

DELIVERABLE EVALUATION REPORT

Result number and title:	D1.1 Project Quality Architecture Toolkit		
Date:	20.08.2025	Prepared by:	Marko Stojanović

A INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of deliverable 1.1 was carried out on 20.08.2025. The purpose of this procedure is to examine the quality, relevance and level of completion of this project deliverable. This evaluation combines fact-finding, descriptive assessment and attitudinal approaches.

B FINDINGS

1. A short description of the produced/achieved result: The PQA Facility Implementation Toolkit for the AGRI-MOCKS project consists of the Implementation Toolkit (a PDF document) and PQA Matrix (excel document). The deliverable is presented as a single (merged) PDF document of 64 pages containing both: Implementation toolkit and PQA Matrix. The Implementation Toolkit has 57 pages and 2 parts:

- a) presentation of the PQA Facility as a specific monitoring and evaluation methodology;
- b) PQA instruments.

The PQA Matrix is a tool for planning and tracking M&E activities. It comprises of an excel document containing the following 5 tabs (7 pages when converted into PDF):

- a) Project Info Sheet,
- b) Contact details of project teams,
- c) Distribution of tasks,
- d) M&E gphant chart,
- e) Indicators.

The methodology seems very well and logically develop and suitable to monitor the quality of implementation, results, management and communication. Specific characteristic of PQA Facility is a 2-staged evaluation and verification of project results/deliverables. This approach ensures that project results are credibly assessed and approved by the authorized persons representing project partners, prior to submitting the results to the donor for approval.

2. The deliverable D1.1 respects the visibility rules of the EU and the Erasmus+ programme. It contains appropriate EU logo and disclaimer.

3. The deliverable is aligned with EU GDPR provisions, no personal data are available.

4. When it comes to the fulfillment of the result-related indicator, it has been achieved and exceeded.

Domain	Indicator number and title (insert)	Target Value (insert)	Current Value (insert)
R	An e-document of 40 pages in English	A Document of 40 pages in English	2 documents: 1) Document of 57 pages in English (PDF) 2) Excel document with 7 pages (tabs)

5. The sources of verification (links, websites, interview with..., etc.): Uploaded on the WB Moodle (HSWT platform).

6. Strong aspects of this result include: Robust, comprehensive and logically coherent methodology adapted to fit the specificities of the Erasmus EVE projects and AGRI-MOCKS design.

7. Weak aspects of this result that should be improved include: Comprehensive methodology implies involvement and commitment of a robust team, which may be a treat that may hamper smooth implementation of the PQA Facility.


C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Team, methodology and instruments seem prepared for implementation.



Project Quality Architecture Facility Implementation Toolkit

v 1.0



Document Information

Document title: **AGRI-MOCKS Project Quality Architecture Facility Implementation Toolkit**

Acronym: PQA Toolkit

Deliverable: D1.1

Date of publishing: 20 August 2025

Publisher: WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE, RS

Version: v 1.0

Disclaimer: Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Project Information

Project title: **Mastering Opportunities-scouting, Career-guidance, and Key-job Skills in Agriculture**

Acronym: **AGRI-MOCKS**

Project number: 101193598

Funding source: Programme: ERASMUS+
Call: ERASMUS-EDU-2024-VIRT-EXCH
Type of Action: ERASMUS Lump Sum Grants

Duration: 36 months

Start date: 01 February 2025

End date: 31 January 2028

Grant: 499,990.96 EUR

Coordinator: HOCHSCHULE WEIHENSTEPHAN-TRIESDORF, DE

Partners: TKUMASI INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE, GH
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY, ET
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER DE SAINT LOUIS, SN
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE, RS
BIZMETRICS (PTY) LTD, ZA
HAMEEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU OY, FI

Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	5
PQA FACILITY: MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY	7
What is this about?.....	7
Structure of PQA Facility.....	8
THE WHITE PILLAR: RESOURCES.....	11
PQA Matrix: tool for planning and evidence of monitoring and evaluation activities.....	11
PQA Instruments: set of tools for implementation of monitoring & evaluation activities	15
Adaptation and optimization	16
Overlap and alignment with other project documents	17
THE BLUE PILLAR: ROLES.....	19
Principal Project Evaluator & PQA Administrator	19
Quality Team members	20
Project Steering Committee members & Institutional Project Managers.....	21
CDE Coordinator	22
Members of the work package teams	23
THE GREEN PILLARS: PROCESSES	24
1.1 Inception: creation	24
1.2 Inception: training of partner staff	24
1.3 Inception: group meetings with partner institutions.....	24
2.1 Implementation: monitoring of the quality of management.....	25
2.2 Implementation: monitoring of the quality of communication, dissemination and exploitation (CDE)	26
2.3 Implementation: monitoring of work packages	27
2.4 Implementation: evaluation of events.....	28
2.5.1 Implementation: evaluation of deliverables	29
2.5.2 Implementation: internal verification of deliverables.....	31
2.6 Implementation: evaluation of e-internship programs	32
2.7 Implementation: administration of PQA Matrix.....	33
2.8 Implementation: The Progress Quality Review(s)	34
3. Impact assessment.....	35
ANNEX: PQA TOOLS.....	38

A1.1 — Template questionnaire form for a baseline review of the quality of management	38
B1.1 — Template reporting form for a baseline review of the quality of management	39
A1.2 — Template questionnaire form for an interim review of the quality of management	41
B1.2 — Template reporting form for an interim review of the quality of management.....	42
A2.1 — Template questionnaire form for baseline review of the quality of CDE	44
B2.1 — Template reporting form for a baseline review of the quality of CDE.....	44
A2.2 — Template questionnaire form for an interim review of the quality of CDE.....	45
B2.2 — Template reporting form for an interim review of the quality of CDE.....	46
A3.1 — Template questionnaire form for WP interim quality review	47
B3.1 — Template reporting form for WP quality review.....	48
A4.1 — Template questionnaire form for evaluation of an event.....	49
B4.1 — Template reporting form for evaluation of an event.....	50
A5.1 — Template questionnaire form #1 for evaluation of a deliverable — team members and stakeholders.....	51
A5.2 — Template questionnaire form #2 for evaluation of a deliverable — PPE	51
B5.1 — Template reporting form for evaluation of a deliverable.....	52
B5.2 — Template form for internal verification of a deliverable	53
B5.3 — Template form for presentation of deliverable subject to a 2-staged quality assurance procedure.....	54
A6.1 — Template questionnaire form for evaluation of an e-internship.....	55
B6.1 — e-internship evaluation report template form	55
A7.1 — Project objectives accomplishment form	56
B7.1 — Template reporting form for Progress Quality Review.....	56

INTRODUCTION

This PQA Facility was developed by WEBIN, initially in 2017, to respond to the growing need in our international projects to establish a relevant, purposeful, methodologically clear & sustainable, and user-friendly quality assurance arrangement. The need for such arrangement was articulated by both, donors who requested persuasive approach in ensuring the quality of performance and results, and partners (mostly universities) who asked for guidance and technical support to better understand the project logic, donor logic, and develop applied (not research) methodology and instruments that will be the missing part to fill the gap in an overall project management arrangement.

The first project to pilot PQA Facility (initial version) was an EU-funded LANDS project (#585833 Erasmus+ CBHE) in the period from 2017-2021. Through this 4-years period, we learnt several key points, which served to modify and improve the methodology and enhance the efficiency of this activity set:

- M&E is an effort and time-consuming activity, requiring staff time to be dedicated, and staff to be budgeted for M&E;
- Every partner institution in a consortium needs to dedicate M&E staff (time), because M&E can be effective only if partners are responsive and see the value in invested time and effort;
- Many partner staff have no idea what M&E is and why it is important in project implementation. Partners need training in M&E, and bilateral or group meetings to clarify their roles and participating in M&E arrangements turned out to be good practice;
- PQA Facility turned out to be a very useful method and tool for collecting and preparing data and materials for narrative reporting to the Donor.

The role of PQA Facility in projects funded by the EU became invaluable after 2021 and introduction of lump-sum budgets, where focus of Donor control of funded projects shifted from financial aspect to quality of implementation and results. With this shift, the methodological approach of PQA Facility turned out to be an added value in projects implementing this Facility. The practice of completed and ongoing EU-funded projects is indicating that many project officers representing the EU as Donor in concrete projects are recognizing and appreciating the PQA Facility as preferred quality assurance arrangement.

In the past 8 years, the PQA Facility was implemented, or is being implemented, in 19 international multi-country projects and 2 national projects, involving more than 60 institutions from 35 countries in Europe and Africa.

Including: **TEACH** (598977 Erasmus+ CBHE), **MATCHING** (48-00-00198/2017-28-4 EU-IPA), **EMBRACE HE** (2019-1-UK01-KA203-062148 Erasmus+ CP), **The Year of Inclusion and**

Employment (81247763, GIZ), **VIRAL** (609755 Erasmus+ CBHE), **BY LEAP** (IPA/2019/162473-7/6 EU-IPA), **CHECK IT** (2020-1-UK01-KA203-079198 Erasmus+ CP), **PLACEMENT** (CFCU/MNE/183 EU-IPA), **STATUS** (2021-1-RS01-KA220-HED-000032129 Erasmus+ CP), **Green GUARDens** (2022-1-DE03-KA220-NI-22-2485094 Erasmus+ CP), **VETpreneur** (101092503 Erasmus+ CBVET), **BASIS** (101082391 Erasmus+ CBHE), **CHAIN** (101082963 Erasmus+ CBHE), **MASSTER** (101129023 Erasmus+ CBHE), **HAWKING** (101128741 Erasmus+ CBHE), **GEAR** (101129408 Erasmus+ CBHE), **e-Stories** (2023-1-TR01-KA220-HED-000167303 Erasmus+ CP), **REBOOTING** (IPA III/2023/177269-5/2 EU-IPA), **TRUST** (101179820 Erasmus+ CBHE), AGRI-MOCKS (101193598 Erasmus+ EVE).

For more information about PQA Facility go to www.wb-institute.org. For inquiries about cooperation and knowledge transfer, please write to Marko Stojanovic at marko.stojanovic@wb-institute.org.

PQA FACILITY: MONITORING AND EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

What is this about?

