



### **D6.2 - ANNEX I**








Deliverable (Titl	e) D1.7 Surve	y Analysis		Date	31/12/2021		
WP Skills ne	eds identification	entification			r ICOS		
Author(s) Billy Goodburn (ICOS)							
Quality assurance Reviewer Remigio Berruto			Partner	UNITO			
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form				Comments	Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>		
					x		
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments	Comments/Remarks		
					x		
The informatior	addressed the ke	Comments	Comments/Remarks				
					x		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable <sup>2</sup>				Comments	Comments/Remarks		
				X			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.











### **D6.2 - ANNEX I**








Deliverable (Title	) D1.7 Surve	y Analysis		Date		23/04/2021	
WP 1				Task Lead	er	ICOS	
Author(s) Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Christoph Knöbl (ISEKI) and Luis Mayor (ISEKI)							
Quality assurance Reviewer Gemma Cornuau			Partner	Partner ACTIA			
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>		
				х			
	20	00			)		
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comment	Comments/Remarks			
				x			
					)	•••	
The information addressed the key issues				Comment	Comments/Remarks		
		I				x	
	20	00			)	•••	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable <sup>2</sup>			Comment	Comments/Remarks			
				x	)		
		<b>N</b>			)	<b></b>	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.











### **D6.2 - ANNEX I**








Deliverable	D1.7	– Survey Analysis	5	Date	29/04/2021		
WP 1 Tas	k 1.4: Bottom u	p survey		Task Leader	ICOS		
Author(s) Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Christoph Knöbl (ISEKI) and Luis Mayor (ISEKI)							
Quality assurance Reviewer Marg Leijde			dens	Partner AE	RES		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form			Comments/Re	Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>			
					V		
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments/Re	Comments/Remarks		
					V		
The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Re	Comments/Remarks		
					V		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable <sup>2</sup>			Comments/Re	Comments/Remarks			
					V		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.












# **D6.2 - ANNEX I**










<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> In case of Technological Output, the Reviewer shall consider if the Deliverable description is comprehensive and coherent with the Technological Output.











#### 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.
	<b>I slightly disagree = 2</b> : There are issues which need to be addressed. Necessary improvements do not, however, require a major revision of the intervention logic and implementation arrangements.
	<b>Neutral = 3</b> : The situation is considered satisfactory, but there may be room for improvement. Recommendations are useful, but not vital to the project or programme.
	<b>I agree = 4:</b> 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.
	<b>I completely agree = 5</b> : 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.