

Annex: External evaluators reports

External evaluator: Dimitrios Vlachos (digitalization)

Deliverable (Title):	D1.1: Stakeholders strategic plans and analysis report	Date:	18/08/2022
Work package:	Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The content develops generally smoothly and comprehensively. The introduction is explanatory and provides an overview of the strategic plan. The analysis of trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitization is quite extensive and comprehensive. However, some parts could be further analysed (please see below). A few paragraphs about the forestry sector might be useful for the reader in order to have a more spherical view of the strategies. <p>In terms of digitalization, the document could provide some more information about key aspects and requirements of the digital transformation, such as the interoperability of the various components and services, and the business models (mainly data-driven) that farmers/entrepreneurs could follow towards circular farming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Table with the type of stakeholders reached and how each of them contributed to the definition of the strategic plans should be included in the report. A summary would be useful at the end of the document with the final considerations. A table explaining the acronyms should have been included in the document. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
The length is reasonable considered the quantity of information that is provided in the document.			
c) Format		Score: 75/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tables should have the same format. Reference numbers throughout the document should be hyperlinked with the reference details at the end of the document. More illustrations and graphs should be used to enhance the consolidation of the content. 			
d) English language use		Score:85/100	
A scanning of the document would eliminate some grammatical mistakes that have been identified.			

17

18

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 85/100
➤ The deliverable addresses sufficiently all key issues and objectives of the project.	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 85/100
It would be interesting to provide (possibly at a later stage) an additional chapter on the consequences of the war in Ukraine.	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 90/100
The information is referenced sufficiently.	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 80/100
As mentioned above, a summary would be useful at the end of the document with the final considerations.	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100

Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 80/100
<p>The section provided generally a sufficient overview of the digitalization sector including the current status, trends and information about the relevant European projects. However, the document could provide some more information about key aspects and requirements of the digital transformation, such as the interoperability of the various components and services, and the business models (mainly data-driven) that farmers/entrepreneurs could follow towards circular farming.</p>	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 85/100
<p>It is not fully clarified which type of stakeholders contributed with their expertise in the implementation of the deliverable, however, based on the content of the document, it is considered that their opinion has been reflected in the deliverable.</p>	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 80/100

19

Despite the lack of a paragraph devoted to that, information about the methodology can be extracted from the introduction and the structure of the content.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 60/100

As mentioned before, a summary with the final considerations is missing.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

No recommendations/final considerations were included in the document.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 80/100

The content develops generally smoothly and comprehensively. The introduction is explanatory and provides an overview of the strategic plan. The analysis of trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitization is quite extensive and comprehensive. More comments and suggestions about the deliverable have been provided above.

Date of external evaluation review:

18/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title):	D1.4: Focus group guidelines	Date:	19/08/2022
----------------------	------------------------------	-------	------------

Work package:	WP1: Skill needs identification
---------------	---------------------------------

External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos
----------------------------	-------------------

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

e) structure and content

Score: 95/100

20

- The structure of the document is well organized, and the content covers all the necessary aspects to provide a complete report on the task.
- The content is comprehensive and well-aimed.
- The proposed methodology and guidelines ensure a reliable procedure and a fruitful discussion between the members of the panels which enables the extraction of considerable results.

f) length

Score: 90/100

The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for the organization of the focus groups.

g) format

Score: 90/100

The format is sufficient.

21

h) English language use

Score: 85/100

- Adequate use of the English language.
- A table explaining the acronyms should have been included in the document.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

e) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 95/100

- The information delivered is very comprehensive and provides all the necessary guidelines and instructions for a successful implementation of the focus groups.

f) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

No missing information detected. The guidelines are clearly described.

g) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 75/100
--	----------------------

The content is sufficient and reliable. However, some references about the methodology and the guidelines provided in the document or the strategy for this kind of activities would enhance the reliability of the information.

h) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 95/100
---	----------------------

The outcomes and the proposed structure for the focus groups are fully applicable.

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

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 95/100
---	----------------------

The section of digitalization is fully covered by the skills list and questionnaires provided by the owners of the deliverable.

22

23

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>The guidelines provide the framework in order the opinion of all responsible stakeholders to be adequately reflected in the deliverable. The diversity of the stakeholders proposed to take part in the focus groups (education providers, advisors, farmers, Agri-food companies, cooperatives...) enables addressing the topics from all of its sides.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The proposed methodology and guidelines are surely described in a clear and adequate manner.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>The deliverable does not include a conclusions section which is quite reasonable, based on the nature of the deliverable.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

The proposed methodology and guidelines ensure a reliable procedure and a fruitful discussion between the members of the panels which enables the extraction of considerable results. The deliverable can be used as a reference for relevant, future activities.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Very good job by team!

The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. It is easy to conclude that the resulting results will be of great interest to the development of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

19/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title):	D1.5: Focus Group Analysis	Date:	22/08/2022
----------------------	----------------------------	-------	------------

Work package:	Skills needs identification
---------------	-----------------------------

External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos
----------------------------	-------------------

24

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

i) structure and content

Score: 90/100

- The document is very well structured and the information provided is well organised. It should be stated that there is a link with deliverable D1.4 Focus Group Guidelines regarding the conduction of focus group discussions.
- The content is comprehensive and well-aimed. The approach of the report is holistic including the following chapters: Introduction, Focus Group Conduction, Focus Group Data Processing and Analysis, Pan-European Focus Group Analysis, Conclusions. Chapter 4: Pan-European Focus Group Analysis provides interesting, well organized and detailed information regarding skills and training.
- Chapter 5: Conclusions is very helpful, providing managerial insides.

j) length

Score: 85/100

- The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for focus group analysis.
- Annex Section seems to be very long; however, it includes all the necessary information regarding the conduction of the focus groups.

k) format

Score: 80/100

- The format is sufficient. My only comment is related to the format of the information per country, where it is clear that there is no common format type. In all cases, executive summaries are suggested to be added.
-

l) English language use

Score: 80/100

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.
-

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

i) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 95/100

- The deliverable is important for the achievement of the project's objectives, providing critical information.
- The recognition of skills and training has been adequately covered.
- The deliverable provides adequately new information in the examined field.

j) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

- No missing information detected.
- The collection of skills for the important sectors such as agriculture, forestry and the food industry were carried out comprehensively covering a wide range of the main skills categories for sustainability, digitalization, bioeconomy, soft skills and business-entrepreneurship. Emphasis was placed on training needs, the needs of training systems at national and European level, the target group for training and methods and professional training certification.

k) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

- The content is sufficient and reliable. The methodology for the conduction of focus groups is adequate and well analysed.

l) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 95/100

25

- The outcomes are fully applicable.

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

Score: /100

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 90/100

26

- Digitization is well covered in the report.
- Although there is no clear separation for the food industry, forestry and agriculture, the skills related to digitization are clearly provided in the deliverable It is very interesting that there is a wide range of skills related to digitalization chosen in the focus groups highlighting the different level of digital harmonization in each country.

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

27

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In this deliverable, many stakeholders participated in the focus groups providing critical information regarding skills and training issues. 	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed methodology and guidelines are clearly described in an adequate manner. Any problems raised (e.g. problems in transcribing with the use of IMAGIO/IBM software) were solved with a safe way. 	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights. It also provides guidelines for future work. 	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The recommendations are relevant and well presented. 	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 90/100</p>

Very good job by team!
The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. It is easy to conclude that the resulting outcomes will be of great interest to the development of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:	22/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

Deliverable (Title):	D1.7 Survey Analysis	Date:	23/08/2022
Work package:	Skills Needs Identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		

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

m) structure and content **Score: 85/100**

- In general, the deliverable provides comprehensive information about the demographics, organisational insights, stakeholder engagement, identified skills, training needs, and business trends.
- The introduction could contain some more information about the methodology used to conduct the survey and to process the results.
- The final remarks section should provide a more extended summary of key results and recommendations based on the survey and the (preliminary) correlation between the results.

n) length **Score: 85/100**

Extended length, however taking into consideration the amount and diversity of information processed, as well as the number of graphs inserted in the document to provide a comprehensive overview of the results in each section, the length seems to be reasonable.

o) format **Score: 80/100**

- The document provides a remarkable number of graphs; however, they are not numbered, and they do not provide the necessary, explanatory information about their components.
- Given the large number of graphs, a list of figures/graphs should be provided, hyperlinked with each figure/graph throughout the document.

p) English language use **Score: 95/100**

Excellent use of English language.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

28

29

<p>m) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The deliverable does address the key issues in relation to the objectives of the project, providing insights into the current and future skills needs across the agricultural, forestry and food sectors in Europe. The analysis of the skills needs was conducted at European, sectoral, and country level to provide an overview of skills development and to highlight any potential gaps that may exist. The skills assessment was conducted in line with the identified skills categories across the project, i.e., sustainability skills, digitalisation skills, bioeconomy skills (agriculture, forestry, food industry), soft skills, business & entrepreneurship skills.</p>	
<p>n) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The information provided is extended, however a smarter way of presenting the results might have helped to get easier the outcomes of the survey. For example, the use of graphs comparing the results between the European countries could be useful to highlight the differences between them in European level. Also, a preliminary correlation between the results would be very useful in order to consolidate the outcomes and better understand the perspectives and future aspects of training/skill needs.</p>	
<p>o) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>In the survey participated more than 500 persons from 29 countries in Europe. This sample is considered as reliable reflecting the current situation in Europe. The information is based on research. However a connection with literature and global trends (when possible) could enhance the reliability of the analysis. As an example, all profiles identified soft skills as being essential or very important, across their areas of operation enabling the improvement of work performance and productivity to make individuals and businesses more marketable. This is in line with the global trends, assessing soft skills as an essential part of the hiring process for potential employees and contractors. Based on global surveys, soft skill-intensive occupations will account for two-thirds of all jobs by 2030 (Deloitte 2017, Forbes 2021).</p>	
<p>p) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The outcomes are very useful and applicable providing important feedback for European entities and policy makers across the agricultural, forestry and food sectors. It is important that the survey highlights potential gaps in country and European level enabling the correlation of the information to receive important results for future skills needs.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>

Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 90/100
<p>The area of digitization has been sufficiently covered and analysed for each country. Trends have been identified such as that there is a high demand in Europe for digital technology as a tool to communicate and to analyse data as well as to manage farm operations through FMIS. Furthermore, data analytics and FMIS require additional training.</p> <p>The results highlight the future skills needs. Further processing and correlation of the results would enable the implementation of policies and educational programs in country level that will improve the digital skills of employees and employers and the cost-efficiency of products and services.</p>	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 90/100
Based on the information provided the opinions of all responsible stakeholders have been adequately reflected in the document.	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 80/100

30

The introduction could contain some more information about the methodology used to conduct the survey and to process the results.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 75/100

The final remarks section should provide a more extended summary of key results and recommendations based on the survey and the (preliminary) correlation between the results.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 75/100

31

Although the results along the document highlight the future skills needs, further correlation of the results is needed to provide more concrete and useful recommendations.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 80/100

Very good work and very interesting results. An updated version of the document could certainly contribute to the implementation of new policies and educational programs in country and European level that will improve the skills of employees (and employers) and the cost-efficiency of products and services.

Date of external evaluation review:

23/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title):	D1.8: Trend and scenario analysis	Date:	24/08/2022
Work package:	Skill Needs Identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			

a) structure and content	Score: 90/100
<p>The methodology of the analysis is sufficiently described. The trends provided are analyzed efficiently and cover all the necessary aspects in agriculture, food industry and forestry sectors, addressing the dimensions of sustainability, bioeconomy, digitalization, and business models. The feedback from the previous deliverables has been sufficiently incorporated in the document. The results of the study can support decision making on selection and prioritization of skills to be included in job profiles and training modules. Also, the results per country contain valuable information for strategy and roadmap formulation, as well as for training design at country level.</p>	
b) length	Score: 90/100
<p>Some parts based on information provided in previous deliverables could be reduced and summarized.</p>	
c) format	Score: 85/100
<p>Further graphical representation of the information (e.g. use of infographics) could enhance readability.</p>	
d) English language use	Score: 95/100
<p>Very good use of the English language.</p>	
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
q) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 85/100
<p>The deliverable does address the key issues in relation to the objectives of the project, analysing the trends across the agricultural, forestry and food sectors in Europe. The analysis of the trends was conducted also at country level to provide an overview highlighting any potential differences that may exist.</p>	
r) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 85/100

32

No missing information detected. The information provided is extended, however a smarter way of presenting the results might have helped to get easier the outcomes of the deliverable. For example, the further use of graphs and/or infographics, comparing the results between the European countries could be useful to highlight the differences between them in European level. Also, a preliminary correlation between the results would be very useful in order to consolidate the outcomes and better understand the perspectives of the trends.

s) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 90/100

The information based on literature/field research are reliable supporting sufficiently the outcomes and results.

t) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

The results of the deliverable are valuable and can be used for further analysis.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

Score: /100

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

The sections for digitalization cover sufficiently the relevant trends and perspectives in agriculture, forestry and the food industry. Authors provide enough references to support their findings.

33

34

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>The methodology of the analysis is sufficiently described.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The conclusions are sufficiently supported by the evidence provided. A preliminary correlation between the results would be very useful in order to consolidate the outcomes and better understand the perspectives of the trends.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

The results of the study can support decision making on selection and prioritization of skills to be included in job profiles and training modules. Also, the results per country contain valuable information for strategy and roadmap formulation, as well as for training design at country level.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

The results of the deliverable are very interesting and useful for the implementation of the project as well as for supporting European policies.

Date of external evaluation review:

24/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

35

Deliverable (Title):	D2.1: List of occupational profiles	Date:	24/08/2022 2
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The document is very well structured and the information related to occupational profiles in the fields of agriculture, food industry and forestry is well organised. Annexes are very comprehensive and descriptive providing a clear outline. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for occupational profiles in the fields of agriculture, food industry and forestry. ➤ Annex Section seems to be very long; however, it includes all the necessary information. 			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The format is sufficient. ➤ It will be quite useful the creation of a glossary of acronyms. 			

36

d) English language use	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In terms of linguistically, there is no need for improvements. The quality of English is sufficient. 	
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
u) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The information delivered is very comprehensive and provides all the necessary information for occupational profiles in the fields of agriculture, food industry and forestry. 	
v) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No missing information detected. ➤ EQF Level 5 Occupational Profiles (technician) in the fields of agricultural and food-industry digitalization and EQF Level 4 Occupational Profiles (operator) for Digitalisation in agriculture, food industry and forestry are fully presented. 	
w) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 95/100
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The content is sufficient and reliable. The objective of the deliverable, that deals with the identification of future skill and knowledge needs, the existing training in response to those needs, and the identification of gaps, is fully achieved.
x) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcomes are fully applicable. 	