This Toolkit is instrumental for the implementation of The Project Quality Architecture (PQA) Facility of the AGRI-MOCKS project. It is part of the AGRI-MOCKS **project implementation package***. The purpose of the Toolkit is to:

- a) **Introduce the team members** participating in project implementation **with the PQA Facility**, acquaint them with procedures and instruments comprising the Facility, and better prepare them to participate in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities planned in the project;
- b) **Support project management structures in managing the project and ensuring good quality** of performance and deliverables, and provide information necessary for distribution of roles and tasks between the partner institutions, not only within the partner institutions, but also in providing accurate and evidence-based data for project reports;
- c) **Facilitate decision making** especially when it comes to giving approval (a "GO") to the project results and deliverables before the project coordinator submits them to the Contracting Authority (Donor) or external evaluators.

* It is a good practice that a project has **an implementation package**. What is this about? The implementation package refers to a set of resources - instructions (e.g.: communication instructions, or rules of procedure, etc.), manuals (e.g.: quality assurance manual or project management manual, etc.), tools (e.g.: gantt chart or monitoring and evaluation questionnaires, etc.) and templates (e.g.: time sheet forms, visuals, etc.) used by the implementing partners (consortium members) in implementation of a project. The implementation package normally includes resources for management (with financial management and administration and reporting), communication and dissemination, risk management and quality assurance.

The Project Quality Architecture (PQA) Facility is a **monitoring and evaluation methodology**. It provides **a holistic methodological framework** for ensuring high-quality performance of projects with complex structures, which are considered challenging to implement. These projects normally involve a multi-member (international) consortium, imply a multiple-year duration, and contain numerous components, intertwined work packages, activities, and results, and expected impact in multiple countries. The PQA Facility has three major functions:

- 1) to inform the AGRI-MOCKS project about **the quality of process** (implementation), i.e. to what extent the AGRI-MOCKS project **implementation is aligned with the work plan and indicators**, and about the **critical risks** when (and if) they occur;

2) to serve as **input for reporting and verification** of implemented activities and achieved results (deliverables);

3) to maintain high partners' **awareness and understanding of mutual dependence** on each other and understanding risks related to such dependencies. In projects with complex structures such as AGRI-MOCKS, partners expose each other to a certain risk associated with potential poor implementation and inadequate quality of delivered and achieved. In such projects, PQA Facility keeps partners aware of these risks and provides an effective framework for their mitigation.

PQA Facility does not focus only on the quality of results and events, but it also monitors the work packages as a group of connected and dependent activities, leading to the creation of expected outputs, deliverables, and results. What is analysed in work packages are the processes, relations, risks, and delays. This way the project gets informed about any significant risk that might be unfolding and threatening to jeopardize further implementation and creation of expected results. Furthermore, the PQA Facility places the focus on monitoring of management practices in the project, seeking to inform the project structures how appropriate and efficient are management arrangements from the involved partners' point of view. Finally, the PQA Facility addresses communication, dissemination, and exploitation (CDE) activities, to inform the project about the quality of reaching-out efforts. Monitoring and evaluation reports of all these quality assurance aspects may serve as invaluable sources for drafting of project reports for the Donor.

The PQA Facility is a **generic resource** for quality assurance of projects. However, considering that every project is unique in content and structure, and that project frameworks set by different donors vary, the PQA Facility **requires to be adapted for and aligned with** every single project. The AGRI-MOCKS PQA Facility was adapted to and aligned with specificities of the Erasmus+ Program — Virtual Exchanges sub-program.

For further reading about PQA methodology, please visit www.wb-institute.org.

Structure of PQA Facility

The PQA Facility generally consists of **White, Blue and Green pillars** which build the architecture of the quality assurance strategy of any project.

The White pillar of the PQA Facility refers to the **resources** for monitoring and evaluation activities. There are 2 groups of resources: PQA Matrix and PQA Instruments.

The Blue pillar of the PQA Facility refers to the **roles** in implementing monitoring and evaluation activities. This includes the roles of Principal Project Evaluator (PPE), & PQA

Administrator, the roles of the Quality Team member, Project Steering Committee member, Institutional Project Manager, the role of CDE Coordinator, and the role of a member of any other project team or task force.

The Green pillars of the PQA Facility refer to monitoring and evaluation **processes**. These are various processes related to monitoring project management, communication, dissemination and exploitation, to evaluation of work packages, results, events, to verification of project outputs, as well as to creation of Progress Quality Reviews (PQR).

More details about the pillars are provided in the following sections.




Figure 1: Illustration of the PQA Facility

THE WHITE PILLAR: RESOURCES

There are 2 groups of M&E resources to be used during project implementation:

- a) **PQA Matrix**
- b) **PQA Instruments.**

The resources were finalized after the kick-off meeting in Addis Ababa in April 2025, and were made available to all project partners at WB Moodle (dedicated virtual space used by the project), at the section *Quality Management*.

PQA Matrix: tool for planning and evidence of monitoring and evaluation activities

PQA Matrix is **a tool for planning and tracking** M&E activities. It comprises of an excel document containing the following 5 tabs:

Tab 1: Project ID page contains key ID data of the project such as title and acronym, reference number, duration, budget, funder, coordinating institution, coordinator name and contact details. This is a static page with content created in the inception phase.





Figure 2: PQA Matrix - tab 1: Project Info Sheet

Tab 2: Project teams and contact details lists the members of respective project teams and their contact details to be used for communication about M&E activities. This is a static page with content created in the inception phase, but it may be modified if any change in project teams takes place.



	A	B	C	D	E
	INSTITUTION	ROLE	NAME	EMAIL	WhatsApp
1	PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE				
2					
3					
4	INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT MANAGERS				
5					
6					
7					
8	PQA TEAM				
9					
10					
11	CDE TEAM				
12					
13					
14	WP#1 TEAM				
15					
16					
17	WP#2 TEAM				
18					
19					
20	WP#3 TEAM				
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					

Figure 3: PQA Matrix - tab 2: Contact details

Tab 3: Distribution of responsibilities for M&E between partner institutions. This is a static page for informing the partners only about the activities they are responsible for, and not about the activities they are expected to contribute to. This page should be developed along with the tab 4 content, and after the tab 5 was created. Later during project implementation, the distribution of responsibilities between the partners may be modified to reflect any agreed change.

PQA Matrix AGRIMOCKS 4.0 - Excel (Product Activation Failed)

M&E activity	Scope	HSWT	KITA	UFS	HAWASSA	UGB	NICOSA YCP	EDI	WEBIN	BIZMETRICS	HAMK
	Baseline review of the quality of management								X		
	#1 Interim review of the quality of management								X		
	#2 Interim review of the quality of management								X		
	#3 Interim review of the quality of management								X		
WPs quality reviews	WP1 quality review	X				X			X		
	WP2 quality review				X				X		
	WP3 quality review		X				X		X		
Monitoring of the quality of CDE	Baseline review of the quality of CDE								X		
	#1 Interim review of the quality of CDE								X		
	#2 Interim review of the quality of CDE								X		
	#3 Interim review of the quality of CDE								X		
	D1.1 Project Quality Architecture Toolkit								X		
	D1.2 Administration Manual for social network accounts								X		
	D1.3 Inception report containing 4 thematic reports and recommendations								X		
	D2.1 Set of training reports from facilitated webinars for HE teachers and youth trainers								X		
	D2.2 Student e-internship curriculum: "Twin transition in agriculture and rural development" for HEIs, with materials, instructions and learning resources								X		
	D2.3 Youth e-internship curriculum: "Civic participation and twin transition in rural development" for youth workers, with materials, instructions and learning resources								X		
	D2.4 Virtual co-working space (VR platform) for collaborative work of students and youth during e-								X		

Figure 4: PQA Matrix - tab 3: Distribution of tasks

Tab 4: M&E gantt chart is a working interactive tab containing M&E activities listed in the vertical axis, and months from the first to the last project month, presented in the horizontal axis. In the cells created this way, PPE should plan and mark the periods for M&E activities listed in the vertical axis. Every new M&E activity should be presented in a new separate row, so that in a cell indicating a month, we may enter the acronym of institution responsible for the respective M&E activity. This refers to the following:

- baseline reviews of the management or CDE,
- every single interim review of the management or CDE,
- review of any WP,
- every single event and every single result,
- every single Progress Quality Review.

This table should be administered and modified periodically by the PPE. Cells containing completed M&E activities should be marked in green, those in progress in yellow, and those skipped or delayed should be marked in red.




Figure 5: PQA Matrix - tab 4: M&E Ghant Chart

Tab 5: Project indicators are taken from project proposal, as they are not specified elsewhere in the grant agreement. This is a page with static content in first 4 columns, while fifth column is left for modification, once the current value change.




Figure 6: PQA Matrix - tab 5: Indicators

It is recommended to save the modified versions of the PQA Matrix as a new version (v1.0, v2.0, v3.0...) with date of modification, while the old versions are recommended to be moved to dedicated folder. The reason for saving the old versions is traceability of changes.

How will the PQA Facility be administered, and what roles will be assigned to project partners in administration of the PQA Facility will be presented to the QT members from all partner institutions at bilateral or small group meetings which are scheduled for September 2025. You can find more details about the roles in section *The Blue pillar: Roles*.

PQA Instruments: set of tools for implementation of monitoring & evaluation activities

The PQA Instruments are forms used for conducting M&E activities. These include a range of questionnaires, forms, interview protocols and reporting templates.

In the inception phase, the PPE has analyzed the project proposal, identified specificities and adapted the instruments to those specificities. Attention has been paid to **the indicators** and monitoring of the level of achieving.

What do you know about the indicators? Indicators reveal the way to measure the achievement of a certain goal, result, or progress of activity. Thus, indicators are data that indicate (measure) a level of accomplishment. Indicators can be **quantitative, qualitative, and temporal**. It is recommended to resort to a greater utilization of quantitative indicators, either in the form of numbers or percentages (%), i.e. some unit of measurement.

Normally, **indicators in the project are values** (numbers or outcomes) that **MUST be reached or accomplished** in the framework of our project. They **indicate the target value** of the substance of our project reached goals or created results, and we must demonstrate that these target values are reached by the end of the project.

Indicators that have been accomplished need to be verifiable and documented. It needs to be clear how they are measured (verified), which methods (e.g. survey, interview, data analysis, etc.) will be used and which sources (e.g. reports, photos, attendance lists, annual reports and official gazettes, etc.) qualify.

Indicators are one of the most important data the PQA Facility focuses on and why PPE needs to make effort to incorporate indicators into the PQA tool in the most appropriate way.

All finalized forms and questionnaire forms are translated into Google e-forms.

