|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable (Title): | | D7.1 Dissemination plan | Date: | 05/08/2022 |
| Work package: | Dissemination and communication | | | |
| 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 | |
| The report is well structured. The objectives of the dissemination exercise are listed in the first chapter provides a good overview of what the task and the resulting deliverable is about.  Highlighting the objectives of each work package followed by the expected outcomes helps in linking the two and understand how the objectives are contributing to the realization of the outcomes. A table with a summary of the outcomes for each work package would have clearly captured this information because presently some outcomes are described in detail compared to others e.g in section 2.1.2, the growth strategy, repository database and trends and scenario analysis report have been well described while information about the web-based survey on skill needs and gaps is scanty.  The list of deliverables and target groups in Annex II should have been in the main report and not the Annex with a column with a short description of the outcomes. A lot of useful information is hidden in the Annex.  A sentence mentioning the partners involved in each work package should have ben added because it helps connect them with the objectives and tasks.  The section with the key messages has not been clearly described making it difficult to understand how they were arrived at, the purpose they serve and where they will be used. | | | | |
| 1. **length** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Very appropriate! The length of each section from the introduction to the Annex are enough, none is too short or long. | | | | |
| 1. **format** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| 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.  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.  This is a short report so the text is not overwhelming to the reader, but the tables have helped in capturing lots of useful information and enhancing the look of the report.  There is lack of uniformity in the table in Annex II because some sections are highlighted in grey, and an explanation is missing.  The current figure 1 and 3 should be labelled as Tables.  The colours on the logos should have been elaborated if at all they have a meaning. | | | | |
| 1. **English language use** | | | **Score**: 75/100 | |
| Simple and easy to understand language has been used. The information is presented in a concise manner.  The meanings of some words are not clear in the context they are in for example: In section renovation in education  In section 2.6.1: The overall objective of WP 7 is to assure professional, effective and most adequate dissemination and communication of the project results, did you mean ensure?  In chapter 4, there is an error: This section identifies and describes the target groups to communicated, what did the authors intend to say? The groups that will be communicated to?  Section 4.1.3: It is planned that 12 trainers will follow the training during the experimentation phase, what does follow in this case mean? Was it supposed to be participate or offer?  The report should have undergone a language check by an expert to eliminate all the small errors that sometimes result in lack of clarity of the message being conveyed.  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: section 1.1: (According to DoW, p.242ff), section2.2.2: (ECVET, EQAVET), section 2.3.2: (EQF, SMEs), section 2.5.3: (DoW, p.153f). A list of acronyms and abbreviations would be useful. | | | | |
| 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**: 80/100 | |
| The deliverable clearly highlights the objectives of the project, expected outcomes, the partners involved, stakeholders targeted and how communication will be carried out during the duration of the project and after. The key messages are also highlighted.  The tagline is too long and might be difficult for most people to remember, a shorter catchy tagline would have been appealing.  One of the objectives of work package 4 is implementation of a platform, but this platform has not been well described, what is it? Who is it targeted at?  The sectors the project intends to cover have not been well highlighted for example, the sectors to be covered by each outcome should have been stated as well as the dimensions (digitalization, bioeconomy and sustainability. The focus of the 8 papers to be published by the end of the project should have also been indicated if that information is already known. | | | | |
| 1. **comprehensiveness (e.g., is there any missing information?)** | | | **Score**: 80/100 | |
| The deliverable is comprehensive.  What was missing:  How the impact of the communication tools will be measured was missing for example will the visits to the websites be counted? Impressions on social media channels?  The key messages to be communicated are very broad, for example:   * 3: FIELDS will promote the attractiveness of the agricultural sector and facilitate transfer of knowledge between countries. One project alone cannot achieve that. The message should have focussed on the action(s) that will contribute to the attainment of that goal. * FIELDS will promote the use of IT technologies in education. How will this be done? * How will this be done? FIELDS is an EU-funded project that aims to improve the employability of the trainees. * I did not understand why these had to be part of the key messages:   + 7. The primary sector and the processing industries have a good reputation to maintain and they pursue social responsibility strategy.   + 8. Trainees have a knowledge and technology transfer mission. * There was no information about the final conference, when will it take place? What are the aims of the conference? Target audience? | | | | |
| 1. **reliability (e.g., is the information based on literature/field research?)** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| The project has combined diverse data sources from existing literature, data from previous projects, legislations, focus group discussions and surveys. All these are a good combination and helps to increase the reliability of the outcomes. Building upon existing data is a brilliant idea for example from a previous Horizon Project, existing legislation. The project also utilised the expertise of the very rich consortium partners to obtain data for some steps which is like killing two birds with one stone. | | | | |
| 1. **usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| The outcomes are applicable, the project has tried to be country specific wherever possible. The objectives of Work package 5 are targeted at ensuring that the proposals can be implemented locally. The second task is ensuring that there are funding opportunities for its implementation and sustainability which will be monitored by the consortium and a governance body.  Translations of the outcomes to different languages will also help reach a wider audience and increase their applicability.  The project first identifies the needs of each specific target group before proposing solutions. This ensures that the proposals match the needs of each group. | | | | |
| 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**: 70/100 | |
| It was difficult to tell just by reading this deliverable. The information was only provided for the outcomes in section 2.1.2. More information should have been provided on how each deliverable covers these topics for example A list of 10 new prioritized job profiles in bioeconomy or forestry. | | | | |
| 1. **Have the opinions of all responsible stakeholders been adequately reflected on the deliverable?** | | | **Score**: 90/100 | |
| Yes the opinions of different stakeholders have been adequately reflected in this deliverable. Chapter 4 explains very clearly who the target groups are and the benefits they will receive as well as how they can be reached and how impact will be measured.  The benefits that each group will receive should have been listed in bullet or number form so that it is easy to evaluate if they have been achieved or not once the task has been concluded. | | | | |
| 1. **Has the methodology of the deliverable been described in a clear and adequate manner?** | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A  Methodology could not be elaborated in this deliverable whose main focus was to highlight the outcomes of the project. | | | | |
| 1. Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable? | | | **Score**: /100 | |
| N/A  This deliverable does not offer conclusions. | | | | |
| 1. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?** | | | **Score**: 85/100 | |
| They are not recommendations as such but the expected outcomes are feasible because a lot of attention has been devoted to identifying who the targets are, how they will benefit from the project and identifying their needs. They are not over ambitious. | | | | |
| **Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:** | | | **Overall Score**: 82.27/100 | |
| Very good! Provides a very good summary of the entire project in a succinct manner. It has highted what is to be expected from the project and how they will reach the target audience. It is a good report. | | | | |
| Date of external evaluation review: | | | 05/08/2022 | |
| 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 |