37

<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Occupational profiles in the fields of digitization, agriculture and food industry are fully examined and contain sufficient information for essential and optional skills and knowledge. ➤ Regarding the EQF Level 5 Occupational Profiles, in the area of digitalization, two profiles are presented: Technician for agricultural digitalization and Technician for food-industry digitalization. In EQF Level 4 Occupational Profiles, the profile of operator for digitalization in agriculture, food industry and forestry is presented. The above approach provides the necessary framework for Occupational Profiles related to digitalization. ➤ 	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ All responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on this deliverable through their participation in other project's tasks, that their outcomes were used for the development of the occupational profiles. 	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>

38

➤ The proposed methodology is clearly described in an adequate manner in Chapter 3 “Methodology”.	
6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	Score: /100
N/A	
7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	Score: 90/100
➤ Deliverable’s recommendations, that include information on the occupational profiles, are relevant and well presented.	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 90/100
Very good job by team! The content is presented simply and comprehensibly.	
Date of external evaluation review:	24/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

Deliverable (Title):	D2.2: Prioritized occupational profiles	Date:	25/08/2022
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content			Score: 80/100

The methodology for ranking the skills and knowledge is sufficiently described. Tables of occupational profiles are provided; however a preliminary interpretation and analysis of the results could have been also provided.

b) length

Score: 80/100

The length of the task is generally appropriate. The final remarks section should have included more information about the results.

c) format

Score: 80/100

The content is provided mainly in tables. Additional textual information could enable a better interpretation of the analysis and the enrichment of the format.

d) English language use

Score: 85/100

Sufficient use of the English language.

39

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

y) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

The deliverable provides tables with the occupational profiles, standardized for transferability. The information addresses the objectives of the project in terms of prioritizing the profiles.

z) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 80/100

The information provided is comprehensive. A summary of the key results of the deliverable could be provided in the final remarks section.

aa) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 80/100
---	----------------------

The methodology could be supported by references. Preliminary analysis of the results and correlation with the literature would contribute to the reliability of the information.

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

The information provided in the deliverable is valuable and useful and will be utilized in the upcoming tasks of the project. The outcomes could be collected in graphs or short paragraphs to enhance their applicability in reports and policies.

40

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

Comments:

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

The field of digitalization has been sufficiently covered in the deliverable and in particular in the profiles. A summary on the digital and soft skills could be useful for the interpretation of the information provided.

41

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>Based on the information provided, the opinion of the stakeholders has been adequately considered in the deliverable.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The methodology is sufficiently and comprehensively described in the document.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>No final considerations are provided in the document.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

The recommendations based on the ranking of the profiles are efficiently provided and can be used for the implementation of the training modules as well as for other future tasks of the project.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 80/100
--	------------------------------

Generally the document provides sufficient information about the task of prioritizing the occupational profiles.

Date of external evaluation review:	25/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

42

Deliverable (Title):	D2.3 principles of a European strategy on agri-food-forestry skills	Date:	26/08/2022
Work package:	WP2 Priorities and Strategy Design		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The structure of the document is well organized, and the content covers all the necessary aspects to provide a complete report on the task. ➤ The approach of the report is holistic including the following chapters: Introduction, Method, Results: Key principles for the formulation of a European agri-food and forestry skills strategy and Conclusions and path forward. ➤ Annexes provide useful information for the report. 			
b) length		Score: 95/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for the survey report on principles of a European strategy on agri-food-forestry skills. 			
c) format		Score: 80/100	

- Specific corrections in formatting should be done.
- In all Tables, text fonts should be bigger.
- In Figure 1, the text, in some cases, is not reader friendly.
- Annexes 2, 4a,4b should have the same format (e.g. font type) with the rest of the report.

d) English language use

Score: 85/100

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

cc) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

- The information delivered is very comprehensive and covers all the key issues compared with the objectives of the task.

dd) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

- No missing information detected.

ee) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 90/100

- The results of the report are based on semi-structured questionnaire research on key topics that distributed among the organisations that partner in FIELDS.
- The results were qualitatively analysed.

ff) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

43

- The outcomes, that deal with the key principles for the formulation of a European agri-food and forestry skills strategy, are applicable.
- The principles created can be used to achieve the European strategy and along with performance indicators (KPIs) to evaluate training modules and courses.

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

Score: /100

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 90/100

44

- The digitization domain has been covered adequately in the deliverable.
- Digital tools will be used on sustainability and bioeconomy sectors, in order to organize training modules and courses.

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 80/100

45

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The questionnaire was distributed among the partners in FIELDS project. It is interesting that there are partners in the consortium (in total 5) that did not participate in the survey. 	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed methodology is clearly described in an adequate manner in Chapter 2 “Method”. 	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score:95 /100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights. 	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The recommendations are relevant and well presented. 	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 90/100</p>

Very good job by team!
The content is presented simply and comprehensibly

Date of external evaluation review: 26/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title): D3.1: Training methodologies Date: 26/08/2022

Work package: New tools and training design

External evaluator (Name): Dimitrios Vlachos

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

a) structure and content **Score: 80/100**

The content is comprehensive providing an overview of the pedagogical approaches that will be used to develop the training programmes in the project.
The structure of the deliverable is efficient providing sufficient introductory information as well as explanations about the decisions taken regarding the means for developing the training courses. The authors provide a list of references that support the information provided.
The deliverable should contain more information about state-of-the-art methodologies for persons with disabilities.

b) length **Score: 95/100**

The length of the report is appropriate.

c) format **Score: 80/100**

The format of the deliverable is sufficient. The introduction of graphs and tables with comparative information about the available systems and learning outcomes would contribute to a more efficient assessment procedure.

d) English language use **Score: 95/100**

Very good use of the English language.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

46

47

<p>gg) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The deliverable does address the key issues of the objectives of the task it belongs and the project in general. The authors provide a comprehensive overview of state-of-the-art training methodologies emphasizing the new tools and training design aspects.</p>	
<p>hh) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The information provided is comprehensive. The introduction of graphs and tables with comparative information about the available systems and learning outcomes would enable an easier understanding of the characteristics of its system. The deliverable should contain more information about state-of-the-art methodologies for persons with disabilities.</p>	
<p>ii) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The authors provide a list of references that support sufficiently the information provided enhancing its credibility.</p>	
<p>jj) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The authors provide very useful information about several methodologies (in person classes, online learning, microlearning, gamification, etc.) based on the considering target groups and their different needs (farmers, students, and farmers advisors), and finally provide their recommendations about using the most suitable training platform.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>

Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 80/100
<p>The deliverable focused on training implementation methods based on digital tools, covering their basic requirements, and technical aspects and capabilities. The authors could extend their study on the digital tools as enablers for the training of persons with disabilities.</p>	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: /100
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: /100

48

N/A

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 90/100

The conclusions and final recommendations have been clearly supported by pedagogical and technical evidence.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 90/100

The authors recommend an open-source learning management system (LMS) which involves less costs related to software licences and maintenance/upgrades and offers the liberty to develop/expand the LMS, based on own goals and requirements, ensuring the sustainability and feasibility of the project.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

The authors provide very useful information about several methodologies and specific recommendations which enables their direct utilization for the next steps of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

26/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title):

D5.1: Regulatory Framework List

Date:

27/08/2022

Work package:

Long term action plan

External evaluator (Name):

Dimitrios Vlachos

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

q) structure and content

Score: 70/100

49

- The document is well structured, including the following chapters: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Concluding remarks and Annex with the list of regulatory framework.
- The content is not very comprehensive, as many parts of the report are very brief. For example, the introductory section is brief and it does not provide any specific information.
- In the results section, the information provided is incomplete.
- Part of the information provided in annex can be transferred to the main body of the deliverable.

r) length

Score: 80/100

- As mentioned before, the report is very brief.

s) format

Score: 85/100

- The format is sufficient.
- Graph 2 should be redesigned, as it is not easily readable in its current form.
- Links in Table A3 are not active.

t) English language use

Score: 90/100

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

kk) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 80/100

- The report's objective is not very clear. Authors should state the impact of the created database and how this database can contribute to the identification of gaps in training areas.

ll) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

50

51

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No missing information detected. 	
mm) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 80/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The information (regulatory frameworks) is based on literature research conducted by project's partners in different countries. ➤ The methodology should be described in a more descriptive and analytical way in order to increase the report's reliability. 	
nn) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 80/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcomes are applicable. 	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 85/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The digitization domain has been significantly presented in the report's context. 	

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 75/100</p>
<p>➤ I would expect the methodological framework to be presented in a more descriptive and analytical way (e.g. how the information is collected in each country, etc)</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>➤ Conclusions section is brief and it does not provide managerial insights.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

52

- There are no recommendations provided in this task.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 80/100
Good job by team! Deliverable can be improved with minor changes and addendums.	
Date of external evaluation review:	27/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

53

Deliverable (Title):	D5.2: Funding Opportunities	Date:	27/08/2022
Work package:	Long term action plan		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content			Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The document is very well structured and the information related to funding opportunities to promote the training and skills uptake is well organised. 			
b) length			Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The length of the document is reasonable and serves well its purpose by providing necessary information for funding opportunities. 			
c) format			Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The format is sufficient. ➤ The numbering format in this report is different from other deliverables. ➤ It will be quite useful the creation of a glossary of acronyms. 			
d) English language use			Score: 95/100

- In terms of linguistically, there is no need for improvements. The quality of English is sufficient.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

oo) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

- The information delivered is very comprehensive and addresses all key issues compared to the deliverable's aims. The main aims were the collection the funding opportunities in order to promote the training and skills uptake and ensure the future use of the project outputs and to list multiple levels of funding.

pp) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

- No missing information detected.

qq) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 90/100

- The content is sufficient and reliable. The criteria for selecting the funding opportunities were determined by LLLP after receiving feedback from partners.

rr) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

The creation of the funding opportunities database is very useful. It is also an important task for the exploitation of project's results

<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Digitalization occupies a fairly large percentage of the list, specifically it appears 40 times as a project topic. ➤ It is also very interesting that Digitalization is combined with other topics such as sustainability, soft skills, entrepreneurship and bioeconomy. 	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>

55

- The proposed methodology is clearly described in an adequate manner, however some clarifications will be needed regarding the collection of information on funding opportunities, the research context, the difference in decentralization/ centralization.
- The database should be updated frequently (according to the authors 2 or 3 times every year)
- It would be interesting if there was comparative information for funding opportunities in different countries.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 90/100

- Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 90/100

The recommendations are relevant and well presented.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Very good job by team!

The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. It is easy to conclude that the resulting outcomes will be of great interest to the development of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

27/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

Deliverable (Title):

D6.1 Quality Plan

Date:

28/08/2022

Work package: Quality assurance

External evaluator (Name): Dimitrios Vlachos

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

a) structure and content

Score: 90/100

56

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

b) length

Score: 95/100

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

c) format

Score: 90/100

- The format is sufficient.
- It will be quite useful the creation of a glossary of acronyms.

d) English language use

Score: 90/100

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.

57

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

ss) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

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

tt) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

58

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No missing information detected. Quality plan provides all the necessary information for the task. 	
uu) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The content is sufficient and reliable. The information of the report is based on international project management practices and tools 	
vv) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcomes are fully applicable. ➤ Qualitative and quantitative indicators for the evaluation of tasks are very useful. ➤ The proposed risk assessment methodology is critical for project's implementation. 	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 80/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Quality plan is common for all domains and it serves horizontally for the whole project. The area of digitization was not considered separately. ➤ A good idea is to address risks and challenges for each domain separately. 	

59

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ The proposed methodology is clearly described in each chapter.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

➤ Deliverable's recommendations are relevant and well presented.	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 90/100
<p>Very good job by team! The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. Quality Plan can be used in order to monitor the project implementation.</p>	
Date of external evaluation review:	28/08/2022
Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos	

60

Deliverable (Title):	D7.1 Dissemination plan	Date:	29/08/2022
Work package:	Dissemination and communication		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content			Score: 90/100
<p>➤ The document is very well structured and the information provided is well organised. ➤ The content is comprehensive and well-aimed, providing dissemination objectives.</p> <p>The structure and content of the report is very well organized, listing the. Chapter 2 was quite interesting, in which the objectives of the previous work packages and the expected results were analyzed. A tabular summary of all the main points would go a long way in summarizing the information. Chapter 3 on key messages needs more clarification to help understand how they arrive, what they serve and how they are used.</p>			
b) length			Score: 95/100
<p>➤ The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for the dissemination plan and activities of the project.</p>			
c) format			Score: 90/100

- The format is sufficient.
- It will be quite useful the creation of a glossary of acronyms.
- Figures 1 and 3 should be renamed to Tables.

d) English language use

Score: 85/100

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

ww) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

- The information delivered is very comprehensive and provides all the necessary information for the project's dissemination activities.
- More analysis will be useful for the online platform (Work package 4)

xx) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

- The deliverable is very comprehensive.
- No missing information detected, except for the information related to the final conference (e.g. date, purpose, etc).

yy) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

- Different data sources were used in the deliverable. Information was gathered from literature, previous projects. Legislation, surveys, etc.

zz) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

- The outcomes are very useful and applicable.

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

Score: /100

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 85/100

62

- The dissemination plan is common for all domains. There is no special reference for the digitalization domain.

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 90/100

63

<p>➤ Opinions of different stakeholders have been adequately reflected in this deliverable. Information regarding the target groups is well presented in Chapter 4.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>➤ The expected results are relevant and well presented.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 90/100</p>

Very good job by team!

