Deliverable (Title):	D5.1: Regulatory Framework List		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**: 70/100

- ➢ The document is well structured, including the following chapters: Introduction, Methodology, Results, Concluding remarks and Annex with the list of regulatory framework.
- ➢ The content is not very comprehensive, as many parts of the report are very brief. For example, the introductory section is rather short, and it does not provide any specific information.
- ➢ In the results section, the information provided is incomplete.
- ➢ Part of the information provided in annex can be transferred to the main body of the deliverable.

b) length	**Score**: 80/100

- ➢ As mentioned before, the report is very brief.

c) format	**Score**: 85/100

- ➢ The format is sufficient.
- ➢ Graph 2 should be redesigned, as it is not easily readable in its current form.
- ➢ Links in Table A3 are not active.

d) English language use	**Score**: 90/100

*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

> ➢ Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. Proof-reading is needed to improve use of English language.

---

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**: 80/100

> ➢ The report's objective is not very clear. Authors should state the impact of the created database and how this database can contribute to the identification of gaps in training areas.

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**: 80/100

> ➢ The information (regulatory frameworks) is based on literature research conducted by project's partners in different countries.
> ➢ The methodology should be described in a more descriptive and analytical way in order to increase the report's reliability.

d) **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)**	**Score**: 80/100

*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

➢ The outcomes are applicable.	
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**: 85/100
➢ The digitization domain is clearly presented in the report's context.	
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:	

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

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	**Score**: /100
N/A	

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	**Score**: 75/100
➢ I would expect the methodological framework to be presented in a more descriptive and analytical way (e.g. how the information is collected in each country, etc)	

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	**Score**: 80/100
➢ Conclusions section is rather brief, and it does not provide managerial insights.	

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	**Score**: 80/100

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

> ➢ There are no recommendations provided in this task.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 80/100
Very good! Deliverable could be improved with minor changes and addendums.	
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.