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 that provided the deliverable reviews, as mentioned in the respective subsections.
Number of pages	22

Executive summary

This deliverable presents the application of the Quality Assurance process implemented by Craeft during the first year of the project.

The deliverable is structured as follows:

- **Section 1** provides an introduction to the Quality Assurance Procedure for Deliverables

- **Section 2** provides all the review forms submitted as part of partner obligations to perform deliverable review

This is the first version of the deliverable. The next version will be submitted on M24.

Document history

Date	Author	Affiliation	Comment
12/2/2024	Polykarpos Karamaounas	FORTH	Concatenated online reviews. The authors of individual reviews are mentioned inside the document.
14/2/2024	Xenophon Zabulis	FORTH	Added introduction
19/2/2024	Xenophon Zabulis	FORTH	Formatting

Abbreviations

DoA	Description of Action
MoCap	Motion Capture
CH	Cultural Heritage
CHI	Cultural Heritage Institutions
CrO	Crafts Ontology
MNO	Museum Narratives Ontology
PC	Project Coordinator
TM	Technical Manager
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 of the project will appoint, for each deliverable, at least one consortium members as peer reviewers 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 internal collaboration website as soon as work begins on the associated tasks.
- Maintain a **master document** of the deliverable in the entire process.
- Collect **contributions** from all participants and integrate them to 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 be preferably 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	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 if 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, which 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 complied with. Partners are encouraged to verify their deliverable 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 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 calculated 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 Date	Reviewer
D1.1	Enhanced ethnographic methods	M12, 24	CNR

D1.2	Knowledge collection and representation	M12, 24	CNAM
D2.1	Action and affordance modelling	M12, 24	CNR
D2.2	Maker-Material-Negotiation model and CAP	M12, 24	CNAM
D3.1	Craft-specific action simulations	M18, 36	ARMINES
D3.2	Advanced digitisation technologies	M18, 36	ETH
D3.3	Scene and activity monitoring	M18, 36	ETH
D4.1	Craft simulation and immersive craft training	M18, 36	ARMINES
D4.2	Haptic devices for training, simulation, and design	M18, 36	KHORA
D4.3	Toys and games for informal craft education	M18, 36	KHORA
D5.1	Craft Design revisited	M18, 36	CERFAV
D5.2	Community Portal	M18, 36	CNR
D6.1	P1 – Education & Training, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.2	P2 – Design, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.3	P3 – Valorisation, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D6.4	P4 – Community, methodology and results	M24, 36	FORTH
D7.1	Communication Plan and Activities	M2, 12, 24, 36	FORTH
D7.2	Dissemination Plan and Activities	M2, 12, 24, 36	FORTH
D7.3	Networking and Coordination	M12, 24, 36	PIOP
D7.4	Exploitation Plan and Activities	M12, 24, 36	PIOP
D8.1	Project Management	M2	KHORA
D8.2	Project reporting	M12, 24, 36	CETEM
D8.3	Innovation Management	M18, 36	ARMINES
D8.4	Quality Assurance	M12, 24, 36	CETEM
D8.5	Data Management Plan	M6, 12, 24, 36	CERFAV
D8.6	Risk Assessment	M6, 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 be also 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 regard only 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 not of the claimed costs by the EC.

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

All partners are to provide 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 every four months with 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 does the conventional numbering of subsections is not followed. Instead, subsections are enumerated and named by the names of the deliverables and version they correspond to.

D1.1 Enhanced ethnographic methods - Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Valentina Bartalesi - CNR

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

Section 2.4.1

I notice a repetition of the word "craftspeople".

Section 2.4.2.2

At the beginning of this section, I suggest clearly stating that one of the project's aims is to create a craft vocabulary, with explicit reporting on the reasons for this choice. Additionally, consider changing the section title to 'Craft Vocabulary,' as only one vocabulary will be created. Also, clarify the dataset to which you refer.

Section 2.5.4.2

The second sentence of the first paragraph is not clear; I suggest rephrasing it.

Section 3

I suggest clarifying the different stages of ethnography for each CHI.

I also suggest adding the links to the official websites of the selected HCI.

Section 3.4

The acronym ENSAD is introduced here for the first time and should be expanded to its complete form (i.e., L'École nationale supérieure d'art et de design).

Section 3.8

At the end of the section, "pottery" should be substituted with "Cretan textile".

Section 5

The last sentence of the third paragraph conveys the same meaning as the final sentence in the first paragraph. I recommend removing one of these sentences to avoid repetition.

Glossary

Adding the definition of Archimedean Simple Machines could clarify the meaning of the term 'machine' in the corresponding vocabulary entry.