The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. It is easy to conclude that the resulting outcomes will be of great interest to the development of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

29/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

External evaluator: Juliet Achieng Owuor (Bio-economy & Forestry)

Deliverable (Title):	D1.1: Stakeholders strategic plans and analysis report	Date:	15/07/2022
Work package:	Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 85 /100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The introduction section provides sufficient overview of the project and the aims of the task, but at times it was difficult to distinguish between the project's objective and the aims of the task. It would be good to describe the project first then end with the task. The justification for developing the growth strategy is not strong enough, as it is, the necessity of having this document is not convincing enough yet we know that this exercise is important because this information is usually spread all over. I like how you analysed the trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitalisation separately, it helps in understanding them better. In as much as there is uniformity in how these sections have been presented, would it have been possible to also highlight the gaps/challenges in sustainability and bioeconomy as you did for digitalisation? On section Also, 2.1.2.1, would it be possible to provide a link to these projects that you have mentioned? "Erasmus+ programme funded several projects related to sustainability topics." As well as section 2.2.3 "Those involved in VET are no exception. The European Commission has captured more than 250 examples and ideas from over 30 countries of how VET providers and other VET stakeholders have adapted." It would be great to inform the readers in advance that more information about the European Projects mentioned in this report are described in detail in Table 1, like you did for the section on bioeconomy (2.3.2.1). What criteria was used to list projects currently found on Table 1 in the Annex? You could add one column to Table 1 for the project websites. Could the trends identified for each field be summarised in a policy brief and the opportunities/gaps listed as well as recommendations provided? This section is very relevant. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The team has done a great job to condense all the information to 39 pages, I am sure that there was a lot of information, and it wasn't an easy task to decide on what to include and leave out. The length is sufficient! 			
c) format		Score: 70/100	

65

- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.
- A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.
- The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.
- Page 18 of 39, a text box or bullet points would help to present the response to the questions related to the key barriers for developing skills and make them visible otherwise they easily get lost in the text.
- More illustrations could be used to break the monotony of the text especially for trends and EU Policies.

d) English language use

Score: 80/100

- Some instances of copy and paste from original documents e.g. The document description on page 1 is copied directly from the project proposal “The growth strategy of the sector will be summarized through the available material and directives from the EU, producers associations and industries, in a comprehensive report in M6” This could be paraphrased to “this document is a summary of the available material and directives from the EU, producers associations and industries.” This is also the case for the description section of Table 1.
- There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: M6
- Few grammatical mistakes but they can be ignored. Some examples:
 - Mix up of spellings for digitalization and digitalisation, choose one and apply consistently
 - Second sentences on page 19, nowadays could be replaced by currently
 - Few wrong tenses
- Language check would help alleviate these minor harmless errors.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

aaa) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 80/100

Comments:

- The information provided adequately addresses the three important areas and I like the description provided on how this task contributes to the other work pages as well as project objectives.
- I could not understand the role of Chapter 3 “European Frameworks in Vocational Education and Training” in relation to Task 1.1, the relevance to other project activities has been stated but this is unclear with regards to T1.1.

bbb) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 80/100

- The information provided offers a good overview of the trends in sustainability, digitalisation and bioeconomy. It is comprehensive and is summarized meticulously, only the presentation is wanting.
- Elaborate more on the challenges that Covid presented to the sector.

66

ccc)reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 80/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very reliable because it is based on information obtained from different sources from past national and EU based projects, EU policy papers, EU level studies from knowledge organisations and reports of associations. That is a good combination of sources. A short description of how the literature review was conducted would have been helpful. 	
ddd) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 80/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A a section to summarize the gaps identified would have been helpful which could be linked to how the next activities would help address them. 	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100
67 N/A	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: /100
N/A	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: 80/100

- Bioeconomy and forestry domain has been addressed sufficiently in this deliverable by making it one of the three sub chapters of chapter 2. This gives it all the attention that it requires.
- There was no definition on forest bioeconomy. It would be great to highlight how the different strategies complement or contradict each other.
- SDGs were mentioned a lot in the report, it would be great to highlight which SDGs these three fields cover (sustainability, digitalisation and bioeconomy) and how they do address them.

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: /100

N/A

- Is this question applicable to this deliverable because the task that produced this output did not require opinions from any stakeholders in my understanding.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: 80/100

68

I am aware that this is not a scientific paper but creating a short section with a description on the methodology would be useful. How were the trends identified? How were the projects identified? Why is it important to list them?

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 70/100

The report is missing a conclusion section, so this is a difficult to assess. As at now, the information is literally all over the place but a conclusion to summarize the findings and the next steps would help.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

N/A

No clear recommendations presented but this could be because it wasn't one of the aims of this task.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 79.55/100
<p>Very good! I like how the information from different sources has been synthesized. The length is perfect, but it is still a lot of information to process. Is it possible to do a policy brief of 2-3 pages on trends for policy makers or a 2-page flyer? The policy brief and/or flyer could be translated into different languages.</p>	
Date of external evaluation review:	15/07/2022
Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor	

Deliverable (Title):	D1.4: Focus group guidelines	Date:	29/07/2022
Work package:	WP1: Skill needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 85 /100	
<p>The description of the document on page 1 is very clear, it wasn't copy pasted text from the proposal. The headings flow very well starting from the task description followed by the summary of the structure of the report before diving into details on focus group discussions.</p> <p>The summary section provides a good overview of that the report is about and what to expect. The content was concise and straight to the point.</p> <p>Use of numbers and bullet points also improved the structure of the report, made it appealing and clearly conveyed the main points.</p> <p>How to motivate the participants was covered, it is good that the team designed an informed consent letter. Section 5.4 "Termination of focus group" could come at the end of section 5.3 "Group discussion", it did not need to be a sub section because it does not provide so much information.</p> <p>The annexed materials are very relevant and, in some cases, provide information that was missing from the focus group discussions for example the participant information sheet had information about Data protection that should have been a sub chapter in the guidelines but was unfortunately not.</p>			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
<p>Very appropriate! The sentences and the paragraphs were short therefore easy to read and not tedious. The team did a great job to condense all that useful information including background information into 10 pages minus the Annex.</p>			
c) format		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as for previous reports. There is room for improvement. The report's appearance is dull, a bright cover page with a nice-looking picture representing the different sectors of the project could be used. • It is not visual enough. Graphics could be used to show the participants who were to take part in the focus group discussion, as well as the topics to be discussed to break the monotony of too much text. Flow charts could have also been used where there is more than one step involved. 			
d) English language use		Score: 85/100	

69

Good. Simple language, great flow, easy to understand.
A list of acronyms and abbreviations should have been created where all the project partners names could be written in full. It is hard for someone who is not part of the consortium to understand who some organizations are only based on the acronyms.
In this deliverable, the work package and task titles were written in full, helps the reader to understand what is being referred to.
There are some few grammatical mistakes for example use of “a” instead of “the”, follow instead of “follows”, wrong prepositions and conjugation. The mistakes are minor and could have been alleviated if a language check was done.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

The information does provide guidance to all the issues around conducting focus group discussions especially online ones which are still new because they started being actively applied when the lockdown started as a result of the Covid pandemic.
It was impressive that the authors started by offering a definition of focus group and its characteristics before going into the nitty gritty of focus group discussions. Preparation has been adequately addressed as well as the actual process of conducting the discussions. Maybe what would have been included is what to do in case the proposed plan fails, for example, what happens if the participants didn't respond to the questions before the discussions, or if they have technical challenges. It is always good to hope for the best but also plan for the worst. An example that was given was how Covid Pandemic caused a change of plan from having face to face focus group discussions to online.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 85/100

The roles of the project partners have been clearly outlined and described.
What was done outside what was stated in the proposal has been highlighted.
Data protection rules should have been explicitly included as a sub section under preparation. It is important to clearly state how the project intends to store data collected, for how long, how they will use it and what happens to it after. This was stated in the participant information sheet only but should have also been included in the guidelines.
The expected participants for the focus group discussions on forestry issues and the policy-oriented one should have been stated. Of course, the composition could have changed but at this point, one has no idea who to expect from the two focus group discussions.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 80 /100

There was no list of references, does that mean that all the information came from the authors? Didn't they refer to secondary sources?
Selection of participants: From my understanding, they were approached informally before they received a formal invitation. You could have supplemented that by setting up a call for participants for groups that could have seen the online posts, advertise it using the project's partners social media platforms so as to reach a wider group and increase diversity in the groups.

70

71

<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The guidelines have been written in a way that can be applied elsewhere outside the project context. It was so informative for me as well. I would recommend that facilitators and their teams join the meeting 30 minutes earlier instead of the proposed 15 minutes so that they have ample time to address any pending issues or any emerging ones. The participants can join 10 minutes earlier so that they have sufficient time to ask any questions that they may have regarding the discussions.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least five of the profiles listed involve stakeholders from forestry. The objectives also focused on the needs in the forest sector which is impressive. • A focus group on forestry by CEPI in Brussels and targeted at a different group was also a good opportunity for collecting information about forestry issues. 	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

A wide range of stakeholders were targeted, good job. Including politicians (including chamber representatives), NGOs (including consumers), market actors (conventional actors in wholesale, logistics and retailing or alternative food networks) into the list added to the diversity. The other two proposed focus group discussions in Brussels with different stakeholders also ensured that as many as possible representatives of the sector were reached.

My biggest concern was how students were missing, they should have been in the main group. Their perceptions are worth capturing which could have compared to the other stakeholders to determine if there is a mismatch in expectations or they are all thinking along the same line.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: 90/100

Very well described. The roles of the project partners have been well listed as well as the roles of the moderators, facilitators and participants. Every step has been clearly elaborated.

A minor comment: Please clarify which native language the rapporteur should be proficient in (I think it should be regional language?)

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: /100

N/A This deliverable does not provide conclusions.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 90/100

The outcomes of this task could act as recommendations. They are very useful as highlighted in section 2d. I wish that there was a way to share them with the public in the form of a handbook or guidelines that whoever wants to carry out focus group discussions can refer to. Such material does exist but they are usually so long compared to what you have produced.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 85.41/100

72

Very good! A very useful output that can be applied beyond the context of this project. Well drafted and easy to understand. All steps involved have been covered and clearly described.

Date of external evaluation review: 29/07/2022

Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor

Deliverable (Title):	D1.5: Focus Group Analysis	Date:	31/07/2022
Work package:	Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		

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

a) structure and content **Score: 90/100**

The flow is great! Interesting information to read. The overview of how the focus group discussions were conducted and data processing and analysis provide good background information and they are very clearly elaborated.

The last two paragraphs in the introduction section help the reader to know what to anticipate in the report. The main information has been well captured in the main body of the report. Conclusion section is well drafted.

b) length **Score: 85/100**

Very appropriate! The Annex section is long but that is not a problem since the main messages are already captured in the main section of the report.

c) format **Score: 90/100**

- A cover page with a nice picture would improve the appearance of the report and draw attention of the reader.
- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.
- A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.
- The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.
- Many figures and tables have been used so the balance between text and illustrations is good.
- The x-axis of all the figures (1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 and 11) should be labelled so that we can be sure whether you are referring to %, numbers or years...
- A legend should be provided for Figure 1, 8, 9, 10, and 11 otherwise it is not easy to understand what the colours represent.
- The quotes used also helped to summarize the main points and increased the diversity in style as well as bullet points.
- The stakeholder profiles for the tables in the Annex section should have been written in full instead of the numbers. The names are not long so they could easily fit into the columns. An additional column with totals would have provided a good overview of the skill that was mentioned most.

73

- The structure and writing styles of the Executive summaries in the Annex sections differed a lot. Was there an agreed style? Some had the trends listed comprehensively like Germany, which was excellent while others like Slovenia, France went straight to the points they wanted to pass across which was also great. Netherlands also provided a comprehensive executive summary.
- The Executive summaries from Greece, Austria and forestry mentioned about the participants unlike the summaries from other countries. The Executive summary from Ireland provided a summary of the process and not trends on the topics being investigated while the summary from Italy was more of questions than highlighting the trends.
-

d) English language use

Score: 80/100

- There is no big problem about this, correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language. A few errors were there
- This text could be paraphrased in a better way: “In the period from May to July 2020, 11 focus groups were conducted (see Table 1), nine of which were conducted at the national level and 2 of which were conducted at a pan-European level on EU policy and on forestry issues, respectively.”
- Same as this one” Then it was decided to look for another method to transcribe the focus groups,”
- A different term should have been used “During the focus groups, all participants were asked to present their top 10 rankings and each participant was requested to present his/her 3 most important skills in a reasoned manner.”
- There were a few other conjugation of verbs errors
- Language checks by an expert recommended.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

74

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

This deliverable is important because many steps rely on it. It has sufficiently covered the objective of identifying skills and touched on many aspects which is commendable.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

The deliverable is comprehensive. It has touched on different aspects of skills ranging from importance among categories and sectors to the missing and changing ones and how they vary within job levels for important sectors that is agriculture, forestry and forest-based industry and food industry. It also highlights training needs, needs of the training systems at national and European level, target group for training and methods as well as certification. It has touched on areas that haven't been very well investigated which is a plus because it provided new information. National, EU and international environmental policies, regulation, subsidy and support programmes is an important point that came across in the results because we have many policies targeted to the sector and it is important to understand them.

Soft skills were given sufficient attention just like technical skills. From the list of missing skills, bioeconomy and soft skills had the longest list which is unfortunately how the real situation is so that is something that needs to be looked into by the relevant stakeholders.

A few topics did not feature prominently yet they are very important especially when we think of the future of the sector for example how to attract young people to the sector, importance of practical experience and lifelong learning. Collaboration among different stakeholders was brought up by the participants in the focus

groups. This is an important issue because successful training can only be achieved through strong partnerships and collaboration among different stakeholders.
It would have been interesting to find out from the focus group participants how the skills would have changed beyond 5-10 years, that time frame is short.
Comparisons of the results at the Eu level then at country level is impressive because it highlights the general trends and also allows for country specific trends to be highlighted.

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

The deliverable is reliable. A rigorous methodology was used including a consultation process among the project partners, revision of the guidelines whenever need arises. Different perspectives have been presented. The number of focus groups carried out are sufficient and the topics have been sufficiently addressed.

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

The outcomes are very applicable.

75

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

N/A

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

N/A

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score:90/100</p>
<p>Bioeconomy has been well covered in this deliverable. Separating bioeconomy into agriculture, forestry and food sector was helpful in ensuring that they are well investigated and capture the differences for each group. The differences in the results for these three groups shows why it was important to separate them otherwise some results would have been overshadowed by others. Forestry has also been sufficiently covered by having a focus group specifically targeted at the topic.</p> <p>The skills regarded as important in bioeconomy and forestry, the gaps and training needs have been well highlighted. Figure 11 about Most selected skills for the Forestry focus group is a true reflection of the challenges and opportunities that the forestry sector has. It is surprising to see how the sector considers technical skills important, this would not have been highlighted if forestry was merged with other sectors.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>Many stakeholders have been represented. A separate focus group targeted at policy issues was also organized to collect opinions on the topic which is excellent. I also liked the separate focus group conducted for forestry to bring together different stakeholders engaged in the topic.</p> <p>More students should have been involved, it should have been a bottom-up approach as it is now, it is a top down approach where educators and policy makers propose ideas without consulting the group on which the ideas are to be implemented. It is always good to balance opinions.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>Very well described. Where modifications were made was also stated. The shortcomings were also stated. Luckily the challenges that arose from using IMAGO/IBM were detected early through the pilot tests. Did the team in charge of procuring the soft ware read reviews before buying it? Didn't they foresee that such a problem could arise?</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>
<p>This is the first deliverable that has a comprehensive conclusion section so far. The conclusions are supported by evidence presented in the deliverable. One can only read the conclusion and understand what the entire deliverable is about.</p> <p>The authors indicated how the results of this deliverable will be applied to future project tasks.</p>	

76

<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>They are relevant because they relevant and address most of the issues in the different sectors that were investigated. They have also been very well presented and easy to pick them out.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 89.23/100</p>
<p>Very good! Great job to the team involved in producing this deliverable. They have touched on many important issues and presented them very well. They invested time to this task and producing the deliverable. Technical aspects were well covered. Impressive!</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>31/07/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>	

77

<p>Deliverable (Title):</p>	<p>D1.7 Survey Analysis</p>	<p>Date:</p>	<p>29/07/2022</p>
<p>Work package:</p>	<p>Skills Needs Identification</p>		
<p>External evaluator (Name):</p>	<p>Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>		
<p>1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*</p>			
<p>u) structure and content</p>		<p>Score:80 /100</p>	
<p>The introduction section provides very little background information. The topics being addressed in the survey are not clearly elaborated beyond this “It will contain information relating to the demographic profile of participants, organisational insights, stakeholder engagement, identified skills (both current and future skills requirements), training needs and recognition of training and finally business trend analysis.” The dissemination campaign is comprehensively elaborated starting from the languages to be used for the survey, details about the survey (content and time taken), additional information collected, and how the survey was disseminated. Why did you settle for the selected languages? The flow is great, main points clearly highlighted. Presenting the main trends for the country level analysis is helpful. It is easy to pick them up and get an idea of what is happening in different countries.</p>			
<p>v) length</p>		<p>Score: 90/100</p>	
<p>Very appropriate! The introduction and methodology section before getting to the main content of this report which were the training legislations in different countries offers good background information.</p>			
<p>w) format</p>		<p>Score: 70/100</p>	

The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.

