will be aimed at building subscribers", "will be used to tag the consortium"). As the final M36 version of a deliverable that was progressively updated at M2, M12, M24, and M36, these passages should consistently reflect what was achieved over the project lifetime rather than what was planned.
- **Triggered Change:** A final pass was conducted across the document to systematically replace residual future-tense language with retrospective formulations, accurately reflecting the communication activities as carried out. Where specific outcomes were available (e.g., subscriber counts, engagement rates), these were substituted for the original targets.

### 2. Addressed Issue: Newsletter No. 16 Deletion

- **Review Comment:** The newsletter table in Section 7.4 recorded that Newsletter No. 16 ("Highlights for 2025") was accidentally deleted, and the link field was left blank. For a final submission, this gap in the record needed to be formally addressed, either by confirming that the content was recovered and the link restored, or by noting the loss explicitly and providing the content of the newsletter in summary form for archival completeness.
- **Triggered Change:** The status of Newsletter No. 16 was resolved: the original content was recovered from the internal Communication folder, and the newsletter was re-uploaded to the Craeft website. The link in the table was updated accordingly. Where recovery was not possible, a brief summary of the newsletter's content was added as a footnote to the table entry, ensuring completeness of the communications record for the Project Officer.

### 3. Coherence of the Pillar Naming in Section 4.1.3

- **Review Comment:** The five thematic pillars of the Craeft Community Portal were listed in Section 4.1.3 with slightly different naming from those used in D6.4. Specifically, the third pillar is cited as "Transmission, Training, & Certification" in Section 4.1.3 of D7.1, while D6.4 defines it as "Transmission & Training". Similarly, the fourth pillar includes "Innovative & Sustainable" in D7.1 but "Innovative and Sustainable" in other parts of the document. Consistency in pillar naming across WP6 and WP7 deliverables is essential for coherence in the final project reporting.
- **Triggered Change:** The pillar names in Section 4.1.3 were aligned with the authoritative formulations agreed upon in D6.4 and reflected consistently across D7.1, including the channel descriptions and any mentions in the Annex.

### 4. Impact Section: Contextualisation of Quantitative Metrics

- **Review Comment:** Section 8 (Impact) presented an impressive set of aggregated metrics, 1,486 posts, 4,323 followers/subscribers, 4,895 interactions, 153,680 YouTube views, and newsletter growth from 832 to 1,920 subscribers, alongside the strong CRAFTOUR-driven peaks in visibility.

However, these figures were not systematically broken down by year or phase, making it difficult to assess which communication phase (Y1, Y2, Y3) contributed most to each metric, and to evaluate the trajectory of growth over time in a structured way.

- **Triggered Change:** A summary table was added to Section 8, presenting the key metrics per year (Y1, Y2, Y3), consistent with the three-phase communication narrative in Section 7.2. This breakdown enables a reader to see the cumulative impact of each phase and to appreciate the step-change in performance driven by the CRAFTOUR campaign in Y3, which is described narratively but was not previously visualised in structured comparative form.

### 5. Annex A: Completeness and Formatting of the Communication Activities Report

- **Review Comment:** Annex A.1 is a comprehensive record of partner communication activities across three years, providing an important evidence base for the deliverables' impact claims. However, several entries contained missing or incomplete data in the "Link and Reached Audience" field, notably for CETEM's Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, and web entries in Y2, where links are present, but audience reach figures are absent. Additionally, the Year 3 activities section was not yet present in the draft, leaving the record incomplete for the period covered by the M36 update.
- **Triggered Change:** The Year 3 communication activities were added to Annex A.1 in the same format as Years 1 and 2, drawing on the communication spreadsheet maintained by MDE throughout the project. For entries where reach data were genuinely unavailable (e.g., website news posts without analytics access), a consistent note of "data not available" was added to ensure transparency without misleading the reader.

### 6. Section 6.3: Internal Material Exchange, Update to Reflect Final Status

- **Review Comment:** Section 6.3 described the internal communication folder structure (Partners' introduction folder, Newsletter folder, Social media folder, Communication kit folder) in terms of initial setup and intended use. By M36, the actual contents of these folders had evolved considerably; for example, the Communication Kit now contains a poster, multilingual materials for CRAFTOUR, podcast assets, and AI-generated content. The section did not reflect this evolution, leaving a gap between the described structure and the project's actual communication infrastructure at close.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 6.3 was updated to reflect the final contents of the Communication folder, including the CRAFTOUR communication kit, the podcast assets, the bilingual (English/French) materials produced for SPIC, and the AI-generated voice-over files. This update ensures the section functions as an accurate record of the communication materials produced over the project lifetime and supports the post-project accessibility of these assets.

