

aN Eu Curriculum
for chef gasTro-engineering
in primAry food caRe



FINAL CONFLICT ANS RISK REPORT

Deliverable Number:	D1.3.3
WP related to the Deliverable:	WP1 Management
Due Date	31 October 2023
PARTNER responsible for the Deliverable:	Odisee
WP starting month	18
WP ending month	36



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Contents of this document are entirely produced by Nectar project, therefore EACEA and European Commission have no responsibilities on them.

AGREEMENT NUMBER – 621707-EPP-1-2020-1-BE-EPPKA2-SSA





1 ABSTRACT

This report has been elaborated to give a description of the risks identified and the procedures and mitigating actions suggested by the partners to avoid the risks from month 18 to month 36. Furthermore, the strategy for conflict prevention, identification and resolution is outlined as well as its implementation in the identified period.

The report has been elaborated with the contribution of the WPs leaders and the discussions carried out during SCs. The PC and the SC have identified in this term 9 risks for the NECTAR project.

These risks include:

- Lack of communication among partners.
- Dissemination problems.
- Pilot course: number of participants and issued certificates parameters not reached.
- Pilot courses don't finish on time for the needed evaluation process.
- The occupational profile is not integrated in ESCO.
- Not enough stakeholders who sign the memorandum of understanding (MoU).
- The EU Curriculum is not delivered on time in order to assure its proper integration in the MoU and its proper dissemination.
- Scaling up actions don't reach the expected results.
- Regional and/or national qualifications are not integrated on project results.

2 INTERNAL REVIEWERS

REVIEWER NAME	ORGANIZATION	DATE OF APPROVAL
Inês Gago Rodrigues	UALG	02-11-2023

3 VERSION HISTORY AND AUTHORS

Version	Name / Organization	Status*	Date	Provided Content/Comment/ Summary of Changes
1	Silvia Bossio	A	17-12-2022	Draft Version 1
1	Willem vanden Berg	IF	27-01-2023	Spelling Check
1	Serena Alvino	C	13-01-2023	Feedback on the first Draft Version
1	Heidemarie Müller- Riedlhuber	C	18-01-2023	Feedback on the first Draft Version
2	Silvia Bossio	A	30-10-2023	Final Version

*Status indicates if:

- A - Author (including author of revised deliverable)
- C - Contributor
- IF – Internal Feedback (within the partner organization)



4 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	ABSTRACT.....	2
2	INTERNAL REVIEWERS.....	2
3	VERSION HISTORY AND AUTHORS	3
4	TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	4
5	INTRODUCTION	5
6	RISK REPORT	5
6.1	Identified Risks	5
6.2	Risk Register	7
7	CONCLUSION.....	15
	ANNEX 1 – QUALITY CONTROL CHECK LIST	16

5 INTRODUCTION

This report is related to Task 1.3 Risk Management and Conflict Resolution, and it is led by Odisee. This task is dedicated to identifying any possible new risks to the project following a “risk management” approach. The main tool to follow up the risk management is the Risk Register (RR) that has been updated throughout the M18-M36 period and discussed by the Steering Committee at each meeting.

To have information about the risk management plan and the risks identified in the period M1-M18, please refer to D1.3.1/D1.3.2 where you can find the main project objectives and expected results in the first period of the project.

The RR tool used to track and monitor any risks that might impact the project, has been used to identify potential risks in the project, sometimes to fulfil regulatory compliance but mostly to stay on top of potential issues that can derail intended outcomes.

6 RISK REPORT

6.1 Identified Risks

Considering the content of the NECTAR project, the short-term results and the long term outcomes, a number of risks have been identified in the last period. All identified risks will be listed below.

Firstly, it is possible that there is a problem with the **communication among partners**. As a consequence, mails are not answered on time and so, activities cannot be tracked, causing delays. This is likely to happen, and the impact would be high as communication is crucial for the correct implementation of the project. It is important to ensure that the partners commit themselves to check and update the contact lists and ensure to follow up mails and messages received from the WP leaders and partners.

The **communication and dissemination approach** has not been successful. There is not enough dissemination of the project on social media or other events. This would be of high impact for the project, and it is likely to happen. To give a response to this risk the project backs up on the members forming the Reference Sites Collaborative Network (RSCN), who have much experience of working at European level and in the field of Primary Food Care and knows the most important stakeholders to reach out to. Partners are involved in the project as there is a Dissemination and Communication Working Group represented by pilot sites who joins monthly to update the dissemination situation. Also, RSCN backed up by Si4life will encourage the promotion of the project by means of publications on social media, webinars, leaflets, participation in conferences, etc.

Another risk that has been spotted is that during the pilot phase, it is possible that the **number of participants** is not reached in one or more **pilot sites**. To mitigate this risk, there are several strategies. First, the recruitment of students starts enough time ahead to guarantee the desired result. Pilot leaders count on their previous experience, and this supports the recruitment process. Also, if the number is not reached, the pilot sites will continue fostering students in order to complete their training even though the implementation period has ended.