A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.

The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.

The mix of tables, graphs, pie charts and even word cloud is great. It makes the report appealing to the reader and easy to pick the main points.

More than 90% of the figures and tables in the deliverable both in the main and annex sections are not numbered making it to refer to them directly. The authors refereed to them as the table/figure on the left or right.

Majority of the figures did not have labels for the x and y axis.

The pie charts did not have % making it difficult to compare the results especially when there were small differences in the sizes of the pies.

The legend in the figure on page 37 should be defined.

x) English language use

Score: 80/100

Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.

Which tasks are these (task 1.3 and task 1.4) in full?

Work Package 1, full name should have been provided

The text in the description of the report on page 1 was copy pasted directly from the project proposal because it is in future tense instead of present tense.

“It will contain information relating” copy pasted from the proposal. So the tense is in future instead of present

I recommend a language check to correct the few mistakes present.

78

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

The deliverable has identified the current and future skills needs which was one of the main project’s goals. It is good to see that the skills assessment was conducted in line with the skills categories that were identified across the project, shows link with the other work packages.

In the proposal, the project planned to identify global trends, but the survey’s focus was Europe. Where does global come in, for this case?

The results from the survey are expected to support the development of a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills which will make the strategy reliable because it represents the real situation as it currently is at the EU and country levels.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 80/100

The target audience of the survey was not specified in the introduction and the questions to be assessed were not elaborated.

There was little/no mention of how these results will be applied in the next project tasks. Since the report is not available to the public, is it possible to summarize the results in the form of a policy brief or factsheets to inform policy makers? The respondents indicated the need for policy initiatives in digitalization, sustainability, business and entrepreneurship skills, and bio industries, sharing the outcomes of the survey with the policy makers could be a starting point. These results should also be presented in meetings where policy makers are present so that they can be aware of what is missing an example of such meetings is the European Forest Week. The project can organize a side event.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 90/100

The sample size is reliable because of the high number of the respondents (517) from 29 countries within the European Union, as well as countries outside of the European Union, and within the European Economic Area (EEA), which surpassed the target of 300 that was stated in the project proposal. Maybe if the data collection period was long enough more than two months, more responses would have been collected. The results show a true picture of the situation in Europe for many topics, that means that the project did a great job. Does the infographic information collected from the survey represent the true picture of the sector? For example, as having more males than females, or the average age of the stakeholders. The depth of the analysis is excellent for example for organizational insights, analysis of skills at three levels. My concern is about the unequal distribution of responses. Why did Spain and Italy have more responses compared to other countries? What did they do to achieve that? It should be stated that results from countries with low number of responses should be interpreted with caution.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 85/100

The analysis of the results at European level and country levels provides a holistic view of very many issues that the stakeholders in agriculture, bioeconomy and forestry sector need to be aware of. I didn't see the need for analysis the identified skills across sectoral levels because even the results revealed that there were no differences in opinions regarding the importance of the skills except for the bio-economy sector which was divided into three categories. The seven skills groups assessed: sustainability skills, digitalisation skills, bioeconomy skills (Agriculture), bioeconomy Skills (Forestry and food industry), soft skills and business and entrepreneurship skills are very essential therefore focusing the survey to address them is a brilliant idea. Most these topics have also not been sufficiently investigated before, so the outcomes of the survey contribute to the knowledge in these areas. Most research usually investigate soft skills or entrepreneurship separately and single country focus, I like how this survey brought together all these aspects at European level. It is impressive that the survey did not end at only identifying the skills but went a step further to investigate the training aspects. I haven't come across this information before, that was very creative! To increase the usefulness, please consider summarizing the outcomes into a policy brief of factsheets for policy makers.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

Score: /100

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

N/A

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

Score: /100

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

79

N/A	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	Score: 85/100
<p>Bioeconomy & Forestry domain has been well covered. Current and future skills for the Bioeconomy sector were identified. The assessment was comprehensive because it looked at bioeconomy from three angles: Agriculture, Forestry and Food Industry. This was helpful because the skills needs are different for these three groups and separating them provided a good opportunity to determine the specific skills for forestry which would have otherwise been overshadowed by agriculture. Gaps in training provision also in bioeconomy were identified. Trends at country and EU levels on bioeconomy have been presented. So far this is the deliverable that has widely covered bioeconomy and forestry.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	Score: 80/100
<p>80 Subsections 3.2 and 3.3 clearly detail the stakeholders involved. There is a lot of diversity in the categories of stakeholders who participated in the survey. Splitting the analysis of the organizational profiles helps to further highlight the diversity among the engaged groups. How were the farmers reached? It is surprising to see them on top of the stakeholders profiles list. Policy makers are also presented which is a group that is usually not well represented and also hard to reach. More students should have been engaged. Bio-based industries did not respond to the survey but I believe that you did not miss out on much because this is something that is yet to be established so there are few players involved at the moment but it would still add value to get their perception.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	Score: 85/100
<p>The dissemination plan was well described. The target group should have been stated and the topics of the survey well elaborated. Are the current respondents what was expected or how are they similar to or different from the original target?</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	Score: 80/100

The interesting findings on stakeholders profiles, differences across countries and trends are supported by the results of the survey.

The conclusion should have gone deeper into highlighting the main interesting results from the EU and country level comparisons. I find the conclusion so brief, it does not provide sufficient policy recommendations.

<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 70/100</p>
--	-----------------------------

There were no recommendations provided by this deliverable to the best of my knowledge. This was not the objective of the task and the deliverable. However summarising the main findings would have been helpful just like how it was done in the country level analysis where the main trends were listed. Otherwise one needs time to read the entire report to be able to identify the trends.

<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 81.54/100</p>
---	--

81

Very good! The report comprehensively highlights the findings from the survey which were very interesting and touched on topics that have been least investigated. The results will contribute to increasing the knowledge the respective fields. To be able to reach a wider audience, recommendations from the results should be developed and presented to policy makers and universities. A scientific paper should also be developed out of this deliverable.

<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>29/07/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>	

<p>Deliverable (Title):</p>	<p>D1.8: Trend and scenario analysis</p>	<p>Date:</p>	<p>30/07/2022</p>
<p>Work package:</p>	<p>Skill Needs Identification</p>		
<p>External evaluator (Name):</p>	<p>Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>		

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

<p>y) structure and content</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
--	-----------------------------

Great flow! Section 1.1 is titled structure of the report but the content is more about the task, it's aim and justification and not about the structure of the report. Section 1.3 which is about the project's dimensions is the one that mentions the structure of the report in the last paragraph. Maybe section 1.1 should be renamed to something else because the content does not live up to the expectation of the title. Overview of the policy framework was great and so was how the project tried to link their work to the priority areas mentioned!

<p>z) length</p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>
-------------------------	------------------------------

Very appropriate! The Annex is long but that is not a problem. The main section is short enough and provides important insights at the EU level and a summary of the regional trends and scenarios and skills needs!

aa) format

Score: 85/100

Boxes, tables, maps, figures have helped in summarizing a lot of information and increased the visual appeal of the deliverable.

Consistent font type throughout the document up to the Annexes.

Highlighting main points in bold for the trends and scenarios identified makes it easy to spot them especially where the paragraphs are too long. Presenting a summary of the trends in a table before expounding on them is very helpful.

Different table styles have been applied, it would be great if they could all have same style, Table 2-7 have the same style which is different from Table 1, 8, 10, 11 and 12. Table 9 has the four dimensions of sustainability, digitalisation, bioeconomy and business models highlighted in blue.

The names of the projects in Annex 2 should be in bold to distinguish them from the rest of the text, they get lost making it difficult to know where information about the next project starts.

The Font sizes in the boxes with country scenarios in the Annex are too small, one can hardly read the information even when you zoom to 100%.

bb) English language use

Score: 100/100

Excellent, no mistakes. Simple to understand language. Correct tenses, conjugation, everything grammar is ok.

There is a minor spelling mistake on the title of Table 9, "h" has been omitted so instead of three scenarios the authors wrote tree scenarios.

82

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

The deliverable builds up on the previous tasks of the project hence helping achieve several objectives at a go. The business models are the elements of management & entrepreneurship and soft skills that were included as dimensions in Task 1.3 -Country and Focus Group Discussions, and Task 1.4 - Bottom-up Surveys. This deliverable therefore contributes to the identification of global trends and skill gaps which will also contribute to the strategy which will be developed at the EU and Country level to improve the skills.

a) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 85/100

The trends and scenarios presented at the EU and country levels are very detailed. I like how the team went a step further to analyse the skills needs at country level based on the scenarios developed.

However, I expected to see trends on workforce related issues, health and safety challenges were mentioned in Table 2 but what about the ageing workforce and lack of sufficient replacement? What about green jobs in these sectors, wouldn't this fit under sustainability? There is also the issue of short-term migrant workers from other EU countries and poor working conditions that they are subjected to, isn't this a trend? Maybe something worth asking is the timeframe for the trends identified by Wepner et al., 2018? Considering that the project is focussed on skills, it would be important to also focus on the people who are supposed to benefit from the skills and ensure that the challenges they are experiencing are clearly highlighted to ensure that the proposals align well with the challenges and are able to solve them. Covering skills needs for each scenario is a step in the right direction!

The reason behind highlighting the countries in Table 8 has not been highlighted therefore confusing to the readers.

Time frame: the reasons why the project decided to go for 2020-30 is not stated. It would be interesting to see if the scenarios would have been different if the time frame was increased from 2030 to 2050 to match with the EU's Green Deal target of making Europe climate neutral by 2050.

The potential of rural areas was briefly mentioned in the scenarios but the important role they play wasn't highlighted enough. These areas create many jobs in the agriculture and forestry sectors, offer recreation and ecotourism opportunities. It was mentioned briefly in the scenarios.

The authors should have also included a step in the methodology where they asked the project team to provide any missing trend to ensure that everything has been captured.

The summary in Annex 2 about the scenario studies from other projects is great!

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

83 The results presented are reliable since the data was obtained from diverse credible sources and using different methods hence minimising bias and ensuring that many important areas are covered.

The team did not try to re-invent the wheel but built on an already existing study from the Horizon2020 project Fit4Food2030 (Wepner et al., 2018), which is something that should be encouraged more so if they are relying on work from previous projects funded by the same source. Scenario analysis was also built from scenario development exercises by EU researchers in the past decade.

A lot of literature and policy documents have also been extensively analysed.

c) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 95/100
---	----------------------

The outcomes are useful, the trends highlighted are exactly what is happening at the moment, none of them is out of place or irrelevant. Keeping the time frame short in this case up to 2030 has an advantage because there is a likelihood that the trends will continue therefore the scenarios presented are most likely going to take place.

The focus on EU followed by country level is also helpful because we know that the priorities for each country may not be the same with the other in as much as they are in the same region or are neighbours.

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

N/A	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: /100
N/A	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: 90/100
<p>84 The deliverable has done justice to the bioeconomy and forestry domain. Separating bioeconomy into agriculture, forestry and food industry sectors provides room for tackling them adequately. Focus on business models in forestry is crucial because this is something that tends to be overlooked many times but we need to focus on it because of the increasing demand for sustainably sourced forest products that is currently being witnessed.</p> <p>It would have been interesting if trends that cut across the three sectors would also be highlighted in Table 2.</p> <p>The results of the key issues for the scenarios in bioeconomy are interesting and would have been overshadowed by the others if bioeconomy way not focussed on separately.</p> <p>Highlighting skills needs for bioeconomy under different scenarios and for different countries was useful! What I missed were bioeconomy trends about the construction and fashion industries, they are growing so fast, I thought they would have been featured.</p> <p>Very pertinent issues in forestry have been highlighted in the trends and scenarios as well as the skills.</p>	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: /100
N/A to this deliverable.	

85

<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>		
<p>The methodology has been very clearly described! No detail was left out, the names of the partners involved in the trend analysis at EU and country level was stated, aim was stated, definition of trends provided, list of trends identified and how they were applied to the four dimensions of the FIELDS study was stated. It's good that literature and sector and policy documents analysed were not listed in this section but instead done in sections 2.3-2.6.</p> <p>The aims should have been stated in a concise manner to make it easy to always double check if they have been achieved. A stronger justification on the need for the trends and scenario analysis should have been provided.</p>			
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>		
<p>The deliverable has provided sufficient justification for everything that has been presented!</p>			
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>		
<p>The identified trends and scenarios are very relevant. Climate change is the biggest challenge that many sectors have to deal with therefore focusing the trends on sustainability around climate change helps to identify very serious issues that the agriculture and forest sectors are currently facing.</p> <p>Highlighting country specific trends, scenarios and skills needs increases the relevance of the deliverable.</p>			
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 92.08/100</p>		
<p>Very good! The results were very interesting and well described! I liked how the findings were focussed at EU level followed by country level.</p>			
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>07/08/2022</p>		
<p>Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>			
<p>Deliverable (Title):</p>	<p>D2.1: List of occupational profiles</p>	<p>Date:</p>	<p>26/06/2022</p>
<p>Work package:</p>	<p>Priorities and strategy design</p>		

External evaluator (Name): Juliet Achieng Owuor	
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*	
a) structure and content	Score: 85/100
The flow of ideas is great and very informative. The aim of the task is well stated at the beginning that is creation of at least 10 new occupational profiles in the sectors of agriculture, food industry and forestry. The Annex is very detailed.	
b) length	Score: 90/100
Comments: Very appropriate, easy to read within a short time and grasp the key messages!	
c) format	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover page is needed to make the report appealing. The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names. • A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white. • The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos. • List of acronyms and abbreviations used in the deliverable is needed. • Presentation of the results in tables helps break the monotony of text and makes the information easy to read and understand. It is easy to identify the key messages. • The mid map in the Annex presents a lot of useful information in a simplified way. 	
d) English language use	Score: 85/100
Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language. There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: WP1, Task 2.1	
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
eee) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 85/100
The deliverable addresses key issues and it is an important one because it will be applied to many other project tasks. The description of each of the essential and optional knowledge for each occupational profile is very helpful.	

