

### ANEXO III

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

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

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

*\*only for Digitalization External Expert*

**Score: 95/100**

Comments:

The dimensions of digitalization and current situation and trends in the agricultural sector are adequately covered.

**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:

Bio economy, its current situation, trends and policies in the EU are adequately covered in the deliverable.

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

**Score: 40/100**

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.

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

**Score: 80/100**

<p>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.</p>	
<p><b>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: 50/100</b></p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable does not contain a section with conclusions. An executive summary and/or a paragraph with conclusions would have been desirable.</p>	
<p><b>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: /100</b></p>
<p>Comments: The deliverable does not contain a list of recommendations; however, I do not think such list would be necessary.</p>	
<p><b>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</b></p>	<p><b>Overall Score: 90/100</b></p>
<p>Comments: Good satisfaction.</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>27/06/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name:</p>	

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.