Ad-hoc instruments may be needed in case of any significant risk occurring in the AGRI-MOCKS project. In this case, the project structures may agree to assign to PPE the task to develop an ad-hoc critical risk monitoring instrument (e-questionnaire, interview protocol and reporting template as appropriate).

Important aspects of preparing and implementation of PQA Facility in any project are **adaptation** and **optimization**, both to be done in the inception phase of the project.

Details about using the instruments, undertaking the M&E activities, about processing the data and creating and using the monitoring and evaluation reports, you may find in the upcoming sections: *The Blue Pillar: Roles*, and *The Green Pillars: Processes*.

Adaptation and optimization

In PQA Facility context, adaptation refers to modification of the PQA Facility and instruments in line with specificities of a concrete project. This refers to modifications such as leaving out some green pillars which are not suitable and appropriate for the project, introduction of some instruments and questions in questionnaires, etc. Communication and dissemination components of the project, as well as any risk management and mitigation strategies of the project should be taken into consideration. The most important part of adaptation is ensuring that project indicators are addressed, meaning that instruments and overall M&E approach are adapted in a way allowing the indicators to be effectively monitored, data on their accomplishment collected and registered in dedicated project evidence (reports, datasets, charts, folders, etc.). This may require making the changes in questionnaire forms and template reports, as well as in PQA Matrix. This set of data is needed for reporting about project implementation (and achieved success) to the Donor. Please see the tab 5: Indicators in the PQA Matrix to get acquainted with the indicators the AGRI-MOCKS need to reach and accomplish by the end of implementation period (end project date in the Grant Agreement).

In PQA Facility context, optimization refers to setting forth the workload and scope of the PQA Facility in line with specificities of a concrete project and availability of the budget for monitoring and evaluation activities. The M&E may be time-consuming, and if limited and insufficient budget is foreseen for PPE, the scope and effort should be optimized to address the most important quality assurance aspects and ensure at least basic monitoring and capability to detect potential risks.

In the AGRI-MOCKS project, the expected workload of partner staff in the field of quality assurance is moderate. The largest workload will be distributed to WEBIN who has appointed Marko Stojanović as the PPE and Yahya Adow Ibrahim as PQA Administrator. The rest of the partners have appointed 1 person to actively participate in the QT. The optimization in this case

refers to delegating workload limited to evaluating the deliverables, taking care for M&E of hosted events (incl. e-events), and reminding PSC members, IPMs and WP coordinators (if any) from own institution about the request to fill in a monitoring or evaluation questionnaire form. This optimization corresponds to the size of the budget allocated for each partner for quality assurance in the AGRI-MOCKS project.

Overlap and alignment with other project documents

Some segments of PQA Facility need to be aligned and synchronized with other project documents regulating the same issue, to avoid potential overlap. These are the 3 areas to align PQA Facility with project documents:

- **Liability for damage (Partnership Agreement):** in order to be able to implement internal verification procedure in full scope, it is necessary to dedicate an article in Partnership Agreement, that will allow execution of internal verification provisions and also execution of mutual rights and responsibilities deriving from internal verification provisions (especially the provision about waiving the partners who BLOCKED the internal verification from recovering the part of the budget in case of budget reduction, and redistribution of this debt to other partners who VERIFIED the respective result).
- **Risk management and mitigation:** Critical risk monitoring and evaluation measures need to be aligned with risk management measures stipulated in the Description of the Action (DoA - Part B) and Grant Agreement. Avoiding duplication.
- **Communication, Dissemination and Exploitation (Plan):** CDE monitoring and data collection and keeping instruments need to be aligned with document (Plan) regulating the area of CDE in respective project. Avoiding duplication.

The overlap often happens during preparation (adaptation) of the PQA Matrix, between the different aspects of M&E, especially between the deliverables and events, for which M&E the different procedures and different instruments are foreseen. In most cases it happens that events such as training sessions, conferences and workshops are at the same time deliverables. In such cases, the quality of event should be evaluated by participants, using the instruments for evaluation of events. Purpose of this evaluation would be to provide an insight into their satisfaction with the event. Separate from this, the PPE will use the instruments for evaluation of deliverables to evaluate the event as deliverable. Subject of this evaluation would be an event implementation report (drafted by the host of the event) together with event evaluation report (indicating the satisfaction of participants in the event). The purpose of this evaluation would be to assess the quality of such deliverable, which goes beyond the satisfaction of the participants. It may include multiple events in a row making one deliverable, and may further analyze the indicators accomplishment, the relevance, the impact, etc.

Another potential area for the overlap when adapting the PQA Matrix is the creation of project teams and work package teams. In many projects with WP structure, management, quality assurance and communication and dissemination either fall under the same work package or each of these fields is a separate WP. It is a regular practice in project management that separate teams are formed for each of these 3 areas: management team (Project Steering Committee, or team of IMRs, etc.), quality team and communication or marketing & promotion team. In cases like this, only so called "content work packages" will be evaluated using the procedure and instruments for WP quality reviews. Management WP, CDE WP, and Quality Assurance WP will not be evaluated as work packages, unless the PPE decides differently, but will be monitored and evaluated using the different procedures for management quality review and for CDE quality review. This is the matter of adaptation and optimization of PQA Facility to a concrete project and its specificities.

THE BLUE PILLAR: ROLES

The PQA Facility requires the following **roles to be planned and executed**:

1. Principal Project Evaluator & PQA Administrator
2. Quality Team (QT) members
3. Project Steering Committee members (PSC) and Institutional Project Managers (IPMs)
4. CDE Coordinator
5. Members of other project teams

Principal Project Evaluator & PQA Administrator

Principal Project Evaluator (PPE) has a major qualitative role in implementation of PQA Facility. (S)he is supported by PQA Administrator — a person responsible for support, administration, and organization of project PQA Facility folder and sub-folders and keeping the files.

Principal Project Evaluator (PPE)	
Stage	Responsibilities
Inception	— Drafting (adapting & optimizing) the resources and building the White Column of the PQA Facility in a single project — Drafting and delivery of PQA training — Facilitating the group meetings with partner institutions' PQA team members
Implementation	— Analysis and interpretation of responses, drafting conclusions and recommendations (creating evaluation reports) — As part of the 1st stage of the internal evaluation of deliverable carries out initial and if any, repetition evaluation of the deliverable by assessing the deliverable and creating the evaluation report — Drafting the PQR
Impact Assessment	— Drafting the ToR for independent consultant
PQA Administrator	
Stage	Responsibilities
Inception	— Translating questionnaires into e-questionnaires, — Preparing single reporting templates and other instruments for further use

	— Contribution to drafting and delivery of PQA training
Implementation	— Sending the e-questionnaires to team members for completion — Translating responses from e-forms to reporting template — Creation of final reports (merging and saving as PDF) — Creation of Internal verification document (for the deliverables) and “package” for a Donor containing the cover page, internal verification report, internal evaluation report and respective deliverable — In communication with activity coordinator, responsible for the respective deliverable, completing a cover page, and merging it with Internal verification report, Internal evaluation report and deliverable — Contribution to drafting the PQR — Administration of PQA Matrix — Organization of project PQA Facility folder and sub-folders, and keeping of files
Impact Assessment	— Contributing to drafting the ToR for independent consultant

Quality Team members

Quality Team (QT) members have a pivotal role in implementation of the PQA Facility in the AGRI-MOCKS project. They are the link between the project PQA Facility, PPE and PQA Administrator on one side, and partner institutions (QT members come from) on the other side.

In the inception stage, QT members will participate in a group meeting (2-3 partner institutions’ designated QT members) organized by PPE and PQA Administrator to discuss the implementation arrangements of the PQA Facility and discuss the roles and responsibilities of QT members and their institutions and colleagues in the area of M&E.

The composition of the Quality Team you may see in the PQA Matrix, on *tab 2: Contact details*.

Reminder:

In implementation of the Green Pillars, the **QT members have the following duties:**

- **Evaluation of project deliverables** (analysis of respective result and filling in the form A5.1)
- **Evaluation of e-internship batch** which was coordinated by his/her institution (adapting and sending out the form A6.1 to e-internship participants, analysis of findings and filling in the form B6.2)

- **Evaluation of events** (i.e. printing the 4.1 questionnaire or distributing the link for A4.1 e-questionnaire, drafting of event evaluation report in form B4.1)
- **Sending the Event evaluation report to:** PQA Administrator, PPM, PSC members, IPMs and WP coordinator
- **Monitoring of CDE quality** (unless there is a dedicated person in each partner organization responsible for CDE)
- **To liaise with their Institutional Project Managers** and make sure that they take active part in monitoring the quality of management,
- **Making sure that IPMs are informed** with available reports and findings about the quality of work packages, quality of events, quality of results, quality of CDE, and of any risk existing or unfolding in the project.

Project Steering Committee members & Institutional Project Managers

Project Steering Committee (PSC) members have an important role in approving the quality of results — the project aspect, which is most exposed to the eyes of the public, stakeholders, third parties, and the Donor. Institutional Project Managers (IPMs) are important actors in applying corrective measures decided by the PSC members.

In PQA Facility, they have **2 important functions**:

- a) **to be informed**, and
- b) **to take/execute decisions**.

Being informed about the quality of different aspects of execution of a project (and a Grant Agreement), is a precondition for preventive acting /intervention and imposing corrective measures to manage potential or actual risks. This is also a necessary precondition for partner institutions to be able to protect themselves from the risk of recovering the funds to the Donor in case of poor and unsatisfactory implementation.

Receiving information from PPE/PQA Administrator about the quality of management, the quality of CDE, the quality of WPs, events and deliverables, will take place periodically by email. The emails sent by PQA Administrator to PSC members/IPMs will contain one out of two subject lines:

either: *AGRI-MOCKS / For information / PQA reports / date,*

or: *AGRI-MOCKS / For action / PQA reports / date.*

The difference between the two is about minor and major deviations identified by PQA reports. Assessment of what is major and what is minor deviation will be made by PPE.

The emails will cover all the new M&E reports by the indicated date (which were not shared with PSC members/IPMs before). All M&E reports should be available at HSWT WB Moodle, and emails should include only links to the new reports, and in the e-mail-body present a summary of each report with critical issues that need attention or require action of PSC members and/or IPMs.

In terms of the PQA Facility, taking decisions by PSC refers to conducting the Internal verification (IV) procedure for respective project deliverable. For more details about this procedure and the expected role of the PSC members, see: *The Green Pillars* chapter, section 2.5.2 *Implementation: internal verification of Outputs/deliverables/results*.