86

fff) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 85/100
<p>Most of the information has been covered including how the task relates with the other project activities both previous and upcoming. I like the idea of applying soft Skills and Business & Entrepreneurship skills to all profiles instead of being a separate occupational profile.</p>	
ggg) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 85/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The outcomes of the skills identification exercises are reliable because they are based on materials on skill gaps and knowledge gaps identified by the previous tasks of the WP 1 activities, focus groups, bottom-up surveys and trends and scenario analysis. • The brainstorming meetings among the working groups must have helped clear any doubts. The methodology applied to the task that resulted in this deliverable is robust. • The skills listed for the operators and technicians in digitalization, sustainability and bioeconomy match their profiles. 	
hhh) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 90/100
<p>The outcomes are useful, they were really thought through and they can even be applied beyond the scope of this project. It would be interesting to see how they contribute to the other project tasks.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	Score: /100
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	Score: /100

87

N/A	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	Score:85 /100
<p>In this deliverable bioeconomy was given sufficient attention. It was one of the three sectors that were focussed on. Separating it into agriculture and food industry helps ensure the assessment to be very specific. Forestry bioeconomy should have been included as a category, I don't know why it was not included. How will the profiles for forestry be established in the subsequent steps if it was not featured in this deliverable?</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	Score: 80/100
<p>The objective of the task was not to represent many stakeholders. However since the outcomes have been informed by other project activities like bottom up surveys and focus group discussions, it is sufficient to say that the opinions of different stakeholders have been indirectly reflected.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The methodology has been clearly described from the first step which involved forming the working groups to the meetings they attended to the last one how the skills were identified. The modifications that were made have also been clarified. • The descriptions of the technicians and operators and their roles have been provided which was missing in Deliverable 2.2 	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	Score: /100

88

N/A	
7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	Score: 85/100
The recommended essential and optional knowledge are relevant for the respective occupational profiles.	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 86.25/100
Very good!	
Date of external evaluation review:	26/06/2022
Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor	

89

Deliverable (Title):	D2.2: Prioritized occupational profiles	Date:	16/07/2022
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content	Score: 85/100		
Overall, the structure and content are ok. The flow of ideas is good and well organized.			
b) length	Score: 90/100		

Overall, the length is perfect, it is not too brief or too long. All the necessary information has been presented. It is not tiresome to read the report.

The introduction section is too brief, a justification of the need for the task that resulted in this deliverable should be stated as well as the objectives. What the deliverable intends to contribute to should also be stated.

c) format

Score: 70/100

- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.
- A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.
- The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.
- The tables are monotonous, use of more visually appealing tools like spider diagrams. A reader feels like they are already at the Annex section of the report because of all those tables. Another solution would be to add another colour to the tables that blends well with yellow to increase the appeal.
- A few sentences after each table, highlighting key points would have helped break the monotony of the tables.
- The table in section 3.2.7 expounds on the skills listed unlike other tables

d) English language use

Score:80 /100

Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.

Use of acronyms at the beginning without providing the full title of the deliverable for example D2.1 mentioned on page 1, D1.8 on page 4

There were a few grammatical mistakes on page 1, I would recommend that the deliverable undergoes a language check though the mistakes are minor.

90

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

It builds up on the list of occupational profiles that had been developed before, so it links with other project tasks. The outcomes will also be helpful for the subsequent tasks. The deliverable has raised important points that will help in achieving the objective on designing a strategy on improving skills.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 80/100

The target group of this deliverable should have been specified as well as what it should achieve.

In the first paragraph on page 1, it is stated that the ranking of the skills/knowledge developed so that it can be used in the later stages of the project but the stages have not been mentioned.

On the description for ranking skills and knowledge, what does nice to know mean. The term does not is confusing, does it mean that a nice skill is optional that is not mandatory but still relevant? How were the overall scores for the skills calculated? Why did you also include a column with values without time, what purpose does it serve? Why were the overall scores slightly lower than the scores where time was not included?

<p>The definitions of skills and knowledge should have also been provided in the methodology section. What are level 4 and 5 occupation profiles? Why were they considered? Were there skills that were cross cutting across for the operators in bioeconomy, digitalization and sustainability or the technicians?</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 70/100</p>
<p>Overall, the deliverable somewhat reliable but more clarification is needed. The experience of the consortium partners was used to determine critically and time, how was this done and why did you choose that option? Was a survey carried out among the project partners? Why was this kt explained in detail in the methodology? I am a bit sceptical about this, it should be well clarified so as to be convincing.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The findings can be easily used by other projects in the future because they are really detailed and well elaborated but guidance on this is needed. For section 3.2.6, the category on good agricultural practices is very broad with topics that are different from each other. It would add more value to either evaluate each of them separately or create smaller groups than what you have at the moment. This is the same as for environmental management aspects and legislation regarding the issue of water, protected areasand environmental licensing.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	

91

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The two domains have been addressed. The deliverable has highlighted very well the essential and optional skills as well as essential and optional knowledge needed for operators and technicians. I would have expected European environmental legislation/regulation, policies, subsidy and support programmes as well as good agricultural practices: Crop diversification, conservation farming; agroforestry to be among the essential knowledge for operators but it is surprising that it is not.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>Only opinions of technicians and operators in the fields of agriculture, food industry and forestry. Is there a way this task could be expanded beyond the two profiles? But the classification is still very helpful.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The methodology is comprehensively covered. Criteria applied was well described in Table 1. Further description of how the criteria were evaluated has been provided. However the definitions of operator and technicians should have been provided because section 3.1 and 3.2 focus on them but we don't have a clear picture of who they really are. Considering that this deliverable is available to the public, then it is important to clarify that.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>

92

The ranking of the skills is very useful. The skills listed are also very relevant. Recommendations on how to use the results from this deliverable would be helpful for those who intend to use in future projects. Policy recommendations would have been helpful too.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 81.25/100
--	---------------------------------

Very good! The results of the rankings were interesting. It will be interesting to see how they will contribute to the structure and organization of the training modules in the next steps of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:	30/07/2022
Signature/Name:	Juliet Achieng Owuor

93

Deliverable (Title):	D2.3	Date:	31/07/2022
Work package:	WP2 Priorities and Strategy Design		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 100/100	
Great flow, introduction, methodology, results and then conclusion and way forward. The introduction section is comprehensive, it states the aims of the FIELDS Project, the aim of the task, what the deliverable will be used for and topics that it will address and action points. Very useful information all synthesized very well on one page. This is an example of a very good introduction section. The results are presented precisely. It is so easy to read and understand. That makes the deliverable very captivating to read. I did not want it to end. Everything flows very well. Since this deliverable is available to the public, it is important that all information is precise.			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
Very appropriate! Introduction section is long enough therefore provides all the needed information.			
c) format		Score: 85/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cover page needed to make the report more appealing. The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names. The font size of the text in Table 1,2,3,4,5, is too tiny and strenuous to read. The existing initiatives at international and national levels to monitor the skills ecosystem should have been presented in a table format with the name of the initiative, short description, level it operates and web link. The small font text on figure 1 is not legible. 			
d) English language use		Score: 85/100	

Good. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.
Some typos are there: This raises the question whether the development of standard education and training modules at European level would be the direction to go.
Two full stops have been used on page 12 “Cross-functional skills are considered very important across job profiles, and perhaps critical for small business/companies, where all-rounder workers are often needed.
Language check would have helped eradicate the minor grammatical mistakes especially for documents that are accessible to the public.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

The deliverable addresses important issues in the project and contributes the objectives on identifying global trends and skill gaps and designing a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

The deliverable is comprehensive.
Principle 2 proposes a supra-national institute/organisation but the sentence before the paragraph states that a supra-national organization is **not needed**; actual needs are best monitored locally. Regional authorities and public employment agencies should have a key role in monitoring. This is confusing. What is the right recommendation?
Listing the existing monitoring skills ecosystems is a good way to create awareness and visibility around them because this deliverable is available to the public.
Addressing the topic of funding tools is great because many at times recommendations can not be implemented because of lack of financial resources. The proposed ideas are applicable because some are offered free and it will be easy to mobilise resources from different sources as listed in the deliverable.
Resilience in training programmes was also highlighted. It is important to keep the courses updated and adapt them to the needs of the market.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 85/100

Data was obtained from a survey conducted on the project partners in combination with results from tasks 2.1 and 2.2. It was supplemented by EU policy documents and reports of EU level organizations involved in the analysis of skill needs and/or the design of training. The process of data collection was rigorous hence making the deliverable reliable. Why did the 5 project partners not respond to the survey? Did their lack of participation affect the results in any way? Was there a sector not represented because of that?

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

Overall, the proposals should be applicable, some can be easily done but others will take time.
The following proposed KPIs for assessment of training modules and courses are dependent on the labour market and not the training offered therefore should be applied with caution: employment status of trainees after graduation, incl. job promotions, placement rate for unemployed learners and rate of young people/workers recruited in agri-food sector.
The deliverable focused on very important topics that have not been addressed in the other deliverables: partnership and governance of the European agri-food and forestry skills ecosystem, gender issues and underprivileged groups and resources.

94

Solutions are proposed where challenges have been highlighted. These proposals are useful in guiding decision making and implementation processes.

The recommendations are very relevant for example this one “Include social entrepreneurship as a topic to learn trainees a “sustainability mindset” with a long-term vision on a sustainable bio-economy.” Entrepreneurship is a skill that is needed a lot in the sector but insufficient training is being offered on the same.

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

Score: /100

N/A

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: /100

N/A

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?
**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: 90/100

Forestry has been sufficiently covered because it was analysed as a sector allowing for the trends to be adequately investigated.

Bioeconomy was one of the domains of focus so it received sufficient attention.

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 90/100

95

Employers should also be included in Table 3: Potential partners in the agri-food/forestry skills partnership because they are on the demand side therefore important to work with them to increase the effectiveness of the partnerships.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: 90/100

- The methodology has been well described in a succinct manner, short and straight to the point.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 100/100

The conclusions have been supported by evidence presented in the deliverable and the connection well elaborated.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 100/100

The 11 principles that have been proposed are very solid and have been backed up by evidence. They are feasible. None was overambitious. The proposed way forward is a step in the right direction and will help improve the principles further.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 91.92/100

Very good! The deliverable is great!

Date of external evaluation review:

31/07/2022

Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor

Deliverable (Title):	D3.1: Training methodologies	Date:	29/07/2022
Work package:	New tools and training design		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		

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

a) structure and content

Score: 100/100

96

The content has been well elaborated. The flow is excellent, it is like reading a novel.
The introduction delivers a lot of useful information about how the task will be organized in a very concise manner. There are no repetitions or very long stories.
The points from Erasmus that were regarded during the decision on the training platforms is helpful to the reader because most of us are not well versed in them.
The chapter on learning objectives sets a good scene for the introduction of the training methodologies.
The chapters are organised very well all, each elaborates the different topics so well and in a step-by-step manner, after introduction comes pedagogical approaches followed by learning objectives then training methodologies and so on.
The learning objectives have been very well elaborated and sufficient examples of training methodologies provided.

b) length

Score: 90/100

Very appropriate! Does not take much time to read! Short paragraphs make the deliverable easy to read.

c) format

Score: 80/100

The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.

A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.

The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.

The deliverable is full of text. More use of tables for example to summarize the training methods just like what was done in Table 1.

d) English language use

Score: 95/100

Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, vocabularies. The technical content was presented it in a way that can be understood by many readers.

Very few grammatical mistakes.

97

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

iii) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

It addresses a very important question about the most effective and efficient teaching methods. This is helpful especially in forestry where the uptake of online training methods has been slow until the pandemic happened, and things had to change drastically. The information provided will help in streamlining that.

The different learning styles have been well described; I am curious about how they were selected. A sentence or two had been provided to that effect but more information about this could have clarified this further as in what indicators were used to qualify a methodology to be featured?

The deliverable will contribute to the objective on skills improvement because it provides options on how to conduct the planned pilot training.

jjj) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

It has touched on so many relevant topics from pedagogical approaches to training methodologies offering definitions, describing their characteristics and activities involved, highlighting the differences among them. I have learnt a lot from this report.

I would recommend that a summary table be created to summarise the main points for some readers who might not have time to go through all the text provided. The table could highlight the main similarities and differences among each method, how it could be applied to different target groups.

With the challenge of forestry being a practical oriented discipline, I was hoping to see training methodologies that could help address the problem that was created by lockdown during the pandemic therefore making students miss out the chance to go for field work.

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

The team did a great job. They did a thorough research and listed their sources of information. This part was well executed.

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

The proposals are very applicable. The forest sector needs information on how to change training from face to face to online or hybrid. This deliverable provides useful information to guide the process. The fact that the recommended methods are going to be applied to the trainings to be carried out by the project is commendable.

98

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

N/A

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

N/A

<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A to this deliverable. The focus of the deliverable was to define the pedagogical approach that will be used to develop the training programme in order to enhance the learning process.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>There was no room to involve stakeholders for this task. But the methods identified target unique groups. I like the idea of targeting farmers and their advisors; these are the most forgotten group when it comes to training, yet they are important stakeholders. It was stated in the project proposal that foresters and their advisors are also targeted but I did not come across this in the report.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A This task did not require a detailed methodology, but I would still recommend that a description be provided on how the methods listed were selected. Including a justification on why the task was needed is a good idea but it was very brief.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The proposed training methodologies are supported by evidence based on the previous chapters on pedagogical approaches and learning objectives. For the section on E-learning platform Access Modality, the authors compared different available tools and developed parameters for comparisons before they settled for Moodle. They provided sufficient reasons based on thorough research that they conducted.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

99

The proposed teaching methods are relevant, some of them are not popular in forestry, I hope that this will be a chance for educators to pick them up and apply them. I would have appreciated if the authors could already state in a summary table which method would be applied to which group and which sector.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 89.55/100
--	---------------------------------

Very good! The deliverable provides very useful information about teaching methodologies that many trainers can borrow and if well applied they can supplement in person teaching which was impossible during the pandemic.
I hope that the deliverable will be published as a scientific paper to increase the reach in this case within the academia community.