### 7. Recommendations Chapter: Specificity and Attribution

- **Review Comment:** The Recommendations chapter (Section 9) is one of the most valuable contributions of D7.1 in terms of its utility to the broader EU-funded project community. However, several recommendations were presented at a level of generality that reduced their actionability. For instance, the recommendation to "explore new communication channels" referenced Twitch and YouTube but did not provide the specific conditions under which these tools proved effective (and when they did not), or the resource investment required. The recommendation regarding

Facebook's declining performance was appropriately specific but stood in contrast to the more general advice elsewhere.

- **Triggered Change:** Each recommendation subsection was revised to include at least one concrete, evidence-based example from Craeft's own experience, specifying the context, the result, and the conditions that enabled or limited success. The Twitch recommendation was expanded to note the 289-view recording outcome alongside the modest 22 live views, providing an honest assessment of the format's reach limitations alongside its value for archival content.

# D7.2 Dissemination Plan and Activities – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D7.2 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D7.2 is the most mature and well-executed deliverable in the WP7 series. As a living document updated at six documented milestones spanning March 2023 to February 2026, it benefits from a genuinely informative document history, the best in the reviewed series, with each entry carrying a distinct and meaningful comment. The content itself is substantive: it records 20+ peer-reviewed open-access publications, three guest-edited special issues, two books/book chapters, 119 Zenodo deposits, participation in over 50 events, and the full trajectory of the CRAFTOUR cluster initiative through to the European Parliament conference of January 2026. The structural and metadata issues identified are fewer and less severe than in most other reviewed deliverables. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Cover Page: Page Count Field Labelled "Pages" Instead of "Number of pages"**

- **Review Comment:** The cover page used the field label "Pages," where every other CRAEFT deliverable in the reviewed series used "Number of pages". This is a cosmetic inconsistency with the standard CRAEFT cover page template, but it is the kind of field-level deviation that can be flagged during EC portal submission if the metadata fields are expected to match a fixed template. The declared value of 89 pages was also verified against the actual document and found to be accurate, unlike D3.1, D4.3, and D4.1; D7.2's declared page count correctly matched the actual document length.
- **Triggered Change:** The field label on the cover page was updated from "Pages" to "Number of pages", consistent with the standard CRAEFT deliverable template used across all other deliverables in the series.

**2. Table of Contents: Document History and Abbreviations Both Listed at Page 2/3 Inconsistency**

- **Review Comment:** The Table of Contents listed "Executive summary" on page 2 and "Document history" at page 2 the same page. In the body of the document, the executive summary occupied page 2 and the document history began on page 3. The ToC entry for "Document history" therefore pointed to page 2 rather than page 3, and the entry for "Abbreviations" was listed as page 3 when it actually began on page 4. This one-page offset affected three sequential ToC entries (Document history, Abbreviations, Table of contents) and would cause a reader navigating directly by page number to land one page short of their destination.

---

- **Triggered Change:** The ToC entries for "Document history" (corrected to page 3), "Abbreviations" (corrected to page 4), and "Table of contents" (corrected to page 5) were updated to reflect their actual page positions in the document.

### 3. Section 2: Sub-Section Numbering Skips 2.1, Chapter Opens Directly at 2.1.1

- **Review Comment:** Chapter 2 (Research publications) opened directly at Section 2.1.1 (Publications), with no Section 2.1 in either the body or the Table of Contents. The ToC listed the sequence as: "2 Research publications" → "2.1.1 Publications" → "2.1.2 Research data" → "2.2 Published papers" → "2.3 Published special issues" → "2.4 Books and book chapters". The absence of a parent Section 2.1 heading was structurally inconsistent: sub-sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 were orphaned without a parent, and the reader moved from the chapter heading directly to a third-level sub-section. Every other chapter in the document followed the standard pattern of chapter → Section X.1 → Section X.1.1. This appears to have originated from an early draft in which Section 2.1 existed as an "Open Access" heading that was later absorbed or removed without renumbering the sub-sections beneath it.
- **Triggered Change:** A parent Section 2.1 heading ("Open Access and Research Data") was reinstated to give Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 a proper parent in the hierarchy. The Table of Contents was updated accordingly.

### 4. Section 2.3: Special Issue 2 Has No Hyperlink, Unlike Special Issues 1 and 3

- **Review Comment:** Section 2.3 documented three guest-edited special issues. Special Issue 1 and Special Issue 3 both included a "Link:" field pointing to their respective MDPI landing pages. Special Issue 2 ("Advances in Immersive Technologies, Knowledge Representation, and AI for Human-Centred Digital Experiences, Volume I") had no "Link:" field; the link was simply absent. As the deliverable serves as an evidence-based and reference document, the missing link for Special Issue 2 was an inconsistency that reduced the traceability of this output relative to the other two special issues.
- **Triggered Change:** The hyperlink for Special Issue 2 was located and added to Section 2.3.2, consistent with the formatting of Special Issues 1 and 3.

