

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. 	
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: 90/100
<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. 	
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:	

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

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 80/100
<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>	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 90/100
<p>➤ The proposed methodology is clearly described in an adequate manner in Chapter 2 “Method”.</p>	
6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	Score: 95 /100
<p>➤ Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights.</p>	
7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	Score: 90/100

*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.