PSC members/IPMs are also expected to take part in the management quality reviews. For more details see: *The Green Pillars* chapter, section 2.1 *Implementation: monitoring of the quality of management*.

The composition of the Project Steering Committee as well as who are partner IPMs, you may see in the PQA Matrix, on *tab 2: Contact details*.

Reminder:

In implementation of the Green Pillars, the **PSC members have the following duties:**

- Take part in a **baseline and interim reviews of the quality of management**
- **Internal verification** of project results
- **Be informed about, and take corrective measures** in relation to the quality of management, WPs, events, deliverables, and CDE, and in relation to any risk existing or unfolding in the project.

In implementation of the Green Pillars, the **IPMs have the following duties:**

- Take part in a **baseline and interim reviews of the quality of management**
- Take part in **baseline review of CDE quality** (unless there is a dedicated person in each partner organization responsible for CDE)
- **Be informed about the quality** of WPs, management, events, deliverables, e-internship batches, CDE, and of any risk existing or unfolding in the project.

CDE Coordinator

CDE coordinator has an important role in assessing the quality of the CDE component. In most projects, CDE is a separate component based on a CDE Plan or Strategy and coordinated by a dedicated staff member. In project inception phase, the person responsible for CDE is expected to develop appropriate CDE tools, such as *Administration Manual for social network accounts*

(D1.2) for data collection, reporting and evidence. Thus, the CDE coordinator has central role in implementation and administration of the CDE Plan, processes and evidence.

The CDE coordinator is expected to participate in CDE quality surveys and provide honest and detailed insight into the CDE implementation.

Reminder:

In implementation of the Green Pillars, the **CDE coordinator** has the following duties:

- Take part in a **baseline and interim reviews of the quality of CDE**

Members of the work package teams

The members of WP teams have a role in quality reviews of WPs. Their role is to honestly fill in the questionnaire and provide insights from activities related to the implementation of WPs that will help the team to make necessary improvements. The composition of the WP teams you may see in the *PQA Matrix, tab 2: Contact details*.

Reminder:

In implementation of the Green Pillars, the **members of the WPs and task forces** have the following duties:

- Take part in a **the reviews of the quality of their respective WP(s)**

THE GREEN PILLARS: PROCESSES

In context of PQA Facility, processes refer to M&E activities needed to be done at different stages of project implementation. All PQA processes are envisaged to take place in 1 of 3 stages. There are **3 stages in implementation of PQA Facility**:

1. Inception
2. Implementation
3. Impact Assessment

1.1 Inception: creation

Creation (adaptation & optimization) of PQA Facility Implementation Toolkit, PQA Matrix, and instruments.

1.2 Inception: training of partner staff

The training of partner staff about the PQA Facility Implementation and how to take part in, and use the PQA Facility.

1.3 Inception: group meetings with partner institutions

Group meetings with partner institutions about their expected roles and contributions in implementation of PQA Facility, and how to take part in, and use the PQA Facility.

Reminder:

To complete inception stage, the following **outputs need to be prepared, and outcomes achieved**:

- ✓ Created (adapted & optimized) PQA Facility Implementation Toolkit
- ✓ Created (adapted & optimized) PQA Matrix
- ✓ Created (adapted & optimized) PQA Instruments (incl. e-questionnaires)
- ✓ Designed (adapted & optimized) PQA Facility Implementation Training and created handouts
- ✓ Project team created and PQA responsibilities agreed

- ✓ Project staff trained about implementation of PQA Facility and their expected roles in this mechanism
- ✓ 9Group meetings held with 2-3 partner institutions to discuss their expected roles and contributions to PQA Facility implementation.

2.1 Implementation: monitoring of the quality of management

The purpose of the management quality reviews is to ensure that actual management arrangements are complete and clear, inclusive, effective, and approved by all partners. The monitoring activities should take place at the beginning of the project, and then once per year.

The baseline review of the quality of management is a fact-finding monitoring activity aimed at identifying if all preparatory management activities were completed with success in the inception phase. These activities may include creating the implementation package, establishing the project teams, signing the partnership agreements, adopting the decision making and conflict resolution mechanisms. **The interim review** of the quality of management is an attitude analysis activity aimed at identifying the attitudes of the PSC members, IPMs and PPM about the critical aspects of the management of the project. The interim reviews should take place once per year as planned out in the PQA gantt chart.

Both the baseline review and interim reviews of the quality of management are conducted using e-questionnaires to be completed by the PSC members, IPMs & PPM. The questionnaire is not anonymous.

When drafting new monitoring reports, PPE will investigate to what extent were the recommendations from the last report addressed by those responsible for action. Monitoring reports should be distributed to IPMs and PSC members.

Ad hoc option: critical management risk review. In case of a significant risk unfolding around management and administration of the project, the PPE may draft an ad-hoc instrument to address the risk, provide facts, views, assessments and recommendations for action and mitigation of the risk.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A1.1, A1.2, B1.1, B1.2.

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A1.1	— PPM	B1.1	— PPM

	— IPMs — PSC members		— IPMs — PSC members
A1.2	— PPM — IPMs — PSC members	B1.2	— PPM — IPMs — PSC members

2.2 Implementation: monitoring of the quality of communication, dissemination and exploitation (CDE)

The purpose of the quality reviews of CDE is to assess the quality of implementation of CDE activities, identify potential risks and room for improvement. CDE will be monitored in 2 phases: during the **inception phase** a Baseline CDE quality review will be conducted to assess whether necessary preconditions were met for effective public communication. This review will be done through a survey of IPMs and CDE Coordinator.

The second phase comprises of monitoring activities of CDE, involving only the CDE Coordinator as a respondent to questionnaire surveys within interim CDE quality reviews. The purpose of the interim CDE quality reviews is to provide periodical insight into the field of implementation of the CDE Plan, and to identify any significant risk or challenge requiring attention of the PSC, IPMs or entire project team. The Interim reviews will be done annually, in the middle or second half of the year.

Ad hoc option: critical CDE risk review. In case of a significant risk unfolding in the CDE field, the PPE may draft an ad-hoc instrument to address the risk, provide facts, views, assessments and recommendations for action and mitigation of the risk.

Monitoring reports of CDE will be made available to PPM, IPMs, CDE Coordinator and PSC members.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A2.1, A2.2, B2.1, B2.2.

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A2.1	— IPMs — CDE Coordinator	B2.1	— PPM — IPMs — PSC members — CDE Coordinator

A2.2	— CDE Coordinator	B2.2	— PPM — IPMs — PSC members — CDE Coordinator
------	-------------------	------	---

2.3 Implementation: monitoring of work packages

The purpose of this procedure is to understand the perceptions and observations of team members about WP implementation, and to identify issues and risks that need to be addressed in a timely manner.

The reviews should take place two times during the lifetime of a WP. First review should be taken in the first half of the implementation period, and second review in the second half. The reviews of the quality of WP are conducted using e-questionnaires to be completed by the WP team members. The questionnaire is anonymous.

When drafting new monitoring reports, PPE will investigate to what extent were the **recommendations from the last report** addressed by those responsible for action. Monitoring reports will be distributed to IPMs, WP coordinator and PSC members.

Ad hoc option: critical WP risk review. In case of a significant risk unfolding around the WP, the PPE may draft an ad-hoc instrument to address the risk, provide facts, views, assessments and recommendations for action and mitigation of the risk.

Monitoring reports of WPs will be made available to PPM, IPMs, WP coordinators and PSC members.

In order to avoid an overlap, the WP4 and WP5 will not be evaluated using the work package monitoring procedure.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A3.1, B3.1

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A3.1	— Team members involved in WP	B3.1	— PQA Administrator — IPMs — PPM

			— WP Coordinator — PSC members
--	--	--	-----------------------------------

2.4 Implementation: evaluation of events

Purpose of evaluation of events is to gain the insight into participants' satisfaction with the quality of the event, especially with regards to the relevance of content, presenters and their approach, practical arrangements and working environment.

Prior to the event, QT member from the partner institution organizing the event will create an e-questionnaire for evaluation of that event, using the A4.1 questionnaire, or will prepare hard copies. The questionnaire is anonymous. After the questionnaires are completed, the QT member will create an evaluation report using B4.1 questionnaire. The draft *Event evaluation report* will be delivered to PQA Administrator for review.

The PQA Administrator distributes the finalized event evaluation report to IPMs, PSC members, and WP coordinator.

Important aspect of **optimization when it comes to the events** is which event should be evaluated and which should not? Normally subject of evaluation are events which host project target groups or participants that come outside the project consortium. Events are organized when organizers are convinced that this mode of interaction, communication, dissemination or exploitation is the most appropriate form of reaching out to target groups, making short-term impact or achieving any other benefit for the project. Thus evaluation of the event is a way to inspect whether the expected short-term impact is achieved through the respective event. This is also the way to test the relevance of topics, the presenters and lecturers, the mode of delivery, and learn what and how to improve for the sake of future similar events. Internal meetings of the project staff, and similar "events" are not subject of evaluation as any necessity for improvement may be communicated in more effective way (through a directly and open communication) and less effort-consuming and time-consuming way.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A4.1, B4.1

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A4.1	— Event participants	B4.1	— PQA Administrator — IPMs — PPM

			— WP Coordinator
			— PSC members

2.5.1 Implementation: evaluation of deliverables

This procedure is one of the most important aspects of the project quality architecture, given that donors pay most attention to the deliverables, and many donors, such as EU Erasmus+ or Horizon Program have in place a formal procedure of approving/accepting the results, or in case of poor quality — rejecting the results. The **purpose of evaluation** of deliverables is to examine the quality, relevance and level of completion of the project results before they are submitted to the Donor for assessment and approval.

This procedure is two-folded, and together with internal verification procedure, forms a 2-stage procedure of quality assurance of results. At the first stage, internal evaluation is done by the QT members and PPE. At the second stage, the result is undergoing internal verification procedure at the PSC.

