|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 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:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 75/100 | |
| * 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. | | | | |
| 1. **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) | | | | |
| 1. **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. | | | | |
| 1. **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. | | | | |
| 1. **Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:** | | | | |
| 1. **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. | | | | |
| 1. **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. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| 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. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 60/100 | |
| 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. | | | | |
| 1. **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**:70 /100 | |
| 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? | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A to this deliverable. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| The methodology has been described in a clear and adequate manner to some extent. The comparison of the results from different countries is commendable.  A few things that were not clarified:   * 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. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| 1. **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 contributes to the attainment of the project’s objectives. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 16/07/2022 | |
| Signature/Name: A picture containing shape  Description automatically generated Juliet Achieng Owuor | | | | |

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