|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | |  | | --- | |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **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 sustainability, digitalization, and the bio-Economy in Agriculture: European skills agenda and Strategy | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Name and surname of the evaluator:** | | | | | | |  |
|  | Mihaela MURESAN | | | | | | |  |
|  | **Signature of the evaluator:** | | | | | | |  |
|  |  | | | | | | |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **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? | | | | | | | | 18 |
| The results achieved so far are in accordance with the proposed work programme, but the deadlines scheduled have not been always respected. The results presented along with the progress report, respectively D2.3 (updated document presented with the previous progress report), D2.4, D2.5 and D3.2 are relevant for the project and illustrate the achievements, especially as regards the national roadmaps, curricula designed for 7 occupational profiles and the transferability framework. However, there are significant delays regarding the delivery of other important project results, such as D3.4 - Online training materials, D3.5 - User guide for trainers and train the trainers’ session material and the related D4.1 (feedback from trainers) which should be delivered with the present progress report. The partners provide justifications regarding the delays of delivering the online training materials (D3.5), highlighting their commitment to provide more elaborated training materials, as well as additional ones. However, there is no clear evidence of the lack of these deliverables in a draft format. The progress report contains explanations regarding the delays in the implementation of the T3.5, T4.1 and T4.2, leading to the impossibility of providing related deliverables on time.  The activities carried out during the reported time span are in line with the objectives stated in the original application. Given the delays concerning the implementation of the WP3 and WP4, the delivery of the training materials and the set-up of the pilot sessions have been postponed. Therefore, the partners have proposed an extension of 6 months of the project lifetime and a related amendment has been drawn up. The successful completion of the WP3 should be prioritised, as the deliverables D2.2, D3.4 and D3.5 are crucial for the project and for the implementation of WP4.  The submitted progress report shows a logic approach and clearly interrelated activities, building on previous achievements. As such, there is clear evidence of the capitalisation of the findings highlighted in the European Skills Strategy (D2.2) for the design of the national roadmaps (D2.4), which are linked to the transferability framework (D2.5). Furthermore, the curricula for the selected occupational profiles are also well defined, but given the delays regarding the development of the training material and piloting the training sessions for trainers, the impact of the curricula and the effectiveness of the activities carried out is not yet clearly demonstrated. The plans for the further implementation are feasible and show the partners’ commitment to overcome the delays. In this regard, there is clear proof of the foreseen activities and the schedule related to the last implementation phase. However, these commitments should be strictly adhered to, since the success of the project depends on these rescheduled activities and the related outputs.  The description of the methodological approach for carrying out the activities planned and developing the expected results is well elaborated. As such, the development of national roadmaps, the design of the curricula and the development of the transferability framework are explained in sufficient detail.  The results presented for the reporting period are clearly in line with the initial plan, including from the qualitative perspective, with minor suggestions of improvement. The deliverables could be disseminated. In this respect, the partners provide open access to the results already achieved, via the project web site, which is a positive aspect. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **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)? | | | | | | | | 20 |
| The activities carried out during the reporting period are aligned to the objectives of the application and are in accordance with the initial Work Programme, except for the delays mentioned for the WP3 (task 3.5) and WP4 (tasks 4.1 and 4.2). For the moment, only WP1 and WP2 are fully implemented, and partially WP3. The main deviations refer to the development of the training materials and the train the trainers guidelines and pilot sessions. These delays should be kept under control, as these could cause further deviations and risks for the successful implementation of the project.  The management activities are adequately presented, along with documents providing information about the partnership’s meetings and decision making process. There is clear evidence of each partner’s responsibilities regarding the implementation of the tasks and their accomplishment. The intensive use of the online tools for communication, meetings and information sharing is well explained, with clear focus on the efficiency of the management process. Overall, the coordination and communication framework is strong.  The articulation of the activities and results with previously implemented phases is well described. Moreover, there is clear evidence of the improvement/update of the previous deliverables (D2.2), as well as the correlation with the previous achievements. In addition, explanations regarding the coherent methodological approach applied during the implementation phases are convincingly presented.  The quality assessment framework (evaluation grids and procedure) is clearly defined in previously implemented phases. The progress report contains clear references to the evaluation of the deliverables developed within the reporting time span.  Risk management plan is clearly referred in the progress report, as well as the responsibilities to integrate the partners’ reports into a coherent risk plan, as part of the quality plan. However, procedures for the risk evaluation and appropriate mitigation measures have not been explicitly mentioned. Although various issues occurred during the implementation of the project, the risk management is not presented in sufficient detail.  The progress report contains references to the quality control and evaluation of the activities carried out and the deliverables provided, but lacks details about the quality procedures and the results of the evaluation process, as there is no clear evidence of the quality report for the analysed period.  The focus on the recognition and validation of the competences acquired is well highlighted and the partners’ approach is clearly presented in the Open transferability framework. Articulation with EU tools is also clarified. In this respect, the use of the ECVET for the recognition and validation of the participants’ learning outcomes is also well explained. Furthermore, the evaluation is also explained in relation with the design of the curricula for the 7 occupational profiles. The way of applying EQAVET is clearly mentioned and explained in the description of the quality assurance methodology, but except for the evaluation of the previous phases and deliverables, there is no clear information about the quality assurance of the activities and results related to the reporting period. | | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **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? | | | | | | | | 22 |
