|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Erasmus+ : KA2 - Sector Skills Alliances BLUEPRINT projects**  **PROGRESS REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET**  **External expert** | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Project number:** | | | | | | |  |
|  | **612664-EPP-1-2019-1-IT-EPPKA2-SSA-B** | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Project title:** | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Addressing the current and Future skIll needs for sustainabilty, digitalization, and the bio-Economy in AgricuLture: European skills agenDa and Strategy** | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Score /25** |
| **1. Relevance of the project results** Are the results achieved so far in accordance with the Work Programme and on time? Have the project’s activities been in accordance with its aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended? Are next activities still relevant according to the project findings so far? What state-of-art methods and techniques are applied or considered for developing the innovative results? Have any valuable results for the sector concerned been achieved at this stage that could be already disseminated? What is the quality of results? | | | | | | | | 22 |
| ***Are the results achieved so far in accordance with the Work Programme and on time?* *Have the project’s activities been in accordance with its aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended?***  The work progress of this project is in line with the planned activities in the work programme. All deliverables have been achieved within the reporting period, with only minor delays of very few deliverables. Thus, specific objectives are generally well addressed with a fair contribution to multi- actor, innovation based collaboration among stakeholders. In general, there has been good progress with the deliverables in identifying the information related to skills/training needs and gaps, best practices and curricula/course on the targeted sectors.  Concerning the core objective of the project to deliver human capital solutions to supply food systems and bioeconomy chains, through the establishment of an Agriculture and Forestry Sector Skill Alliance (SSA) the following results have been achieved:  WP1: the project has documented significant results in WP1, Skills needs Identification: the state of the art report was well planned, discussed and agreed among participants involving key stakeholders from agriculture, forestry and bioconomy fields and a large number of VET providers; adequate surveys are on-going in order to identify skills and training needs and gaps as well as future trends analysis in the areas of sustainability, digitalisation and bioeconomy. Meetings and workshops have been conducted and deliverables uploaded to the management portal. The D1.7 with the analysis of bottom-up survey has not been submitted and it will serve together with the outcomes of WP2 to address WP3.  WP2: no deliverables were planned during 2020, however relevant information has been collected concerning the analysis of skill gaps.  WP3: There is some delay concerning training methodologies and curricula design. A reasonable delay is justified in order to obtain the outcomes from WP2 and a complete analysis of the bottom-up survey from WP1.  WP4: it is proceeding according to the plan with a map linked to the organizations database and the Open public platform, which serve to make the project output visible.  WP5: At this early stage, some contacts have been initiated with ESCO Secretariat.  WP6: As planned the Quality Plan and the Evaluation grid showing an exhaustive quality plan and quality assessment procedure has been completed; This is reflected in the high quality of submitted deliverables and documentation.  WP7: has addressed the dissemination plan, participation in Social Networks, Press release, the Newsletter and leaflets and Poster. The public web site had some delay, but now it hosts the database and platform from WP4 and the bottom-up survey from Task 1.4.  ***Are next activities still relevant according to the project findings so far?***  Next activities are planed and relevant to achieve the project objectives, special attention is paid to the delay of WP3, which is extremely dependent on the successful completion of WP2 (analysis of skill gaps and new profiles creation) and WP1 (the analysis of bottom-up survey D1.7). Implementation (WP4) is considered, keeping updated the open public platform and map as well as public web-site, translation of dissemination material is on-going and the translation of training courses material is planned as soon as WP3 deliverables become available. Next activities also deal with a strong involvement with National and EU regulatory frameworks. At this stage, aspects of the EU Skills Panorama, ECVET and EQAVET have not yet been considered. Quality assurance has been sufficiently considered, which ensures the completion of outcomes.  ***What state-of-art methods and techniques are applied or considered for developing the innovative results?***  Although relevant information has been collected concerning the state of the art and skill needs, few achievements have been reached so far.  The outputs from the project are mainly related with skill needs Identification, collation and dissemination of information, so there is limited scope for innovation, other than in terms of database and platform design, rather than in terms of quality of the results. Therefore, the project in this period, is focused on the identification of existing information and highlighting how this could be used by end users and the consortium.  ***Have any valuable results for the sector concerned been achieved at this stage that could be already disseminated? What is the quality of results?***  The project has documented the activities carried out for analysing skill gaps for bioeconomy, digitalisation and sustainability, information related to EU and country strategies, curricula, apprenticeship schemes, modular training material and opportunities to implement further the skills after the project ends. The project addresses how the information will be handled. The consortium has made a good input to this with little delay in milestones and deliverables. The project has already had an impact on the dissemination of key information and provided a basis from which the uptake of new strategies can be assessed. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Score /30** |