The first-stage internal evaluation should be initiated when a pre-final version of the deliverable is completed, and before it is published. A team leader responsible for the creation of a deliverable should inform PPE when the deliverable is ready for internal evaluation. Once informed, the PQA Administrator shall send the e-questionnaire A5.1 together with the link to the respective deliverable to QT members for evaluation over the next (up to) 5 days. The questionnaire is anonymous. At the same time, the PPE will use the form A5.2 and carry out internal assessment of the quality of the respective deliverable. In the scope of PPE quality assessment, (s)he will analyze the alignment of the deliverable with its description in the Grant Agreement or in project proposal, and the level of accomplishment of the respective indicators. This procedure combines fact-finding and descriptive assessment approaches. Once the A5.1 is completed by QT members, PPE will analyze data from A5.1 and A5.2 and draft *Deliverable evaluation report* — version 1.0 (using the form B5.2). In case any significant flaw was identified in the Report, it will be returned to the team leader responsible for the deliverable to make improvements. After the new version of the result is submitted to PPE, (s)he will again review the quality (using the A5.2 form), and create a new *Deliverable evaluation report* (#2). PPE will merge both evaluation reports (#1 and #2) into a single document and send it back to the team leader responsible for the respective deliverable. The PQA Administrator is responsible for submitting the deliverable, together with the evaluation report to the Project Steering Committee for internal verification (2nd stage).

In total, this first-stage procedure may take between 2 and 4 weeks before the deliverable is submitted to the PSC for internal verification.

Iterations. As indicated in section above, after the initial evaluation and set of recommendations (using questionnaire forms A5.1, A5.2, and reporting form B5.1), the PPE will repeat internal evaluation only once more (using questionnaire form A5.2, and reporting form B5.1), without involving the QT members in the repetition evaluation (questionnaire form A5.1 shall not be used in a repetition evaluation).

Exceptions in internal evaluation of deliverables. In exceptional cases only the PPE will carry out evaluation of the limited number of deliverables (exception #1). In exceptional cases limited number of deliverables will skip the first stage (exception #2), and only be subject to internal verification in the second stage of the quality assurance of deliverables.

Exception #1: due to the optimization of an effort needed for implementation of PQA Facility, a limited number of deliverables (training and conference reports) will be evaluated only by the PPE, with no involvement of the QT members. In these exceptional cases, the PPE will be using only questionnaire form A5.2, and reporting form B5.1. In AGRI-MOCKS project, this exception refers to the following deliverables: D2.1, D2.7—D2.8, D3.1, D4.6.

The reason for this exception apart from the optimization of the workload, is a technical character of a limited number of deliverables, which doesn't require involvement of a multiple alternative views and assessment styles in creating the relevant, coherent, sustainable and evidence-based assessment reports for these deliverables.

Exception #2: internal evaluation procedure is reduced to the internal verification of limited number of deliverables (the second stage of the quality assurance procedure for deliverables). This exception applies only on quality assurance reports created by the QT, such as the progress quality reports (#1 and #2) and Impact Assessment report. The reason for this exception is the fact that authors of these deliverables which are subject of exception are the same as those responsible for the internal evaluation of these deliverables within the first stage of quality assurance procedure.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A5.1, A5.2, B5.1.

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A5.1	— QT members	B5.1	— PSC members — IPMs — PPM — WP coordinator (if any)

A5.2	— PPE		— WP team members (if any)
------	-------	--	----------------------------

2.5.2 Implementation: internal verification of deliverables

Internal verification (IV) is a second stage in quality assurance arrangement for the project deliverables. The purpose of the second stage is to ensure that project deliverables are credibly assessed and approved by the authorized persons representing project partners, prior to submitting the results to the donor for approval.

It starts after the PSC received from PQA Administrator the *Deliverable evaluation report(s)* with links to the respective results, e-mail request for internal verification of the deliverable(s) and information if any deadline is set (for example deadline for submission of deliverable to the donor, or last day of the project, or deadline for submitting the project report to the donor, etc.). Shortly after, the PSC will set a date when all PSC members should send their votes VERIFIED or BLOCKED (with justification and request for improvement). In case of any BLOCK, PSC will internally decide whether to INTERNALLY PARTLY VERIFY the quality of deliverable (with a table presenting the votes from each PSC members), or to internally reject the deliverable and send it back to the respective team leader responsible for the deliverable.

By voting for the option VERIFIED, the PSC members gave their consent for the deliverable to be shared with the donor for quality assessment and approval, and by this, they are taking full responsibility for the outcome of such assessment.

How to treat the BLOCK option? If any PSC member votes for the BLOCK option, (s)he is rejecting the deliverable because of inferior quality. The BLOCK also means that PSC member perceives a higher risk from result being rejected or assessed as poor by the donor, which may lead to rejecting or reducing the budget approved for that deliverable. In case of multiple BLOCKS, the deliverable will not be internally verified, and it will be rejected. In case of 1 or 2 BLOCKS, the PSC may decide to partly internally verify the deliverable acknowledging the existing BLOCKS. In this case, if the unwanted outcome of budget reduction for the respective deliverable or associated WP come true, in line with provisions of the Partnership Agreement (consult the section: *Overlap and alignment with other project documents* under *The White Pillar: Resources* chapter), only those institutions that voted to VERIFY the deliverable should solidary bare the amount of reduction.

Preparing the “package” for the Donor. Once the internal verification procedure is finalized, the PQA Administrator will create the “package” for the Donor. The “package” refers to a single (merged) PDF document (or any other appropriate form) containing the following 4 pieces:

- Cover page (form B5.3),

- Internal verification report(s) (form B5.2),
- Internal evaluation report(s) (form B5.1),
- Deliverable.

These documents should be merged in the presented order, but in communication with Donor, you may opt for a different order, where the cover page would be initial document, and would be followed by a deliverable, than internal verification report and finally the internal evaluation report.

The merged single document starts with **the cover page** (form B5.3), a document summarizing the number and title of deliverable, WP, structure, dissemination level and revision history.

Tracking the quality improvement. The internal evaluation report and internal verification report contained in "the package" doesn't refer only to an initial evaluation/verification report, but also to any repetition evaluation or verification report(s) created after the recommended improvements were introduced. Thus, its document should contain the initial reports with findings and recommendations, and repetition reports (if any) that should confirm recommendations from the previous report were introduced in appropriate way, or were ignored. The same refers the internal verification reports - initial, and if any, repetition report.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: B5.2, B5.3.

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
B5.3	— PQA Administrator	B5.1, B5.2, B5.3	— PSC members — IPMs — PPM — WP coordinator (if any) — WP team members (if any)

2.6 Implementation: evaluation of e-internship programs

As part of the adaptation of the PQA Facility to the specific structure and needs of the AGRI-MOCKS project, the Green Pillar was extended for a set of M&E instruments for the quality assurance of the e-internships, as major and most important products of the AGRI-MOCKS

project, with a direct impact on the specific objectives. Thus the evaluation of the e-internships fall under the most important M&E procedures in the project.

In total, 4 editions encompassing 8 batches of e-internships are envisaged by the proposal. Four batches of e-internship will be organized for students, and another 4 for youth workers. Each edition will encompass 2 batches, one for students, and second one for the youth workers. The first edition should be executed in spring 2026, the second is expected in the fall 2026, the third in spring 2027, and the fourth edition in the fall 2027. In total 625 participants (students and youth workers) should take part in each edition (2 batches together).

The roles. The evaluation will be carried out in the last week of the e-internship. A partner institution coordinating implementation of a batch and having access to the email addresses of all participants enrolled in a batch, and a quality team members from this institution, will be responsible to distribute a link and information to the participants that evaluation of an e-internship has been initiated, as well as for drafting the evaluation report about the e-internship batch.

The report shall be distributed to the WP3 coordinator to compile it with other reports. The batch evaluation reports should also be distributed to all IPMs for information and follow up action.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A7.1, B7.2.

Instrument for completion:	Instrument to be completed by:	Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
A7.1	— E-internship participants	B7.1	— PPM — IPMs — PSC members — WP3 coordinators
B7.1	— QT members from institutions coordinating the batch of e-internship which is being evaluated		

2.7 Implementation: administration of PQA Matrix

Administration of PQA Matrix refers to periodical modification of data in tabs 2, 3 and 4 of the Excel document. More frequent modifications are expected in tab 4 — gantt chart of M&E

activities. These modifications should be inserted after every M&E activity. More details about PQA Matrix can be found in chapter *The White Pillar: Resources*.

2.8 Implementation: The Progress Quality Review(s)

At the end of each project year, the PPE should prepare the Progress Quality Report (PQR) summarizing the implementation and quality aspects from the previous year. **The purpose** of this review is to assess the scope and quality of implemented activities and project objectives and deliverables achieved up to date, and provide recommendations for the next period.

In particular, the PQR should **elaborate on the level of achieved project objectives**, measures through the accomplishment of objective-related indicators and achieved objective-related deliverables.

The review should commence in the last month of the project year and should be finalized by the end of the project year. The activity should encompass the review of all M&E reports, accomplishment of project indicators from the PQA Matrix, completion of questionnaire form A7.1 by the PPE, and analysis of the level of achievement of project objectives. In template reporting form B7.1, the PPE should also present recommendations for the next project year.

The report has proposed structure (template reporting form A7.1). It should have the following 4 parts:

Part of report	What should it contain?
1) Summary	Present in cca. 1 page the summary of the achieved progress and quality of project implementation. Elaborate the level of accomplishment of project results and indicators.
2) Implementation of the PQA Facility to date	Present in up to 2 pages the implementation of the PQA Facility to date, and add to this additional 5+ PDF pages of the latest version of the PQA Matrix (each tab in excel document saves as a PDF document, merged into a single PDF file).
3) Findings	Present the M&E findings as per structure suggested in template reporting form B7.1.
4) Recommendations	Present key conclusions and recommendations for the next project year.

The form is to be distributed to Principal Project Manager, IPMs, PSC members, and coordinators of work packages.

Reminder:

Instruments to be used: A7.1, B7.1.

Report for information:	Report to be sent to:
B6.1	— PPM — PSC members — IPMs — WP coordinators

3. Impact assessment

Impact assessments or external project evaluations are independent reviews of the overall project performance aimed at identifying and assessing the level of expected change created through the project intervention. **Purpose** of the impact assessment is to provide evidence of change, but also to provide understanding of what worked and what did not work in the project and why.

The Impact Assessment (or external evaluation of the project) should elaborate on the **level of accomplishment of project objectives** (overall and specific) and provide exact data on the level of accomplishment of project indicators associated with the objectives.