| There is clear proof of all partners’ active involvement, according to their expertise and to the initial plan. There are no changes in the partnership and in the distribution of lead roles and specific responsibilities. Each partner has accomplished his tasks according to the plan. Moreover, there is clear evidence of a strong and smooth cooperation for carrying out the activities planned.  There is sufficient insight provided into the mechanism put in practice for the efficient and effective communication and information sharing within the partnership. In this respect, there are clear references to the email communication, online meetings and intranet communication tools. The bi-weekly online meetings have been positively focused on monitoring progress and evaluating results. Moreover, concrete data have been provided along with the progress report for illustrating the effectiveness of the partners’ meetings.  Each partner’s effort during the reporting period is clearly presented and is in line with the activities carried out. Therefore, the reported costs reflect the real contribution of each partner. Moreover, the allocation of resources is appropriate and aligned to the proposed budget, as initially presented.  The partnership has demonstrated a strong internal cohesion and no problems have been reported during the analysed period. | | | | | | | | |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | **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? | | | | | | | | 17 |
| There is clear evidence of the communication and dissemination process, with concrete information provided about reaching and engaging with the stakeholders and with a wide audience as well. The dissemination activities are diverse and relevant to the objectives of the project and enable the promotion of the project and its results. Various dissemination products and channels have been efficiently use for reaching a wide audience. The leaflets, the poster and the newsletters developed and distributed during the third implementation year are provided along the progress report. In addition, there are also scientific papers related to bioeconomy skills and occupational profiles presented in various international and sectoral events (conferences, congresses, fora, webinars, web meetings and conferences etc.) and also uploaded on various Fields social media channels (Twitter , Facebook, LinkedIn, YouTube). The scientific papers presented in various events are also available on various platforms and social media channels of the international conferences. The public web site of the project provides also access to the main project outcomes and to the scientific papers. A comprehensive list of publications, information and documents disseminated via social media channels, project web site and various online platforms, as well as the participation in various events is positively provided along with the progress report (Global Dissemination Report). Moreover, in the progress report the links to the online dissemination products are also listed. Positive is also that precise indicators and related values have been mentioned for illustrating the effectiveness of the dissemination activities.  The impact of the project is presented in a structured manner, with clearly identified target groups and specific benefits provided by each deliverable. In addition, quantitative indicators are also clearly listed together with the values recorded up to reporting time. Aspects regarding the wide impact outside the partnership, at the sectoral level, are also clearly highlighted.  There is clear evidence of engaging with sectoral stakeholders in agrifood sector and bioeconomy, as well as with representatives of various EU projects and initiatives. In addition, reaching and engaging with national relevant stakeholders is also clearly presented.  The previous deliverables regarding the regulatory framework (D5.1) and the funding opportunities (D5.2) are supporting the sustainability of the project. However, the exploitation plan and the future engagement plan and Memorandum of understanding will be provided in the last phase (the forth implementation year), according to the initial work plan. As such, there is no clear evidence of significant achievements regarding the sustainability during the reporting time span, except for the Open transferability framework (D2.5), that can facilitate the sustainability of the project.  The public web site of the project provides open and free access to the main results of the project. Positive is that the Fields web site is kept updated.  The national work groups play the major part in the roll-out at the national level. The National roadmaps (D2.4) stands for an important resource for the national exploitation of the project results, as it facilitates  the development of the action plans at the country level, according to the national contexts. However, concrete results are not available, as the pilot sessions have not been yet organised. | | | | | | | | |
| **Global score** | | | | | | | | **77** |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| D2.3 | European Strategy | The deliverable D2.3 is an updated document, reported along with the first progress report. The deliverable is well substantiated and presented in a structured manner. Its content illustrates the methodological approach and the principles on which the design of the strategy builds on. In addition, there is clear evidence of an in-depth analysis (statistical data, surveys, desk research) for the identification of skills. Therefore, there is clear proof of the development of the European agri-food and forestry skills strategy according to the actual challenges and needs identified. Positive is also that the professional and transversal skills identified are well correlated with the training approach.  However, although the key performance indicators are clearly identified and presented, appropriate target values and related timelines have not been mentioned. Given the partners’ commitment to continuously update the strategy until the end of the project, these aspects could be considered. | **Ready to be published with suggested updates** |
| D2.4 | National roadmaps | The National roadmaps represent action plans for the implementation of the European agri-food and forestry skills strategy in the specific national context. In this regards, there are clear explanations of setting up the national working groups and their methodological approach in order to design country specific action plans. The deliverable is well elaborated and clearly presented. In this respect, the deliverable provides appropriate information about each national context of the agri-food sector and the related training system. The action plans reflect the prioritised occupational profiles, according to each national working group’s analysis. Furthermore, there are sufficient details about EQF levels and training modules proposed for piloting. | **Ready to be published** |
| D2.5 | Open transferability framework | The deliverable is well developed, with sufficient information about the methodological approach, and the concrete aspects enabling transferability of the results in various contexts. In this regard, there are sufficient details related to the alignment with ESCO, EQF, as well as with the ECTS, ECVET and EQAVET. Compatibility with the European frameworks for digital, green and entrepreneurship competences is also clearly pointed out, facilitating the validation, recognition and certification of the learning outcomes, as well as their transferability. | **Ready to be published** |
| D3.2 | Curricula design | The document presented is well developed and comprehensive. The deliverable presents clearly the methodological approach and the proposed curricula corresponding to 7 (3 for EQF level 4 and 4 for the EQF level 5) out of the 10 occupational profiles developed, according to the prioritisation presented in the D2.2. The table of contents should be updated, as it is not in line with the content of the document. | **Ready to be published with suggested updates** |

Please add more rows if needed