






































































Deliverable	D2.2 (Prioritized occu	upational profiles)	Date	30/11/2021
WP 2 Task 2.2: Pr	WP 2 Task 2.2: Profiles prioritization			CONFAGRI PT
Author(s) Domin	gos Godinho, Cátia Rosas	(CONFAGRI PT)		
Quality assurance Re	eviewer Marg Leij	jdens	Partner Aer	es
The Deliverable con form	nply with the description	stated in the application	Comments/Rem	narks¹
			X	
The Deliverable con	nply with all Task require	ments	Comments/Rem	narks
			Х	
	000			
The information add	dressed the key issues		Comments/Rem	narks
			Х	
	000	000		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments/Rem	narks
			Х	
	000		00	

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.













































































Deliverable (Title)	D2.2: Prioritized occu	pational profiles	Date	30/11/2021
WP 2 - Priorities	WP 2 - Priorities and strategy design			CONFAGRI-PT
Author(s) Doming	gos Godinho, Cátia Rosas			
Quality assurance Re	viewer Remigio	Berruto	Partner U	INITO
		stated in the application	Comments/Re	
			X	
The Deliverable com	ply with all Task require	ments	Comments/Re	emarks
				х
56	000	000	00	
The information add	ressed the key issues		Comments/Re	emarks
				Х
56	000	lo lo		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments/Re	emarks
				х
0.6	000	lo lo		

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 prese	nted is using the proje	ct's format	Comments/Rema	arks	
				X	
The Deliverable is writ	tten in good English		Comments/Rema	arks	
			X		
The Deliverable has be	een released by its due	date	Comments/Rema	Comments/Remarks	
66	X				
Overall assess	Suggestion	ons for improvements:			
			X		
Date of Quality Assura	nce review		06/12/2021		
Signature: Reuto					







































































Deliverable 2	2.2 Prioriti	ed Occupationa	al Profiles	Date		06/12/2021
WP 2 Prio	Priorities & Strategy Design			Task Leade	r	Confagri PT
Author(s)	Domingos Godinh	no, Cátia Rosas	(Confagri PT)			
Quality assur	ance Reviewer	Billy Good	lburn	Partner	ICOS	
The Delivera form	ble comply with th	ne description	stated in the application	Comments,	/Remarks¹	
						X
The Delivera	ble comply with a	ll Task requirer	nents	Comments,	Comments/Remarks	
						Χ
			000	00		
The informat	tion addressed the	key issues		Comments,	/Remarks	
						X
				00		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments,	/Remarks		
						Х
				00		

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 writ	tten in good English		Comments/Rema	arks
				X
The Deliverable has bo	een released by its due	date	Comments/Rema	arks
	X			
Overall assess	Suggestion	ons for improvements:		
			X	
Date of Quality Assurance review 06/12/2021				








































































Deliverable (Title)	DX.X		Date	dd/mm/yyyy
WP			Task Leader	
Author(s)				
Quality assurance Revi				ACTIA
The Deliverable comp form	ly with the description	stated in the application	Comments/R	emarks ¹
				Х
	00			
The Deliverable comp	ly with all Task requirer	ments	Comments/R	emarks
				X
	00			
				e key issues clearly en if we understand the
The information addre	essed the key issues		aim of the de	
			X	
	00			
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments/R	emarks
				Х

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.












































































Deliverable (2.2		Date	08/12/2021	
WP Prio	WP Priorities and strategy design				CONFAGRI PT	
Author(s)	Dionysios Boch	ntis				
Quality assur	ance Reviewer	Efthymio	s Rodias	Partner CE	RTH	
The Delivera	ble comply witl	h the description	stated in the application	Comments/Rer	Comments/Remarks ¹	
66					× ×	
The Delivera	ble comply witl	h all Task requirer	nents	Comments/Rer	marks	
6.6					₩ .	
The informa	tion addressed	the key issues		Comments/Rer	marks	
					X	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments/Rer	marks		
66					×	

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.











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
56	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.
900	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.
00	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.










































































Deliverable (Title)	D2.2: Prioritized occu	pational profiles	Date	06/12/2021
WP 2			Task Leader	CONFAGRI-PT
Author(s) Domingo	os Godinho (CONFAGRI-	PT), Cátia Rosas (CONFA	GRI PT)	
Quality assurance Revi	iewer Luis Mayo	or	Partner ISE	KI
The Deliverable comp	ly with the description	stated in the application	Comments/Ren	narks ¹
				X
The Deliverable comp	ly with all Task requirer	ments	Comments/Ren	narks
			Х	
56		000	0 0	
The information addre	essed the key issues		Comments/Ren	narks
56				X
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments/Ren	narks
		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.









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
56	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.
000	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.
lo lo	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.
0 0	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.