|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D1.5: Focus Group Analysis | Date: | 31/07/2022 |
| Work package: | Skills needs identification | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The flow is great! Interesting information to read. The overview of how the focus group discussions were conducted and data processing and analysis provide good background information and they are very clearly elaborated.  The last two paragraphs in the introduction section help the reader to know what to anticipate in the report.  The main information has been well captured in the main body of the report. Conclusion section is well drafted. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Very appropriate! The Annex section is long but that is not a problem since the main messages are already captured in the main section of the report. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * A cover page with a nice picture would improve the appearance of the report and draw attention of the reader. * The information on the first page should be separated in to two pages: a cover page with the title of the project followed by that of the report, FIELDS Project and Erasmus Programme logos and date it was published and authors names. * A nice colour (green or blue) be used for the cover page instead of leaving it white. * The remainder information from the table currently on page 1 be moved to page 2 together with the project partner logos. * Many figures and tables have been used so the balance between text and illustrations is good. * The x-axis of all the figures (1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10 and 11) should be labelled so that we can be sure whether you are referring to %, numbers or years… * A legend should be provided for Figure 1, 8, 9, 10, and 11 otherwise it is not easy to understand what the colours represent. * The quotes used also helped to summarize the main points and increased the diversity in style as well as bullet points. * The stakeholder profiles for the tables in the Annex section should have been written in full instead of the numbers. The names are not long so they could easily fit into the columns. An additional column with totals would have provided a good overview of the skill that was mentioned most. * The structure and writing styles of the Executive summaries in the Annex sections differed a lot. Was there an agreed style? Some had the trends listed comprehensively like Germany, which was excellent while others like Slovenia, France went straight to the points they wanted to pass across which was also great. Netherlands also provided a comprehensive executive summary. * The Executive summaries from Greece, Austria and forestry mentioned about the participants unlike the summaries from other countries. The Executive summary from Ireland provided a summary of the process and not trends on the topics being investigated while the summary from Italy was more of questions than highlighting the trends. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * There is no big problem about this, correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language. A few errors were there * This text could be paraphrased in a better way: “In the period from May to July 2020, 11 focus groups were conducted (see Table 1), nine of which were conducted at the national level and 2 of which were conducted at a pan-European level on EU policy and on forestry issues, respectively.” * Same as this one” Then it was decided to look for another method to transcribe the focus groups,” * A different term should have been used “During the focus groups, all participants were asked to present their top 10 rankings and each participant was requested to present his/her 3 most important skills in a reasoned manner.” * There were a few other conjugation of verbs errors * Language checks by an expert recommended. | | | | |
| 1. **Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:** | | | | |
| 1. **relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| This deliverable is important because many steps rely on it. It has sufficiently covered the objective of identifying skills and touched on many aspects which is commendable. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 95/100 | |
| The deliverable is comprehensive. It has touched on different aspects of skills ranging from importance among categories and sectors to the missing and changing ones and how they vary within job levels for important sectors that is agriculture, forestry and forest-based industry and food industry. It also highlights training needs, needs of the training systems at national and European level, target group for training and methods as well as certification. It has touched on areas that haven’t been very well investigated which is a plus because it provided new information. National, EU and international environmental policies, regulation, subsidy and support programmes is an important point that came across in the results because we have many policies targeted to the sector and it is important to understand them.  Soft skills were given sufficient attention just like technical skills. From the list of missing skills, bioeconomy and soft skills had the longest list which is unfortunately how the real situation is so that is something that needs to be looked into by the relevant stakeholders.  A few topics did not feature prominently yet they are very important especially when we think of the future of the sector for example how to attract young people to the sector, importance of practical experience and lifelong learning. Collaboration among different stakeholders was brought up by the participants in the focus groups. This is an important issue because successful training can only be achieved through strong partnerships and collaboration among different stakeholders.  It would have been interesting to find out from the focus group participants how the skills would have changed beyond 5-10 years, that time frame is short.  Comparisons of the results at the Eu level then at country level is impressive because it highlights the general trends and also allows for country specific trends to be highlighted. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The deliverable is reliable. A rigorous methodology was used including a consultation process among the project partners, revision of the guidelines whenever need arises. Different perspectives have been presented. The number of focus groups carried out are sufficient and the topics have been sufficiently addressed. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The outcomes are very applicable. | | | | |
| 1. **a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**   *\*only for Sustainability External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Digitalization External Expert* | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| **c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**  *\*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert* | | | **Score**:90/100 | |
| Bioeconomy has been well covered in this deliverable. Separating bioeconomy into agriculture, forestry and food sector was helpful in ensuring that they are well investigated and capture the differences for each group. The differences in the results for these three groups shows why it was important to separate them otherwise some results would have been overshadowed by others. Forestry has also been sufficiently covered by having a focus group specifically targeted at the topic.  The skills regarded as important in bioeconomy and forestry, the gaps and training needs have been well highlighted. Figure 11 about Most selected skills for the Forestry focus group is a true reflection of the challenges and opportunities that the forestry sector has. It is surprising to see how the sector considers technical skills important, this would not have been highlighted if forestry was merged with other sectors. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Many stakeholders have been represented. A separate focus group targeted at policy issues was also organized to collect opinions on the topic which is excellent. I also liked the separate focus group conducted for forestry to bring together different stakeholders engaged in the topic.  More students should have been involved, it should have been a bottom-up approach as it is now, it is a top down approach where educators and policy makers propose ideas without consulting the group on which the ideas are to be implemented. It is always good to balance opinions. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Very well described. Where modifications were made was also stated. The shortcomings were also stated.  Luckily the challenges that arose from using IMAGO/IBM were detected early through the pilot tests. Did the team in charge of procuring the soft ware read reviews before buying it? Didn’t they foresee that such a problem could arise? | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| This is the first deliverable that has a comprehensive conclusion section so far. The conclusions are supported by evidence presented in the deliverable. One can only read the conclusion and understand what the entire deliverable is about.  The authors indicated how the results of this deliverable will be applied to future project tasks. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| They are relevant because they relevant and address most of the issues in the different sectors that were investigated. They have also been very well presented and easy to pick them out. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 89.23/100 | |
| Very good! Great job to the team involved in producing this deliverable. They have touched on many important issues and presented them very well. They invested time to this task and producing the deliverable. Technical aspects were well covered. Impressive! | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 31/07/2022 | |
| Signature/Name: A picture containing shape  Description automatically generated Juliet Achieng Owuor | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maximum number of points for a criterion** | **Range of scores** | | | |
|  | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Weak** |
| 100 | 76-100 | 51-75 | 26-50 | 0-25 |