Date of external evaluation review:	29/07/2022
Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor	

100

Deliverable (Title):	D5.1: Regulatory Framework List	Date:	25/06/2022
Work package:	Long term action plan		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content			Score: 75/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The target audience of the report need to be elaborated further, stating that the report targets relevant governmental and sectoral authorities is not enough. The introduction section is very brief. Background information including the need for the report has not been stated as well as the relevance/importance which is necessary to justify why the task needed to be done. The introduction and methodology section before getting to the main content of this report which were the training legislations in different countries offers good background information. Explanation of the results is very brief especially for country level, this was only done for Italy for graphs 1 and 2: Italy is the country with the most regional regulatory framework identified (12 out of 16) in four themes (Agri-business, Bioeconomy, Sustainability and Training). Since the report is not that long, Tables A1-A3 could be moved to the main section of the report or another possibility would be to carry out an in depth analysis of the results from the Tables and present the findings in the main section then have the tables in the Annex. 			
b) length			Score: 85/100
Ok but the introduction section is very brief as well as the conclusion. The Annex is awkwardly longer than the main section: (5 pages vs 54 pages)			
c) format			Score: 85/100

- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the report, author(s) names and date it was published and a second page with the contributions of the partner organizations, their logos, work package and task titles and status.
- The font type and size in paragraph 1 and 2 of section 3.1. List of regulatory frameworks are different. The conclusion section also has a different font type and size.
- The links on column 12 are not active as much as they are in blue colour, please find a way of activating them so that the readers can easily click on them and be directed to the rightful place for more information.
- The information on Table A1. on FIELDS Regulatory Framework per territory could be presented as a graph to break the monotony of tables in the report.
- Table A2 on FIELDS Regulatory Framework per Framework (Theme) per Territory could be divided into three columns: one on framework, the second one on countries and the third on the number. This will help eliminate the confusion arising on why the frameworks are included together with the countries.
- Different colours could be used to represent different countries or the different frameworks to make Table A3 more appealing and there was no need to include the column on comments since it was empty.
- Information on Table A2 could be organized in ascending or descending order instead of alphabetically to make comparisons easier.

d) English language use

Score:80 /100

- Good. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.
- There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: M21. D2.4. D5.1, M24
- A language check with a professional who is also a native English speaker could have helped identify the minor mistakes and improve the quality of the language.

101

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

mmm) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 60/100

- I didn't quite get the importance of this task/output. What value does having this database of framework create? How is it expected to contribute to the identification of gaps in training areas that can be proposed for future projects? The connection with the overall work package and other tasks was not well clarified.
- Compiling the list is useful and I don't dispute that but if the task would have gone a step further to analyse the gaps that haven't been addressed by these frameworks would have been helpful for future projects to build on your work but again this wasn't the goal of this task.
- The information on the gaps could have been summarized into a fact sheet/policy brief targeted at policy makers.

nnn) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 100/100

The list of frameworks is comprehensive, and I appreciate that you were able to find all those frameworks and took time to classify them to suit the table headings. It must have taken time to read each document and synthesise the information to one or two lines, that is impressive.

<p>ooo) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The information provided in the list is what already exists. I would suggest that the methodology be properly described which in turn will increase the reliability of this output.</p>	
<p>ppp) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 60/100</p>
<p>This output is accessible to the public. Aside from knowing the frameworks that already exist, what else do we do with the information? How can we apply it in future? Why should we apply it? The output might be sufficient to guide other project tasks, but not for public consumption and for developing future projects.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score:70 /100</p>

102

I am impressed to see that at least 7.9% of the frameworks touch on Bioeconomy. I suppose that there was no other way to increase the number, but I am wondering how broad was the definition, what did it include and not? Were there cross-cutting frameworks touching on different themes?

<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A to this deliverable.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 70/100</p>
<p>The methodology has been described in a clear and adequate manner to some extent. The comparison of the results from different countries is commendable.</p> <p>A few things that were not clarified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where was the information on the training legislations obtained? • How was the search conducted? Were there any frameworks that had been identified but were left out later for some reason? • Were all the keywords applied to all the countries or were modifications done? Were they translated to the local language of each country? • Definitions of the terms under application (national, regional and Europe level), what's the difference among the three? • What criteria was used to allocate the countries to the project partners • The descriptions of the framework have varying lengths and content, it would be better to do them in a structured manner using some guiding questions for example: what is the framework about? Who is it targeted at and by who? How is it applied? This will ensure uniformity and uniformity in length. Some descriptions are long enough (e.g. Framework 32-37, 43-45,) while others are too short (Framework 4, 16, 18, 20, 25, 87, 91 etc), some contain dates 15, 17 in their descriptions. It is confusing. • How were the variables in column 4 determined and why? Please elaborate. 	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>

103

N/A	
7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	Score: /100
N/A. There are no recommendations provided because that is not the aim of this task.	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 76.5/100
Very good! The need for this deliverable was not clearly stated as well as how it will contribute to the attainment of the project's objectives.	
Date of external evaluation review:	16/07/2022
Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor	

104

Deliverable (Title):	D5.2: Funding Opportunities	Date:	25/06/2022
Work package: 5	Long term action plan		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thanks for highlighting the aim(s) of the report in this section but you could also indicate the target audience. • The need for the report could be stated. • A footnote with the link to the project's website could be added for those interested in finding out more about the project. • Apply the same numbering style for all the outputs decide whether it is 3/24 or 3 of 24 for example. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	

- Very appropriate, I personally prefer short reports because they serve two purposes in one, that is they can act as a report and also a policy brief therefore relevant for all stakeholders!
- The short work package description and methodology sections before getting to the main section of the report (list of funding opportunities) offers good background information.

c) format

Score: 80/100

- The report's appearance is dull starting from the cover page, it is not visual enough.
- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and author's name.
- A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.
- The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.
- Infographics could have also been utilized especially for the results section (3.1.1-3.1.5) to highlight the main findings.
- Different colours could be used to represent different countries or the different themes to make the Table in Annex 1 more appealing and to create a distinction.
- There was no need to include the column on centralization or decentralization since it was mostly empty, an asterisk and legend to describe this would be sufficient.

d) English language use

Score: 90/100

- Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple to understand language and great flow of ideas.
- There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: ICOS, please add LLLP in brackets after writing the full name in the table currently on page 1.
- In short, please create a list of acronyms and abbreviations.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

qqq) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 90/100

- It addresses the objective on providing sustainability and awareness of the project after it ends and shows how this will happen for example through the MOU that will be signed by the 50 project partners to achieve Sector Skills Alliance.

rrr) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 85/100

- Adding links to the finding opportunities would be helpful to those interested in applying for them and directs them to the specific call.
- What does decentralization and centralization mean? The lack of clarity could have contributed to the section being sparsely populated. If there was very little information on that, the entire section could have been deleted.
- It would be helpful to elaborate on the categories of beneficiaries beyond public and private organizations. The granting bodies could be classified into categories (public, private) for further to compare where most of the funding is coming from and as something to explore in the future when thinking of fundraising.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For the closed calls, if they are recurring it would be helpful to include the dates they open if possible. 	
sss) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The information is reliable because the criteria used in identifying them is robust. The 13 columns on the table provide most relevant information needed when searching for funding opportunities so searching for all this information makes the list very reliable. Setting the two conditions set before an opportunity is included into the list are very good: opportunity in the European Union and relevance in terms of the topics the address and eligibility of the project partners. Exploring the partners interest in applying for these opportunities is great and the interest to collaborate in applying for them. My small concern is about the determination of the themes to prevent overlaps, more information to clarify this will be appreciated. What does each theme cover and what is excluded? 	
ttt) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score:90 /100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having the idea of long-term sustainability of the strategy and training materials from the beginning and clearly highlighting it is important because it helps ins shaping the proposals and outcomes. Updating the list from time to time is a good idea because the information about these opportunities changes each time the call is opened. 	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100
N/A	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: /100
N/A	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: 75/100

106

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bio-economy is a cross cutting theme and therefore having clearly defined indicators for this theme would be helpful otherwise most of the opportunities will most likely fall under agriculture, forestry, sustainability etc. • More effort should have been directed to ensuring that this theme is well covered. • There are no specific opportunities for forestry but most of them are for agro-forestry, this confirms my concern raised in the point above. • It is good to see that entrepreneurship is covered because this is one of the topics that is largely missing or insufficiently addressed by the forestry curriculum as well as soft skills. 	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is question this applicable to this deliverable because the task that produced this output did not require opinions from any stakeholders in my understanding. But to ensure that the stakeholders are represented, see my point on 2b bullet number 3.
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The comparison of the results from different countries is commendable. A few things that were not clarified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where was the information on the funding opportunities obtained? • How was the search conducted? • Were all the keywords applied to all the countries or were modifications done? Were they translated to the local language of each country? • Centralization vs decentralization needs to be clarified. 	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To some extent, but first separate the conclusion and recommendation sections. • Secondly, add more points to the conclusion including a summary of the results on the themes, level of funding and budget, beneficiaries, as well as the future partnership survey.
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

107

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The recommendations are relevant and useful but separate the recommendation section from the conclusion section. Provide more information to the recommendation section based on the results in section 3.1. It would be useful if you could also provide ideas on how to ensure that the funding opportunities database reach a wider audience beyond the project partners. 	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 84.17/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very good! The length, the content and structure are ok. Many a times, people don't know where to start looking for funds to implement their activities, I find the table with the opportunities excellent and very relevant. It will be very helpful for different stakeholders interested in finding information on funding opportunities in their countries and beyond. The best output from the project so far, it is well written and presented! A side comment, did you try to find out if such a database exists? If there are, how similar or different are they from yours? 	
Date of external evaluation review:	25/06/2022
Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor	

108

Deliverable (Title):	D6.1 Quality Plan	Date:	05/08/2022
Work package:	Quality assurance		
External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 85/100	
<p>The presentation of some of the content in the cover page is different from the other 13 deliverables. In this case, the authors email addresses have been included. The months for the work package and task have been indicated.</p> <p>The summary section states need for the project which helps in connecting the different sections of this deliverable.</p> <p>The introduction section provides a good overview of the project. The goals of the project have been well outlined. To avoid repetition of information, sections 1.1 and 1.2 should have been merged, 1.3 and 1.4 should have also been merged. Section 1.4 talks of purpose of the Quality plan and so does section 2.1. The aims of the quality plan should have been stated concisely as bullet points.</p> <p>The project structure has also been well elaborated. There is lack of uniformity when listing the project aims for some work packages 4,6,7,8 the aims are not listed in bullet points like it has been done for the rest making it difficult to identify them.</p> <p>Table 1 with information on quality and quantitative indicators is very informative and so is Table 3 with the list of deliverables and additional descriptions.</p> <p>For section 4.1 with consortium members, it would be great to include a column stating the sectors represented by the partners whether academia, research, companies and so on.</p> <p>The section on Risk Assessment is very thorough which is fantastic! How were the risks listed in the Table in section 5.3 identified? It would be interesting to see how many of them were encountered and how effective the proposed mitigation measures were.</p>			
b) length		Score: 100/100	

Very appropriate! The authors have done a great job presenting such a huge amount of information in a concise manner that fits in to 43 pages. The length of the chapters is good, neither too long nor too short.

c) format

Score: 85/100

- Tables included in this deliverable have helped break the monotony of text. The bullets have also made it easier to identify the main points and read the deliverable.
- The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.
- A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.
- The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.
- The size of the Gantt chat should have been increased so that it is legible.
- Colours should have been added to the tables for example in Table 3 deliverables from the same work package could be presented by the same colour

d) English language use

Score: 85/100

Very good. Only a few minor grammatical mistakes. Language check expert would have pointed out these mistakes.

There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: Summary section: (ESCO, EQAVET, ECVET), SSA, the names of project partners. Please include a list of acronyms and abbreviations.

109

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

uuu) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 85/100

Many aspects of the projects have been addressed from organization, aims, partners in charge, expected outcomes, timeline and expected risks. Ways of achieving the project's objectives of identifying global trends and skill gaps, designing a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills, providing training material and training pilot to implement these strategies, allowing transferability of the skills among EU countries following European frameworks (ESCO, EQAVET and so on) and provide sustainability and awareness of the project after the project ends, have been clearly stated.

The deliverable clearly describes how quality will be measured throughout the project in a very thorough manner.

vvv) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 100/100

The deliverable is very comprehensive. All the relevant information has been provided. The why, how and who has been clearly elaborated. The expectations have been set well.

<p>www) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>The deliverable is reliable because the project partners have provided input and they are all in agreement with the content therein.</p>	
<p>xxx) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>The proposals are very useful. The assessment measure for the deliverables and dissemination events are applicable and if followed to the latter, they will result in high quality deliverables. Assessing both qualitative and quantitative indicators is excellent. The list of expected risks captures all the potential risks that may occur and the proposed mitigation measures make it easy to deal with them once they arise.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

110

This was not clear. The authors should have included a section stating how the project would ensure that this domain is well covered in the project so that it is not side-lined as stated in R8. Since bioeconomy is a relatively new field, many challenges are expected including confusing terms as stated in R4 and the challenge of mobilising stakeholders to participate in different activities of the project. The project should have highlighted how they will ensure that they are able to overcome these risks specifically for bioeconomy.

<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
--	---------------------------

N/A
This question is not directly applicable to this deliverable

<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>
--	------------------------------

The methodology has been very well described in each chapter.

<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
--	---------------------------

N/A

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

111

The recommendations on how to carry out assessments of different project outputs and activities are also very relevant.

The deliverable has provided recommendations on how to deal with the anticipated risks that might arise during the course of the project which are realistic. The risks highlighted are very relevant and well thought through.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 89.55/100

Very good! The Quality Plan is very well drafted and clear. It provides very useful information needed for guiding the project activities. It is in itself a very quality document and I can understand why the deliverables from this project are of high quality. The emphasis on quality is commendable.

Date of external evaluation review:

05/08/2022

Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor

Deliverable (Title):	D7.1 Dissemination plan	Date:	05/08/2022
----------------------	-------------------------	-------	------------

Work package:	Dissemination and communication
---------------	---------------------------------

External evaluator (Name):	Juliet Achieng Owuor
----------------------------	----------------------

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

a) structure and content

Score: 80/100

The report is well structured. The objectives of the dissemination exercise are listed in the first chapter provides a good overview of what the task and the resulting deliverable is about.

Highlighting the objectives of each work package followed by the expected outcomes helps in linking the two and understand how the objectives are contributing to the realization of the outcomes. A table with a summary of the outcomes for each work package would have clearly captured this information because presently some outcomes are described in detail compared to others e.g in section 2.1.2, the growth strategy, repository database and trends and scenario analysis report have been well described while information about the web-based survey on skill needs and gaps is scanty.

The list of deliverables and target groups in Annex II should have been in the main report and not the Annex with a column with a short description of the outcomes. A lot of useful information is hidden in the Annex. A sentence mentioning the partners involved in each work package should have been added because it helps connect them with the objectives and tasks.

The section with the key messages has not been clearly described making it difficult to understand how they were arrived at, the purpose they serve and where they will be used.

b) length

Score: 90/100

Very appropriate! The length of each section from the introduction to the Annex are enough, none is too short or long.

c) format

Score: 80/100

112

The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names.

