# Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

# D2.4 - ANNEX I

# Deliverable Assessment Grid

fields

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

# 1   ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

| Deliverable (Title) | D2.4 National Roadmaps | | Date | 31/05/2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2 | Priorities and strategy design | | Task Leader | CONFAGRI |
| Author(s) | Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Daniel Rossi, Elisabetta Pierantoni (CONFAGRI Italy), Krista Mikkonen (AP Finland), Billy Goodburn (ICOS Ireland), Marg Leijdens,  Daniël van Straten, Jan Gundelach (AERES The Netherlands), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA Austria), Manuel Andrés Rodrigo, José María Tarjuelo Martín-Benito (UCLM Spain), Alexandre Morin (AC3A France), Jacques Trienekens (WUR The Netherlands) | | | |
| Quality assurance Reviewer | | | Partner | |

| **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 | ☐ |
| 🔴 | 🟠 | 🟡 | 🙂 | 😀 |

---

[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.

| The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2] | | | | Comments/Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | **X** |
| 🔴 | 🟠 | 🟡 | 🟢 | 🟢 |

| 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 | |
|---|---|
| **07/06/2024** | |

---

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

Signature:

# Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

## D2.4 - ANNEX I

## Deliverable Assessment Grid

![fields logo]

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

# 1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

| Deliverable (Title) | D2.4 National Roadmaps | | Date | 31/05/2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2 | Priorities and strategy design | | Task Leader | CONFAGRI |
| Author(s) | Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Daniel Rossi, Elisabetta Pierantoni (CONFAGRI Italy), Krista Mikkonen (AP Finland), Billy Goodburn (ICOS Ireland), Marg Leijdens, Daniël van Straten, Jan Gundelach (AERES The Netherlands), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA Austria), Manuel Andrés Rodrigo, José María Tarjuelo Martín-Benito (UCLM Spain), Alexandre Morin (AC3A France), Jacques Trienekens (WUR The Netherlands) | | | |
| Quality assurance Reviewer | Luis Mayor | | Partner | ISEKI |

| 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 | 05 April 2024 |
|---|---|
|  |  |

Signature:

# Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

## D2.4 - ANNEX I

## Deliverable Assessment Grid

| Deliverable (Title) | **D2.4 National Roadmaps** | | | Date | 31/05/2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2 | Priorities and strategy design | | | Task Leader | CONFAGRI |
| Author(s) | Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Daniel Rossi, Elisabetta Pierantoni (CONFAGRI Italy), Krista Mikkonen (AP Finland), Billy Goodburn (ICOS Ireland), Marg Leijdens, Daniël van Straten, Jan Gundelach (AERES The Netherlands), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA Austria), Manuel Andrés Rodrigo, José María Tarjuelo Martín-Benito (UCLM Spain), Alexandre Morin (AC3A France), Jacques Trienekens (WUR The Netherlands) | | | | |
| Quality assurance Reviewer | Remigio Berruto | | | Partner | UNITO |

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

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

| **The information addressed the key issues** | | | | 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.

| The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable[2] | | | | Comments/Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | **X** |
| 😠 | 😟 | 😐 | 🙂 | 😀 |

| 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 | 03/06/2024 |
|---|---|
| | |

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

Signature:

# Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy

# D2.4 - ANNEX I

# Deliverable Assessment Grid

# 1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

| Deliverable (Feedbacks from trainers) | D2.4 – National Roadmaps | | Date | 31/05/2024 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| WP2 | Priorities and strategy design | | Task Leader | CONFAGRI |
| Author(s) | Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Daniel Rossi, Elisabetta Pierantoni (CONFAGRI Italy), Krista Mikkonen (AP Finland), Billy Goodburn (ICOS Ireland), Marg Leijdens, Daniël van Straten, Jan Gundelach (AERES The Netherlands), Katharina Stollewerk (LVA Austria), Manuel Andrés Rodrigo, José María Tarjuelo Martín-Benito (UCLM Spain), Alexandre Morin (AC3A France), Jacques Trienekens (WUR The Netherlands) | | | |
| Quality assurance Reviewer | Dionysis Bochtis | | Partner | CERTH |

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

| The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements | | | | Comments/Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ |

| The information addressed the key issues | | | | Comments/Remarks: |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☒ | ☐ |

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

---

[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:

|  |  |  |  | ☒ |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**The Deliverable is written in good English**

Comments/Remarks:

|  |  |  | ☒ |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**The Deliverable has been released by its due date**

Comments/Remarks

|  |  |  | ☒ |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Overall assessment** | Suggestions for improvements:

|  |  |  |  | ☒ |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| Date of Quality Assurance review | 06/06/2024 |
|---|---|

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. |