



































































Deliverable	(Title)	D4.2 – Report and a experimentation	Date	07/06/2024		
WP5 Imp	olementation	n	Task Leader	АР		
Author(s)	Marg Leijo	dens (AERES), Jan Gun	delach (AERES), Femke van V	Verven (AERES)		
Quality assu	rance Revie	wer Dionysis	Bochtis	Partner CERT	Н	
The Delivera	able comply	with the description	stated in the application	Comments/Rema	rks ¹	
	5				ix	
The Deliver	able comply	with all Task require	ments	Comments/Remarks		
6					XI	
The informa	ntion addres	sed the key issues		Comments/Rema	rks:	
5						
The informa	ation provide	ed in the Deliverable	Comments/Rema	rks		
6						

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.











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
56	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.
900	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.
lo lo	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.
00	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.
000	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.







































































Deliverak	ole (Title)	D4.2: Repor		ysis of the training		Date		07/06/2024
WP4	Implementati	on				Task Leade	r	AP
Author(s)) Marg Lei	ijdens (AERES), Jan Gund	delach (AERES), Femke v	an We	erven (AERE	S)	
Quality a	ssurance Revi	iewer	DANIEL R	OSSI		Partner	CONFAG	RI
The Deliv	erable comp	ly with the de	escription	stated in the application	1	Comments	/Remarks¹	L
								Х
6	6	000				00		
The Deliv	verable comp	ly with all Tas	sk requirer	nents		Comments/Remarks		
6								X
The infor	mation addre	essed 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 provi	ded in the Deliverable	are reliable ²	Comments/Rem	arks
56			X	
The Deliverable preser	nted is using the proje	ct's format	Comments/Rem	arks
				X
The Deliverable is writ	ten in good English		Comments/Rem	arks
56				x
The Deliverable has be	een released by its due	e date	Comments/Rem	arks
56		X		
Overall assess	Suggesti	ons for improvements:		
56				x
Date of Quality Assura	nce review	'		,
10/06/2024				

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





Signature: Daniel Rossi











































































Deliver	able (Title)	D4.2: Repo experimen		Date		07/06/2024		
WP4	Implemer	ntation		Task Leade	er	АР		
Author((s) Mar	g Leijdens (AERES	S), Jan Gun	delach (AERES), Femke va	an Wer	ven (AERE	S)	
Quality	assurance	Reviewer				Partner		
The De	liverable co	omply with the d	escription	stated in the application	1	Comments	:/Remarks¹	ı
		30	00		(X
The De	liverable co	omply with all Ta	sk require	ments		Comments/Remarks		
		00	90 1		(X
The information addressed the key issues						Comments	/Remarks	
		00	00		(x O O		

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 provi	ided in the Deliverable	e are reliable ²	Comments/Rem	arks
56			X	
The Deliverable prese	nted is using the proje	ect's format	Comments/Rem	arks
				X
The Deliverable is wri	tten in good English		Comments/Rem	arks
			X	
The Deliverable has b	een released by its du	e date	Comments/Rem	arks
		X		
Overall assess	Suggest	ions for improvements:		
			X	
Date of Quality Assura	nce review		11/06/2024	1

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





Signature:







































































Deliverab	ole (Title)	D4.2: Repo		ysis of the training		Date		07/06/2024
WP4	mplementati	on				Task Leade	er	AP
Author(s)	Marg Le	ijdens (AERES), Jan Gund	delach (AERES), Femke v	an We	erven (AERE	S)	
Quality as	ssurance Revi	iewer	Luis Mayo	or		Partner	ISEKI	
The Deliv	erable comp	ly with the d	escription	stated in the application	1	Comments	s/Remarks ²	1
The Deliv	erable comp	ly with all Ta	sk requirer	ments		Comments/Remarks		
5						X		
The infor	mation addre	essed the key	issues			Comments	/Remarks	
6		000				x O O		

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 provi	ded in the Deliverable	are reliable ²	Comments/Rem	arks	
				X	
The Deliverable prese	nted is using the proje	ct's format	Comments/Rem	arks	
				X	
The Deliverable is writ	ten in good English		Comments/Rem	arks	
				x	
The Deliverable has be	een released by its due	e date	Comments/Rem	arks	
				X	
Overall assess	Suggesti	ons for improvements:			
			X		
Date of Quality Assurance review					
14 June 2024					

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





Signature:







































































Deliver	able (Title)	D4.2: Repo experimen		Date		07/06/2024			
WP4	WP4 Implementation Task Leader AP								
Author	(s) Marg	Leijdens (AERE	S), Jan Gund	delach (AERES), Femke va	an We	erven (AERE	S)		
Quality	assurance F	leviewer	Remigio I	Berruto		Partner	UNITO		
The De	liverable co	mply with the d	lescription	stated in the application	1	Comments	/Remarks	1	
]					X	
		00	50						
The De	liverable co	mply with all Ta	ısk requirei	ments		Comments/Remarks			
		0						X	
The info	ormation ac	ldressed the ke	y issues			Comments	/Remarks		
		00	90			x (0 0)			

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 provi	ided in the Delivera	ible are reliable ²	Comments/Rem	narks
			X	
The Deliverable prese	nted is using the pi	oject's format	Comments/Rem	narks
				×
The Deliverable is wri	tten in good English	1	Comments/Rem	narks
				x
The Deliverable has b	een released by its	due date	Comments/Rem	narks
		X		
Overall assess	Sugg	estions for improvements:		
			x	
Date of Quality Assura	nce review		12/06/2024	1

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





Signature:

Rento







































































Deliverable	(Title)	D4.2: Repor		Date		07/06/2024		
WP4 Implementation Task Leader AP								
Author(s)	Marg Lei	jdens (AERES), Jan Gund	delach (AERES), Femke v	an We	erven (AERE	S)	
Quality assu	rance Revi	ewer	Gemma C	Cornuau		Partner	ACTIA	
The Delivera	able comp	ly with the do	escription	stated in the application	1	Comments	/Remarks¹	L
								X
		No.				00		
The Delivera	able comp	ly with all Ta	sk requirer	nents		Comments/Remarks		
	3							x
The informa	ition addre	essed 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 prov	ided in the Deliverable	e are reliable ²	Comments/Rem	arks
			X	
The Deliverable prese	nted is using the proje	ect's format	Comments/Rem	arks
				X
The Deliverable is wri	tten in good English		Comments/Rem	arks
56				x
The Deliverable has b	een released by its du	e date	Comments/Rem	arks
		X		
Overall assess	Suggesti	ions for improvements:		
			X	
Date of Quality Assura	ince review		11.06.2024	

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





	1	
Signature:		