

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	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>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.</p>			
b) length		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The core text is adequately concise and short. The list of regulatory frameworks is long, but provided in an annex.</p>			
c) format		Score: 95/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format is adequate. It makes reading quick and easy.</p>			
d) English language use		Score: 100/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Good</p>			
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: 95/100
Comments: Having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 95/100
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.	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 95/100
Comments: The list of regulatory frameworks results from the compilation by partners; therefore, we can assume that it is reliable.	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 95/100
Comments: Rather than useful, having the regulatory framework is essential to frame all activities and outputs of FIELDS.	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: 95/100

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.