

Deliverable (Title):	D7.1 Dissemination plan	Date:	29/08/2022
Work package:	Dissemination and communication		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The document is well-structured and the information provided is well-organised. ➤ The content is comprehensive and documented, providing clear dissemination objectives. 			
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 dissemination plan and activities of the project. 			
c) format		Score: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The format is satisfactory. ➤ A glossary of acronyms could be useful. ➤ Figures 1 and 3 should be renamed to Tables. 			
d) English language use		Score: 85/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs proof-reading to improve the quality of English. 			

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

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: 85/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The information delivered is very comprehensive and provides all the necessary information for the project's dissemination activities. ➤ More analysis will be useful for the online platform (Work package 4) 	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The deliverable is very comprehensive. ➤ No missing information detected, except for the information related to the final conference (e.g. date, purpose, etc). 	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Different data sources were used in the deliverable. Information was gathered from literature, previous projects, legislation, surveys, etc. 	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The outcomes are very useful and applicable. 	

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

<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: 85/100</p>
<p>➤ The dissemination plan is common for all domains. There is no special reference for the digitalization domain.</p>	
<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>	
<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</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.

<p>➤ Opinions of different stakeholders have been adequately reflected in this deliverable. Information regarding the target groups is well presented in Chapter 4.</p>	
<p>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>N/A</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 85/100</p>
<p>➤ The expected results are relevant and well presented.</p>	

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

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	Overall Score: 90/100
<p>Quite good!</p> <p>The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. It is easy to conclude that the resulting outcomes will be of great interest to the development of the project.</p>	
Date of external evaluation review:	29/08/2022
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.