



# **D2.3 - ANNEX I**








Deliver	able	D2.3 Europ		Date		23/02/2024				
WP2	Priorities	orities and strategy design					er	WUR		
Author	Author(s) Jacques Trienekens (task leader WUR), Remigio Berruto (UNITO), Patrizia Busato (UNITO), Daniele Rossi (Confragricoltura), Luis Mayor (ISEKI), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Erika Somlyay (LLLP), Amrit Nanda (Plant-ETP), Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Lorenza Lirosi (FDE), Lisa Kretschmann (CEPI), Giulia Fadini (CEPI), Josef Rathbauer (FJ-BLT), David Ortega (FJ-BLT), Josef Petschko (Agrar Plus), Daniel Fenrich (UHOH), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA), Julian Drausinger (LVA), Krista Mikkonen (ProAgria), Marg Leijdens (AERES), Eva Bozou (GAIA), Domingos Godinho (Confagri-Pt), Patricia Castejon (SCOOP), Eirini Maravelia (SEVT), Natassa Kapetanakou (SEVT), Jose Tarjuelo (UCLM)									
Quality	assurance	e Reviewer	Remigio E	Berruto		Partner	UNITO			
The De form	liverable o	comply with the d	escription	stated in the applicatior	ı	Comments	/Remarks	1		
								x		
The De	liverable o	comply with all Ta	sk requirer	nents		Comments/Remarks				
			<b>N</b>			x				
The inf	The information addressed the key issues						Comments/Remarks			
			Ö			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.





Bento

Signature:





# **D2.3 - ANNEX I**








Deliver	able	D2.3 Europ	ean Strate	ean Strategy				23/02/2024		
WP2	Priorities	orities and strategy design				Task Leader		WUR		
Author	Author(s) Jacques Trienekens (task leader WUR), Remigio Berruto (UNITO), Patrizia Busato (UNITO), Daniele Rossi (Confragricoltura), Luis Mayor (ISEKI), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Erika Somlyay (LLLP), Amrit Nanda (Plant-ETP), Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Lorenza Lirosi (FDE), Lisa Kretschmann (CEPI), Giulia Fadini (CEPI), Josef Rathbauer (FJ-BLT), David Ortega (FJ-BLT), Josef Petschko (Agrar Plus), Daniel Fenrich (UHOH), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA), Julian Drausinger (LVA), Krista Mikkonen (ProAgria), Marg Leijdens (AERES), Eva Bozou (GAIA), Domingos Godinho (Confagri-Pt), Patricia Castejon (SCOOP), Eirini Maravelia (SEVT), Natassa Kapetanakou (SEVT), Jose Tarjuelo (UCLM)									
Quality	assurance	e Reviewer	Gemma (	Cornuau		Partner	ACTIA			
The De form	liverable o	comply with the d	escription	stated in the applicatior	1	Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>				
							x			
The De	liverable o	comply with all Ta	sk require	nents		Comments/Remarks				
						x				
The inf	The information addressed the key issues						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.





Æ Signature:





# **D2.3 - ANNEX I**








Deliver	able	D2.3 Europ	ean Strate	37		Date		23/02/2024		
WP2	Priorities	orities and strategy design					ir	WUR		
Author(s) Jacques Trienekens (task leader WUR), Remigio Berruto (UNITO), Patrizia Busato (UNITO), Daniele Rossi (Confragricoltura), Luis Mayor (ISEKI), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Erika Somlyay (LLLP), Amrit Nanda (Plant-ETP), Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Lorenza Lirosi (FDE), Lisa Kretschmann (CEPI), Giulia Fadini (CEPI), Josef Rathbauer (FJ-BLT), David Ortega (FJ-BLT), Josef Petschko (Agrar Plus), Daniel Fenrich (UHOH), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA), Julian Drausinger (LVA), Krista Mikkonen (ProAgria), Marg Leijdens (AERES), Eva Bozou (GAIA), Domingos Godinho (Confagri-Pt), Patricia Castejon (SCOOP), Eirini Maravelia (SEVT), Natassa Kapetanakou (SEVT), Jose Tarjuelo (UCLM)										
Quality	assurance	Reviewer	Jan Gund	elach		Partner	AERES			
The De form	liverable c	omply with the d	escription	stated in the applicatior	ı	Comments	/Remarks	1		
						*				
The De	liverable c	omply with all Ta	sk requirer	nents		Comments/Remarks				
						*				
The inf	The information addressed the key issues						Comments/Remarks			
								*		