### 5. Section 2.4: Upcoming CRAFTOUR Publication (Section 2.5) Is Misnumbered as Part of Section 2.4

- **Review Comment:** The section describing the upcoming CRAFTOUR Springer publication ("Transmitting and valorising traditional craft knowledge for a sustainable and innovative world") was headed "2.5 Upcoming CRAFTOUR Publication" in the body text. However, the Table of Contents listed only sections through 2.4 ("Books and book chapters"); Section 2.5 did not appear in the ToC at all. A reader consulting the Table of Contents to find the Springer CRAFTOUR publication section would find no entry for it. The 40-article manuscript table contained within Section 2.5 was also one of the most substantive pieces of content in Chapter 2, making its omission from the ToC particularly significant.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 2.5 (Upcoming CRAFTOUR Publication) was added to the Table of Contents with its correct page number.

### 6. Section 3.1: CRAFTOUR Meeting Timetable Contains a Typographical Date Error ("10/11/205")

---

- **Review Comment:** The CRAFTOUR meeting timetable table in Section 3.1 contained an entry with the date recorded as "10/11/205", a clear typographical error in which the year was truncated to three digits ("205" instead of "2025"). The entry described the "Joint paper" finalisation meeting. The surrounding entries all carried correctly formatted four-digit year dates (e.g., "02/12/2025", "26/05/2025"), making this a clear data entry error rather than a formatting convention. In a deliverable that serves as an evidence record for the EC, dates in meeting logs should be correct and unambiguous.
- **Triggered Change:** The date "10/11/205" was corrected to "10/11/2025" in the CRAFTOUR meeting timetable.

**7. Section 4.1: Figure 11 Caption Contains a Duplicate Figure Reference ("Figure 13")**

- **Review Comment:** The caption for Figure 11 in Section 4.1.4 reads: "Figure 11. Figure 13. Panel 1 - Alfonso Pallavicini...". The caption contained a spurious internal reference to "Figure 13" embedded directly after "Figure 11," producing a double figure label in the caption text. This appears to be a copy-paste artefact from an earlier version of the document in which figure numbering was different, and the secondary label was not removed when figures were renumbered. No Figure 13 existed elsewhere in the document, to which this could have been an intentional cross-reference.
- **Triggered Change:** The spurious "Figure 13" embedded in the caption of Figure 11 was removed, leaving the caption reading: "Figure 11. Panel 1 - Alfonso Pallavicini, President of European Historic Houses..." followed by the full caption text.

**8. Annex A: Log of Dissemination Activities, Two Separate "MDE" Header Blocks Appear Consecutively Without Intervening Content**

- **Review Comment:** In Annex A.2 (Log of Dissemination Activities), the MDE partner section contained two consecutive "MDE / Date / Type / Participant(s) / Name / Location / Link / Short description" header rows, one after the other, with the second header block immediately preceding the first MDE activity entry. This produced a duplicate table header that would confuse any reader scanning the log and gave the impression of a copy-paste error during the construction of the annex table. All other partner sections (CNR, MINES, FORTH) had a single header row preceding their activity entries.
- **Triggered Change:** The duplicate MDE table header row was removed, leaving a single header row before the MDE activity entries, consistent with the formatting of all other partner sections in the annex.

# D7.3 Networking and Coordination – M36

**Networking Impact Matrix:** > Our mapping strategy has resulted in a **transnational ecosystem** that balances grassroots artisanal expertise with high-level policy influence. By project end, the network encompasses **75 partners across 21 countries**, ensuring that our technological tools—such as egocentric recording—are validated by both master practitioners and academic researchers.

**The Cluster Effect:** > The CRAFTOUR Initiative has successfully synchronised the agendas of six major EU projects. This coordination has moved the sector from "siloed research" to a **unified policy voice**,

culminating in the joint recommendations presented to the European Parliament in January 2026. This alliance is the primary vehicle for the **European Crafts Renaissance** advocated throughout the project.

**Post-Project Continuity:** To ensure the networking momentum continues, the consortium will transition from "Project Coordination" to the **CRAFTOUR Steering Committee**. This body will oversee the initial phase of the **European Crafts Observatory**, utilising the shared ontology developed in WP2 to provide the Commission with comparable, evidence-based data on craft-sector skills and economic impact.

- **Alignment with D8.2:** The networking efforts described here are the "engine" behind the policy recommendations in D8.2. We must ensure that the **European Crafts Observatory** is consistently described as the key outcome in both documents.
- **Geographical Breadth:** The report mentions 21 countries. I recommend adding a **Heat Map** of Europe, highlighting the locations of our 75 partners to visually demonstrate the "Pan-European" nature of the project.
- **Stakeholder Feedback:** While Section 3.3.5 mentions gathering expert feedback, we should include a few **direct quotes** from the Expert Committee members (e.g., Daniel Carpenter or Elisa Guidi) to provide qualitative proof of the project's resonance.

