|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D2.1: List of occupational profiles | Date: | 26/06/2022 |
| Work package: | Priorities and strategy design | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The flow of ideas is great and very informative. The aim of the task is well stated at the beginning that is creation of at least 10 new occupational profiles in the sectors of agriculture, food industry and forestry.  The Annex is very detailed. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Comments:  Very appropriate, easy to read within a short time and grasp the key messages! | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * Cover page is needed to make the report appealing. The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names. * A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white. * The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos. * List of acronyms and abbreviations used in the deliverable is needed. * Presentation of the results in tables helps break the monotony of text and makes the information easy to read and understand. It is easy to identify the key messages. * The mid map in the Annex presents a lot of useful information in a simplified way. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Excellent. 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: WP1, Task 2.1 | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| The deliverable addresses key issues and it is an important one because it will be applied to many other project tasks.  The description of each of the essential and optional knowledge for each occupational profile is very helpful. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Most of the information has been covered including how the task relates with the other project activities both previous and upcoming.  I like the idea of applying soft Skills and Business & Entrepreneurship skills to all profiles instead of being a separate occupational profile. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| * The outcomes of the skills identification exercises are reliable because they are based on materials on skill gaps and knowledge gaps identified by the previous tasks of the WP 1 activities, focus groups, bottom-up surveys and trends and scenario analysis. * The brainstorming meetings among the working groups must have helped clear any doubts. The methodology applied to the task that resulted in this deliverable is robust. * The skills listed for the operators and technicians in digitalization, sustainability and bioeconomy match their profiles. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The outcomes are useful, they were really thought through and they can even be applied beyond the scope of this project. It would be interesting to see how they contribute to the other project tasks. | | | | |
| 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**:85 /100 | |
| In this deliverable bioeconomy was given sufficient attention. It was one of the three sectors that were focussed on. Separating it inti agriculture and food industry helps ensure the assessment to be very specific. Forestry bioeconomy should have been included as a category, I don’t know why it was not included. How will the profiles for forestry be established in the subsequent steps if it was not featured in this deliverable? | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The objective of the task was not to represent many stakeholders. However since the outcomes have been informed by other project activities like bottom up surveys and focus group discussions, it is sufficient to say that the opinions of different stakeholders have been indirectly reflected. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * The methodology has been clearly described from the first step which involved forming the working groups to the meetings they attended to the last one how the skills were identified. The modifications that were made have also been clarified. * The descriptions of the technicians and operators and their roles have been provided which was missing in Deliverable 2.2 | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| The recommended essential and optional knowledge are relevant for the respective occupational profiles. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 86.25/100 | |
| Very good! | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 26/06/2022 | |
| Signature/Name:  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 |