|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | D5.2: Funding Opportunities | Date: | 25/06/2022 |
| Work package: 5 | Long term action plan | | |
| External evaluator (Name): | Juliet Achieng Owuor | | |
| 1. **Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:\*** | | | |
| 1. **structure and content** | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * Thanks for highlighting the aim(s) of the report in this section but you could also indicate the target audience. * The need for the report could be stated. * A footnote with the link to the project’s website could be added for those interested in finding out more about the project. * Apply the same numbering style for all the outputs decide whether it is 3/24 or 3 of 24 for example. | | | |
| 1. **length** | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * Very appropriate, I personally prefer short reports because they serve two purposes in one, that is they can act as a report and also a policy brief therefore relevant for all stakeholders! * The short work package description and methodology sections before getting to the main section of the report (list of funding opportunities) offers good background information. | | | |
| 1. **format** | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * The report’s appearance is dull starting from the cover page, it is not visual enough. * 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 author’s name. * 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. * Infographics could have also been utilized especially for the results section (3.1.1-3.1.5) to highlight the main findings. * Different colours could be used to represent different countries or the different themes to make the Table in Annex 1 more appealing and to create a distinction. * There was no need to include the column on centralization or decentralization since it was mostly empty, an asterisk and legend to describe this would be sufficient. | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * Excellent. Correct tenses, spelling, terms used, simple to understand language and great flow of ideas. * There are instances where acronyms are used without being written in full which might be difficult for someone who is not part of the project to understand or for someone who is interested in reading only one deliverable. Examples: ICOS, please add LLLP in brackets after writing the full name in the table currently on page 1. * In short, please create a list of acronyms and abbreviations. | | | |
| 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 | |
| * It addresses the objective on providing sustainability and awareness of the project after it ends and shows how this will happen for example through the MOU that will be signed by the 50 project partners to achieve Sector Skills Alliance. | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| * Adding links to the finding opportunities would be helpful to those interested in applying for them and directs them to the specific call. * What does decentralization and centralization mean? The lack of clarity could have contributed to the section being sparsely populated. If there was very little information on that, the entire section could have been deleted. * It would be helpful to elaborate on the categories of beneficiaries beyond public and private organizations. The granting bodies could be classified into categories (public, private) for further to compare where most of the funding is coming from and as something to explore in the future when thinking of fundraising. * For the closed calls, if they are recurring it would be helpful to include the dates they open if possible. | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| * The information is reliable because the criteria used in identifying them is robust. The 13 columns on the table provide most relevant information needed when searching for funding opportunities so searching for all this information makes the list very reliable. * Setting the two conditions set before an opportunity is included into the list are very good: opportunity in the European Union and relevance in terms of the topics the address and eligibility of the project partners. * Exploring the partners interest in applying for these opportunities is great and the interest to collaborate in applying for them. * My small concern is about the determination of the themes to prevent overlaps, more information to clarify this will be appreciated. What does each theme cover and what is excluded? | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | **Score**:90 /100 | |
| * Having the idea of long-term sustainability of the strategy and training materials from the beginning and clearly highlighting it is important because it helps ins shaping the proposals and outcomes. * Updating the list from time to time is a good idea because the information about these opportunities changes each time the call is opened. | | | |
| 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**: 75/100 | |
| * Bio-economy is a cross cutting theme and therefore having clearly defined indicators for this theme would be helpful otherwise most of the opportunities will most likely fall under agriculture, forestry, sustainability etc. * More effort should have been directed to ensuring that this theme is well covered. * There are no specific opportunities for forestry but most of them are for agro-forestry, this confirms my concern raised in the point above. * It is good to see that entrepreneurship is covered because this is one of the topics that is largely missing or insufficiently addressed by the forestry curriculum as well as soft skills. | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | **Score**: /100 | |
| * Is question this applicable to this deliverable because the task that produced this output did not require opinions from any stakeholders in my understanding. But to ensure that the stakeholders are represented, see my point on 2b bullet number 3. | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The comparison of the results from different countries is commendable.  A few things that were not clarified:   * Where was the information on the funding opportunities obtained? * How was the search conducted? * Were all the keywords applied to all the countries or were modifications done? Were they translated to the local language of each country? * Centralization vs decentralization needs to be clarified. | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * To some extent, but first separate the conclusion and recommendation sections. * Secondly, add more points to the conclusion including a summary of the results on the themes, level of funding and budget, beneficiaries, as well as the future partnership survey. | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| * The recommendations are relevant and useful but separate the recommendation section from the conclusion section. * Provide more information to the recommendation section based on the results in section 3.1. * It would be useful if you could also provide ideas on how to ensure that the funding opportunities database reach a wider audience beyond the project partners. | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | **Overall Score**: 84.17/100 | |
| * Very good! The length, the content and structure are ok. Many a times, people don’t know where to start looking for funds to implement their activities, I find the table with the opportunities excellent and very relevant. It will be very helpful for different stakeholders interested in finding information on funding opportunities in their countries and beyond. * The best output from the project so far, it is well written and presented! * A side comment, did you try to find out if such a database exists? If there are, how similar or different are they from yours? | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | 25/06/2022 | |
| 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 |