The Impact assessment should be based on the OECD DAC principles for evaluating developmental activities.¹ Following these standards, the Impact assessment focuses on the following project (interrelated) aspects:

- **Relevance: is the intervention doing the right things?**
i.e. project alignment with the final beneficiaries and target groups needs; specific country based contexts in which the project is carried out; priorities and politics of partner institutions as well as that of donor agencies, existing regional and global trends in relevant sectors.
- **Coherence: how well does the intervention fit?**
i.e. the compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector or institution.
- **Effectiveness: is the intervention achieving its objectives?**
i.e. the degree in which specific project objectives are reached. Effectiveness represents a qualitative measurement of immediate and visible change that the project brought about with reference to the specified target groups (beneficiaries) and which is a direct result of the implementation of the project activities, whereby both intangible and tangible project outcomes are taken into account.

¹ DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Quality Standards for Development Evaluation. OECD 2010
<http://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf>

- **Efficiency: how well are resources being used?**
i.e. degree to which the project envisaged activities are successfully carried out, especially with regards to partnership quality, readiness of the project team to follow the set objectives, and overcoming the obstacles faced in order to be accountable to their tasks delivery.
- **Impact: what difference does the intervention make?**
i.e. wider and long term effects produced as a result of project developmental activities, be it positive or negative, direct or indirect, emerging intentionally or accidentally. In a broader sense, the project impact is assessed as a strategic change emerged from the developmental action and within the defined socio-economic and political context. It showcases the level of fulfillment of the overall project objective.
- **Sustainability & replication: will the benefits last?**
i.e. probability that positive changes introduced as a result of project implementation will be continuously available also after the project closure, The key aspect of this dimension is related to the knowledge transfer among key stakeholders, and its access to the existing and incoming stakeholders. Replication potential is dependent on sustainability framework set, and shall take the form of the assessment of both structural and soft measures possibilities to be replicated in communities outside the beneficiary ones.

Based on the assessment findings under each of the aforementioned project implementation aspect, **good practices and lessons learnt** shall be formed in order to support future initiatives in the field in terms of scope, structure and/or objectives.

With respect to desk analysis of the documentation, the Impact assessment is a result of detailed review of the available written project documents that were developed by the partners in the consortium (as single institutional products or jointly developed documents). The documentations to be reviewed and analyzed include the following:

- Initial project proposal (detailed project description, LFM, workplan and the initial project budget)
- Interim narrative and financial report(s)
- Project created tangible and intangible outputs / results / deliverables
- QA reports created within the PQA Facility
- Other relevant documents, e.g. activity reports from seminars, partnership agreements, legal documents, etc.
- Monitoring visits reports prepared by the Donor.

When? In second half of project life-cycle, the PPE is expected to draft the ToR for independent impact assessment. The assessment shall be conducted at the end of project implementation. The implementation of this activity may continue and finish after the end date of the project implementation (in most cases 1-2 months after the end date). This is normally

allowed by the Donors only for this specific result/deliverable. However, do not forget to notify the Donor about this arrangement before the arrangement starts.

Optimization. In most projects the Impact assessment or external evaluation reports are also considered project results/deliverables. In PQA Facility this deliverable is normally not subject to the 2-staged project evaluation, as it is expected that this activity will be carried out in close collaboration with the PPE.

Completed by:	
Institution:	

- Page 38 of 57

10. **The coordination method** — is it agreed? In the comment section you may comment it is clear, inclusive, transparent and effective.

• Yes • No • Partly

Comment: _____

11. **The institutional project teams** are they formed at all partner institutions? In the comment section you may comment about composition of institutional project team at your institution.

• Yes • No • Partly

Comment: _____

12. **The shared project disc** — is it dedicated and made available to all partners? In the comment section you may comment is it user friendly.

• Yes • No • Partly

Comment: _____

13. Only for Principal Project Manager: Please briefly present how the **collection and keeping of implementation (technical) documents, deliverables and financial documents** are organized? _____

B1.1 — Template reporting form for a baseline review of the quality of management

BASELINE REVIEW REPORT OF THE QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT

Date:		Prepared by:	
-------	--	--------------	--

A INTRODUCTION

The Baseline review of the quality of management was carried out in the period from ____ to _____. The purpose of this procedure was to identify if all pre-conditions for effective management of the project are met in sufficient scope. This procedure combined fact-finding and attitude survey questions. The form was completed by _____ out of ____ respondents, accounting for ____ %. The report was created by: _____.

B FINDINGS

1. The Kick-off meeting was held... _____

2. The Partnership agreement was signed... _____

3. The Implementation package was adopted... _____

4. The project teams... _____

5. The level of accomplishment of indicator(s) for Management criterion: _____

Domain	Indicator number and title	Target value	Current value
MNG	Number of project participants and structures constituted (PSC, QA team, expert WG teams, etc.)	No value set	---

6. The highest project managing and decision-making body... _____
7. Conflict resolution... _____
8. Coordination... _____
9. The Institutional project teams... _____
10. The shared project disc... _____
11. The collection and keeping of implementation (technical) documents, deliverables, and financial documents... _____

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

Completed by:	
Institution:	

1. If any recommendation was addressed to you and your institution in the previous report, please explain how you/your institution follow-up on this (if relevant): _____
2. Project management arrangements, rules and procedures that partners and team members need to follow and comply with are clear and user-friendly. You may add more details about your choice in the comment below.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
3. The method/style in which this project and consortium is being managed is appropriate, inclusive, transparent and effective.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
4. Information and instructions shared in the project are relevant, clear and distributed on time.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
5. Project-related decision-making is democratic, transparent and effective.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
6. Project meetings take place on regular basis, as frequently as needed, with regular attendance of expected participants. In the comment section you may provide details if you disagree with this statement or any part of the statement.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
7. The involvement of my institution in project-related decision-making processes is appropriate.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
8. Crisis management and conflict-resolution management are appropriate, time-bound, effective and fair.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
9. The coordination method is appropriate, inclusive, and effective.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
10. The method of the collection and keeping of implementation (technical) documents, deliverables and financial documents is appropriate and user-friendly.
▪ Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
Comment: _____
11. The involvement and contribution of my institution in narrative and financial reporting related to project implementation is appropriate.

• Yes • No • Partly

Comment: _____

12. The involvement and contribution of the lead institution and partner institutions in narrative and financial reporting related to project implementation is appropriate.

• Yes • No • Partly

Comment: _____

B1.2 — Template reporting form for an interim review of the quality of management

INTERIM REVIEW REPORT OF THE QUALITY OF MANAGEMENT #N

Date:		Prepared by:	
-------	--	--------------	--

A INTRODUCTION

The interim review #___ of the quality of management was carried out in the period from _____ to _____. The purpose of this survey was to identify the attitudes of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) members, Institutional Project Managers (IPMs) and Principal Project Manager (PPM) about the critical aspects of the management of the project. This was an attitudinal survey. The questionnaire was completed by ___ out of ___ respondents, accounting for ___ %.

B FINDINGS

1. The previous report recommendations for follow-up efforts included (if relevant): _____

2. The project management arrangements, rules and procedures... _____

3. The method/style this project and consortium are being managed is appropriate, inclusive, transparent and effective... _____

4. The information and instructions shared in the project are relevant, clear and distributed on time ... ____

5. The Project-related decision-making is democratic, transparent and effective ... _____

6. Frequency of the meetings.... _____

Domain	Indicator number and title	Target value	Current value
MNG	Number of meetings/events and participants, frequency of attendance of each institution	No value set	---

7. The involvement of my institution in project-related decision-making processes is appropriate ... ____

8. Crisis management and conflict-resolution management are appropriate, time-bound, effective and fair... _____

9. The Coordination method is appropriate, inclusive, and effective ... _____

10. The method of collection and keeping of implementation (technical) documents, deliverables and financial documents is appropriate and user-friendly... _____

11. The involvement and contribution of my institution in narrative and financial reporting related to project implementation is appropriate... _____

12. The involvement and contribution of the lead institution and partner institutions in narrative and financial reporting related to project implementation is appropriate... _____

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION

A2.2 — Template questionnaire form for an interim review of the quality of CDE

1. If any recommendation was addressed to you and your institution in the previous report, please explain how did you/your institution follow-up on this (if relevant): _____
2. Please assess the quality of implementation of CDE Plan in the previous period, is it in line with the work plan, is contribution of partner institution as expected? _____
3. In the previous period, up to date, what were the major CDE objectives, efforts and who were the major target groups? _____
4. Please elaborate on the major challenges in relation to CDE: _____
5. Please indicate any significant risk related to communication and dissemination, you have identified, requiring attention of the project team: _____
6. Please indicate the number of internal dissemination activities organized in the reporting period, and by who: _____
7. Please indicate the number of staff, students and other stakeholders who got informed about the project and its results in the reporting period: _____
8. Please indicate the number and type of media materials disbursed in the reporting period through the internet and press, press releases, TV and radio: _____

B2.2 — Template reporting form for an interim review of the quality of CDE

INTERIM REVIEW REPORT OF THE QUALITY OF CDE #N

Date:		Prepared by:	
-------	--	--------------	--

A INTRODUCTION

The interim review of the CDE quality was carried out in the period from _____ to _____. The purpose of this procedure was to assess the quality of implementation of CDE activities and identify potential risks and room for improvement. This was an attitudinal survey. The questionnaire was completed by CDE officer.

B FACTS

1. The previous report recommendations for follow-up efforts included (if relevant): _____
2. The quality of implementation of CDE Plan in the previous period... _____
3. In the previous period, the major CDE objectives, and efforts... _____
4. The major challenges and significant risks related to CDE: _____
5. Fulfillment of CDE indicators... _____

Domain	Indicator number and title	Target Value	Current value
CDE	Number of internal dissemination activities (ToT, etc.)	No value set	---
CDE	Number of staff and students and other stakeholders who get informed about the project and its results	No value set	---
CDE	Number/type of media materials disbursed internet and press articles, press releases, TV and radio	No value set	---

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

WP number and title:	
----------------------	--

1. If any recommendation was addressed to you and your institution in the previous report, please explain how you/your institution follow-up on this (if relevant): _____
2. The WP is being implemented according to the work plan, and envisaged distribution of roles and tasks.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
3. Are there any modifications or deviations introduced in the WP work plan? In the comment the reasons and elaborate about those modifications or deviations.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
4. Are there any significant delays or failures in the WP implementation so far? In the comment section you may comment on the reasons for delays and what corrective measures were taken or are planned.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
5. The WP strategy and working method are appropriate and effective.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
6. Information distribution and instructions within the WP are clear and timely.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
7. Teamwork and inclusion are encouraged/practiced in the WP implementation.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
8. Project meetings within your WP are taking place on regular basis, as frequently as needed, with regular attendance of expected participants. In the comment section you may provide details if you disagree with this statement or any part of the statement.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
9. Partner institutions' involvement and contribution to the WP implementation is appropriate, and they all actively participate.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
10. The progress made so far in WP indicates that the expected results are likely to be produced.
• Yes • No • Partly
Comment: _____
11. Please elaborate about identified risks that may jeopardize the WP implementation and production of results and require action:

B3.1 — Template reporting form for WP quality review

INTERIM REVIEW REPORT OF THE QUALITY OF WORK PACKAGES

WP number and title:	
Date:	
Prepared by:	

A INTRODUCTION

The WPs interim evaluation was carried out in the period from __to__. The purpose of this procedure was to examine the perceptions and observations of team members about WP implementation and identify issues and risks that need to be addressed in a timely manner. This was an attitudinal survey. The questionnaire was completed by __out of __ team members, accounting for __%.