Regarding the necessity of reaching 80% of the learning outcomes, the evaluation matrix created by Si4life helps to guarantee the completion of this requirement. The parameter related to the qualification and the drop out, the pilot responsible have worked from the very beginning with the students trying to give them additional supervision to solve this risk. Each pilot site has developed a specific strategy to face this possible risk. These strategies could be seen in the Risk Register (Tables I to IX).



Deliverable 1.3.1 – Risk Management Plan

If **pilot courses** do not finish on time for the needed evaluation process, WP6 could be affected. Pilot sites have been warned about the necessity of ending the pilots by the end of June 2023 and so, they are working in advance to fulfil this task in due time.

Regarding the **integration of the Occupational Profile in ESCO**, all the necessary negotiations will be done to guarantee the fulfilment of this long-term outcome as it is known that ESCO is in a constant updating process. We are positive that the quality of the occupational profile and the content of this innovative proposal will be viewed favourably by the ESCO Secretariat. The project will develop the essential skills and Knowledge and the Optional skills and knowledge to successfully achieve this goal.

A specific number of VET providers, stakeholders and competitive institutions has to be contacted to reach quantitative indicators related to **the MoU signature**. The partnership will work together to contact the stakeholders and achieve the success of this indicator receiving the necessary positive feedback ensuring the continuity of the tasks started with NECTAR project.

We know it is absolutely necessary to deliver the **EU Curriculum** on time to be integrated in the MoU and to guarantee its dissemination. So that, Si4life and UALG will work together supported by the partners to fulfil this task in M33 instead of M35 to have enough time to complete the MoU phase.

As the **scaling up actions** are very important to ensure the continuity of the project after its end, RSCN together with the partners, will work to shape the scaling up plan and to guarantee that the short-term results and long-term outcomes come to fruition. This will be possible by organizing meetings, conferences and progress reports which will be the basis of the plan and its future once the project is completed.

Regarding **regional and/or national qualifications integrated on project results**, partners are working to achieve the accreditation at these two levels applying to regional and national qualification frameworks becoming a qualitative leap for the project. We hope that in the future the different partners that have the possibility to reach these qualifications, can do so benefiting the project.

6.2 Risk Register

As indicated in previous deliverables, a Risk Register has been created to easily overview the most pressing risks in the NECTAR project, as illustrated in the following tables, from I to IX. The Risk Register has been differentiated between the content of the Risk, Description, Likelihood, Impact, Response and Mitigation Strategy to be taken. The Impact is defined in Low (L), Medium (M) and High (H), whereas the Likelihood is measured in Very Unlikely, Unlikely, Likely, Very likely. The definition of the possible impact and likelihood helps to have a general overview of the risk magnitude.

The analysed Risk Register can be found in the following tables.

Table I

Risk	1 - Lack of communication among partners			
Description	There is no fluent communication between partners. Mails are not answered and so activities can't be tracked, and this can cause delays.			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>This lack of communication is pointed out during steering committee meetings to remind the partners the importance of answering mails and fulfil the requested tasks. The high commitment of the partners towards the project facilitates the solution of this problem. The mailing list will be updated. Each WP leader will check the general mailing list and will provide a list of contacts with the people currently participating in the project. Also, each WP leader will make a list with the people they need to contact for the correct development of the project.</p> <p>All these lists will be uploaded on TEAMS.</p> <p>Partners commit themselves to follow and answer the mails they receive in order to guarantee a fluid communication.</p>			
Risk responsibility	All partners + PC			

Table II

Risk	2- Dissemination problems			
Description	Not enough dissemination about the project is being done. Low performance of partners to deliver content. For example, on the Web page from August to November there weren't any news and on social media the last publication was in June 2022. There is not enough participation in events related to health and nutrition to disseminate the project.			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>WP7 leader and partners have extensive experience on how to disseminate a project. Specific actions taken in the NECTAR project are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a Dissemination and Communication Working Group, representative of all Pilot Sites, has been established. The Working Group will meet monthly, and its role is to update the Steering Committee about the general situation in each of the Pilot Sites, and any upcoming 			

	<p>activities for each partner such as publications, event attendance, appearance in local media, etc. In addition, it will advise the Steering Committee on progress of the individual dissemination plans. This information will be used 1) to create a global message about NECTAR, and 2) to update the global channels with the activities and results achieved in each Pilot Site and tasks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partners will complete and forward monthly to the WP7 Team information on forthcoming activities and events in their regions for posting on the website and social media platforms. • Partners and Pilot Site organisations will provide links to the NECTAR website and social media platforms on their own websites and platforms to promote awareness of the project and its activities. • Wider promotion of the project through public webinars will be organised by the RSCN. This will target health and care providers, and others with an interest in nutrition and food, within the RSCN's network of 64 AHA Reference Site regions across Europe. • Internal project webinars will be organised to share the know-how and good practices inside the consortium so partners can improve their participation on the project thanks to others' experience. • NECTAR leaflets will be produced in the language of each pilot site to facilitate promotion of the project. • The NECTAR Stakeholder Map will be regularly updated by Pilot Sites and Partners • Opportunities for promoting NECTAR at relevant conference and events across Europe will be identified.
Risk responsibility	RSCN and all the partners