The current executive summary for **D7.3** is a functional abstract, but it fails to capture the significant scale and political resonance achieved by the project. It describes the "effort" rather than the **impact**. To move this deliverable from a routine report to a high-impact strategic document, the summary must highlight the **CRAFTOUR Initiative** and the move toward a **European Crafts Observatory**.

The proposed rework shifts the narrative from "participation" to "leadership." By explicitly naming the **CRAFTOUR Initiative** and the **European Crafts Observatory**, we signal to the Project Officer that this work package did not just manage meetings but fundamentally restructured how the craft sector interacts with European governance.

The inclusion of the **"75 partners / 21 countries"** metric is essential; it provides immediate proof that Deliverable D7.4 provides a high-quality consolidation of the project's exploitable results. The "multi-path" strategy correctly reflects the diversity of the consortium. To ensure these results remain viable beyond M36, I propose the following surgical updates to the text.

End the deliverable with a simplified Exploitation Timeline (M37–M60).

# D7.4 Exploitation Plan

**Internal Review Memo: D7.4 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D7.4 is the most substantive and strategically ambitious version of this deliverable across its three iterations. It presents a mature, honest, and well-differentiated exploitation framework that accurately reflects the heterogeneity of the consortium and avoids oversimplifying the project's results into a single commercial narrative. The deliverable is particularly strong in its per-WP exploitable result descriptions, its partner-by-partner exploitation achievements, and its candid acknowledgement that exploitation across diverse partner types required continuous renegotiation of scope and intent. The following

observations record the review comments raised during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Document History: Duplicate and Inconsistent Entries**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table contained two identical entries dated "14-02-2024" for Jelena Krivokapic and Nikolaos Partarakis (Final draft) and two entries with the same description "Update in M24 by adding partners' contributions" and "Update in M36 by adding partners' contributions" both dated "04-02-2025", the latter of which appears to be a copy-paste error, as the M36 update should be dated in 2026. Additionally, the M36 formatting entry by Xenophon Zabulis is dated "15-02-2026", while the M24 formatting entry is dated "15-02-2024", making these two entries easily confused.
- **Triggered Change:** The document history table was corrected to remove the duplicate "14-02-2024" entry and to update the M36 contributions entry to an accurate 2026 date, reflecting when the M36 update was actually compiled. Dates were verified against the communication records to ensure the full revision trail is accurate.

**2. Completion of Missing Exploitation Achievements Sections**

- **Review Comment:** Section 5 (Exploitation Achievements) provided detailed and well-written narratives for MDE (5.1), Khora (5.2), ARMINES (5.3), CERFAV (5.4), CETEM (5.5), FORTH (5.6), PIOP (5.7), ETH (5.8), and CNR (5.9). However, three consortium partners, CNAM, ETH (partially noted in a stub), and KHORA, were represented at varying levels of depth. In particular, CNAM's exploitation of the Design Pilot (WP5 co-leadership) and the Gestural Visualisation Toolkit was not reported in Section 5, despite CNAM being a co-IPR holder across multiple outcomes. ETH's section (5.8) was present but notably shorter than those of other technical partners.
- **Triggered Change:** The CNAM exploitation section was completed, covering the integration of the Gestural Visualisation Toolkit and the Plaster Simulator into ongoing design education at ENSAD Limoges, and CNAM's contribution to the CRAFTOUR initiative. ETH's section was expanded to better reflect its contribution to the Haptic Interfaces outcome and its plans for post-project integration of these tools into its own research activities.

**3. Consistency of TRL Reporting Across WP Outcomes**

- **Review Comment:** Several exploitable result subsections in Section 3 mentioned Technology Readiness Levels (TRL) implicitly, through phrases such as "at project end, the system supports..." or "fully operational at M36", without assigning an explicit TRL value. Other outcomes, such as the haptic interfaces and the high-resolution 2½D scanner, were described with sufficient technical detail to infer a TRL of 6–7, yet this was not stated. For a deliverable aimed in part at external exploitation and future funding applications, explicit TRL statements per outcome would significantly increase the document's utility to technology transfer offices and follow-up project proposers.
- **Triggered Change:** A TRL statement (with a brief justification) was added to the Sustainability Outlook subsection of each exploitable result in Section 3, providing prospective adopters and funding applicants with a standardised indicator of the readiness of each outcome for deployment.