Appendix A

The tables corresponding to each RCI should be introduced in the respective sections to convey the meaning of the provided data accurately.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 4

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 4

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 4

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 4

This deliverable contributes to defining a Craft Ethnographic Protocol and can certainly serve as a scientific foundation for future publications.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 4

D1.2 Knowledge collection and representation – Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Arnaud Dubois, CNAM

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

We suggest adding to the index the locations of the narratives, which could be interesting since they have a link to both the Geonames and Getty thesaurus.

The document's structure should report firstly the methodology used to collect the resources and how these resources are represented. In the theory part, highlighting the importance of standard thesauri to represent resources within the Linked Open Data approach and to link different knowledge bases that collect the same individuals could be interesting.

The last item on the list is our paper since, in Section 2, we report an overview that, maybe, can be exploited to contextualise the use of thesauri in the CRAEFT ontology and, generally, in the Semantic Web field.

Add the actual text of these knowledge elements (i.e., their description).

We do not report recordings here (media objects: video, audio, 3D etc). Only knowledge elements. We think that these should go into the ethnographic methods deliverable.

If you don't have a specific need to use Getty for locations, in our opinion, Geonames is more than sufficient. Furthermore, entries in Geonames are more accurate than those in the Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names. The advantage of including both Getty and Geonames URIs for each resource is the mapping of the two knowledge bases, but perhaps this is beyond the scope of the project's objectives.

- Address the text issues in blue highlight
- Fixed references and add citations
- See changes in the narratives
- Merged the two separate documents we had (annexes).

Add theoretical sections to enhance the deliverable.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 4

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 4

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 4

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 4

Advances the state-of-the-art: 4

D2.1 Action and affordance modelling – Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Valentina Bartalesi, CNR

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes.

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 4

Section 1.1

I suggest adding this reference when the difference between events and actions is introduced: Davidson, D. (2001). Essays on Actions and Events: Philosophical Essays Volume 1. Clarendon Press

---

I also suggest adding a brief definition of endurants and perdurants, e.g., Endurants are entities that exist in full in every instant at which they exist at all. Perdurants are entities which unfold themselves over time in successive temporal parts or phases.

Section 2.2

Are the craft simulators presented in the following the only ones currently available? If not, I suggest specifying the reason for the choice to report these and not others.

Section 2.3

At the beginning of this section, I suggest adding a sentence to introduce the systems presented here.

Section 2.4

At the beginning of this section, I suggest adding a sentence to introduce the systems presented here.

Section 3.2

Since the gravity condition is reported in the table, I think it should also be cited in this sentence that introduces the content of the table. Indeed, temperature and humidity are cited, but gravity is missing.

Section 3.5.1

The CRM is cited as an acronym but has never been introduced before.

Is "an" correct in the following paragraph? Maybe it should be "a": "Force is a time-dependent entity because, throughout a time interval, v and a may change. To digitise this variability, we discretize the time interval at a sampling rate and represent the values of v and an at several states that match this rate. In the computer, the values of v and a are stored in matrices."

Section 6

The reason for the choice of Unity game engine should be added and explained.

I corrected a few typos in the document.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 5

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 5

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 4

Once (M24) the immersive presentation using visual and haptic modalities is implemented, the content of this deliverable can be used as a reference work for a scientific paper.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 4

The tools and software used are state-of-the-art. The proposed approach towards action and affordance modelling and identifying the elements of crafting actions to consider in the design of simulations can be considered innovative.

D2.2 Maker-Material-Negotiation model and CAP – Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Arnaud Dubois, CNAM

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 4

The deliverable is problematic in the formatting and enumeration (which was absent).

Figure captions should end with a period.

A section is needed to introduce the CAP and its differences from the MOP.

The simulation on the "Hammering a piece of wood" is not illustrated.

The work regarding the new 3D viewer in the CAP is absent.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Yes. Also the collected knowledge has been entered in the CAP.

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 3

Not relevant is a content collection deliverable.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 5

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 5

Advances the state-of-the-art: 4

D7.1 Communication Plan and Activities – Month 02

Reviewer Name & Organization: Xenophon Zabulis, FORTH

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes, as is.

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

The partners collaborated in the kick of meeting and the content of this deliverable has been verified by all partners.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 1

This is not a technical deliverable.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 3

Depends on the nature of synergies with other projects established. However, it will provide input to the next versions of this deliverable and will facilitate collaboration between partners in creating academic publications for dissemination.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 1

This is not a deliverable that contains scientific content.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 1

This is not a deliverable that contains scientific content.

