

Deliverable (Title):	D1.8: Trend and scenario analysis	Date:	24/08/2022
Work package:	Skill Needs Identification		
External evaluator (Name):	Dimitrios Vlachos		
<b>1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*</b>			
<b>a) structure and content</b>		<b>Score: 90/100</b>	
<p>The methodology of the analysis is sufficiently described. The trends provided are analyzed efficiently and cover all the necessary aspects in agriculture, food industry and forestry sectors, addressing the dimensions of sustainability, bioeconomy, digitalization, and business models. The feedback from the previous deliverables has been sufficiently incorporated in the document. The results of the study can support decision making on selection and prioritization of skills to be included in job profiles and training modules. Also, the results per country contain valuable information for strategy and roadmap formulation, as well as for training design at country level.</p>			
<b>b) length</b>		<b>Score: 90/100</b>	
<p>Some parts based on information provided in previous deliverables could be reduced and summarized.</p>			
<b>c) format</b>		<b>Score: 85/100</b>	
<p>Further graphical representation of the information (e.g. use of infographics) could enhance readability.</p>			
<b>d) English language use</b>		<b>Score: 95/100</b>	

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

Very good use of the English language.

**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: 85/100**

The deliverable does address the key issues in relation to the objectives of the project, analysing the trends across the agricultural, forestry and food sectors in Europe. The analysis of the trends was conducted also at country level to provide an overview highlighting any potential differences that may exist.

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

**Score: 85/100**

No missing information detected. The information provided is extended, however a smarter way of presenting the results might have helped to get easier the outcomes of the deliverable. For example, the further use of graphs and/or infographics, comparing the results between the European countries could be useful to highlight the differences between them in European level. Also, a preliminary correlation between the results would be very useful in order to consolidate the outcomes and better understand the perspectives of the trends.

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

**Score: 90/100**

The information based on literature/field research are reliable supporting sufficiently the outcomes and results.

**d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)**

**Score: 90/100**

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

The results of the deliverable are valuable and can be used for further analysis.

**3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Sustainability External Expert*

**Score: /100**

Comments:

**b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Digitalization External Expert*

**Score: 95/100**

The sections for digitalization cover sufficiently the relevant trends and perspectives in agriculture, forestry, and the food industry. Authors provide enough references to support their findings.

**c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable?**

*\*only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*

**Score: /100**

Comments:

<p><b>4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: /100</b></p>
<p><b>5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: 95/100</b></p>
<p>The methodology of the analysis is sufficiently described.</p>	
<p><b>6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: 85/100</b></p>
<p>The conclusions are sufficiently supported by the evidence provided. A preliminary correlation between the results would be very useful in order to consolidate the outcomes and better understand the perspectives of the trends.</p>	
<p><b>7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?</b></p>	<p><b>Score: 90/100</b></p>

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

The results of the study could support decision making on selection and prioritization of skills to be included in job profiles and training modules. Also, the results per country contain valuable information for strategy and roadmap formulation, as well as for training design at country level.

**Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:**

**Overall Score:** 90/100

The results of the deliverable are very interesting and useful for the implementation of the project as well as for supporting European policies.

Date of external evaluation review:

24/08/2022

Signature/Name: Dimitrios Vlachos

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.