



EUROPEAN EDUCATION AND CULTURE  
EXECUTIVE AGENCY (EACEA)

EACEA.A - Erasmus+, EU Solidarity Corps  
EACEA.A.2 - Platforms, Skills and Innovation

Brussels  
EACEA.A.2.002/MG/HB/JL/MDV/21D007991

ESPOON SEUDUN  
KOULUTUSKUNTAYHTYMA OMNIA  
Mr Sampo Suihko  
PO BOX 77700  
FI-02070 ESPOO

**Subject: Erasmus+ - KA3- Joint Qualification in Vocational Education and Training - Approval of Final Report and Notification of Payment**

**Grant Agreement: 2018-3856 / 597859-EPP-1-2018-1-FI-EPPKA3-VET-JQ**  
*(please use this reference n° in all correspondence)*

**Title of Project: Cooking for the future**

Dear Mr Sampo Suihko

I am pleased to inform you that we have approved the Final Report for the above mentioned project and your score is **75 on 100**. The approval is based on an assessment undertaken by the Agency.

The final European Union grant for the above project has now been established at EUR 271.635,18, subsequently a final payment of EUR 21.200,78 has been initiated in accordance with the Grant Agreement.

Annex 1 presents an assessment of the final report and the comments and recommendations done by the Agency.

Annex 2 provides all details and explanation of the financial analysis and final grant calculation and details of any expenses that have been considered ineligible by the Agency in accordance with the Grant Agreement and its annexes.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that, in addition to the means of redress referred to in the agreement, the following means are available for challenging this decision:

- If you believe that this decision is affected by an error or irregularity, you may request a review of the Agency's decision, clearly stating the reasons for disagreement, preferably within one month of receiving this letter, by writing to the following address:

European, Education and Culture Executive Agency,  
Ms Michèle GROMBEER,  
Head of Sector A2,  
SPA2 03/90  
Avenue du Bourget, 1  
B – 1049 Brussels  
Michele.Grombeer@ec.europa.eu

- If you believe there has been a maladministration you may also lodge a complaint to the European Ombudsman in accordance with and under the conditions laid down in Article 228 TFEU within two years of becoming aware of the facts on which the complaint is based (see <http://www.ombudsman.europa.eu>).

Please note that, in accordance with the General Conditions of your Grant Agreement, you may be the subject of a financial control by the European Commission or by the Court of Auditors. You are therefore requested to keep all accounting items and all supporting documents related to your project for a period of five years from the date of payment of the balance.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your contribution to the Erasmus+ Programme.

Yours sincerely,

Michele GROMBEER  
Head of Sector

Contact: Hélène Barry, tel. +32-2-296 6621, e-mail: [EACEA-EPLUS-VET@ec.europa.eu](mailto:EACEA-EPLUS-VET@ec.europa.eu)

Enclosure:           1. Comments and Recommendations from the Agency  
                          2. Calculation of Final Amount of the European Union Grant

c.c.:                   Mika Heino



<p><b>FINAL REPORT ASSESSMENT SHEET</b>  <b>Call EACEA 27/2017</b></p>
--

<b>Project number:</b>	
	597859-EPP-1-2018-1-FI-EPPKA3-VET-JQ

<b>Project title:</b>	
	Cooking for the Future (CORE)

	Score /30
<p><b>1. Relevance of the project</b></p> <p>Have the activities been in accordance with the project's aims and objectives as declared in the original application or as officially amended?            How have they contributed to achieving the Call's objectives to increase the employability of young people and to contribute to the development of a highly skilled, qualified and mobile workforce from which companies should also benefit , as well as to support joint developments in VET in Europe and strengthen overall its quality, relevance and attractiveness?            How has the project contributed to support the preparation or setting up of joint VET qualifications or the improvement of such existing qualifications.?            Are there valuable results achieved?</p>	25
<p>The purpose of the project was to harmonize and develop a joint vocational qualification for professional cooks in the catering sector. The project successfully developed this joint qualification. It completed activities according to the application, with some adjustments due to the COVID 19 restrictions.</p> <p>The project contributed to the development of a highly skilled workforce by relying on technology for remote learning and developing new and innovative content useful for the labour market (for instance personal branding and marketing). It contributed to increase the quality and attractiveness of VET with attractive learning tools (for instance Guild school method, virtual 360° and open badges) and strongly promoting the use of social media as a pedagogical and promotional. The pop-up restaurant and competition activities also contributed to making training more relevant and attractive for both employers and students.</p> <p>There are significant achievements contributing to the setting up of the joint VET qualification. The 3 reports produced as part of WP2 provide a clear picture of the context and needs in the sector. However, it is not clear where the ECVET toolbox and experiences and good practices – indicated as part of the deliverables - are available.</p> <p>The main results consist of the web platform and the five learning modules. The web platform is visually attractive and sophisticated with many interactive features. It gives access to all public results from the project The pedagogical approach based on a virtual 360° webpage contributes to make the learning a dynamic process. The purpose and learning outcomes of the modules are</p>	

clearly described. However, the fact that each module is divided between a part on competition and a part on pop-up event is a bit confusing. A short explanation could be provided about this in the module description.

Although the competition could only partially take place, the framework for the cooking competition is an added value to the project as well as the eBook with the creations of students who participated in the event.

