

### ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):	D2.2. Prioritized occupational profiles	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	Priorities and strategy design		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
<b>1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*</b>			
<b>a) structure and content</b>		<b>Score: 100/100</b>	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The structure is simple, in tables and an annex. The structure is adequate for the presentation of the deliverable.</p>			
<b>b) length</b>		<b>Score: 100/100</b>	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The length is adequate for the content to be presented.</p>			
<b>c) format</b>		<b>Score: 100/100</b>	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The format, presenting, first, the methodology, and, then, the multicriteria evaluation for the skill/knowledge required for each occupational profile (in tables) is adequate.</p>			
<b>d) English language use</b>		<b>Score: 100/100</b>	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Good</p>			
<b>2. Please evaluate the overall quality of the deliverable in terms of:</b>			

<b>a) relevance (e.g., does the information address all key issues compared to the objectives of the project?)</b>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>
Comments: Relevant. However, since 10 profiles were to be selected but that was the profiles proposed in D2.1, the relevance here stems from the multicriteria valuation.	
<b>b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)</b>	<b>Score: 95/100</b>
Comments: The deliverable is comprehensive.	
<b>c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)</b>	<b>Score: /100</b>
Comments: The information is based on Deliverable D 2.2, as it should be expected.	
<b>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</b>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>
Comments: The usefulness lies on the multicriteria evaluation. Since 10 profiles were to be selected and that was the number of profiles in d2.1, the usefulness on this aspect is limited.	
<b>3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?</b> <i>*only for Sustainability External Expert</i>	<b>Score: /100</b>

Comments: Sustainability is addressed indirectly (see evaluation of D.2.1.)	
<b>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?</b> <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	<b>Score: /100</b>
Comments:	
<b>c) Has Bio-economy &amp; Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?</b> <i>*only for Bio-economy &amp; Forestry External Expert</i>	<b>Score: /100</b>
Comments:	
<b>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</b>	<b>Score: 95/100</b>
Comments: I think so, through the application of the multicriteria evaluation.	
<b>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</b>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>

Comments: Yes, methodology is clear.	
<b>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</b>	<b>Score: 95/100</b>
Comments: The final remark is: "This ranking exercise will support the structure and organization of the training modules in the next steps of the project. It can also be useful in future tasks of the project". I agree.	
<b>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</b>	<b>Score: 95/100</b>
Comments: Yes, they are.	
<b>Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:</b>	<b>Overall Score: /100</b>
Comments: Very good.	
Date of external evaluation review:	23/09/2022
Signature/Name:	

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.