**4. Sustainability Outlook Subsections: Harmonisation of Format**

- **Review Comment:** The "Sustainability Outlook" subsection appeared at the end of each exploitable result description and was one of the most valuable components of Section 3. However, the formatting of these subsections was inconsistent: some were written as prose paragraphs with embedded analysis (e.g., the section on Games and Toys, which included the memorable observation about 3D-printed toys not requiring installation), while others were presented as brief bullet lists of generic factors (e.g., "modular architecture", "standards compliance") without elaboration. This inconsistency reduced the comparative utility of the sustainability assessments.
- **Triggered Change:** The Sustainability Outlook subsections were standardised to include two elements in all cases: (i) a brief bullet list of enabling factors, and (ii) at least one sentence of contextualised narrative explaining why these factors are meaningful for this specific outcome, drawing on evidence from the project where available. The distinctive prose contributions already present in several sections were retained and used as the benchmark quality level.

**5. Exploitation Roadmap: Clarity on Events Already Completed**

- **Review Comment:** Section 6 (Conclusion and Roadmap) included Phase 1 actions presented in the future tense, specifically the CRAFTOUR Policy Roundtable in Brussels (January 30, 2026) and the CRAFTOUR Scientific Conference in Antwerp (January 29, 2026). Both of these events had already taken place by the time of the M36 submission date, as confirmed by mentions elsewhere in the deliverable (Sections 5.1 and 5.6). Referring to past events in the future tense within a final deliverable introduces an inconsistency that could mislead the Project Officer regarding what has been achieved.
- **Triggered Change:** The Phase 1 roadmap entries for both events were updated to the past tense, noting that both the Brussels Policy Roundtable and the Antwerp Scientific Conference took place in January 2026 as planned, and briefly summarising the outcomes and follow-up actions they generated.

**6. Abbreviations Table Completeness**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table contained only eight entries, despite the deliverable making extensive use of acronyms across technical, institutional, and policy domains. Terms used throughout the body text, including TRL, VET, GAN, SME, MR, RCI, CAD, FDM, SLA, VCoP, PGI, and CRAFTOUR, were absent from the table. This places an unnecessary burden on readers unfamiliar with the full Craeft consortium vocabulary, particularly external reviewers and potential third-party exploiters for whom the document is intended to be a self-contained reference.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was expanded to include all acronyms used in the deliverable. UK English spelling was verified throughout the document in line with project standards, and first-instance definitions were checked for consistency with the extended table.

**7. Forward-Looking Language in Per-Partner Sections**

- **Review Comment:** Several partner exploitation sections in Section 5 contained future-tense language describing activities that were planned rather than confirmed, for example, MDE's reference to "will leverage the Communities forum" and CETEM's description of a "specialised

---

design tool [that] will be developed". As an M36 final deliverable, the distinction between what has been achieved, what is actively underway, and what remains aspirational must be clearly maintained. The document already modelled this distinction well in some sections (notably Khora's candid description of transferring VR workflows beyond the heritage domain), but applied it inconsistently across partners.

- **Triggered Change:** Each partner section in Section 5 was reviewed to distinguish clearly between: (i) actions completed during the project, (ii) activities already underway at M36, and (iii) post-project plans and intentions. Future-tense statements for activities that remained at the planning stage were reframed as such, preventing them from being mistaken for achieved deliverables.

# WP8

## D8.2 Policy Recommendations

**Executive Summary of Review**

The current version of D8.2 is a comprehensive and evidence-informed document that successfully bridges ethnographic fieldwork with European policy frameworks. However, to maximise the impact of these recommendations on European and national policymakers, I recommend several surgical enhancements. These additions focus on improving scannability, addressing supply-chain gaps, and providing a clearer "Strategic Roadmap" for different classes of stakeholders.

The following recommendations are designed to be integrated into the final text using simple, clear prose and consistent UK English spelling.

**1. Enhancement of Findings Scannability (Section 4.4)**

While the findings are well-detailed, adding a summary matrix at the end of Section 4.4 will allow readers to grasp the "problem-solution" pairs derived from our case studies.

**2. "Innovation Spotlights" for Case Studies (Section 4.3)**

To better illustrate how digital tools bridge the "tacit-digital" gap, I propose adding "Innovation Spotlights" to the conclusion of specific case analyses.

- **Addition to 4.3.3 (Ioannina):** Practitioners have transitioned from purely local sales to a hybrid e-commerce model, exporting heritage designs and ecclesiastical objects to international Orthodox markets. This proves that digital platforms can preserve cultural narratives while ensuring economic resilience.
- **Addition to 4.3.8 (Tinos):** The integration of CNC machines and air-powered chisels allows for the initial roughing-out of blocks, while retaining hand-finishing to ensure the personal touch of craftsmanship remains. This demonstrates technology as an enhancement rather than a replacement for manual expertise.

**3. Addressing Supply-Chain Gaps (Section 5.1.2)**

The report notes that sustainability is often hindered by infrastructure loss. I recommend a specific paragraph to address this "middle-ground" gap.

**Proposed Addition to Section 5.1.2:**

Achieving full circularity is currently hindered by fragmented supply chains. For instance, the closure of the last thread factory in Anogia, Crete, has left local weavers unable to source processed wool from local husbandry despite raw material availability. Policy measures must therefore go beyond supporting the "final craft" and extend to **Micro-Infrastructure Re-industrialisation**, ensuring that foundational supply chains are revitalised to meet the goals of the **European Green Deal**.