A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white.

The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos.

This is a short report so the text is not overwhelming to the reader, but the tables have helped in capturing lots of useful information and enhancing the look of the report.

There is lack of uniformity in the table in Annex II because some sections are highlighted in grey, and an explanation is missing.

The current figure 1 and 3 should be labelled as Tables.

The colours on the logos should have been elaborated if at all they have a meaning.

d) English language use

Score: 75/100

Simple and easy to understand language has been used. The information is presented in a concise manner. The meanings of some words are not clear in the context they are in for example: In section renovation in education

In section 2.6.1: The overall objective of WP 7 is to assure professional, effective and most adequate dissemination and communication of the project results, did you mean ensure?

In chapter 4, there is an error: This section identifies and describes the target groups to communicated, what did the authors intend to say? The groups that will be communicated to?

Section 4.1.3: It is planned that 12 trainers will follow the training during the experimentation phase, what does follow in this case mean? Was it supposed to be participate or offer?

The report should have undergone a language check by an expert to eliminate all the small errors that sometimes result in lack of clarity of the message being conveyed.

There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: section 1.1: (According to DoW, p.242ff), section2.2.2: (ECVET, EQAVET), section 2.3.2: (EQF, SMEs), section 2.5.3: (DoW, p.153f). A list of acronyms and abbreviations would be useful.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 80/100

The deliverable clearly highlights the objectives of the project, expected outcomes, the partners involved, stakeholders targeted and how communication will be carried out during the duration of the project and after. The key messages are also highlighted.

The tagline is too long and might be difficult for most people to remember, a shorter catchy tagline would have been appealing.

One of the objectives of work package 4 is implementation of a platform, but this platform has not been well described, what is it? Who is it targeted at?

The sectors the project intends to cover have not been well highlighted for example, the sectors to be covered by each outcome should have been stated as well as the dimensions (digitalization, bioeconomy and sustainability). The focus of the 8 papers to be published by the end of the project should have also been indicated if that information is already known.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 80/100

The deliverable is comprehensive.
What was missing:
How the impact of the communication tools will be measured was missing for example will the visits to the websites be counted? Impressions on social media channels?
The key messages to be communicated are very broad, for example:

- 3: FIELDS will promote the attractiveness of the agricultural sector and facilitate transfer of knowledge between countries. One project alone cannot achieve that. The message should have focussed on the action(s) that will contribute to the attainment of that goal.
- FIELDS will promote the use of IT technologies in education. How will this be done?
- How will this be done? FIELDS is an EU-funded project that aims to improve the employability of the trainees.
- I did not understand why these had to be part of the key messages:
 - 7. The primary sector and the processing industries have a good reputation to maintain and they pursue social responsibility strategy.
 - 8. Trainees have a knowledge and technology transfer mission.
- There was no information about the final conference, when will it take place? What are the aims of the conference? Target audience?

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

The project has combined diverse data sources from existing literature, data from previous projects, legislations, focus group discussions and surveys. All these are a good combination and helps to increase the reliability of the outcomes. Building upon existing data is a brilliant idea for example from a previous Horizon Project, existing legislation. The project also utilised the expertise of the very rich consortium partners to obtain data for some steps which is like killing two birds with one stone.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 85/100
---	----------------------

The outcomes are applicable, the project has tried to be country specific wherever possible. The objectives of Work package 5 are targeted at ensuring that the proposals can be implemented locally. The second task is ensuring that there are funding opportunities for its implementation and sustainability which will be monitored by the consortium and a governance body.
Translations of the outcomes to different languages will also help reach a wider audience and increase their applicability.
The project first identifies the needs of each specific target group before proposing solutions. This ensures that the proposals match the needs of each group.

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

N/A

114

<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 70/100</p>
<p>It was difficult to tell just by reading this deliverable. The information was only provided for the outcomes in section 2.1.2. More information should have been provided on how each deliverable covers these topics for example A list of 10 new prioritized job profiles in bioeconomy or forestry.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Yes the opinions of different stakeholders have been adequately reflected in this deliverable. Chapter 4 explains very clearly who the target groups are and the benefits they will receive as well as how they can be reached and how impact will be measured. The benefits that each group will receive should have been listed in bullet or number form so that it is easy to evaluate if they have been achieved or not once the task has been concluded.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A Methodology could not be elaborated in this deliverable whose main focus was to highlight the outcomes of the project.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>

115

<p>N/A This deliverable does not offer conclusions.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>They are not recommendations as such but the expected outcomes are feasible because a lot of attention has been devoted to identifying who the targets are, how they will benefit from the project and identifying their needs. They are not over ambitious.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 82.27/100</p>
<p>Very good! Provides a very good summary of the entire project in a succinct manner. It has highted what is to be expected from the project and how they will reach the target audience. It is a good report.</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>05/08/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Juliet Achieng Owuor</p>	

116

External evaluator: Luciano Mateos (Sustainability)

Deliverable (Title):	D1.1 Stakeholders strategic plans and analysis report	Date:	27/06/2022
Work package:	Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 90/100	
<p>Comments: The document is very well structured. Using the same headings to present sustainability, digitalization, and bio economy helps the reader to keep an integrated vision of the content. An executive summary and/or conclusions would have improved the deliverable.</p>			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments: Including the inventory of projects in an Annex ensures that all information is gathered without compromising readability of the document.</p>			
c) format		Score: 85/100	
<p>Comments: Very good. It would have helped if all acronyms were defined the first time used, or if a list of acronyms had accompanied the document.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments: Excellent.</p>			
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:			

117

118

<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The document addresses all key issues relevant to the objectives stated in the project.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Should the document include more information, it would lose vigour. I think the document is sufficiently comprehensive.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The content is supported by ample and relevant bibliography that confers reliability to the deliverable.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The document summarizes the growth strategy of the sector based on projects and publications from the EU. In that sense, the deliverable is useful as starting paper in the project.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>

<p>Comments: The document deals with the concept of sustainability in clear terms. The section defining sustainability and presenting trends, policies and projects is particularly enlightening.</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The dimensions of digitalization and current situation and trends in the agricultural sector are adequately covered.</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Bio economy, its current situation, trends and policies in the EU are adequately covered in the deliverable.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 40/100</p>
<p>Comments: This is not clear in the deliverable. There is no identification of the stakeholders or a clear explanation of how their positions have been taken into account.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

119

Comments:
Because of the nature of this deliverable, there is no need for presenting specific methodology. One critique here could be related to point 4, regarding the lack of identification of stakeholders.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 50/100

Comments:
The deliverable does not contain a section with conclusions. An executive summary and/or a paragraph with conclusions would have been desirable.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

Comments:
The deliverable does not contain a list of recommendations; however, I do not think such a list would be necessary.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Comments:
Good satisfaction.

Date of external evaluation review:

27/06/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos



120

Deliverable (Title):	D 1.4. Focus group guidelines	Date:	28/06/2'22
Work package:	WP1 Skill needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score:90/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The delivery is rather straightforward. The guidelines consist of a step-by-step procedure to stablish,run and report focus groups, including templates and questionnaires templates as annexes.</p> <p>My only minor concern is the composition of the focus groups and the time proposed for the focus groups meetings: It is said that a functional focus group consists of 5-10 members and that it should include at least five different profiles. I think these two conditions will conduct to focus groups of 10 or near 10 members. In that case, meetings of two hours might be too short to address all key issues.</p>			
b) length		Score:100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The length is adequate since the "heavy" material is in annexes.</p>			
c) format		Score:85/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format is adequate. I wish a list of acronyms had been included in the deliverable.</p>			
d) English language use		Score:95/100	

121

Comments:
Good.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score:100/100
--	----------------------

Comments:

The deliverable is extremely relevant. It provides common guidelines for the Project for key activities aiming to identify skill needs. The questionnaires proposed for the focus groups address all key issues stated as objectives of the project.

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

Comments:

I think the deliverable is comprehensive. The partners in charge of running the focus groups will find in the deliverable guidance necessary for their task.

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

Comments:

I think the guidelines are based on tested guidelines used by other focus groups, although this is not stated in the document.

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

122

Comments:

The deliverable is extremely necessary to organise focus groups that address in comprehensive and harmonised manner the key issues stated as objectives of the project involving a significant number of stakeholders.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score:100/100

Comments:

Yes. Sustainability is adequately addressed in Sheet 1 (Annex VII).

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score:100/100

Comments:

Yes. Digitalization is adequately addressed in Sheet 2 (Annex VII).

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score:100/100

Comments:

Yes. Bio economy is adequately addressed in Sheets 3a, 3b and 3c (Agriculture, Forestry and Food Industry, respectively) (Annex VII).

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: /100

123

<p>Comments: There is no indication in the deliverable of consultation to the stakeholders about the guidelines.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes; methodology is clear.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable does not include conclusions; however, I think a section with conclusions would be unnecessary in this document.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable does not include recommendations other than those aiming to conduct focus groups; however, I think other type of recommendations would be unnecessary in this document.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 95/100</p>

124

Comments: Excellent	
Date of external evaluation review:	28/06/2022
Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos	

ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):	D1.5 Focus Group Analysis	Date:	28/06/2022
Work package:	WP1. Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content			Score: 70/100
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The deliverable is well structured, presenting methodology followed by pan-European results and conclusions. The primary data of each focus group are presented in annexes, probably the most valuable part of the deliverable.</p> <p>The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing. I imagine running a focus group as proposed in D1.4 quite different to an on-line meeting.</p> <p>Ranking most selected skills may be misleading. Some of them are transversal, while other are sectorial. It is expectable that those that are transversal would be selected by more focus group members. Other skills are environment-dependent. For instance, water management is surely more selected where water scarcity or water excess are important. A stratified analysis would have provided more insight. I understand that this type of analysis requires random stratified sampling, which is not the methodology when doing focus group-based research. Annex II (selected skills by stakeholder profiles) solves this drawback partially.</p> <p>I wonder why focus group members were anonymised. In D1.4 I read that opinions would be anonymised, but I do not remember reading that the names of the focus group members would not be shown.</p>			
b) length			Score: 70/100

125

Comments:

Some sections are lengthy and tedious to read. Inserting comments and statements of individual focus group members was a good idea; however, the authors abuse this resource. This is particularly notable in section 4.1.2.

c) format

Score: 70/100

Comments:

The format is adequate to the analysis presented, although, as stated above, the overuse of quotations makes reading tedious. Should the authors have chosen other type of analysis, the format should have been different.

d) English language use

Score: 80/100

Comments:

Overall is good, although there are some minor grammar errors.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 80/100

Comments:

The deliverable addresses all key issues in the objectives of the project. As stated above, the analysis does not provide full insight of the results.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

Comments:

The deliverable is comprehensive since it presents in Annex the detailed results of all focus groups.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/fieldresearch?)

Score: 75/100

Comments:

The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing. I imagine running a focus group as proposed in D1.4 quite different to an on-line meeting.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 75/100

Comments:

Following my comment above, since it is not stratified, the analysis does not provide full insight of the results.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: 90/100

Comments:

Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where sustainability is addressed adequately.

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 90/100

Comments:

Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where digitalization is addressed adequately.

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: 90/100

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Comments:

Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where bio economy is addressed adequately.

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

Comments:

Yes. The deliverable is about the opinions of stakeholders.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner? Score: 80/100

Comments:

The methodology is in deliverable D1.4. The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? Score: 75/100

Comments:

Rather than conclusions, the corresponding section presents a summary of the results.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

Comments:

I do not think it appropriate to propose recommendations in this deliverable. In any case, there aren't.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 76/100

Comments:

Date of external evaluation review:

28/06/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

Deliverable (Title):

D1.7. Survey Analysis

Date:

28/06/2022

Work package:

Skills Needs Identification

External evaluator (Name):

Luciano Mateos

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

a) structure and content

Score: 90/100

129

130

<p>Comments: Well structured. Substantial content, which complements D1.5 and partially corrects its drawbacks. The survey is extensive and covers all key issues. The provision of the primary data will allow further analysis. The stratified analysis gives good insight of the identified skills, training needs and business trends.</p>	
b) length	Score: 100/100
<p>Comments: The length is adequate since most of the raw data are in Annexes.</p>	
c) format	Score: 100/100
<p>Comments: The format is good. The presentation of the results in graphs facilitates reading greatly.</p>	
d) English language use	Score: 95/100
<p>Comments: Overall good.</p>	
<p>2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:</p>	
a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 90/100

<p>Comments: The deliverable addresses all key issues in the objectives of the project.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive since it presents in Annex the detailed results of the survey.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/fieldresearch?)</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>Comments: The results sound reliable. The presentation of means seems sufficient to me, although statistical analysis could strengthen comparisons.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The survey provides a comprehensive view useful to identify both current and future skills requirements, training needs and business trends.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes. The deliverable presents results of a web-based questionnaire where sustainability is addressed adequately.</p>	

<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes. The deliverable presents results of a web-based questionnaire where digitalization is addressed adequately.</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes. The deliverable presents results of a web-based questionnaire where bio economy is addressed adequately.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 100/100</p>
<p>Comments: The web-based survey had 517 respondents relatively well balanced in terms of age, gender, country of origin, area of operation and job profile. I believe this ensures that the opinions of all responsible stakeholders has been adequately reflected on the deliverable.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The methodology is described adequately. The sample size and characteristics is well described. Statistical analysis of comparisons is missing, although I am not sure it is necessary.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

Comments:

The conclusions are supported by the results presented in the deliverable. One important conclusion is that the web-survey results are coherent with the focus group results presented in D1.5.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

Comments:

There are no specific recommendations in the document; however, do not think they would be pertinent in this deliverable.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Comments:

Extensive work. Useful as baseline.

Date of external evaluation review:

- 28/06/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

Deliverable (Title):

D1.8. Trend and scenario analysis

Date:

28/06/2022

Work package:

Skill Needs Identification

External evaluator (Name):

Luciano Mateos

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

a) structure and content

Score: 90/100

133

Comments:

Interesting analysis of trends and scenarios. In the analysis of trends, some quantitative impact/scale assessments would have strengthened the results. Sometimes, what is presented as a trend it looks rather as a promise, or may be anecdotic, or reflect a position rather than a scientific evidence. In these cases, a critical analysis could have been more useful. However, overall the analysis of trends is relevant and well focused. The exposition of scenarios, particularly that of the three selected ones, seems particularly enlightening to me. I am not sure “high-tech pathway” is what distinguishes the third scenario from the other two, though this is just a matter of name. The connection between the identification of skill needs based on the scenario analysis is weak or not clearly presented, though there is apparent coherency.

b) length

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The length is adequate. The document is long because country reports are compiled as annexes as part of the deliverable. Including the primary information confers value to the deliverable.

c) format

Score: 90/100

Comments:

The format is good. Some infographics could have facilitated reading.

d) English language use

Score: 100/100

134

Comments:
Good.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?) **Score: 95/100**

Comments:

Yes, the analysis of trends and scenarios is relevant to address the objectives of the project.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The deliverable is comprehensive and I think it contains all important aspects.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

My comment above (1a) about trends applies here. The selection of scenarios is based on previous well supported studies.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 95/100

135

<p>Comments: The analysis of trends and scenarios is without doubt useful to identify skill needs.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes, sustainability is adequately covered in the deliverable.</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes, digitalization is adequately covered in the deliverable.</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes, bio economy is adequately covered in the deliverable.</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>

136

<p>Comments: This is not clear. The 3 scenarios are based on previous research.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Yes, methodology is adequately described.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The section “Conclusions” is a summary rather than an exposition of conclusions. The rational from scenario results to skill needs is not clearly stated, although there is apparent coherence.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: I understand the recommendations are the selected skill needs, derived from the analysis of trends and scenarios. They are useful.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 90/100</p>

137

Comments:
Interesting analyses.