| **2. Quality of the project design and implementation** Are the activities carried out so far in accordance with the Work Programme? Is the project implementation so far on time? Were the project management measures adequate and efficient? Has the project methodology been adapted according to the findings of the first project period? Have relevant quality control measures already been put in place? Is the risk management adequate? Is quality control of project outputs appropriate?  Have arrangements been put in place for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes; are they in line with ECVET? Are EQAVET recommendations applied (if foreseen in the application)? | | | | | | | | 24 |
| ***Are the activities carried out so far in accordance with the Work Programme?***  In general all planned activities for this period have been realized so far according to the Work Programme. All deadlines for deliverables and milestones have been respected with minor insignificant delays except D1.7 and D1.8, which are on going. There is a significant delay in deliverable D1.3, which was justified in the report as an adaptation subject to feedback obtained in WP1 and WP2.  WP1: All 5 planned tasks are well addressed as planned for this period. 6 out of 8 deliverables are concluded.  WP2: No deliverables were planned for this tasks  WP3: A request to delay D3.1 has been proposed in order to define methodology with a broader information obtained in WP1 and WP2.  WP4: tasks 4.3 and 4.4 are on-going as planned and D4.3 submitted  WP5: little information is available concerning tasks 5.1 and 5.2 and no deliverables are planned for this period  WP6: All planned tasks and deliverables have been realized according to the work programme  WP7: All planned tasks and deliverables have been realized according to the work programme  WP8: All planned tasks and deliverables have been realized according to the work programme  ***Is the project implementation so far on time?***  The work progress of this project is in line with the planned activities in the work programme. All deliverables have been achieved within the reporting period, with only minor delays in very few deliverables. Thus, specific objectives are generally well addressed with a fair contribution to multi-actor, innovation based collaboration among stakeholders.  ***Were the project management measures adequate and efficient?***  The reporting on the WPs shows that there has been very good integration between the WPs leaders and partners. There is an interdisciplinary cooperation between work packages as online platform will feed from content from WP1, and from WP2 and WP3 as soon as information is available. The project structure requires such an integrated approach to enable the project objectives to be achieved as there is great dependency between each WP.  ***Has the project methodology been adapted according to the findings of the first project period?***  There is no mention to any adaptation of the project methodology from the initial proposal.  ***Have relevant quality control measures already been put in place? Is the risk management adequate? Is quality control of project outputs appropriate?***  Quality Control has been applied to deliverables according to the risk management plan and the evaluation grid. The risk management plan is well defined, with clear identification of responsibilities concerning quality control implementation, monitoring and planning of tasks. Potential risks arising from the delay in D.3,1 are well identified and a solution is proposed. Outputs are properly checked according to internal quality assessment and there is a Quality Committee responsible for checking material and content of outcomes.  ***Have arrangements been put in place for the recognition and validation of participants' learning outcomes; are they in line with ECVET? Are EQAVET recommendations applied (if foreseen in the application)?***  ECVET principles or EQAVET recommendations are, at this early stage of the project, not yet applied. However, the analysis of existing curricula/courses should consider applying ECVET principles and EQAVET recommendations from the beginning, so that the databases have harmonised information. | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Score /25** |
| **3. Project consortium and cooperation arrangements** Is the involvement of partners balanced and in accordance to the planning?  Are effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between partners in place?Any partnership problems/issues reported and solutions described? | | | | | | | | 21 |
| ***Is the involvement of partners balanced and in accordance to the planning?***  The involvement of partners is clear and fits to the work programme and the objectives of the project. The project is being efficiently managed, and the consortium has shown good cooperation with many of the deliverables. The contribution of each beneficiary of this project is consistent with the working plan. WP lead partners show a more intensive workload in terms of person month while other partners show less person month of work, which is comprehensible.  ***Are effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between partners in place***  The project demonstrates efficient management, and the consortium has shown good cooperation with many of the deliverables. There appears to be a good working relationship between the partners. The following procedures were followed: Meetings every two weeks, discussions of working plans, circulation and agreement of deliverables.  The project is dealing with a large volume of data, therefore a data management plan is critical to allow the data to be categorised accurately and consistently. The project established efficient data management and quality assurance procedures with clearly targeted audiences.  Overall the resources used and managed for the activities in this period are reasonable and in line with the Working Plan.  ***Any partnership problems/issues reported and solutions described?***  No problems have been reported | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **Score /20** |
