Co-funded by the European Union

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

D3.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.5 User guide for trainers and train the trainers' session material	Date	26/06/2023
WP	3 - New tools and training design	Task Leader	Agrarplus
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Remigio Berruto	Partner	UNITO

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				26/06/2023
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 European Union

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

D3.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.5 User guide for trainers and train the trainers' session material	Date	27/06/2023
WP	3 New tools and training design	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Ana Ramalho	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				28/06/2023
Signature: Ana Ramalho Ribeiro				

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 European Union

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

D3.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title) DX.X		Date	dd/mm/yyyy
WP 3	Task 3.5 User guide for trainers and train the trainers' session material	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	(AP) Josef Petchko		
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 
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				07/07/2023
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 European Union

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

D3.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.5 User guide for trainers and train the trainers' session material	Date	26/06/2023
WP	3 - New tools and training design	Task Leader	Agrarplus
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
Quality assurance Reviewer	Gemma Cornuau	Partner	ACTIA

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				26/06/2023
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

Co-funded by the European Union

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

D3.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D3.5: User guide for trainers and train the trainers' session material	Date	23/06/2023
WP3	New tools and training design	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
Quality assurance Reviewer	DANIEL ROSSI	Partner	CONFAGRI

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 23/06/2023

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.