ANEXO III

Deliverable (Title):		D3.1. Training methodologies	Date:	23/09/2022
Work package:	New tools and training design			
External evaluator (Name):	Luciano Mateos			

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

a) structure and content	**Score**: 95/100

Comments:

The structure and content of this deliverable have been of great interest to this evaluator. It reads fluently and is easy to understand. However, this evaluator has no background in training methods. Therefore, although his perception of the deliverable is positive, he does not have sufficient elements of judgement to evaluate it.

b) length	**Score**: /100

Comments:

Apparently adequate.

c) format	**Score**: 95/100

Comments:
Good. Easy to read even for a non-expert in training methods.

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

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:
Developing good training methodologies is essential for the project. I think the deliverable addresses the current and emerging training methodologies with the aim of combining them according to specific need. Many of the training methods were unknown for this reviewer; however, all of them seem relevant.

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

Comments:
The deliverable seems comprehensive for this reviewer who is not expert on training methods, who cannot think about missing information.

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

Comments:
The authors of the deliverable seem very well informed; although this evaluator does not have criteria to evaluate it.

d) usefulness (e.g., are the outcomes/proposals applicable?)	Score: 95/100

Comments:
The proposed methods are useful in the sense that may be taken into practice.

3. a) Has Sustainability domain of the project been adequately covered in the deliverable? *only for Sustainability External Expert*	Score: 95/100

Comments:
The deliverable addresses sustainability indirectly.

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

Comments:

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:

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

Comments:
Difficult to assess based on the reading of the deliverable.

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

Comments: I believe this question is not relevant for this deliverable.	
6. **Have the conclusions been clearly supported by the evidence presented in the deliverable?**	**Score**: 95/100
Comments: I think so.	
7. **Are the recommendations of the deliverable relevant, feasible, and/or useful?**	**Score**: 95/100
Comments: The proposed training methods are useful in the sense that may be taken into practice strightforward.	
Overall satisfaction about the deliverable:	**Overall Score**: 95/100
Comments: Very good.	
Date of external evaluation review:	23/09/2022
Signature/Name: Luciano Mateos	

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.