

Deliverable (Title):	D2.3 principles of a European strategy on agri-food-forestry skills	Date:	26/08/2022
Work package:	WP2 Priorities and Strategy Design		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 95/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The structure of the document is well organized, and the content covers all the necessary aspects to provide a complete report on the task. ➤ The approach of the report is holistic including the following chapters: Introduction, Method, Results: Key principles for the formulation of a European agri-food and forestry skills strategy and Conclusions and path forward. ➤ Annexes provide useful information for the report. 			
b) length		Score: 95/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for the survey report on principles of a European strategy on agri-food-forestry skills. 			
c) format		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Specific corrections in formatting should be done. ➤ In all Tables, text fonts should be bigger. ➤ In Figure 1, the text, in some cases, is not reader friendly. ➤ Annexes 2, 4a,4b should have the same format (e.g. font type) with the rest of the report. 			
d) English language use		Score: 85/100	

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

<p>➤ Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. Proof-reading is needed to improve the use of English.</p>	
<p>2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:</p>	
<p>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ The information delivered is comprehensive and covers all the key issues with respect to the objectives of the task.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ No missing information detected.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ The results of the report are based on semi-structured questionnaire research on key topics that distributed among the organisations participating in FIELDS. ➤ The results were qualitatively analysed.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcomes, that deal with the Key principles for the formulation of a European agri-food and forestry skills strategy, are applicable. ➤ The principles created can be used to achieve the European strategy and along with performance indicators (KPIs) to evaluate training modules and courses. 	
<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: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The digitization domain has been covered adequately in the deliverable. ➤ Digital tools will be used on sustainability and bioeconomy sectors, in order to organize training modules and courses. 	
<p>c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i></p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

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

<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 80/100</p>
<p>➤ The questionnaire was distributed among the partners in FIELDS project. It is interesting that there are partners in the consortium (in total 5) that did not participate in the survey.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ The proposed methodology is clearly described in an adequate manner in Chapter 2 “Method”.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score:95 /100</p>
<p>➤ Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 90/100</p>

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

- The recommendations are relevant and well presented.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Very good!

The content is presented simply and comprehensibly

Date of external evaluation review:

26/08/2022

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.