D7.2 Dissemination Plan and Activities – Month 02

Reviewer Name & Organization: Xenophon Zabulis, FORTH

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes, as is.

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

The contents of this deliverable have been unanimously approved by partners in the kick-off meeting.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 1

This is not a technical deliverable.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 5

Can be used in forthcoming versions of this deliverable.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 1

This is not an academic deliverable.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 1

This is not an academic deliverable.

D7.3 Networking and Coordination – Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Nikolaos Partarakis, FORTH

The deliverable can be submitted: Accept after revisions

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

Yes, it does.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Yes, it does.

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 5

The deliverable is ok. Some improvements:

- Formatting needs adjustment to align with the project's latest template
- Sizing and padding in tables should be fixed
- Please add a conclusions section
- Please revisit the document's navigation since not all sections are numbered correctly.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 5

Yes, it can be used since it reports on the networking activities of the project.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 5

Only if the papers are targeting on building a network on crafts or a similar subject where reporting networking activities could be of interest. No scientific content here.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 5

This is not the purpose of this deliverable.

D7.4 Exploitation Plan and Activities – Month 12

Reviewer Name & Organization: Christodoulos Ringas, PIOP

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

Please provide a conclusions section to the deliverable to summarize the deliverable.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

The deliverable meets the specification as presented in the project DoA. Some improvements can be made such as (a) remove the tables and replace them with text to enhance the readability of content, (b) reduce extensive descriptions, (d) itemize innovation rationale and market potential

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 5

This is not a technical deliverable. Yet it addresses the areas of interest that it targets.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 5

Yes and it will be used by subsequent version of this deliverable but also on other deliverables pointing out to specific exploitable outcomes and their innovation or market potential.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 5

The justification of each innovation can be used to support the progress to the state of the art in relevant papers.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 5

The innovation potential described gives insight on how the state of the art can be progressed. The deliverable itself is not technical to advance the state of the art by itself.

D8.1 Project Management – Month 02

Reviewer Name & Organization: Laura Werup, Khora

The deliverable can be submitted: Yes, after adjusting the minor edits as highlighted as comments in the deliverable document.

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 5

This deliverable meets the high-quality standards outlined in the Description of Work. It reflects the objectives, subtasks, and dependencies, serving as a valuable reference for project management and partners' operations management.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 5

Approved unanimously by the Project Steering Board, this deliverable covers partner communication, shared storage space, procedure for reviewing deliverables, meetings, and reporting in a satisfactory

manner. Overall, it's a well-structured reference for project management principles that demonstrates the project's commitment to excellence.

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 5

This deliverable provides a comprehensive reference for project management principles, and is an achievement that meets the overall technical requirements for the part of the project concerned with project management.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 3

Yes, as is relevant.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 3

Yes, as is relevant.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 3

D8.5 Data Management Plan – Month 06

Reviewer Name & Organization: Xenophon Zabulis, FORTH

The deliverable can be submitted: No

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 3

The introduction states six (6) goals, but not all are addressed in the rest of the document. It is recommended to:

- Reference at which section is goal is addressed
- Say which goals are met in this document and which goals will be addressed in future versions of this deliverable and which one.

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 3

The deliverable addresses all peripheral matters to data management, except the technical plan. There is no description of how the data will be managed by the consortium partners so all the requirements mentioned will be met. In other words, the plan on data management is partially provided.

Section "2. Data summary" does not contain a summary of data. Section 2 contains also material that should probably comprise a new section, or distributed in existing ones.

Section 3 makes promised that we might get to be checked upon and prior experience showed that we do not adhere to.

Section 4 does not seem relevant to this document.

Section 5 is on data security and this is not mentioned in the Introduction. Privacy & confidentiality issues (which are mentioned) seem to be elaborated in Section 6.

Section 7 should place emphasis on data not publications. Also, it is weird that arXiv is not mentioned in the publication's subsection.

Section 9, does not say how FAIR is implemented in the directory structure.

Section 9 has only one subsection.

The table in Section 9 contains irrelevant material than the "definition of datasets" that it claims. (data security, allocation of resources etc, are not dataset definition).

The deliverable does not predict a shared space for collaboration of partners.

The deliverable addresses all peripheral matters to data management, except the technical plan. There is no description of how the data will be managed by the consortium partners so all the requirements mentioned will be met. In other words, the plan on data management is partially provided.

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 3

It addresses them but not closely.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 3

The deliverable needs to be improved before reused, otherwise the same mistakes will propagate.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 1

NA. This is a management deliverable.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 1

This is a management deliverable.

