

### ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):	D1.5 Focus Group Analysis	Date:	28/06/2022
Work package:	WP1. Skills needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos		
1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*			
a) structure and content		Score: 70/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>The deliverable is well structured, presenting methodology followed by pan-European results and conclusions. The primary data of each focus group are presented in annexes, probably the most valuable part of the deliverable.</p> <p>The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing. I imagine running a focus group as proposed in D1.4 quite different to an on-line meeting.</p> <p>Ranking most selected skills may be misleading. Some of them are transversal, while other are sectorial. It is expectable that those that are transversal would be selected by more focus group members. Other skills are environment-dependent. For instance, water management is surely more selected where water scarcity or water excess are important. A stratified analysis would have provided more insight. I understand that this type of analysis requires random stratified sampling, which is not the methodology when doing focus group-based research. Annex II (selected skills by stakeholder profiles) solves this drawback partially.</p> <p>I wonder why focus group members were anonymised. In D1.4 I read that opinions would be anonymised, but I do not remember reading that the names of the focus group members would not be shown.</p>			
b) length		Score: 70/100	
<p>Comments:</p> <p>Some sections are lengthy and tedious to read. Inserting comments and statements of individual focus group members was a good idea; however, the authors abuse this resource. This is particularly notable in section 4.1.2.</p>			
c) format		Score: 70/100	

Comments:

The format is adequate to the analysis presented, although, as stated above, the overuse of quotations makes reading tedious. Should the authors have chosen other type of analysis, the format should have been different.

**d) English language use**

**Score: 80/100**

Comments:

Overall is good, although there are some minor grammar errors.

**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: 80/100**

Comments:

The deliverable addresses all key issues in the objectives of the project. As stated above, the analysis does not provide full insight of the results.

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

**Score: 90/100**

Comments:

The deliverable is comprehensive since it presents in Annex the detailed results of all focus groups.

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

**Score: 75/100**

Comments: The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing. I imagine running a focus group as proposed in D1.4 quite different to an on-line meeting.	
<b>d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)</b>	<b>Score: 75/100</b>
Comments: Following my comment above, since it is not stratified, the analysis does not provide full insight of the results.	
<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: 90/100</b>
Comments: Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where sustainability is addressed adequately.	
<b>b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?</b> <i>*only for Digitalization External Expert</i>	<b>Score: 90/100</b>
Comments: Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where digitalization is addressed adequately.	
<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: 90/100</b>

Comments:

Yes. The analysis is based on guidelines where bio economy is addressed adequately.

**4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?**

**Score: 100/100**

Comments:

Yes. The deliverable is about the opinions of stakeholders.

**5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?**

**Score: 80/100**

Comments:

The methodology is in deliverable D1.4. The guidelines in D1.4 had to be adapted due to limitations imposed by COVID. Detailed description of this adaptation is missing.

**6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?**

**Score: 75/100**

Comments:

Rather than conclusions, the corresponding section presents a summary of the results.

**7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?**

**Score: /100**

Comments:

I do not think it appropriate to propose recommendations in this deliverable. In any case, there aren't.

**Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:**

**Overall Score:** 76/100

Comments:

Date of external evaluation review:

28/06/2022

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.