




# **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.





### Deliverable Assessment Grid




<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>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	e (Title)	D2.4 Natior	nal Roadm	aps	D	Date		31/10/2022	
WP2 Pr	iorities and	strategy desi	gn		Т	Task Leader		CONFAGRI	
Author(s) Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Elisabetta Pierantoni, Daniele Rossi									
Quality ass	urance Revi	ewer	Remigio I	Berruto	Р	artner U	NITO		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form						Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>			
								x	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements						Comments/Remarks			
			0					x	
The information addressed the key issues						Comments/Remarks			
						x			
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable <sup>2</sup>					с	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.











# **D6.2 - ANNEX I**








Deliverable	(Title)	D2.4 Natior	nal roadma	ips		Date		06/02/2023	
WP 2	1					Task Leade	r	CONFAGRI	
Author(s) Claudio Carpineti, Camilla Tomao, Elisabetta Pierantoni, Daniele Rossi									
Quality assu	irance Revi	ewer	Gemma (	Cornuau		Partner	ACTIA		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form						Comments/Remarks <sup>1</sup>			
	0		<b>D</b> O			x			
The Deliver	able comp	ly with all Ta	sk require	nents		Comments/Remarks			
	3					X			
The information addressed the key issues						Comments/Remarks			
	3		No A			X			
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable <sup>2</sup>						Comments/Remarks			
	3					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.











### 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.
	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.






# **D6.2 - ANNEX I**









<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>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.






# **D6.2 - ANNEX I**









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





