ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):		D 1.4. Focus group guidelines	Date:	28/06/2'22
Work package:		WP1 Skill needs identification		
External evaluator (Name):		Luciano Mateos		

1. Please provide a general evaluation of the deliverable in terms of:*

a) structure and content	**Score**:90/100

Comments:

The delivery is rather straightforward. The guidelines consist of a step-by-step procedure to stablish, run and report focus groups, including templates and questionnaires templates as annexes.

My only minor concern is the composition of the focus groups and the time proposed for the focus groups meetings: It is said that a functional focus group consists of 5-10 members and that it should include at least five different profiles. I think these two conditions will conduct to focus groups of 10 or near 10 members. In that case, meetings of two hours might be too short to address all key issues.

b) length	**Score**:100/100

Comments:

The length is adequate since the "heavy" material is in annexes.

c) format	**Score**:85/100

Comments:
The format is adequate. I wish a list of acronyms had been included in the deliverable.

d) English language use	**Score**:95/100

Comments:
Good.

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**:100/100

Comments:
The deliverable is extremely relevant. It provides common guidelines for the Project for key activities aiming to identify skill needs. The questionnaires proposed for the focus groups address all key issues stated as objectives of the project.

b) comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)	**Score**:100/100

Comments:
I think the deliverable is comprehensive. The partners in charge of running the focus groups will find in the deliverable guidance necessary for their task.

c) reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)	**Score**:90/100

Comments:
I think the guidelines are based on tested guidelines used by other focus groups, although this is not stated in the document.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	**Score**:100/100

Comments:
The deliverable is extremely necessary to organise focus groups that address in comprehensive and harmonised manner the key issues stated as objectives of the project involving a significant number of stakeholders.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Sustainability External Expert*	**Score**:100/100

Comments:
Yes. Sustainability is adequately addressed in Sheet 1 (Annex VII).

b) Has Digitalization domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Digitalization External Expert*	**Score**:100/100

Comments:
Yes. Digitalization is adequately addressed in Sheet 2 (Annex VII).

c) Has Bio-economy & Forestry domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Bio-economy & Forestry External Expert*	**Score**:100/100

Comments:
Yes. Bio economy is adequately addressed in Sheets 3a, 3b and 3c (Agriculture, Forestry and Food Industry, respectively) (Annex VII).

4. Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?	**Score**: /100

Comments: There is no indication in the deliverable of consultation to the stakeholders about the guidelines.	

5. Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?	**Score**:100/100

Comments: Yes; methodology is clear.

6. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?	**Score**: /100

Comments: The deliverable does not include conclusions; however, I think a section with conclusions would be unnecessary in this document.

7. Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?	**Score**: /100

Comments: The deliverable does not include recommendations other than those aiming to conduct focus groups; however, I think other type of recommendations would be unnecessary in this document.

Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	**Overall Score**:95/100

Comments:	
Excellent	
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.