<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.





y gundelach Signature:





# **D6.2 - ANNEX I**








Deliverable (Feedbacks from D2.3 Date 16/02/2024 trainers)										
WP	Priorities and	Priorities and Strategy Design						WUR		
Author(	Author(s) Jacques Trienekens (task leader WUR), Remigio Berruto (UNITO), Patrizia Busato (UNITO), Daniele Rossi (Confragricoltura), Luis Mayor (ISEKI), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Erika Somlyay (LLLP), Amrit Nanda (Plant-ETP), Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Lorenza Lirosi (FDE), Lisa Kretschmann (CEPI), Giulia Fadini (CEPI), Josef Rathbauer (FJ-BLT), David Ortega (FJ-BLT), Josef Petschko (Agrar Plus), Daniel Fenrich (UHOH), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA), Julian Drausinger (LVA), Krista Mikkonen (ProAgria), Marg Leijdens (AERES), Eva Bozou (GAIA), Domingos Godinho (Confagri-Pt), Patricia Castejon (SCOOP), Eirini Maravelia (SEVT), Natassa Kapetanakou (SEVT), Jose Tarjuelo (UCLM)									
Quality	assurance Rev	iewer	Dionysis B	ochtis		Partner	CERTH			
The Del form	iverable comp	ly with the d	escription s	tated in the application	ı	Comments	/Remarks	1		
(										
The Del	iverable comp	ly with all Ta	sk requiren	nents		Comments	/Remarks			
¢								×		
The information addressed the key issues						Comments/Remarks:				
ł		0								

<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.
00	<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.





# **D2.3 - ANNEX I**








Deliver	rable	D2.3 Europ	ean Strate	gy	Date	2	23/02/2024			
WP2	Priorit	ies and strategy desi	gn		Task Leade	er V	WUR			
Author	Author(s) Jacques Trienekens (task leader WUR), Remigio Berruto (UNITO), Patrizia Busato (UNITO), Daniele Rossi (Confragricoltura), Luis Mayor (ISEKI), Ana Ramalho (ISEKI), Erika Somlyay (LLLP), Amrit Nanda (Plant-ETP), Billy Goodburn (ICOS), Lorenza Lirosi (FDE), Lisa Kretschmann (CEPI), Giulia Fadini (CEPI), Josef Rathbauer (FJ-BLT), David Ortega (FJ-BLT), Josef Petschko (Agrar Plus), Daniel Fenrich (UHOH), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA), Julian Drausinger (LVA), Krista Mikkonen (ProAgria), Marg Leijdens (AERES), Eva Bozou (GAIA), Domingos Godinho (Confagri-Pt), Patricia Castejon (SCOOP), Eirini Maravelia (SEVT), Natassa Kapetanakou (SEVT), Jose Tarjuelo (UCLM)									
Quality	assurar	nce Reviewer			Partner					
The De form	liverabl	e comply with the d	escription	stated in the application	Comments	s/Remarks <sup>1</sup>				
							×			
The De	liverabl	e comply with all Ta	sk require	nents	Comments	Comments/Remarks				
			<b>D</b> O				×			
The inf	ormatic	on addressed the key	Comments	Comments/Remarks						
			0				×			

<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.





 fields
 Addressing the current and future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization

 and the bio-economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and strategy - Agreement 612664-EPP-1-2019-1-IT-EPPKA2-SSA-B