

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D6.5 – ECVET accreditation report			Date	18/06/2024
WP5	Quality assurance				Task Leader	CERTH
Author(s)	Erica Giordano, Carlo Colomba (task leader, INFOR ELEA), Jan/Marg (AERES), Krista (ProAgria)					
Quality assurance Reviewer	Dionysis Bochtis			Partner	CERTH	
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks:	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

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:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks:	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		26/06/2024			
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.

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D6.5 – ECVET accreditation report			Date	18 th June 2024	
WP	WP6 - Quality Assurance				Task Leader	CERTH	
Author(s)	Erica Giordano, Carlo Colomba (task leader, INFOR ELEA), Jan/Marg (AERES), Krista (ProAgria)						
Quality assurance Reviewer			Gemma Cornuau		Partner	ACTIA	
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			

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	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		27.06.2024			
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.

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D6.5 – ECVET accreditation report			Date	18 th June 2024
WP	WP6 - Quality Assurance			Task Leader	CERTH	
Author(s)	Erica Giordano, Carlo Colomba (task leader, INFOR ELEA), Jan/Marg (AERES), Krista (ProAgria)					
Quality assurance Reviewer				Partner		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form				Comments/Remarks ¹		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements				Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²				Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

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	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review					
Signature:					

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D6.5 – ECVET accreditation report			Date	18 th June 2024
WP	WP6 - Quality Assurance				Task Leader	CERTH
Author(s)	Erica Giordano, Carlo Colomba (task leader, INFOR ELEA), Jan/Marg (AERES), Krista (ProAgria)					
Quality assurance Reviewer			DANIEL ROSSI		Partner	CONFAGRI
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

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	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review		27/06/2024			
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.

Addressing the current and Future skill needs for sustainability, digitalization and the bio-Economy in agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy

D6.5 - ANNEX I

Deliverable Assessment Grid



1 ANNEX I: Deliverable Assessment Grid

Deliverable (Title)		D6.5 – ECVET accreditation report			Date	18 th June 2024	
WP	WP6 - Quality Assurance				Task Leader	CERTH	
Author(s)	Erica Giordano, Carlo Colomba (task leader, INFOR ELEA), Jan/Marg (AERES), Krista (ProAgria)						
Quality assurance Reviewer			Ana Ramalho, Luis Mayor		Partner	ISEKI	
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The information addressed the key issues					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>			
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable²					Comments/Remarks		
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	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	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable is written in good English				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
The Deliverable has been released by its due date				Comments/Remarks	
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Overall assessment		Suggestions for improvements:			
<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	X 	<input type="checkbox"/> 	
Date of Quality Assurance review					
Signature:					
Luis Mayor		Ana Ramalho			

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.