**4. Governance-Level Funding (Section 6.1.1)**

To assist policymakers in identifying their specific roles, I propose substituting the introductory narrative of Section 6.1.1 with a structured approach.

**Proposed Substitution for 6.1.1:**

To ensure long-term sustainability, funding must be targeted at three distinct governance levels:

- **EU Level:** Explicitly include traditional crafts in **Creative Europe** and **Horizon Europe** calls, specifically rewarding projects that bridge the gap between "born-digital" tools and intangible heritage.
- **National Level:** Implement **fiscal incentives**, such as VAT reductions or tax credits, for artisans who adopt eco-certified materials or participate in formal apprenticeship certification.
- **Regional Level:** Deploy **ERDF micro-grants (€5k–€25k)** to support small workshops in adopting e-commerce infrastructure or energy-efficient machinery.

**5. The Strategic Roadmap to 2030 (Section 7.6)**

Finally, the deliverable should conclude with an actionable summary of the "short versus long-term" measures.

**Proposed Addition to Section 7.6:**

- **Phase 1: Stabilisation (Years 0–2):** Fast-track micro-grants for digital adoption and create regional "Living Workshop" tourism routes to provide immediate income.
- **Phase 2: Integration (Years 3–5):** Embed hybrid curricula (manual + digital) into national VET systems and institutionalise shared European digital repositories for tacit knowledge.
- **Phase 3: Resilient Prosperity (Years 5+):** Establish a unified European quality label (PGI) for artisanal goods and fully integrate craft clusters within Smart Specialisation Strategies.

# D8.3 Innovation Management – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D8.3 Final Revisions (M36)**

**Executive Summary of Review**

D8.3 is a substantially expanded and well-structured deliverable that successfully evolves from a planning document into a project-wide innovation inventory. The addition of Section 6 (partner-reported innovations), Section 7 (WP-by-WP innovation rationale), and Annex A (full partner fiches) reflects a genuine and meaningful upgrade from the M18 version. The CRAFTOUR section (5.4) is a particular strength: it provides a well-evidenced account of inter-project collaboration with precise dates, events, and institutional actors. The following observations record the review comments identified during the process and the changes implemented in the final version.

**1. Deliverable Number Referenced in Section 1.2 (Intended Audience)**

- **Review Comment:** The Intended Audience section stated: "The dissemination level of D8.1. is sensitive (SEN)." This is a clear copy-paste residue from a prior document. The deliverable being submitted is D8.3, not D8.1. This error appears directly in the public-facing body of a section that addresses the document's access and confidentiality classification, precisely the section where correct identification is most critical.
- **Triggered Change:** The reference to "D8.1" in Section 1.2 was corrected to "D8.3" throughout, and the sentence was reviewed for any further inaccuracies in the dissemination level or sensitivity classification.

**2. Document History: Incomplete M36 Update Entry**

- **Review Comment:** The document history table contained only a single entry for M36 work: "11/2/2026 – Peiman Sichani – Khora – Combined the partners' input." This entry is under-descriptive for a document that underwent substantial structural revision between M18 and M36, including the creation of an entirely new Section 6, the WP-by-WP Section 7 analysis, and the full partner fiche Annex A. The entry also did not record a final review step, despite the deliverable having four named authors, three of whom (Laura Werup, Xenophon Zabulis, Nikolaos Partarakis) are absent from the M36 history entirely.
- **Triggered Change:** The document history was expanded with a final review and sign-off entry dated February 2026, attributing contributions by section to the relevant authors, and recording the final review step prior to submission. The description field was updated to more accurately reflect the scope of M36 work.

**3. Executive Summary: Not Updated for M36**

- **Review Comment:** The executive summary was carried over verbatim from the M18 version. It described the Innovation Management Plan in future-oriented, prospective terms ("outlines the strategies and processes to cultivate a dynamic environment..."), making no reference to the innovation inventory, partner fiche collection, CRAFTOUR inter-project collaboration, or the WP-by-WP analysis that now constitute the majority of the deliverables' content. A reader relying solely on the executive summary would have no indication that the document is the final, project-closing version of this deliverable.
- **Triggered Change:** The executive summary was rewritten to provide a retrospective overview of the full M36 deliverable. It was revised to summarise: (i) the innovation management framework and its guiding principles, (ii) the innovation monitoring and assessment activities conducted over the project lifetime, (iii) the CRAFTOUR inter-project collaboration and its policy-level outcomes, (iv) the partner-reported innovation inventory, and (v) the structure of the WP-by-WP innovation rationale presented in Section 7.

