

Deliverable (Title):	D1.4: Focus group guidelines	Date:	19/08/2022
Work package:	WP1: Skill needs identification		
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 content is comprehensive and well-aimed. • The proposed methodology and guidelines ensure a reliable procedure and a fruitful discussion between the members of the panels which enables the extraction of considerable results. 			
b) length		Score: 90/100	
The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for the organization of the focus groups.			
c) format		Score: 90/100	
The format is sufficient.			
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.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequate use of the English language. • A table explaining the acronyms should have been included in the document. 	
<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: 95/100</p>
<p>➤ The information delivered is very comprehensive and provides all the necessary guidelines and instructions for a successful implementation of the focus groups.</p>	
<p>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>No missing information detected. The guidelines are clearly described.</p>	
<p>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</p>	<p>Score: 75/100</p>
<p>The content is sufficient and reliable. However, some references about the methodology and the guidelines provided in the document or the strategy for this kind of activities would enhance the reliability of the information.</p>	
<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

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

The outcomes and the proposed structure for the focus groups are fully applicable.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Sustainability External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Digitalization External Expert*

Score: 95/100

The section of digitalization is fully covered by the skills list and questionnaires provided by the owners of the deliverable.

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?

**only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

Score: /100

Comments:

<p>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>The guidelines provide the framework in order the opinion of all responsible stakeholders to be adequately reflected in the deliverable. The diversity of the stakeholders proposed to take part in the focus groups (education providers, advisors, farmers, Agri-food companies, cooperatives...) enables addressing the topics from all of its sides.</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 and guidelines are surely described in a clear and adequate manner.</p>	
<p>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</p>	<p>Score: /100</p>
<p>The deliverable does not include a conclusions section which is quite reasonable, based on the nature of the deliverable.</p>	
<p>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>

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

The proposed methodology and guidelines ensure a reliable procedure and a fruitful discussion between the members of the panels which enables the extraction of considerable results. The deliverable can be used as a reference for relevant, future activities.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:

Overall Score: 90/100

Very good job!

The content is presented simply and comprehensibly. it is easy to conclude that the resulting results will be of great interest to the development of the project.

Date of external evaluation review:

19/08/2022

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.