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

➤ 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

➤ The length of the document is reasonable and serves well its purpose by providing necessary information for funding opportunities.

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

➤ The format is sufficient.
➤ The numbering format in this report is different from other deliverables.
➤ A glossary of acronyms will be useful.

.

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

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

*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

![fields logo]

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

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 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.	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	**Score**: 95/100
➢ No missing information detected.	
c) 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.	
d) 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	

*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

fields

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

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
➢ **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.	

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

*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

![fields logo]

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

N/A	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	**Score**: 85/100
➢ 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

*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.

The recommendations are relevant and well presented.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	**Overall Score**: 90/100

Very good!

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

Maximum number of points for a criterion	Range of scores			
	Very good	**Good**	**Fair**	**Weak**
100	76-100	51-75	26-50	0-25

*Please check the grades' table at the end of this file. Reviewers' comments must be accurate, comprehensive, and fully articulated.