**4. Abbreviations Table: Critical Gaps for a Technical Deliverable**

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table contained only five entries (AR, CNC, FabLabs, VR, WP), despite the deliverable making extensive use of additional acronyms throughout its 52 pages. Acronyms used in the body text but absent from the table include: AI, CAD, CAP, CH, CHI, CrO, CIDOC-CRM, DoA, EDM, ETH, FDM, GANs, ICH, IPR, MARL, MOP, PBR, RCI, R&D, SEN, SLA, SME, TRL, UI, UX. In a deliverable submitted under Horizon Europe, the absence of definitions for acronyms such as TRL, MARL, and IPR, which carry specific meaning in the EC innovation context, is particularly notable.
- **Triggered Change:** The abbreviations table was comprehensively expanded to include all acronyms used in the document. UK English spelling was verified throughout.

**5. Section 3 Title: Missing Apostrophe**

- **Review Comment:** The section heading "CRAEFTs Innovation Potential" was missing the possessive apostrophe throughout the document, both in the Table of Contents and in the body heading itself. The same issue recurred with "CRAEFT's innovation reported by partners" (Section 6) and "CRAEFT's innovative results and rationale" (Section 7), which were correctly punctuated, making the inconsistency more visible. Possessive apostrophes were similarly absent from the Section 5.4 sub-heading "CRAEFT's strategy" in the running text.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 3's heading was corrected to "CRAEFT's Innovation Potential" in the Table of Contents, body heading, and all running text references. The full document was checked for punctuation consistency in project name references.

**6. Section 5 (Innovation Monitoring & Assessment): Predominantly Forward-Looking**

- **Review Comment:** Section 5.1 (Innovation Management Activities) described the innovation monitoring process entirely in future tense, as though the project had not yet begun: "the Innovation Manager will use identified tools to gather information...", "CRAEFTwill monitor market needs...", "The first version of the CRAEFTInnovation Management Plan will be submitted in Month 18." By M36, all of these activities had been completed. The section also referred to the Innovation Funnel and Innovation Radar as planned tools without confirming whether they were ultimately applied and what they revealed. This creates a significant gap: the document describes a monitoring and assessment plan without confirming the outcome of that plan.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 5.1 was revised to reflect the completed state of the project's innovation monitoring activities. Future-tense language was converted to retrospective reporting. A brief statement was added confirming whether the Innovation Funnel and Innovation Radar (Sections 5.2 and 5.3) were applied during the project and, if so, what the key outputs were, or acknowledging, if that was the case, that they served as planning tools rather than formally applied assessment instruments.

**7. Section 7 (WP Innovation Rationale): WP6 and WP7 Absent**

- **Review Comment:** Section 7 structured the WP-by-WP innovation rationale across WP1 through WP5 (Sections 7.1–7.5), but the Table of Contents showed no sections for WP6 (Pilots and Community Engagement) or WP7 (Dissemination and Communication). The partner innovation inventory in Section 6 and Annex A included innovations attributed to WP5 (Community Portal),

and partners such as CERFAV, MadInEurope, and PIOP reported innovations with clear dissemination and community dimensions, but these were not addressed in the WP-structured Section 7 analysis. Given that the pilots (WP6) are a primary mechanism of CRAEFT's innovation-to-impact pathway, their absence from Section 7 is a structural gap.

- **Triggered Change:** Section 7 was reviewed with the authors to determine whether WP6 and WP7 innovations warranted dedicated subsections or whether their outputs were intentionally folded into adjacent WPs. If the former, concise subsections for WP6 (Pilots) and WP7 (Dissemination) were added. If the latter, a clarifying note was added at the start of Section 7 explaining the WP coverage decision and confirming that pilot and dissemination innovations are captured within other WP sections or in Annex A.

### 8. Conclusion: Future-Tense Language in a Final Deliverable

- **Review Comment:** The Conclusion (Section 8) contained several passages that were clearly unrevised from the M18 version and remained in the future tense: "Throughout the CRAEFTproject, our multidisciplinary team *will leverage* advanced digitisation..." and "CRAEFTis *poised to create* a vibrant future for crafts..." These statements are not appropriate for a project-closing deliverable. The Conclusion should reflect what was achieved, not what was planned.
- **Triggered Change:** The Conclusion was revised to adopt a retrospective voice, confirming what the Innovation Management process delivered over the full 36-month project period, referencing the partner innovation inventory, the CRAFTOUR outcomes, and the cross-WP innovation rationale as concrete outputs of the process. The final sentence was updated to affirm the project's legacy rather than its aspirations.

# D8.5 Data Management Plan – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D8.5 Final Revisions (M36)**

### 1. Shift from Inaugural to Retrospective Perspective

- **Review Comment:** The initial text in the Introduction still referred to the document as an "inaugural version" produced in the "sixth month". For the final submission, this must be reframed as the terminal project update.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 1 (Introduction) was rewritten to establish the document as the final M36 consolidation of three years of data stewardship.

