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 (Title)	D1.8 Trend and scenario analysis		Date	31/03/2021
WP	Skills needs identification		Task Leader	WUR
Author(s)	Jacques Trienekens (WUR); PlantETP, FoodDrinkEurope, GAIA-EPICHEIREIN, CEPI, Confagricoltura, University of Turin, ISEKI, FJ-BLT, ANIA, ProAgria, ICOS			
Quality assurance Reviewer	Remigio Berruto		Partner	UNITO

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form			Comments/Remarks[1]	
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The information addressed the key issues			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2]			Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	☐	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.

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

The Deliverable presented is using the project's format				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	X	☐

Overall assessment	Suggestions for improvements:			
☐	☐	☐	☐	X

Date of Quality Assurance review	01/05/2021

Signature: *Remigio Berruto*

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 (Title)		D1.8 Trend and Scenario Analysis		Date	23/04/2021
WP	1			Task Leader	WUR
Author(s)		WUR (Prof. Jacques Trienekens), PlantETP, FoodDrinkEurope, GAIA-EPICHEIREIN, CEPI, Confagricoltura, Univerity of Turin, ISEKI, FJ-BLT, ANIA, ProAgria, ICOS			
Quality assurance Reviewer		Gemma Cornuau		Partner	ACTIA

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form				Comments/Remarks[1]	
☐	☐	☐	☐	x	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	x	x	
The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	☐	x	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2]				Comments/Remarks	
☐	☐	☐	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

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable is written in good English | Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

The Deliverable has been released by its due date | Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	X	☐	☐

Overall assessment | Suggestions for improvements:

☐	☐	☐	☐	X

Date of Quality Assurance review	23/04/2021

Signature:

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	D1.8 Trend and scenario analysis		Date	13/04/2021
WP	1 - Skill Needs Identification (T1.5 Future Trends Analysis)		Task Leader	WUR
Author(s)	WUR (Prof. Jacques Trienekens), PlantETP, FoodDrinkEurope, GAIA-EPICHEIREIN, CEPI, Confagricoltura, University of Turin, ISEKI, FJ-BLT, ANIA, ProAgria, ICOS			
Quality assurance Reviewer	Marg Leijdens		Partner	Aeres

The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form | Comments/Remarks[1]

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements | Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The information addressed the key issues | Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2] | Comments/Remarks

☐	☐	☐	☐	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
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

Overall assessment	Suggestions for improvements:			
☐	☐	☐	☐	x

Date of Quality Assurance review	02/05/2021
Signature:	

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

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.