B FINDINGS

1. Follow-up effort recommendations made in the previous report included (if relevant): _____
2. (If relevant) When it comes to the fulfillment of the WP-related indicator(s), ... _____

Domain	Indicator number and title	Target value	Current Value
WP	Number of meetings/events and participants, frequency of attendance of each institution	No value set	---

3. The WP is being implemented... _____
4. Modifications or deviations introduced in the WP work plan... _____
5. Delays or failures in WP implementation... _____
6. The WP strategy and the work method... _____
7. The Information distribution and instructions within WP... _____
8. Teamwork and inclusion in the WP... _____
9. When it comes to partner involvement in and contribution to the WP implementation, ... _____
10. The progress made so far in WP... _____
11. Major risks identified in WP implementation... _____

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A4.1 — Template questionnaire form for evaluation of an event

Event title:	
Date and venue:	
Organizer:	

1. Gender
 - Male ▪ Female ▪ Other
2. Participation category
 - XX ▪ YY ▪ ZZ ...
3. The event content was relevant and useful.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____
4. The facilitator/trainer/lecturer was well prepared and knowledgeable about the topic.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____
5. The facilitator/trainer/lecturer(s) approach(es) was(were) appropriate.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____
6. The event duration was appropriate, and training dynamics was effective to produce new/expected learning outcomes.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____
7. The event space and working conditions were appropriate.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____
8. What I liked the most about the event was: _____
9. What I liked the least about the event was: _____
10. The event fulfilled my expectations, and I would recommend it to people I know might be interested.
 - Yes ▪ No ▪ Partly
 Comment: _____

B4.1 — Template reporting form for evaluation of an event

EVENT EVALUATION REPORT

Event title:	
Date and venue:	
Organizer:	
Prepared by:	

A INTRODUCTION

Event evaluation survey was conducted at the end of event to assess the attitudes of participants about the quality of this event. This was an attitudinal survey. The questionnaire was completed by ____ out of ____ participants, accounting for ____%.

B FINDINGS

1. Gender distribution

% Male: % Female: % Other:

2. Categories of participants:

A) B) C) ...

3. The event content was... _____

4. The facilitator/trainer/lecturer was... _____

5. The facilitator/trainer/lecturer's approach was... _____

6. The event duration and dynamics were... _____

7. The event space and conditions were... _____

8. What participants liked the most about the event was: _____

9. What participants liked the least about the event was: _____

10. The event fulfilled expectations... _____

11. (*If relevant*) When it comes to the fulfillment of the result-related indicator(s), ... _____

Domain	Indicator number and title	Target value	Current value
E	Level of satisfaction of the teachers/students/ non-academics and management staff with activities taken part in/results obtained	No value set	---

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

A5.1 — Template questionnaire form #1 for evaluation of a deliverable — team members and stakeholders

Deliverable number and title:	
-------------------------------	--

1. The deliverable is relevant and likely to meet the needs of specific target groups.
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partly Comment: _____
2. Strong points of this deliverable are: _____
3. Weak points of this deliverable are: _____

A5.2 — Template questionnaire form #2 for evaluation of a deliverable — PPE

Deliverable number and title:	
-------------------------------	--

1. Please provide a short description of the deliverable: _____
2. Please provide the sources of verification (links, websites, interview with..., etc.): _____
3. Please indicate and elaborate on the level of accomplishment of indicator for this deliverable:

Domain	Indicator number and title (insert)	Target Value (insert)	Current Value (insert)
R	---	---	---

4. Where appropriate, please indicate if the Donor visibility rules (logo, disclaimer, etc.) have been respected in appropriate way.
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partly Comment: _____
5. Where appropriate, please indicate if the EU GDPR rules have been respected in appropriate way.
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partly Comment: _____
6. Strong points of this deliverable are: _____
7. Weak points of this deliverable are: _____

B5.1 — Template reporting form for evaluation of a deliverable

DELIVERABLE EVALUATION REPORT

Deliverable number and title:			
Date:		Prepared by:	

A INTRODUCTION

The evaluation of deliverable was carried out in the period from _ to__. The purpose of this procedure is to examine the quality, relevance and level of completion of a project deliverable. This evaluation combines fact-finding, descriptive assessment and attitudinal approaches. The form A5.1 was completed by ____ out of __respondents, accounting for ____ %.

B FINDINGS

1. A short description of the produced/achieved deliverable: _____

2. (If relevant) When it comes to the fulfillment of the respective indicator(s), ... _____

Domain	Indicator number and title (insert)	Target Value (insert)	Current Value (insert)
R	---	---	---

3. The sources of verification (links, websites, interview with..., etc.): _____

4. The Donor visibility rules (logo, disclaimer, etc.) have been respected in appropriate way... _____

5. The EU GDPR rules have been respected in appropriate way... _____

5. The previous report recommendations follow-up efforts included (if relevant): _____

6. Strong aspects of this result include: _____

7. Weak aspects of this result that should be improved include: _____

C CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

B5.2 — Template form for internal verification of a deliverable

INTERNAL VERIFICATION REPORT

Following the PQA Facility and two-stage quality assurance procedure* for the deliverable, the Project Steering Committee of the AGRI-MOCKS project, reference number 101193598, on (ADD DATE) carried out internal verification of the following deliverable:

(ADD NUMBER AND TITLE)

Following the procedure, the Steering Committee decided to (unanimously) internally VERIFY the deliverable (alternatively: to PARTLY INTERNALLY VERIFY or to INTERNALLY BLOCK the deliverable).

INTERNALLY VERIFIED



PARTLY INTERNALLY VERIFIED



INTERNALLY BLOCKED



#	PSC member	Institution	Vote	#	PSC member	Institution	Vote
1.	---	---	Green	6.	---	---	Green
2.	---	---	Green	7.	---	---	Green
3.	---	---	Green	8.	---	---	Red
4.	---	---	Red	9.	---	---	Red
5.	---	---	Red	10.	---	---	Red

* Two-stage quality assurance procedure for the deliverable refers to internal quality assurance procedure which is part of the PQA Facility. The procedure is implemented by the project consortium to ensure that project deliverables are credibly assessed and approved by the authorized persons representing project partners, prior to submitting the deliverables to a Donor for quality assessment and approval. The first stage of this procedure refers to a two-fold internal evaluation of the quality of deliverable, carried out by the Quality team on one side, and Principal Project Evaluator on the other. The Deliverable evaluation report, together with the deliverable, is to be delivered to the PSC members for the review and internal verification. By voting to internally verify the result, the PSC members are giving their consent for deliverable to be shared with the Donor for further assessment. By doing this, the PSC members are taking full responsibility for the outcome of such assessment.

B5.3 — Template form for presentation of deliverable subject to a 2-staged quality assurance procedure

COVER PAGE

Deliverable number and title				
Work Package				
Structure	Internal verification report	☐	Page:	
	Internal evaluation report	☐	Page:	
	Deliverable	☐	Page:	

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public Deliverable	☐
SEN	Limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement	☐
EU-Classified (i.e. CO)	Confidential	☐

Document Revision History		
Date	Version	Change
XX/XX/2025	V1.0	

A6.1 — Template questionnaire form for evaluation of an e-internship

N/A until February 2026.

B6.1 — e-internship evaluation report template form

N/A until February 2026.

A7.1 — Project objectives accomplishment form

Date:		Completed by:	
-------	--	---------------	--

1. Using the project results / deliverables evaluation report, elaborate the level of accomplishment of envisaged project results, and put them in relation to project objectives - which accomplished results contribute to which project objective and respective indicator. Elaborate on the level of accomplishment of the project objectives through the prism of accomplished results and indicators for the respective objectives: _____

2. Fill in the table below using the PQA Matrix (tab 5) to create first 3 columns, and M&E reports to provide data for the remaining 2 columns.

OBJECTIVE (OO/SO)	INDICATOR TITLE	TARGET VALUE	SOURCE	CURRENT VALUE

3. Present your recommendation in relation to the accomplishment of project results, indicators and objectives: _____

B7.1 — Template reporting form for Progress Quality Review

#(NUMBER) PROGRESS QUALITY REPORT

INTRODUCTION AND APPROACH

This report is an outcome of the progress quality review of implementation of the AGRI-MOCKS project reference number: 101193598, being implemented in the period from _____ until _____.

The report covers the period from _____ until _____. The purpose of this review is to assess the scope and quality of implemented activities and the level of accomplishment of project results and project objectives up to date. This review is a segment of the PQA Facility which is a quality assurance methodology used in (title) project.

The review was carried out in the period from _____ to _____ by the Principal Project Evaluator.

The review encompassed the following activities:

Data collection from the Principal Project Manager

Completing a *Project objectives accomplishment form*

Reviewing the *Reports of the quality of project management*

Reviewing the *Reports of the quality of CDE*

Reviewing the *Reports of the quality of work packages*

Reviewing the *Deliverable evaluation reports*

Reviewing the *E-Internship evaluation reports*
Reviewing the *Events evaluation reports*
Reviewing the other resources
Analysis and synthesis.

