










































Deliverable 7	7.3 Project lea	flet and pos	ter	Date		30/06/2020	
WP 7 Dissemination and communication			Task Leade	er	FIAB		
Author(s)	Author(s) Francesca Sanna (UNITO)						
	ance Reviewer	Billy Good	burn	Partner	ICOS		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹		
		001				X	
The Delivera	The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments	Comments/Remarks		
						Χ	
	0					000	
The informat	The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks		
]				Χ	
		90				000	
The informat	The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²				s/Remarks		
		90				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.















































































Deliverable 7	7.3 Project lea	flet and post	ter	Date		30/06/2020	
WP 7 Dissemination and communication			Task Leade	er	ACTIA		
Author(s)	Author(s) Francesca Sanna (UNITO)						
	ance Reviewer		Luis Mayor	Partner	ISEKI		
The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Comments/Remarks ¹		
66		001				X	
The Delivera	The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments	Comments/Remarks		
]				Х	
		00				00	
The informat	ion addressed the ke	y issues		Comments	Comments/Remarks		
]				Χ	
66		00				00	
The informat	The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²				Comments/Remarks		
		90				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.













































































Deliverable (Title	e) D7.3 Projec	t leaflet and	Poster	Date		30/06/2020		
WP7 Dissemination and communication				Task Leade	er	ACT1A		
Author(s) Fra	Author(s) Francesca Sanna (UNITO)							
Quality assurance	Quality assurance Reviewer Remigio Berruto							
	The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application			Comments	Partner (UNITO) Comments/Remarks ¹			
66	90	90				X		
The Deliverable	The Deliverable comply with all Task requirements			Comments	Comments/Remarks			
				Х				
56	90	30	000			000		
The information	The information addressed the key issues				Comments/Remarks			
				Х				
66	90	30	000					
The information	The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²			Comments	/Remarks			
						X		
66	80	30			Š			

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.













































































Deliverable	(Title) D7.3			Date		30/10/2020	
	semination and commu	nication		Task Leade	er	UNITO	
Author(s)	Dionysios Bochtis				<u> </u>		
	'	E01 :	s /5		050711		
Quality assurance Reviewer Efthymios Rodias/ Eirini Aivazidou The Deliverable comply with the description stated in the application form					Partner CERTH Comments/Remarks ¹		
		900					
The Deliver	able comply with all Ta	sk requirem	ents	Comments	Comments/Remarks		
5		90				×	
The information addressed the key issues				Comments	Comments/Remarks		
		90					
The information provided in the Deliverable are reliable ²				Comments	/Remarks		
		90					

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.
00	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.





































































Deliverable 7.3	Project leaflet and pos	ter	Date	30/06/2020	
WP 7 Dissemination	and communication	Task Leader	FIAB		
Author(s) Francesc	a Sanna (UNITO)				
Quality assurance Revi	ewer Daniel Ros	Partner CONFAGRI			
The Deliverable comp form	ly with the description s	tated in the application	Comments/Rema	rks ¹	
				'd	
69	000	00			
The Deliverable comp	ly with all Task requiren	nents	Comments/Remarks		
				₩	
66		000			
The information addr	essed the key issues	1	Comments/Remarks		
				\forall	
66	000	() () () () () () () () () ()	00		
The information prov	ided in the Deliverable	Comments/Rem	arks		
				\square	
66	90	() () () () () () () () () ()	00		

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 preser	nted is using the proje	ct's format	Comments/Remai	rks		
				M		
	900	(5 5)				
he Deliverable is writ	ten in good English		Comments/Remai	Comments/Remarks		
				\forall		
he Deliverable has be	en released by its due	Comments/Remarks				
	X					
		8 8				
Overall assessi	Suggestion	ons for improvements:		,		
				A		
	500					
Date of Quality Assura	nce review	13/11/2020				
iignature: Daniel Rossi						
2, 2, 17 - 25 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2		*				

