

Deliverable (Title):	D1.5: Focus Group Analysis	Date:	22/08/2022
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: 90/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The document is very well structured and the information provided is well organised. It should be stated that there is a link with deliverable D1.4 Focus Group Guidelines regarding the conduction of focus group discussions. ➤ The content is comprehensive and well-aimed. The approach of the report is holistic including the following chapters: Introduction, Focus Group Conduction, Focus Group Data Processing and Analysis, Pan-European Focus Group Analysis, Conclusions. Chapter 4: Pan-European Focus Group Analysis provides interesting, well organized and detailed information regarding skills and training. ➤ Chapter 5: Conclusions is very helpful, providing managerial insides. 			
b) length		Score: 85/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The length of the document is reasonable and provides all the necessary information for focus group analysis. ➤ Annex Section seems to be very long; however, it includes all the necessary information regarding the conduction of the focus groups. 			
c) format		Score: 80/100	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The format is sufficient. My only comment is related to the format of the information per country, where it is clear that there is no common format type. In all cases, executive summaries are suggested to be added. 			
d) English language use		Score: 80/100	

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

- Linguistically, the deliverable needs minor improvements. It needs a proof reader to increase the quality of English.

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: 95/100

- The deliverable is important for the achievement of the project's objectives, providing critical information.
- The recognition of skills and training has been adequately covered.
- The deliverable provides adequately new information in the examined field.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)

Score: 90/100

- No missing information detected.
- The collection of skills for the important sectors such as agriculture, forestry and the food industry were carried out comprehensively covering a wide range of the main skills categories for sustainability, digitalization, bioeconomy, soft skills and business-entrepreneurship. Emphasis was placed on training needs, the needs of training systems at national and European level, the target group for training and methods and professional training certification.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)

Score: 95/100

- The content is sufficient and reliable. The methodology for the conduction of focus groups is adequate and well analysed.

<p>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</p>	<p>Score: 95/100</p>
<p>➤ The outcomes are fully applicable.</p>	
<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: 90/100</p>
<p>➤ Digitization is well covered in the report. ➤ Although there is no clear separation for the food industry, forestry and agriculture, the skills related to digitization are clearly provided in the deliverable It is very interesting that there is a wide range of skills related to digitalization chosen in the focus groups highlighting the different level of digital harmonization in each country.</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>

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

Comments:	
4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In this deliverable, many stakeholders participated in the focus groups providing critical information regarding skills and training issues. 	
5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	Score: 90/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The proposed methodology and guidelines are clearly described in an adequate manner. Any problems raised (e.g. problems in transcribing with the use of IMAGIO/IBM software) were solved with a safe way. 	
6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	Score: 95/100
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Conclusion section is complete and provides managerial insights. It also provides guidelines for future work. 	

*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: 85/100</p>
<p>➤ The recommendations are relevant and well presented.</p>	
<p>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</p>	<p>Overall Score: 90/100</p>
<p>Very 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>	
<p>Date of external evaluation review:</p>	<p>22/08/2022</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.