	<b>Score /25</b>
<p><b>2. Quality of the project design and implementation</b></p> <p>Have the activities been carried in accordance with the Work Programme? Are they consistent with the project objectives? Is the project implementation on time and on budget? Have relevant quality control measures already been put in place?</p>	18
<p>Activities were mostly carried out in accordance with the work programme. However, several deviations are reported due to the restrictions from the COVID 19 pandemic.</p> <p>The activities most affected were the pilot sessions (WP3), the competition (WP 5) and the pop up restaurant (WP 6). The redesign of these 2 activities into one single activity called “virtual pop-up competition” is well justified but creates some confusion in the reporting of activities. The coordinator also explains that cuts in the initial budget made it more difficult to recruit students for the events. Another shortcoming is that only Estonian and Finnish students could participate in the main event (pop up competition), the Spanish and Irish students still being locked down. Nonetheless, the mitigating measures and the activities realised are consistent with the initial objectives. Most of the planned deliverables were completed. Deliverables that could not be completed were replaced by alternative deliverables in line with the objectives.</p> <p>The Agency made two amendments to the grant agreement. The first one was for a prolongation of the eligibility period of 5 months due to delays related to COVID 19. The second was for a change in the budget and partnership (merge of an organisation) and budget. The management of the project was well conducted. It is obvious that considerable efforts were made to conduct the activities in alternative settings due to the restrictions.</p> <p>The total costs for the project is 22.000 EUR less than the initial budget. This is coherent with the degree of implementation of activities.</p> <p>The partnership implemented the planned quality assurance and evaluation tasks. They were based on a sound methodology with different areas of the projects being regularly reviewed. The final project evaluation report is comprehensive and provides a good insight on the different areas of the project with a description of challenges and learning points.</p>	

	<b>Score /25</b>
<p><b>3. Quality of the project team and the cooperation arrangements</b></p> <p>Does the project show full commitment and active involvement of all partners? Have effective mechanisms for coordination and communication between partners been in place? Has the project already shown active involvement of relevant stakeholders beyond the partnership?</p>	18

The project brought together 5 organisations from Finland (2 organisations), Ireland, Estonia and Ireland. Due to the COVID 19 restrictions, only 3 face-to-face meetings were carried out but the consortium relied on effective online communication with monthly meetings. Minutes of meetings are included with the report.

The partners seemed to be committed to accomplish their tasks as initially planned. However, partners from Spain and Ireland did not participate in the pop-up competition due to the school restrictions. The partners established a communication platform (slack) to make communication easier and more effective and relied on Google Drive for document sharing

Appropriate management mechanisms were established. They contributed to delivering the project activities despite the considerable challenges.

The report also mentions that associated partners and other stakeholders also participated in surveys during the first phase. Their involvement seem to be lower during the second phase. ...

	Score /20
<p><b>4. Impact and dissemination</b></p> <p>Which measures have been taken for evaluating the outcomes of the project?            Has any impact on selected target groups and across partners been reported?            Have appropriate indicators been provided?            Which activities have been carried out for implementing the dissemination plan?            What measures have been taken for ensuring the sustainability of the project?</p>	14
<p>The main outcomes of the project were evaluated according to the evaluation plan. The final evaluation report and the report on the evaluation of WP2 provide a good overview of the evaluation procedures and results.</p> <p>While the impact is described in general terms, the report mentions that some of the modules will be used by the Finnish schools involved. Discussions with regulatory bodies have also taken place.</p> <p>A dissemination plan was produced defining the visual identity and tools/templates. A major webinar was organised at the end project of the project. The report mentions that all partners have been active in disseminating the project. However, most of the dissemination activities seem to have been conducted by the Finnish partners, with a much lower participation from Spanish, Estonian and Irish partners. Flyers and a few newsletters were produced. The project was very active on social media (mainly Facebook) with regular contributions and a YouTube channel. The logo and disclaimer are visible on the deliverables.</p> <p>The creation of the 14 open badges to certify the training is an attractive tool to promote the training in the sector. However, it is not clear to what extent they have been used (uploaded) by students in the project.</p> <p>The sustainability plan provides information and recommendations for transfer of the materials developed. It is meant to ensure that deliverables are transferable and sustainable, which is very useful for the transferability to other sectors. There are no additional measures to ensure sustainability.</p>	
<b>Global score</b>	<b>75/ 100</b>

## Annex 2

### CALCULATION OF THE FINAL GRANT AND BALANCE PAYMENT

Grant Agreement ref. : 597859-EPP-1-2018-1-FI-EPPKA3-VET-JQ/2018-3856

#### • Section 1: Result of the financial analysis

The analysis of your final report was based on the declared and corrected expenditures and in the light of the documents you have submitted in your final report and after possible supplementary information request.

1. Declared expenditures.	370.196,02 €	
2. Ineligible expenditures (see section 2 below for details).	30.651,83 €	
3. Eligible expenditures.	339.544,19 €	
4. Maximum grant indicated in the grant agreement.	313.043,00 €	Balance 1
5. Grant calculated applying the % of EU funding to eligible expenditures limited to maximum grant.	271.635,18 €	Balance 2
6. Amount of the Grant requested in the final report.	296.156,63 €	Balance 3
7. Maximum to be paid for the project (the lowest of 4, 5 and 6)	271.635,18 €	
8. Advance already paid.	250.434,40 €	
9. Interest earned on pre-financing or other income earned to be deducted	0,00 €	
<b>10. Final Balance to be paid</b>	<b>21.200,78 €</b>	

#### Section 2: Explanation of the ineligible expenditure by budget categories

- **Costs reported as ineligible in the Report of Factual Findings on the Final Financial Report – Type I, provided by KPMG Julkistarkastus Oy**

295.10 € is ineligible as the proofs of payment were missing

259.04 € is ineligible as these costs are outside the eligibility period

28.047.01 € is ineligible as these costs are not recorded in the bookkeeping of the partners

- **Indirect costs : 2.050,68 €**

Only 6.69 % of the eligible direct costs (317.373,82 €) are eligible, the difference between the indirect costs declared and the indirect costs eligible is therefore ineligible (2.050.68 €) as specified by your grant agreement.