1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.1. Training methodologies	Date	27/01/2022
WP	3	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Francesca Sanna, Remigio Berruto (UNITO)		
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				23/02/2022
Signature:				

1. ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.1 "Training methodology"	Date	22/02/2022
WP3	New toold and training design	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Francesca Sanna (UNITO)		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Daniel Rossi	Partner	Confagri

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				22/02/2022
Signature: Daniel Rossi				

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.

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

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)	D3.1	Date	27/01/2022
WP	New tools and training design	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Francesca Sanna, Remigio Berruto (UNITO)		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Gemma Cornuau	Partner	ACTIA

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	24/02/2022
Signature: 	

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

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.

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

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

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)	D3.1 Training Methodologies	Date	24/02/2022
WP	3	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)			
Quality assurance Reviewer	Billy Goodburn	Partner	ICOS

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				24/02/2022
Signature: Billy Goodburn				

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.

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

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	D3.1	Date	3/03/2022
WP	New tools and training design	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Dionysios Bochtis		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Efthymios Rodias	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				03/03/2022
Signature: 				

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.

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

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 (Evaluation Grid)	D3.1 – Methodology Definition	Date	27/01/2022
WP	3 - New tools and training design	Task Leader	UNITO
Author(s)	Francesca Sanna, Remigio Berruto (UNITO)		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Marg Leijens	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				16/03/2022
Signature: 				

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.