



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Lifelong Learning: Erasmus, Jean Monnet

Brussels, 20. 12. 2011
EACEA/P2/MH/MFID(2011) 039865

Mr Joe English
Louth County Enterprise Board
Quayside Business Park, Mill Street ,
IE-BT1 Dundalk

Subject : Approval of Progress Report
Agreement N°: 510432-LLP-1-2010-1-IE-ERASMUS-ECUE (2010-4005)

Dear Mr English,

I am pleased to inform you that the Progress Report of the above mentioned project has been approved by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA).

The assessment of the report was supported by the expertise of an external expert. Enclosed you will find the expert's comments and recommendations (Annex 1). Please, keep in mind that during the evaluation of your Final Report, it will also be assessed to what extent you have incorporated the recommendations made concerning the project implementation.

As mentioned in article II.15.3 of the Grant Agreement, the approval of the Progress Report does not imply a confirmation of the eligibility of expenditures declared in the financial reporting tables. A complete financial analysis on the eligibility of these expenditures will be made at the *final report stage* only. Nevertheless, we have had a look at your financial reporting tables and would like to invite you to take our comments (Annex 2) into consideration for the final implementation and reporting for your project.

If you have sent a request for an amendment with your Progress Report, we will reply to it separately. Approval of your Progress Report does not imply that a request for an amendment has been accepted.

Please, do not hesitate to contact Ms Mireia Fàbrega Iglesias, Project Manager, (Tel.: +32-2-29 67717 e-mail: mireia.fabrega-iglesias@ec.europa.eu) should you have any further inquiries in this respect.

Yours sincerely,

Mónica HOLIK
Head of Unit

Annex 1: Progress Report Recommendations
Annex 2: Financial Reporting Table Comments

LLP PROGRESS REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET

Project number: [number]-[year]-[country]-[LLP Action]
 510432-LLP-1-2010-1-IE-ERASMUS-ECUE

Project title:
 SUPORT

	Score /10
<p>1. Objectives, results and products Have the project's activities been in accordance with its aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended? Have there already been any valuable results/products achieved at Progress Report stage?</p> <p>The project is well on track. The products due to be delivered at the progress report stage are presented, in particular the 'Needs Analysis', the 'Good Practice Review' and the resulting 'White paper', of good quality and essential for the development of the next outcomes. The progress made on the DVD training resource pack and on the elearning materials is very little as this stage, but this is coherent with the work programme.</p>	7

	Score /10
<p>2. Coherence between workplan and activities carried out to date Have the planned activities been implemented in accordance with the project's work plan as declared in the original application, or as officially amended, and have any variations been adequately justified?</p>	8

Despite a slight delay at the beginning of the project, the activities developed so far are in line with the initial objectives.

The withdrawal of the German partner The Fraunhofer IFF led to a delayed start of the development of the roadmap for SMEs and HEIs (WP3). The English version of the roadmap is completed. The other linguistic versions and the production of the printed materials have to be urgently completed as the roadmap is an important product for dissemination.

	Score /10
<p>3. Partnership Are there indicators to show that the partnership is working properly? Are there clear indications of a real and effective involvement of the partners? Are there significant changes in the partnership compared to the application? If so, have these changes had any impact on the partnership?</p>	9
<p>Following the withdrawal of the German partner at the very beginning of the project, a reallocation of tasks and responsibilities, especially in WP3 - Development of roadmap - and WP10 - exploitation -, took place. These changes in the partnership were well managed and are not an obstacle to the project's implementation.</p> <p>All partners take part in the project's activities and meetings (also virtual) and the team work is several emphasised in the progress report.</p>	

	Score /10
<p>4. Management Does the project seem to be well managed on the whole? How efficient were the management and coordination arrangements? To what extent were appropriate decisions made to support effective implementation and problem resolution? Have any deviations/changes been satisfactorily justified?</p>	8

The project is visibly well managed. In addition to physical partners meetings, the dialogue between partners is maintained through regular conference calls and the use of innovative management tools. As part of the management methodology, the partnership is carefully monitored through quarterly surveys.

	Score /10
5. Financial management Are the expenditures made so far in line with the project activities?	8
The project seems well managed for a financial point of view as well. The incurred so far are reasonable and in line with the activities developed.	

