Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D4.1 Feedback from trainers	Date	21/07/2023
WP4	Implementation	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko (AP)		
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				01/09/2023
Signature: Luis Mayor 				

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

D4.1 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D4.1 Feedback from trainers	Date	21/07/2023
WP4	Implementation	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko (AP)		
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			5/09/2023	
Signature:				

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)	D4.3	Date	22/02/2021
WP	4	Task Leader	AERES
Author(s)	Francesca Sanna		
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				22/02/2021
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

D4.1 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title) D4.1				Date	21/07/2023
WP	4.1 Setup and running of Train-the-trainer pilot			Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko				
Quality assurance Reviewer	Marg Leijdens			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				31/08/2023
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.

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

D4.1

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	4.1 Feedbacks from trainers	Date	30/08/2023
WP	Implementation	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Ap		
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 06/09/2023

Signature: DANIEL ROSSI

fields ADDRESSING THE CURRENT AND FUTURE SKILL NEEDS FOR SUSTAINABILITY, DIGITALIZATION
AND THE [illegible] FROM THE AGRICULTURAL 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 (Feedbacks from trainers)	**D4.1**	**Date**	**21/07/2023**
WP	Implementation	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
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	07/09/2023
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

D4.1 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid

1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)	D4.1	Date	30/08/2-23
WP	4.1	Task Leader	AP
Author(s)	Josef Petschko		
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				30/08/2023
Signature: Billy Goodburn - ICOS				

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.