|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D2.2: Prioritized occupational profiles | Date: | 16/07/2022 |
| Work package: | Priorities and strategy design | | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Overall, the structure and content are ok. The flow of ideas is good and well organized. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Overall, the length is perfect, it is not too brief or too long. All the necessary information has been presented. It is not tiresome to read the report.  The introduction section is too brief, a justification of the need for the task that resulted in this deliverable should be stated as well as the objectives. What the deliverable intends to contribute to should also be stated. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| * 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. * The tables are monotonous, use of more visually appealing tools like spider diagrams. A reader feels like they are already at the Annex section of the report because of all those tables. Another solution would be to add another colour to the tables that blends well with yellow to increase the appeal. * A few sentences after each table, highlighting key points would have helped break the monotony of the tables. * The table in section 3.2.7 expounds on the skills listed unlike other tables | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**:80 /100 | |
| Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.  Use of acronyms at the beginning without providing the full title of the deliverable for example D2.1 mentioned on page 1, D1.8 on page 4  There were a few grammatical mistakes on page 1, I would recommend that the deliverable undergoes a language check though the mistakes are minor. | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| It builds up on the list of occupational profiles that had been developed before, so it links with other project tasks. The outcomes will also be helpful for the subsequent tasks. The deliverable has raised important points that will help in achieving the objective on designing a strategy on improving skills. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The target group of this deliverable should have been specified as well as what it should achieve.  In the first paragraph on page 1, it is stated that the ranking of the skills/knowledge developed so that it can be used in the later stages of the project but the stages have not been mentioned.  On the description for ranking skills and knowledge, what does nice to know mean. The term does not is confusing, does it mean that a nice skill is optional that is not mandatory but still relevant? How were the overall scores for the skills calculated? Why did you also include a column with values without time, what purpose does it serve? Why were the overall scores slightly lower than the scores where time was not included?  The definitions of skills and knowledge should have also been provided in the methodology section.  What are level 4 and 5 occupation profiles? Why were they considered?  Were there skills that were cross cutting across for the operators in bioeconomy, digitalization and sustainability or the technicians? | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 70/100 | |
| Overall, the deliverable somewhat reliable but more clarification is needed. The experience of the consortium partners was used to determine critically and time, how was this done ad why did you choose that option? Was a survey carried out among the project partners? Why was this kt explained in detail in the methodology? I am a bit sceptical about this, it should be well clarified so as to be convincing. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The findings can be easily used by other projects in the future because they are really detailed and well elaborated but guidance on this is needed. For section 3.2.6, the category on good agricultural practices is very broad with topics that are different from each other. It would add more value to either evaluate each of them separately or create smaller groups than what you have at the moment. This is the same as for environmental management aspects and legislation regarding the issue of water, protected areas ….and environmental licensing. | | | | |
| 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**: 85/100 | |
| The two domains have been addressed. The deliverable has highlighted very well the essential and optional skills as well as essential and optional knowledge needed for operators and technicians. I would have expected European environmental legislation/regulation, policies, subsidy and support programmes as well as good agricultural practices: Crop diversification, conservation farming; agroforestry to be among the essential knowledge for operators but it is surprising that it is not. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| Only opinions of technicians and operators in the fields of agriculture, food industry and forestry. Is there a way this task could be expanded beyond the two profiles? But the classification is still very helpful. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The methodology is comprehensively covered. Criteria applied was well described in Table 1. Further description of how the criteria were evaluated has been provided. However the definitions of operator and technicians should have been provided because section 3.1 and 3.2 focus on them but we don’t have a clear picture of who they really are. Considering that this deliverable is available to the public, then it is important to clarify that. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The ranking of the skills is very useful. The skills listed are also very relevant. Recommendations on how to use the results from this deliverable would be helpful for those who intend to use in future projects. Policy recommendations would have been helpful too. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 81.25/100 | |
| Very good! The results of the rankings were interesting. It will be interesting to see how they will contribute to the structure and organization of the training modules in the next steps of the project. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 30/07/2022 | |
| 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 |