	Score /10
6. Evaluation and/or quality assurance If evaluation activities have already taken place, are they satisfactory? How well has the project's strategy for evaluation been implemented so far? To what extent has the project considered the comments or recommendations following the project selection?	6
An evaluation strategy has been elaborated, with a very important input from the external evaluator. However, no quality plan, as such, was provided with the progress report. Monitoring reports are regularly produced. While the monitoring of the partnership is well elaborated, the quality assurance strategy relating to the products themselves is not presented.	

	Score /10
<p>7. Dissemination How does the project develop communication, visibility, and the dissemination of its activities and results as outlined in the original application? With reference to the original application, to what extent has the consortium addressed the issue of the exploitation of the project activities / results during the project lifetime (and beyond)?</p>	8
<p>A dissemination strategy and an exploitation plan were designed and submitted with the progress report. A number of dissemination activities took place during the first phase of the project and a number of support materials are presented (press releases, business cards...). Figures relating to beneficiaries of the various dissemination materials (visitors of the website, recipients of the newsletter...) are provided. The collection of the each partner's network into a common database was an effective dissemination tool.</p> <p>The project's website is online, only in English for the time being. It is user-friendly and contains relevant information about the project, the partners and the products completed so far. It would be interesting to add a visible link from the project's website to the blog created by the French partner and vice versa. In addition, once the website will be available in the other 4 languages, the translated newsletters, press release, etc. will also become available online.</p>	

Supplementary information to be submitted

Supplementary information required from the project to allow for a complete Progress Report analysis:
<p>The progress report mentions a "monitoring, quality and evaluation plan." This document wasn't annexed to the report. Could you please provide it as well as a detailed evaluation strategy as regards the quality assurance of the project's final outputs (DVD Training Resource pack, elearning materials)?</p>

Overall evaluation

Overall comment:
<p>The SUPORT project is generally well on track. The initial delay and challenges due to the withdrawal one of the core partners were overcome and hasn't penalised the implementation of the project's activities and the completion of the products so far.</p>
<p>Strong points:</p>

The impact of the project's outcomes is potentially substantial thanks to a dynamic involvement of all the partners, excellent communication channels and a dissemination strategy that has already proven to be producing tangible results.

Weak points:

The progress made on the development of the DVD training resource pack and the elearning materials is difficult to evaluate given that these products will be mainly achieved in the second phase of the project. However, some indications could be provided, especially through the quality assurance strategy.

Summary scoring sheet for Progress Report	
Criterion	Score
1 Objectives, results and products	7
2 Coherence between work plan and activities carried out during life of the project	8
3 Partnership	9
4 Project Management	8
5 Financial Management	8
6 Evaluation	6
7 Dissemination	8

Your global score is:	8 /10	80%
------------------------------	--------------	------------

KEY TO THE SCORING SYSTEM

Score	Definition	Description of score
0	No evidence	Fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated
1 or 2	Very weak	Addresses the criterion but with significant and/or many weaknesses
3 or 4	Weak	Addresses the criterion but with weaknesses
5 or 6	Acceptable	Addresses the criterion sufficiently
7 or 8	Good	Addresses the criterion with some aspects of high quality
9 or 10	Very good	Addresses the criterion with all aspects of high quality
X	Not applicable	Activity of the criterion was not planned for the evaluated period of



Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

Lifelong Learning : Erasmus, Jean Monnet

Annex 2: Financial Reporting Table Comments

Agreement N°: 510432-LLP-1-2010-1-IE-ERASMUS-ECUE (2010-4005)

Please find below our main comments (the list is not exhaustive) regarding the financial reporting attached to your progress report:

Staff costs:

Please note that the declared costs for partner P4 in category 4 (Administrative) exceed the maximum daily staff cost rates (see Article 2.3.1 of the Administrative and Financial Handbook).

Travel/subsistence costs:

The declared costs related to Joe English and Ronan Dennedy for the "Third partner meeting "(Paris in June 2011) exceed the maximum per diem amount per person per day.

Please be reminded that **only** travel and subsistence costs **for staff taking part in the action** should be reported under "*Travel and subsistence costs*".

General comments/other comments:

For **non staff members**, please note that:

Travel and subsistence costs incurred in the framework of a procurement contract should be reported under "*Subcontracting costs*". Therefore, specific Community rules with regard to procurement apply (according to the different thresholds from the handbook section 2.3.4).

Travel and subsistence costs reimbursed to third parties outside a procurement contract (e.g. a speaker) should be reported under "*Other (direct) costs*".