

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.2 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable D1.3		VET list and classification		Date	06/07/2020
WP1	Skills needs identification			Task Leader	ISEKI
Author(s)	Riccardo Gulletta (LLL-P)				
Quality assurance Reviewer	Remigio Berruto			Partner	UNITO
The Deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project				Comments/Remarks ¹	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	

¹ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.

² In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		08/07/2020			
Signature: Remigio Berruto					

Deliverable (Title)		D1.3			Date	03/07/2020	
WP	1				Task Leader	LLL-P	
Author(s)							
Quality assurance Reviewer			ICOS		Partner		
Does the Deliverable comply with the overall objectives of the project?					Comments/Remarks ³		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the Deliverable comply with all Task requirements?					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the information addressed key issues?					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the information provided in the Deliverable reliable?⁴					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the Deliverable presented using the project's format?					Comments/Remarks		

³ In case of NOT ENOUGH & POOR grades the reporting of comments/remarks is mandatory, otherwise the assessment will be invalidated. Reviewer comments must be accurate, comprehensive and fully articulated.






⁴ In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.

X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the Deliverable written in good English?			Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has the Deliverable been released by its due date?			Comments/Remarks	
X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/>
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:		
<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/>
Date of Quality Assurance review		03/07/2020		
Signature:				

2 The grading system

The grading system included in the Evaluation Grid template (Annex I) provides a quick overview of the main conclusions at the level of each assessment question. A five-grade scale is adopted using the following categories (Table 1):

Table 1. Grading reference table.

Score	Grading reference table for assessing and monitoring questions
	I disagree = 1: There are deficiencies which are serious. If not addressed, they may lead to failure of the Deliverable. Major adjustments and revision of the intervention logic and/or implementation arrangements are necessary.
	I slightly disagree = 2: There are issues which need to be addressed. Necessary improvements do not, however, require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
	Neutral = 3: The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
	I agree = 4: All issues within the scope of the project have been fairly addressed. Authors have answered any requirement stated in the Task description, reaching the intended objectives. There is no request for further improvements gathered in the evaluation process.
	I completely agree = 5: The Deliverable quality goes beyond the expected quality standards reported in the Quality assurance procedure, leading to an outstanding standard. Authors did not confine the activity implementation to the proposal description, but they have contingently approached the task by considering any additional information arising during the project development. The delivery deadline has been met.