Date of external evaluation review: 30/06/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

Deliverable (Title):	D2.1. Detailed baseline of occupational profiles	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:			
a) structure and content			Score: 95/100
Comments: The structure is simple and adequate, with the outputs well organized in an Annex and the methodology and process clearly explained in the core text. The mind mapping approach adopted as methodology seems adequate, with details in Annex 4.			
b) length			Score: 95/100
Comments: The length is adequate. The core of the text is short, well justified since the outputs are in an Annex.			
c) format			Score: 95/100
Comments: The format is adequate. The compilation of the occupational profiles in forms with a common structure facilitates targeted reading.			
d) English language use			Score: 100/100

Comments:

English grammar and stile are good.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?) **Score: 95/100**

Comments:

The deliverable is finalist, presenting the most specific results (occupational profiles) addressing the objectives of the project.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The deliverable is comprehensive. The selection and grouping of occupational profiles to be developed is clear and well justified. The detailed description of the occupational profiles in an annex is complete.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The information is based on previous work in the project (WP1) and participatory research through working groups. This methodology ensures reliability.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 95/100

139

Comments:

The outcome is very useful. It comprised the specific outputs the one should expect from the project. The way they are presented also ensure applicability, in the sense that decision makers will be able to take the selected occupational profiles for future plans.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: 100/100

Comments:

Yes, sustainability is adequately covered in the deliverable. There are occupational profiles addressing specifically sustainability, while areas like forestry also have occupational profiles focusing on sustainability.

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 100/100

140

Comments:
I believe so. The methodology based on working groups ensures participation of all relevant stakeholders.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: /100

Comments:
Yes, methodology is adequately described

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: /100

Comments:
The deliverable does not contain a section with conclusions, but I think such section is not necessary.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 100/100

Comments:
The deliverable does not contain a section with recommendations, although the occupational profiles can be taken as recommendations. In that sense, they are relevant

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 100/100

141

Comments:
Very relevant work.

Date of external evaluation review:

23/09/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

Deliverable (Title):	D2.2. Prioritized occupational profiles	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		

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

a) structure and content

Score: 100/100

Comments:

The structure is simple, in tables and an annex. The structure is adequate for the presentation of the deliverable.

b) length

Score: 100/100

Comments:

The length is adequate for the content to be presented.

c) format

Score: 100/100

Comments:

The format, presenting, first, the methodology, and, then, the multicriteria evaluation for the skill/knowledge required for each occupational profile (in tables) is adequate.

142

d) English language use	Score: 100/100
<p>Comments: Good</p>	
<p>2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:</p>	
<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	Score: 90/100
<p>Comments: Relevant. However, since 10 profiles were to be selected but that was the profiles proposed in D2.1, the relevance here stems from the multicriteria valuation.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	Score: 95/100
<p>Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	Score: /100
<p>Comments: The information is based on Deliverable D 2.2, as it should be expected.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	Score: 90/100

143

Comments:
The usefulness lies on the multicriteria evaluation. Since 10 profiles were to be selected and that waste the number of profiles in d2.1, the usefulness on this aspect is limited.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:
Sustainability is addressed indirectly (see evaluation of D.2.1.)

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

Comments:
I think so, through the application of the multicriteria evaluation.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: 90/100

Comments:
Yes, methodology is clear.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

Comments:
The final remark is: "This ranking exercise will support the structure and organization of the training modules in the next steps of the project. It can also be useful in future tasks of the project".
I agree.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 95/100

Comments:
Yes, they are.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: /100

145

Comments:

Very good.

Date of external evaluation review:

23/09/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

Deliverable (Title):	D.2.3. European strategy on agri-food-forestry skills	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	WP2 Priorities and Strategy Design		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
Comments: The document is well structured and is easy to read.			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
Comments: The document is long. However, its length is needed to properly describe the methodology and principles of the strategy.			
c) format		Score: 95/100	

146



Comments:

The format is appropriate for the purpose. 8 topics are rightly selected and developed with detail, explaining the basis and structuring the inputs from the survey respondents.

d) English language use

Score: 100/100

Comments:

Good.

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

147

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The relevance of the deliverable is in line with the relevance of the task. The final contribution of the project should be a European strategy on skills.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

I think the document is rather comprehensive. I cannot think about any relevant information that it is missing.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The information is based on deliverables 2.1 and 2.2 and on a survey which questionnaire was responded by 25 out of the 30 partners of the project, thus I think the results are reliable.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 90/100

Comments:

A strategy on agri-food-forestry skills is highly relevant.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: 90/100

148

Comments:

Sustainability is covered implicitly.

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable? Score: 95/100

Comments:

The survey source of the strategy was responded by 25 out of the 30 partners of the project, thus I think the document reflects the opinion of most stakeholders.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner? Score: 100/100

Comments:

I think the survey, the questionnaire and the number of respondents are clearly described in the document and its annex.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? Score: 95/100

Comments:

I think the conclusions, summarising the principles of the strategy and the path forward, are clear and comprehensive.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful? Score: 95/100

Comments:

Yes, they are, since they contain the principles for the European strategy.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 95/100

Comments:

Very good.

Date of external evaluation review:

23/09/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

150

Deliverable (Title):	D3.1. Training methodologies	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	New tools and training design		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The structure and content of this deliverable have been of great interest to this evaluator. It reads fluently and is easy to understand. However, this evaluator has no background in training methods. Therefore, although his perception of the deliverable is positive, he does not have sufficient elements of judgement to evaluate it.</p>			
b) length		Score: /100	



Comments:
Apparently adequate.

c) format

Score: 95/100

Comments:
Good. Easy to read even for a non-expert in training methods.

d) English language use

Score: 100/100

Comments:
Good

151

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:

a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)

Score: 100/100

Comments:
Developing good training methodologies is essential for the project. I think the deliverable addresses the current and emerging training methodologies with the aim of combining them according to specific need. Many of the training methods were unknown for this reviewer; however, all of them seem relevant.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: /100

Comments:

The deliverable seems comprehensive for this reviewer who is not expert on training methods, who cannot think about missing information.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: /100

Comments:

The authors of the deliverable seem very well informed; although this evaluator does not have criteria to evaluate it.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The proposed methods are useful in the sense that may be taken into practice.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: 95/100

Comments:
The deliverable addresses sustainability indirectly.

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

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: /100
**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

153

Comments:

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

Comments:
Difficult to assess based on the reading of the deliverable.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner? Score: /100

Comments:
I believe this question is not relevant for this deliverable.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

Comments:
I think so.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 95/100

Comments:
The proposed training methods are useful in the sense that may be taken into practice straight forward.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 95/100

Comments:
Very good.

Date of external evaluation review:

23/09/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos



154

Deliverable (Title):	D5.1. Regulatory Framework List	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	Long term action plan		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>This is a simple report containing lot of information in a long annex. Using a common form, the project partners provided the compilation of national regulatory frameworks. Then a database in the FIELDS platform systematised all the information. The database has 152 entries and it is provided in an Annex.</p>			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The core text is adequately concise and short. The list of regulatory frameworks is long, but provided in an annex.</p>			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format is adequate. It makes reading quick and easy.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Good</p>			
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:			


156

<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The list seems comprehensive. It results from the compilation by partners. However, this evaluator does not have the capacity to state that there is no missing information.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The list of regulatory frameworks results from the compilation by partners; therefore, we can assume that it is reliable.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Rather than useful, having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

<p>Comments: Sustainability is implicit.</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The database with regulatory frameworks has 152 entries and is the result of compiling the national and EU frameworks by the partners; therefore, it may be assumed that opinion of relevant stakeholders has been taken into account.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

157

158

<p>Comments: The methodology is simple (collecting and building a database) and it is sufficiently described.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The conclusions are simple and refer to the dynamic nature of the database.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments: There are no specific recommendations because they do not proceed in this task.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Good</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>23/09/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos</p> 	

Deliverable (Title):	D5.2. Funding Opportunities	Date:	30/09/2022
Work package:	WP 5. Long term action plan		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The deliverable is simple. It presents how the Project searched funding opportunities. For that purpose, a survey conducted by the partners from different countries identified and described those opportunities. A common questionnaire allowed systematizing the opportunities. The deliverable presents the resulting database in an Annex and a summary of the results in the core text.</p>			
b) length		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The length of the deliverable is adequate. The core text is concise, while the database, which is longer, is presented in an annex. This is a good structure.</p>			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format of the deliverable is adequate. The core text presents the methodology briefly and summarizes the results of the funding opportunities survey. Presenting the complete database in an annex is the right format.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Good.</p>			
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:			


159

<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The information addressed in this deliverable is relevant. Funding opportunities is a key issue related to the viability of the recommendations of the FIELS project.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive. The methodology is sufficiently explained. The summary of the results is clear. The 120 entries in the database presented in the annex demonstrate the extend of the work.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The information is based on field research by carried out by the partners of the project in the form of survey with a common questionnaire that contains the main characteristics of interest in a funding program. The participation of all partners and the 120 entries in the resulting database are indicators of reliability.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable has the potential to be useful. However, as stated in the conclusions, the usefulness will be materialized if the database remains updated after the end of the project.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

160

<p>Comments: Sustainability is implicit in the deliverable although it does not address sustainability explicitly.</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments: The way in which the survey was conducted, involving all project partners, ensures that the contribution of all responsible stakeholders has been reflected in the funding opportunities database.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

161

<p>Comments: Yes, the methodology is clearly explained. The delivery explains how the survey was conducted and the 13 items in which the questionnaire was structured to be loaded in the database.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: The conclusions are supported by the results. The fact that only 25% of the respondents are considering applying for the funding opportunities collected in the database is a bit surprising, although not highlighted in the conclusions.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The recommendation of updating the database is important. The recommendation to share new project ideas among the project partners is also very important.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Very good.</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>3/10/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos</p> 	

162

Deliverable (Title):	Deliverable 6.1. Quality Plan	Date:	30/09/2022
Work package:	Quality assurance		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:			
a) structure and content		Score: 80/100	
Comments: The deliverable reads well. However, it has too much content. It explains the Quality Plan, but also the project itself. This makes the Quality Plan a bit diluted. Part of the document looks like the project proposal. The verb tense used in almost the whole document (future) contributes to this appearance. The deliverable presents a fairly standard Quality Plan for projects.			
b) length		Score: 75/100	
Comments: The document is too long. More focus on the Quality Plan would have been preferable, avoiding detailed description of the project (e.g. work packages). Even tables such as the one on risks are too long.			
c) format		Score: 90/100	
Comments: The format is appropriate. In fact, the deliverable reads quite well.			
d) English language use		Score: 95/100	
Comments: Good			

163

2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:	
a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)	Score: 95/100
<p>Comments: The deliverable presents a fairly standard Quality Plan for projects. The importance of these plans does not derive from how they meet project objectives, but how they help management to make the project flow and meet its objectives.</p>	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 80/100
<p>Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive. However, it is formulated as a proposal. It would have been interesting to know how the proposed mechanisms, committees, etc. are actually working, how well they are operating, how effective they are, how efficiently they are fulfilling their functions.</p>	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 85/100
<p>Comments: As commented above, it would have been interesting to know how the proposed mechanisms are fulfilling their functions. That would be a probe of its reliability. Because the nature of this deliverable, it does not proceed evaluating whether its information is based on literature/field research or not.</p>	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 100/100
<p>Comments: A quality plan is a must for the management of a project of this type.</p>	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100

164

Comments:

The deliverable does not address (and it should no be expected to address) sustainability.

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: /100

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: /100

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

165

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable? Score: 80/100

Comments:

The Quality Plan seems to be derived directly from the project proposal, i.e. it is the coordinator and the people who undertook the formulation who have probably also formulated this Plan. Therefore, it is not clear that stakeholders were involved.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?

Score: /100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 80/100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, a conclusion reporting on how the proposed mechanisms are working would have been very useful.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: 80/100

Comments:
This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, recommendations derived from how the proposed mechanisms are working would have been very useful.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 80/100

Comments:
Good

Date of external evaluation review:

03/10/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos



166

Deliverable (Title):	D7.1. Dissemination plan	Date:	04/10/2022
Work package:	Dissemination and communication		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments: The dissemination plan is very comprehensive, well conceived, covering all target sectors and using appropriate and current dissemination media. the structure of the deliverable is good and reads well. An important part of what it proposes has already been implemented and documented in the form of a deliverable evaluated by this reviewer.</p>			
b) length		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments: The deliverable is long, but its length is justified in order to present the different aspects of the dissemination plan.</p>			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments: The deliverable is well structured. The structure is logical, the tables, appendices and figures contribute to a smooth reading and logical path.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments: Good</p>			
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:			

167

168

<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable presents a fairly standard Dissemination Plan for projects. The importance of these plans does not derive from how they meet project objectives, but how they help reaching the target groups.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The Dissemination Plan is very comprehensive.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The already reported outcomes of the project as deliverables that have been evaluated by this reviewer demonstrate that, at least this part of the dissemination Plan, was reliable. Because the nature of this deliverable, it does not proceed evaluating whether its information is based on literature/field research or not.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: A Dissemination Plan is a must in a project of this type.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

Comments:

The deliverable does not address (and it should not be expected to address) sustainability.

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: /100

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Comments:

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? Score: /100

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Comments:

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable? Score: 95/100

Comments:

The Dissemination Plan seems to be formulated by a limited number of persons. Therefore, it is not clear that stakeholders were involved. However, its main goal is that the project results reach all stakeholders and other target groups.

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner? Score: 95/100

Comments:

This question does not apply to this deliverable.

169

<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, a conclusion reporting on how the dissemination plan is working would have been very useful.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Comments: This question does not apply to this deliverable. However, recommendations derived from how the dissemination plan is working would have been very useful.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Very good</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>04/10/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos</p>	

170



Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

171

