|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D2.3 | Date: | 31/07/2022 |
| Work package: | WP2 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**: 100/100 | |
| Great flow, introduction, methodology, results and then conclusion and way forward.  The introduction section is comprehensive, it states the aims of the FIELDS Project, the aim of the task, what the deliverable will be used for and topics that it will address and action points. Very useful information all synthesized very well on one page. This is an example of a very good introduction section.  The results are presented precisely. It is so easy to read and understand. That makes the deliverable very captivating to read. I did not want it to end. Everything flows very well. Since this deliverable is available to the public, it is important that all information is precise. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| Very appropriate! Introduction section is long enough therefore provides all the needed information. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| * Cover page needed to make the report more appealing. 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. * The font size of the text in Table 1,2,3,4,5, is too tiny and strenuous to read. * The existing initiatives at international and national levels to monitor the skills ecosystem should have been presented in a table format with the name of the initiative, short description, level it operates and web link. * The small font text on figure 1 is not legible. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Good. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple language.  Some typos are there: This raises the question whether de development of standard education and training modules at European level would be the direction to go.  Two full stops have been sued on page 12 “Cross-functional skills are considered very important across job profiles, and perhaps critical for small business/companies, where all-rounder workers are often needed..  Language check would have helped eradicate the minor grammatical mistakes especially for documents that are accessible to the public. | | | | |
| 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 | |
| The deliverable addresses important issues in the project and contributes the objectives on identifying global trends and skill gaps and designing a strategy at the EU and Country level to improve the skills. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The deliverable is comprehensive.  Principle 2 proposes a supra-national institute/organisation but the sentence before the paragraph states that a supra-national organization is **not needed**; actual needs are best monitored locally. Regional authorities and public employment agencies should have a key role in monitoring. This is confusing. What is the right recommendation?  Listing the existing monitoring skills ecosystems is a good way to create awareness and visibility around them because this deliverable is available to the public.  Addressing the topic of funding tools is great because many at times recommendations can not be implemented because of lack of financial resources. The proposed ideas are applicable because some are offered free and it will be easy to mobilise resources from different sources as listed in the deliverable.  Resilience in training programmes was also highlighted. It is important to keep the courses updated and adapt them to the needs of the market. | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| Data was obtained from a survey conducted on the project partners in combination with results from tasks 2.1 and 2.2. It was supplemented by EU policy documents and reports of EU level organizations involved in the analysis of skill needs and/or the design of training. The process of data collection was rigorous hence making the deliverable reliable. Why did the 5 project partners not respond to the survey? Did their lack of participation affect the results in any way? Was there a sector not represented because of that? | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Overall, the proposals should be applicable, some can be easily done but others will take time.  The following proposed KPIs for assessment of training modules and courses are dependent on the labour market and not the training offered therefore should be applied with caution: employment status of trainees after graduation, incl. job promotions, placement rate for unemployed learners and rate of young people/workers recruited in agri-food sector.  The deliverable focused on very important topics that have not been addressed in the other deliverables: partnership and governance of the European agri-food and forestry skills ecosystem, gender issues and underprivileged groups and resources.  Solutions are proposed where challenges have been highlighted. These proposals are useful in guiding decision making and implementation processes.  The recommendations are very relevant for example this one “Include social entrepreneurship as a topic to learn trainees a ‘’sustainability mindset’’ with a long-term vision on a sustainable bio-economy.” Entrepreneurship is a skill that is needed a lot in the sector but insufficient training is being offered on the same. | | | | |
| 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 | |
| Forestry has been sufficiently covered because it was analysed as a sector allowing for the trends to be adequately investigated.  Bioeconomy was one of the domains of focus so it received sufficient attention. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Employers should also be included in Table 3: Potential partners in the agri-food/forestry skills partnership because they are on the demand side therefore important to work with them to increase the effectiveness of the partnerships. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * The methodology has been well described in a succinct manner, short and straight to the point. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| The conclusions have been supported by evidence presented in the deliverable and the connection well elaborated. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 100/100 | |
| The 11 principles that have been proposed are very solid and have been backed up by evidence. They are feasible. None was overambitious. The proposed way forward is a step in the right direction and will help improve the principles further. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 91.92/100 | |
| Very good! The deliverable is great! | | | | |
| 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 |