| **4. Impact and dissemination** Are the dissemination activities relevant and sufficient to reach the project target audience? What impact on participating organisations and target groups is already achieved? What measures are taken in order to prepare the basis for reaching and measuring the expected impact after the end of the project? Are the delivered project results likely to have an impact after the end of the project?  How does the project include active involvement of relevant stakeholders from the sector? What measures have been taken so far for ensuring the sustainability of the project? Are the results accessible to the public?  Are the relevant activities for ensuring national/regional roll out of results by national/regional authorities implemented? Are there any concrete results in this respect? | | | | | | | | 16 |
| ***Are the dissemination activities relevant and sufficient to reach the project target audience?***  In general, all planned dissemination activities for this period have been realized so far as well as the respective deliverables submitted.  The public website is working, and leaflets, posters and newsletters published. There is progress in social media, the project is present on Twitter, LinkedIn, Facebook, Youtube and press, which leads to an increasing impact. It is early to assess the success of social media, for example in the case of Twitter it would appear that the majority of posts are limited to the work performed within the frame of FIELDS, and little interaction, for example replies with followers or followed occurs.  While there has been good dissemination of results, fewer scientific publications have been published.  ***What impact on participating organisations and target groups is already achieved? Are the delivered project results likely to have an impact after the end of the project?***  The work carried out to this point contributes to the expected impact planned in the application.  Specifically, it achieves the expected impact related to WP1 and aims at establishing a frame to collect useful information for databases, to identify and involve VET providers and to aware stakeholders. At this early stage, results in form of survey analysis (WP1) platform (WP4), website and dissemination material (WP7) cannot yet be fully evaluated. The platform is at the moment incorporated into the project website and will in future be relevant for long-term impact after the end of the project.  ***What measures are taken in order to prepare the basis for reaching and measuring the expected impact after the end of the project?***  As described in the work plan, results have a potential impact on target groups and beneficiaries mainly by establishing a net of VET providers and by engaging stakeholders (in and out of the project partners) through the Focus Groups. The basis for reaching and measuring the expected impact after the end of the project lies in the partners' ability to keep the platform updated, to maintain an effective communication with relevant governmental and sectoral authorities at national and European level, as well as to identify funding opportunities in European and national programmes. The report foresees a plan for the sustainability of the platform and future exploitation of the results.  ***Are the delivered project results likely to have an impact after the end of the project?***  So far the measures taken in the project show a clear intention to maintain its impact after the end of the project, such as the quality of the information collected, the organisation of the Focus Groups and the design of the platform.  Concerning dissemination, the impact of the project in general population, food chain actors and students, will be determined by the success rate of the social media and websites. Other target audiences, (e.g. EU-National policy makers, students, VET providers, etc.) are well considered in the dissemination plan. To date it would appear that the structure for dissemination will achieve the desired impact, but this can be determined at a later stage in the project  ***How does the project include active involvement of relevant stakeholders from the sector?***  This is a strength of the project: the database collects information related to VET providers and sets up a network; the Focus Groups aim to boost awareness and involve stakeholders in the project; finally, the open platform and survey available to stakeholders ensure an adequate feedback. Some of the data collected in the project should be used by policy makers to consider the direction of future regulations related to VET, meetings are planned to take place with national and European administrations, recommendations and policy briefs are planned in the future and will be subject to revision in the next review period***.***  The signature of first Memorandum of Understanding to create a Strategy Sector Alliance among 50 stakeholders will bring forward the members to collaborate and multiply the resource usage  ***What measures have been taken so far for ensuring the sustainability of the project?***  ***Are the results accessible to the public?***  The report foresees a plan for the sustainability of the platform and future exploitation of the results, but the report contains little information on it.  Web is accessible to general public, with information according to the timing of the project | | | | | | | | |