The report has 4 parts:

- 1) Summary
- 2) Implementation of the PQA Facility to date
- 3) Findings
- 4) Recommendations

Disclaimer: AGRI-MOCKS is funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Introduction and approach

- 1) Summary
- 2) Implementation of the PQA Facility to date
- 3) Findings
 - 3.1) Fulfillment of project objectives
 - 3.2) Reaching of project results and fulfillment of indicators
 - 3.3) Ghant Chart of M&E activities
 - 3.4) Quality of work packages
 - 3.5) Quality of deliverables
 - 3.6) Quality of e-internship programs and satisfaction of learners
 - 3.7) Quality of events
 - 3.8) Project management quality
 - 3.9) CDE quality
- 4) Recommendations

PROJECT INFO SHEET

Programme: ERASMUS-EDU-2024-VIRT-EXCH

Project title: " Mastering Opportunities-scouting, Career-guidance and Key-job Skills in Agriculture"

Acronym: AGRI-MOCKS

Project number: 101193598

Duration: 01 February 2025 - 31 January 2028

Coordinator: Anja Weber, HOCHSCHULE WEIHENSTEPHAN-TRIEDS DORF, DE

Cell/Viber N°:

e-mail:



Co-funded by the
European Union



INSTITUTION	ROLE	NAME	EMAIL	WhatsApp
PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE (WP #5 TEAM)				
HOCHSCHULE WEIHENSTEPHAN-TRIESDORF (HSWT)	Principal Project Manager	Anja WEBER		
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	Member	Yahya Adow IBRAHIM		
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA	Member	Corli WITTHUN		
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA	Member	Thembeni MAZAMISA		
HAMEEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU OY, FI	Member	Elija LAITINEN		
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER DE SAINT LOUIS, SN	Member	Anicet MANGA		
KUMASI INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE(KITA), GH	Member	Samuel OWUSU-TAKYI		
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY	Member	Yitna GEBREAB		
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET	Member	Getnet DADEBO		
BIZMETRICS	Member	Matthew ASH		
INSTITUTIONAL PROJECT MANAGERS				
HOCHSCHULE WEIHENSTEPHAN-TRIESDORF (HSWT)	Institutional Project Manager	Anja WEBER		
KUMASI INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE(KITA), GH				
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	Member	Dragana JOVANOVIC		
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA	Member	Regina Cornelia WITTHUN		
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET	Member	Getnet DADEBO		
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER DE SAINT LOUIS, SN	Member	Ousmane THIARE		
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY	Member	Yitna GEBREAB		
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA	Member	Thembeni MAZAMISA		
HAMEEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU OY, FI	Member	Eija LAITINEN		
BIZMETRICS (PTY) LTD, ZA	Member	Matthew ASH		
QUALITY TEAM				
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	Principal Project Evaluator	Marko STOJANOVIC		
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	PQA Administrator	Yahya Adow IBRAHIM		
HOCHSCHULE WEIHENSTEPHAN-TRIESDORF (HSWT)	Member	Anja WEBER		
KUMASI INSTITUTE OF TROPICAL AGRICULTURE(KITA), GH	Member	Damiene		
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA	Member	Corli WITTHUN		
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET	Member	Abrham Aberra		
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER DE SAINT LOUIS, SN	Member	Ousmane THIARE		
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY	Member	Anbes Tenaye		
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA	Member			
HAMEEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU OY, FI	Member			
BIZMETRICS (PTY) LTD, ZA	Member	Matthew ASH		
CDE TEAM (WP #4 TEAM)				
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE	Member	Yahya Adow Ibrahim		
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA	Member	Corli WITTHUN		
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY	Member	Tirusew TAYE		
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA	Member	Thembeni MAZAMISA		
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET	Member	Tsigereda MEKURIA		
UNIVERSITY OF THE FREE STATE, ZA	Member	Lynette JACOBS		
WP#1 TEAM				
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	Member	Dragana JOVANOVIC		
UNIVERSITE GASTON BERGER DE SAINT LOUIS, SN	Team Leader	Ousmane THIARE		
ENTREPRENEURSHIP DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE, ET	Team Leader	Getnet DADEBO		
WP#2 TEAM				
HAMEEN AMMATTIKORKEAKOULU OY, FI				
HAWASSA UNIVERSITY				
NICOSA YOUTH CAREER PROGRAMME NPC, ZA				
WESTERN BALKANS INSTITUTE (WEBIN)	Member	Dragana JOVANOVIC		
BIZMETRICS (PTY) LTD, ZA				
WP#3 TEAM				

[illegible]

[illegible]

Legend:

- Task completed
- Task set but not started yet
- Task incomplete / postponed

DOMAIN	INDICATOR	TARGET VALUE	TOOLS TO USE	CURRENT VALUE
Management	Number of project participants and structures constituted (PSC, QA team, experts WG teams, etc.)	No target value set	A1.1/B1.1	0
Management	Number of meetings/events and participants, frequency of attendance of each institution	No target value set	A1.2/B1.2 A3.1/B3.1	0
CDE	Number of internal dissemination activities (ToT, etc.)	No target value set	A2.2/B2.2	0
CDE	Number of staff and students and other stakeholders who get informed about the project and its results	No target value set	A2.2/B2.2	0
CDE	Number/type of media materials disbursed internet and press articles, press releases, TV and radio	No target value set	A2.2/B2.2	0
Results	— Number of output materials created — Number of downloads Feedback on satisfaction with these materials	No target value set	A7.1/B7.1	0
Results	Level of satisfaction of the teachers/students/ non-academics and management staff with activities taken part in/results obtained	No target value set	A4.1/B4.1	0
SO.1: To increase intercultural discussion and career guidance opportunities for European and African youth and HE students in topics related to modern agriculture and rural living and development, tackling also critical thinking and civic participation skills.	— 4 editions of e-internship programme implemented with students and youth workers, — 6 new HEIs and 6 new youth NGOs outside consortium accepted e-internship	4 editions new HEIs + 6 new NGOs	A7.1/B7.1	0
SO.2: To directly support at least 1,000 European and SAA youth and 1,500 European and SAA students enhancing their entrepreneurial learning, employability and civic participation through virtual exchanges and virtual companies	— 2500 participants of EVE, min. 40% of participants fall under different gender — 80% of participants think they improved entrepreneurial learning, employability and civic participation	2500 participants of EVE, 40% M/F 80% improved competences	A6.1/B6.1	0
SO.3: To increase youth and students' abilities to innovate and being entrepreneurial in agriculture and rural living and development, with focus on green and digital solutions and twin transition;	— 7 national small project competitions with 10 projects per country, — 1 international competition with 14 projects competing)	7 national + 1 international competition 70 projects (10 per country) + 14 projects at international competition	A7.1/B7.1	0
D1.1 Project Quality Architecture Toolkit	— e-document of 40 pages in English	1 document of 40 pages	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	1 document of 54 pages in English
D1.2 Administration Manual for social network accounts	— e-document of 40 pages in English — 80% of Institutional Project Managers find the Manual clear and user-friendly.	1 document 80% GOs	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D1.3 Inception report containing 4 thematic reports and recommendations	— e-document of 40 pages in English — 1 report containing 4 thematic areas — 80% of Institutional Project Managers find the Inception reports informative and well done.	1 document 80% GOs	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.1: Set of training reports from facilitated webinars for HE teachers and youth trainers	Set of 3 e-documents in English, each upto 8 pages long	3 documents, 8 pages per document	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.2 e-internship curriculum #1: "Twin transition in agriculture and rural development" for HEIs, with materials, instructions and learning resources	— e-document in English, containing 10 pages without annexes — e-Internship curriculum verified by FoP as good quality	1 document	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.3 e-internship curriculum #2: "Civic participation and twin transition in rural development" for youth workers, with materials, instructions and learning resources	— e-document in English, containing 10 pages without annexes — e-Internship curriculum verified by FoP as good quality	1 document	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.4 Virtual co-working space (VR platform) for collaborative work of students and youth during e-internship	Virtual platform for collaborative work of students and youth, with 2 modes, one for virtual companies for students, and another for office collaborative work of youth organizations.	1 platform, 2 modes	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.5 Set of e-internship recognition tools	Zip folder containing e-internship recognition tools with procedures of acceptance and validation	No value set	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.6 Gender-sensitive and social inclusion supportive call for participant and admission procedure	e-document in English 6 pages long, containing gender-sensitive and social inclusion supportive call for participant and admission procedure	1 document, 6 pages gender sensitive and inclusion supportive	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.7 ToT training report	— e-document in English 5 pages long — 80% of participants find the training relevant, approach of trainers appropriate and working environment good	1 document, 5 pages, 80% satisfaction	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D2.8 Training report from project training development session for HE teachers and youth trainers	e-document in English 5 pages long	1 document, 5 pages	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.1 Set of reports from e-debates	Set of 36 reports (from each partner institution 1 report per edition) from e-debates merged into 1 single file. Document in English, cca. 108 pages long.	36 reports, each 3 pages long	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.2 Implementation report of e-internship Spring 2026	e-document in English of 20 pages without annexes	1 document with 20 pages	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.3 Implementation report of e-internship Fall 2026	e-document in English of 20 pages without annexes	1 document with 20 pages	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.4 Implementation report of e-internship Spring 2027	e-document in English of 20 pages without annexes	1 document with 20 pages	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.5 Implementation report of e-internship Fall 2027	e-document in English of 20 pages without annexes	1 document with 20 pages	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.6 Merged a min. 4 draft proposals for EVE with 35% completion	Zip file containing a min. 4 draft proposals for EVE with 35% completion rate	4 draft proposals, 35% completion	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.7 Transformative learning toolkit on e-internships	e-document in English of 60 pages	1 document, 60 pages	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D3.8 Set of evaluation reports of 4 editions of e-internships	Zip file containing 4 evaluation reports of 4 editions of e-internships. Each e-document is in English and has up to 12 pages.	4 documents, 12 pages per a document	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.1 Alumni e-network of students and youth multipliers	e-network of alumni students and youth multipliers	No value set	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.2 Set of video testimonials (links)	Selected video testimonials, each 30-120 seconds long	No value set	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.3 Green paper	e-document in English, containing 3 merged newsletters, all together up to 20-24 pages long	3 documents, 8 pages per document	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.4 Set of 3 merged newsletters	3 newsletters	3 newsletters	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.5 Set of institutional programme transfer agreements	Set of 12 Transfer Agreements, 6 with HEIs 6 with youth NGOs	6 + 6 transfer agreements	A5.1, A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D4.6 Conference report	e-document in English of 5 pages	1 document, 5 pages	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D5.1 Set of internal verification reports	1 document, 90% of IPMs find it strong and likely effective	1 document, 90% GOs	A5.2/ B5.1-B5.3	0
D5.2 Progress quality report #1	e-document in English will be up to 30 pages	1 document, 30 pages	/	0
D5.3 Progress quality report #2	e-document in English will be up to 30 pages	1 document, 30 pages	/	0
D5.4 External evaluation report	e-document in English will be up to 40 pages	1 document, 40 pages	/	0