D8.6 Risk Assessment – Month 06

Reviewer Name & Organization: Xenophon Zabulis, FORTH

The deliverable can be submitted: No

States its objectives, related subtask(s) and dependencies, as specified in the Description of Work: 3

Section 3.2

Practitioners' actions is first based on observation of the material and the preparation of the mind. Maybe this should be analysed as a risk, not to be able to record their observation process. Observation is part of the action ..., how to observe before acting and transforming is crucial.

Observation should be part of the process, and the risk is high level of individualisation and difficult replicability

Section 3.3

especially when education is non-formal and given inside workshops - not enough schools for crafts in Europe to cover needs. Many craftspeople do not get paid to train and do not see the need to spend time and energy with youngsters that may not follow up after the training. There should be an incentive for them.

Section 3.4

Also difficulty in "how to use" virtual material by people in areas that have weak digital knowledge we could add add "understanding" and learners do not see the real applicability and conversion of the practice into finished products and real job opportunity

Section 3.5

risk to create confusion between a standardised process (design + manufacturing) described above and a craft production where all pieces are unique because interpretation, conditions etc are never the same. We do not record the manufacturing process to industrialise craft gestures.

Section 3.6

Risk comes from consumers' mindset - need to change people's mindset about crafted products - higher quality / longevity versus mass consumption / waste

Section 4.1.2

As mentioned before reporting on practitioners' "observation" could help understanding.

User and practitioner feedback would also help to validate the effectiveness

Section 4.1.4

Also involving practitioners

Section 4.1.5

Whom do we mean for fabrication experts? Craftspeople?

Section 4.1.6

we discussed the problem of certifying skills digitally... this is not feasible and will not be recognized by the profession. Maybe it would be easier to certify knowledge (theoretical) digitally and complete the process of skills certification with hands-on certification. It would be interesting since it would play as a filter to keep only motivated learners. Validate all knowledge and practice with AI and then complete with practice after certification of knowledge; so here I would focus on "defining adequate certification process, based on "what can be submitted to certification" (income streams, lexicon, sustainability, entrepreneurship...), and what cannot, (making.)

Section 4.1.7

based on the human aspect of crafts also to mitigate the virtual approach

and the maker's know-how, they must keep the focus on the human based activity

also giving true information is crucial, two handmade vases will always be different, it is important that the customers understand that imperfection and differences are part of the craft made product's value versus industrially made ones.

I think this risk is HIGH.

adapting the product to customers' preferences is also risky because crafts cannot compete with big brands in prices and cannot be reactive enough. Also when crafts follow trends, they uniformise the product (Instagram products!!) and lose their real value. Trends can inspire but focus must be on unicity and particularities, like local culture, roots, that give to crafts made products an added value.

Section 5

studies : respect...

practitioners = artisans?

knowledge and skills?

knowledge and skill?

and tools?

Who are they?

making? In crafts, the term making is more used. fabricating sounds more industrial.

See previous note on certification. Certification on knowledge as a filter to further develop skills by practical earning.

sector?

see previous note on danger about following market trends and importance of valorising differences and territoriality. Good marketing can educate consumers to more accurate consumption

.. craft that have roots and represent territoriality can benefit from digital innovation to modernise design (not changing and following trends) reinforce their visibility optimise production costs...

In general, I noted some comments on the certification which on my opinion must be re-oriented towards a certification of knowledge, as a first step for further practical training. No digital certification of skills could be accepted in the sector of crafts but those that "prepare" to practical learning can (theory, tools, techniques, gestures, sustainability, etc...).

Also, I noted dome issues about the risk of product standardisation and "trendification" (this term does not exist but you understand.) of crafted products. Attention must be paid to territorial cultures, to local materials, to unique techniques etc... if crafts follow trends, they will never be fast enough nor competitive with big brands. Transparency and communication must highlight that digital design will never correspond exactly to the final product. Unicity and ""imperfection" are added values of the crafted production. Digital design and related tools can help accelerating, saving material, simulating etc... but not creating an industrial-looking product.

Finally, but this is not in the document so it's probably not relevant here, we do not enhance the challenge of the sustainability of results themselves. How to make them still usable and improvable after CRAEFT is finished? Shouldn't we talk more about this?

Meets the deliverable description and objectives as specified in the DoA: 3

Closely addresses the specific technical areas that the DoA describes for this deliverable: 3

It addresses them but not closely.

Can be used by dependent deliverables as stated in the DoA: 3

The deliverable needs to be improved before reused, otherwise the same mistakes will propagate.

Can be used for further outputs (papers, standards contributions etc.): 1

This is a management deliverable.

Advances the state-of-the-art: 1

This is a management deliverable.