

ANEXO III

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	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>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, o 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The connection between the identification of skill needs based on the scenario analysis is weak or not clearly presented, though there is apparent coherency.</p>			
b) length		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>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.</p>			
c) format		Score: 90/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format is good. Some infographics could have facilitated reading.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	

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

Comments:

The analysis of trends and scenarios is without doubt useful to identify skill needs.

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

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: 95/100

Comments:

Yes, sustainability is adequately covered in the deliverable.

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

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 95/100

Comments:

Yes, digitalization is adequately covered in the deliverable.

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

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

Score: 95/100

Comments:

Yes, bio economy is adequately covered in the deliverable.

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

Score: 80/100

Comments:
This is not clear.
The 3 scenarios are based on previous research.

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

Score: 95/100

Comments:
Yes, methodology is adequately described.

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

Score: 90/100

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.

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

Score: 90/100

Comments:
I understand the recommendations are the selected skill needs, derived from the analysis of trends and scenarios. They are useful.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Comments:

Interesting analyses.

Date of external evaluation review:

30/06/2022

Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos

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.