

Deliverable (Title):	D1.1: Stakeholders strategic plans and analysis report	Date:	18/08/2022
Work package:	Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The content develops generally smoothly and comprehensively. • The introduction is explanatory and provides an overview of the strategic plan. • The analysis of trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitization is quite extensive and comprehensive. However, some parts could be further analysed (please see below). • A few paragraphs about the forestry sector might be useful for the reader in order to have a more holistic view of the strategies. In terms of digitalization, the document could provide more information about key aspects and requirements of the digital transformation, such as the interoperability of the various components and services, and the business models (mainly data-driven) that farmers/entrepreneurs could follow towards circular farming. • A Table with the type of stakeholders reached and how each of them contributed to the definition of the strategic plans should be included in the report. • A summary would be useful at the end of the document with the final considerations. • A table explaining the acronyms should have been included in the document. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
The length is reasonable considered the quantity of information that is provided in the document.			
c) Format		Score: 75/100	

*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"> • Tables should have the same format. • Reference numbers throughout the document should be hyperlinked with the reference details at the end of the document. • More illustrations and graphs should be used to enhance the consolidation of the content. 	
d) English language use	Score:85/100
<p>A scanning of the document would eliminate some grammatical mistakes that have been identified.</p>	
<p>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?)	Score: 85/100
<p>➤ The deliverable addresses sufficiently all key issues and objectives of the project.</p>	
b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	Score: 85/100
<p>It would be interesting to provide (possibly at a later stage) an additional chapter on the consequences of the war in Ukraine.</p>	
c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	Score: 90/100

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

The information is referenced sufficiently.	
d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 80/100
As mentioned above, a summary would be useful at the end of the document with the final considerations.	
3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	Score: /100
Comments:	
b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	Score: 80/100
The section provided generally a sufficient overview of the digitalization sector including the current status, trends and information about the relevant European projects. However, the document could provide some more information about key aspects and requirements of the digital transformation, such as the interoperability of the various components and services, and the business models (mainly data-driven) that farmers/entrepreneurs could follow towards circular farming.	
c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?	Score: /100

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

<i>*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert</i>	
Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 85/100
It is not fully clarified which type of stakeholders contributed with their expertise in the implementation of the deliverable, however, based on the content of the document, it is considered that their opinion has been reflected in the deliverable.	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 80/100
Despite the lack of a paragraph devoted to that, information about the methodology can be extracted from the introduction and the structure of the content.	
6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	Score: 60/100
As mentioned before, a summary with the final considerations is missing.	

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

<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>No recommendations/final considerations were included in the document.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 80/100</p>
<p>The content develops generally smoothly and comprehensively. The introduction is explanatory and provides an overview of the strategic plan. The analysis of trends and policies for sustainability, bioeconomy and digitization is quite extensive and comprehensive. More comments and suggestions about the deliverable have been provided above.</p>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>18/08/2022</p>
<p>Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos</p>	

<p>Maximum number of points for a criterion</p>	<p>Range of scores</p>			
	<p>Very good</p>	<p>Good</p>	<p>Fair</p>	<p>Weak</p>
<p>100</p>	<p>76-100</p>	<p>51-75</p>	<p>26-50</p>	<p>0-25</p>

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