

ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):	D5.1. Regulatory Framework List	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	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: 100/100	
Comments: This is a simple report containing lot of information in a long annex. Using a common form, the project partners provided the compilation of national regulatory frameworks. Then a database in the FIELDS platform systematised all the information. The database has 152 entries and it is provided in an Annex.			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
Comments: The core text is adequately concise and short. The list of regulatory frameworks is long, but provided in an annex.			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
Comments: The format is adequate. It makes reading quick and easy.			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	
Comments: Good			
2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:			

<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The list seems comprehensive. It results from the compilation by partners. However, this evaluator does not have the capacity to state that there is no missing information.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: The list of regulatory frameworks results from the compilation by partners; therefore, we can assume that it is reliable.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>Comments: Rather than useful, having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.</p>	
<p>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

Comments: Sustainability is implicit.	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 95/100
Comments: The database with regulatory frameworks has 152 entries and is the result of compiling the national and EU frameworks by the partners; therefore, it may be assumed that opinion of relevant stakeholders has been taken into account.	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 95/100

Comments:

The methodology is simple (collecting and building a database) and it is sufficiently described.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?

Score: 95/100

Comments:

The conclusions are simple and refer to the dynamic nature of the database.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?

Score: /100

Comments:

There are no specific recommendations because they do not proceed in this task.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 95/100

Comments:

Good

Date of external evaluation review:

23/09/2022

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.