| **Global score** | | | | | | | | **83** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Maximum number of points for a criterion** | **Range of scores** | | | |
|  | **Very good** | **Good** | **Fair** | **Weak** |
| 30 | 26-30 | 21-25 | 15-20 | 0-14 |
| 25 | 22-25 | 18-21 | 13-17 | 0-12 |
| 20 | 17-20 | 14-16 | 10-13 | 0-9 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Please provide a short analysis of each deliverable that was due for the reporting period and its readiness for publication** |

| **Ref no (table 1.5.2)** | **Title of the result/product** | **Comments on the quality and relevance of the deliverables and what should be revised in case the quality is not satisfactory** | **Ready to be published/ Have to be revised** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D1.1 | Stakeholder strategic plan and analysis report | A comprehensive analysis of the state of the art of the sector as the basis for a Growth Sectoral Strategy proposal. The report delves into trends in European policies and European projects on sustainability, bio economy and digitalisation, as well as a complete description of the EQF targeting VET and NQFs. | Ready |
| D1.2 | Repository of previous projects and best practices | Relevant information has been managed as online databases in an open platform. The structure of databases is established. Contributions from partners have been allocated according to their expertise. Fields in databases are related to organisations and stakeholders, curricula-courses/Best practices/projects and Policy/Advocacy. It would be useful setting clearer criteria for accepting the entry in the databases and assigning the keyword field. | Ready |
| D1.3 | VET and stakeholders lists and classification | Stakeholders strategic mapping is addressed to build a specific database focussed on Organisation/Stakeholders, Curricula/courses and Policy/Advocacy. All partners were involved in this task, which is relevant to identify potential stakeholders to target in WP7. A complete revision of curricula/courses has been included in the database providing very useful information for further skill needs identification. Finally a database containing policy-decision makers and relevant stakeholders for advocacy has been set. It would be useful to explain better criteria for accepting the entry in the databases and assigning the keyword field | Ready |
| D1.4 | Focus group guideline | The organisation of the different Focus groups are addressed to provide guidance in the preparation, conduction and reporting of the Focus Groups. A good management procedure of FGs is reported, being very relevant to guarantee the transdisciplinary approach of the project. Responsibilities are identified and the operating procedures well established | Ready |
| Deliverable 1.5 | Focus group analysis | Results from 9 national+2 topical (european) FGs are reported. Main purpose of FGs is to identify skill needs and future trends in the sectors concerning the projects and categorise them in databases (Sustainability, digitalisation, Bioeconomy, soft-skills and Business-entrepreneurship.) An extensive list of outcomes is reported as quantitative and qualitative information, ranked in order of importance. Infographic is really helpful and the information collected exhaustive. Important issues have been considered, such as missing skills, potential changes in the future and the identification of skills that need more training. Training needs are also well addressed and suggestions related with either national or European education-training systems. A holistic approach is suggested and it is very interesting to consider universities as capacity building entities and lifelong learning for the entire workforce. Although “existing training to identified needs” and “industry needs” have not been addressed the outcomes provided in D1.5 are excellent | Ready |
| D1.6 | Web-based questionnaire | Having accessed the web-based survey it looks to be user friendly to complete; the questions are well addressed in order to collect relevant information on skills-training needs and gaps in the Agri-food and Forestry sectors. | Ready |
| D4.3 | Online public platform and map | Having accessed the website it looks to be easy to navigate with useful information about the project. This needs to be kept up to date and disseminated. | Ready |
| D6.1 | Quality Plan | Comprehensive document for management, structure, reporting and organisation of the project. No further comments. | Ready |
| D6.2 | Evaluation grids | Comprehensive document dealing with data management, security and quality of deliverables. The deliverables submitted so far evidence a good performance of the system. No further comments. | Ready |
| D7.1 | Dissemination Plan | This deliverable is the critical link in the project chain to enable stakeholders to be informed of the project outputs and activities. The various social media routes and website all look good and attractive to use. The document establishes a well dissemination plan targeting priorities, outputs and audiences linked to each WP. A detailed communication plan is provided and the deliverables agreed in the working plan submitted, including Newsletter, Web-based questionnaire, leaflets and posters.  As most of work related with WP1 has been done, the project team need to monitor the use of the various media sites to give feedback on their success and any changes which may be required, based on what has worked or not in attracting new users.  As the project matures these outputs will become more critical to optimise dissemination. | Ready |
| D7.2 | Public Website | The website is easy to navigate and contains useful information about the project. This needs to be kept up to date and disseminated. | Ready |
| D7.3 | Project leaflet and poster | A detailed procedure to design posters and leaflets and communication objectives are presented. No further comments | Ready |

Please add more rows if needed