ANEXO III

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

Comments:

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.

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

Comments:

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.

c) format	**Score**: 95/100

Comments:
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.

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

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:
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.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	**Score**: 95/100

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.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	**Score**: 95/100

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.

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

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.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Sustainability External Expert*	**Score**: 90/100

Comments: Sustainability is implicit in the deliverable although it does not address sustainability explicitly.	
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
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.	
5. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?**	**Score**: 95/100

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.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	**Score**: 90/100

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 surprinsing, although not highlighted in the conclusions.

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

Comments:
The recommendation of updating the database is important. The recommendation to sharte new project ideas among the project partners is also very important.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	**Overall Score**: 95/100

Comments:

Very good.

Date of external evaluation review:	3/10/2022
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.