### 2. High-Level Summary of Open Science Impact

- **Review Comment:** While the Zenodo table is comprehensive, its length makes it difficult for reviewers to quickly grasp the total volume of open outputs.
- **Triggered Change:** A high-level **Summary of the Open Research Outputs** table was added to Section 3.2. This aggregates over 115 images, 25 technical datasets, and 30 audiovisual recordings into a scannable format.

### 3. Verification of "Housekeeping" Outcomes

- **Review Comment:** The "Housekeeping" section describes the *tools* used for data quality, but lacks a statement on the *final status* of the knowledge base.
- **Triggered Change:** Recommended adding a "Housekeeping Results" summary to Section 3.1.3 to confirm that all mandatory metadata—such as pilot attribution and Creative Commons licensing—has been verified and remediated for M36.

**4. Clarity of Dual-Viewpoint Recording**

- **Review Comment:** The description of ethnographic data collection was technically sound but needed a clearer explanation of why both "frontal" and "egocentric" views are used for craft preservation.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 3.3 was refined to define the **Static Frontal View** (environmental context) and the **Egocentric View** (detailed tool/material interaction) as complementary datasets.

**5. Checklisted Post-Project Maintenance**

- **Review Comment:** The commitment to preserve data for "at least five years" needed a more professional, actionable checklist to satisfy EU transparency requirements.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 4 was updated with a specific **Post-Project Preservation Routine** checklist, including scheduled integrity checks (checksums), restore testing for VM backups, and active media refreshment for RAID storage.

**6. Executive Summary Re-positioning**

- **Review Comment:** The existing executive summary focused on *plans*. As the first page of the final deliverable, it must highlight the *scale* of the final data holdings.
- **Triggered Change:** The Executive Summary was completely updated to showcase the final metrics: over **11,000 images**, **4,200 events**, and **450 3D models** preserved across the project's three primary infrastructures.

**7. Glossary and Abbreviation Consolidation**

- **Review Comment:** Critical project-specific terms used throughout the text—such as **CAP** and **RCI** —were missing from the primary abbreviations table.
- **Triggered Change:** The Abbreviations table (Section 1) was expanded to ensure full self-consistency for external reviewers.

# D8.6 Risk Assessment – M36

**Internal Review Memo: D8.6 Final Revisions**

**1. Executive Summary and Conclusion Alignment**

- **Review Comment:** The initial draft showed significant overlap between the Executive Summary and the Conclusion. For an M36 deliverable, the summary must be "punchier" and more scannable to allow for clarity at a glance.

- **Triggered Change:** The Executive Summary was rewritten to use bulleted lists for residual risks (Sustainability, Stakeholder Engagement, etc.), and the Conclusion was refined to focus strictly on the project's legacy and four core pillars of success.

## 2. Quantification of Post-Project Risks

- **Review Comment:** The Risk Analysis table in Chapter 4 identified risk areas but lacked traditional scoring. Without **Likelihood** and **Impact** scores, future stakeholders cannot effectively prioritise maintenance efforts.
- **Triggered Change:** A revised **Post-Project Risk Assessment Table** was generated. It assigned scores (e.g., "High Impact" for Data Availability and Security) to provide a more rigorous, evidence-based evaluation of the residual risk landscape.

## 3. Specificity of Institutional Governance

- **Review Comment:** The document frequently used general terms such as "partner institutions" or "institutional hosting". To make the mitigation strategies actionable, the responsibilities need to be explicitly framed as formal transitions.
- **Triggered Change:** Guidance was provided to replace general placeholders with specific lead partners or bodies within the consortium to ensure accountability for the long-term hosting of the Craeft Authoring Platform (CAP).

## 4. Intellectual Property and Content Security (Section 5.3.4)

- **Review Comment:** While the draft mentioned "IP management," it lacked detail on the actual mechanisms of protection.
- **Triggered Change:** A new section (5.3.4) was drafted to outline the use of **Creative Commons** licensing, **GDPR compliance**, and the role of institutional ownership in safeguarding digital assets.

## 5. Consolidation of Lessons Learned (Section 5.4)

- **Review Comment:** Lessons learned were scattered throughout several chapters. These needed to be synthesised into a single, cohesive "blueprint" for future initiatives.
- **Triggered Change:** Section 5.4 was expanded to tie together stakeholder collaboration, modular design, and data-driven decision-making into five clear takeaway points for post-project governance.

## 6. Refinement of Technical Abbreviations

- **Review Comment:** The abbreviations table needed to be more comprehensive to cover the full technical scope of the M36 delivery.
- **Triggered Change:** The table was alphabetised and updated to include critical terms like **M36**, **MoCap**, and **UCD**, ensuring that the document is accessible to external reviewers and cultural heritage stakeholders.