Table III

Risk	3- Pilot course: number of participants and issued certificates parameters not reached			
Description	<p>The parameters to be reached are as follows:</p> <p>A minimum of 20 chefs must be trained during the pilot course.</p> <p>At least 80% of the course learning outcomes have been reached by students getting the qualification.</p> <p>At least 75% of the students attending the course get the qualification</p> <p>We have to take into account that the drop out must be under 20%</p>			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>Recruitment starts enough time ahead to guarantee the desired result. Pilot leaders count on their previous experience, and this supports the recruitment process.</p> <p>AUSTRIA PILOT PROJECT:</p> <p>The pilot course is advertised via various available channels so that as many potential participants as possible can be reached and recruited for the course.</p> <p>Where relevant (depending on the structure of the respective pilot), continuous close cooperation as well as clarification of necessary</p>			

parameters with the VET-provider offering the respective pilot course is encouraged so that clear framework conditions and objectives are in place/agreed.

Using the evaluation matrix created by Si4Life, the successful completion of the required learning outcomes (in percentage) for each student who receives the qualification is monitored.

For participants who have difficulties in the course (and a successful completion is questionable), additional supervision will be considered in order to achieve the highest possible pass rate and receipt of the certification.

ITALY CAMPANIA PILOT PROJECT:

For the pilot course in Campania students were selected with public selection.

The ITS BACT Foundation provides that at the end of each training module students must take a written test of the acquired skills.

The ITS BACT Foundation in its training program for all its courses, provides that the qualification is possible only if each student has obtained 80% of attendance and has successfully passed the final tests of all modules.

In order to contain the percentage of drop out to the course, all the tools are provided to support the students, who can follow the lessons even in asynchronous mode in case they can't be always present at the face-to-face lessons.

In the working based learning phase, specific agreements are concluded with the partner companies in order to maximize the learning outcomes on the job.

BELGIUM PILOT PROJECT:

The pilot course is advertised via the website of the Odisee University College, and social media channels of Center for Gastrology (CfG).

The required learning outcomes (in percentage) for each student who receives the qualification is monitored by using the evaluation matrix created by Si4Life, a useful tool to reach this result.

If any participant has difficulties in the course, additional supervision will be taken into account and considered by CfG in order to achieve the highest possible pass rate and receipt of the certification.

ITALY LIGURIA PILOT PROJECT

The Ligurian pilot has reached an adequate number of participants. However, as a lot of them are workers of the primary food care sectors, a possible reason of dropping out is the overload of work and study. Therefore, we have guaranteed flexibility and the choice whether coming to school or attending lessons online. Only work-based learning requires physical presence at school. As far as the learning outcome, we have a test at the end of each LO; Qualification will be guaranteed to those students who will succeed in at least 80% of the LOS.

PORTUGAL PILOT PROJECT

Recruitment starts in advance. Pilot leaders draw on past experience, and this aids in the recruitment process.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The pilot course is publicized on the SCMA website. - Through the evaluation matrix prepared by Si4Life, the successful conclusion of the required learning outcomes (in percentage) is monitored for each student who receives the qualification. - For participants who struggle with the course (and successful completion is questionable), additional supervision will be considered to achieve the highest possible pass rate and receipt of certification. - Taking into account that seasonal work could be a problem for students to finish the course, they will be supported and encourage to finish the course successfully although the expected period has expired.
Risk responsibility	Each Pilot project leader + WP5 leader Odisee

Table IV

Risk	4- Pilot courses do not finish on time for the needed evaluation process			
Description	<p>Some of the pilot courses need to be implemented till June 2023 in order to fulfil the constraints concerning student's workload and ECVET points. According to the project proposal June 2023 is the closing month for WP5 since then a process of pilots' evaluation and collection of feedback loops is planned in WP6.</p> <p>If pilots end late, WP6 would be affected by a delay which could have a high impact on the results.</p>			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>Pilot leaders have been alerted since the meeting in Sorrento that pilots should end by June 2023.</p> <p>AUSTRIA PILOT PROJECT:</p> <p>The specified end date of the pilot course (no later than end of June) will be agreed in advance with the VET provider and the course design, including the schedule, will be made accordingly.</p> <p>ITALY CAMPANIA PILOT PROJECT:</p> <p>For the ITS BACT Foundation it is of fundamental importance to select students who have previous experience in the field of reference, so as to schedule more asynchronous lessons on the MOOC platform and to dedicate more hours to laboratory activities and internships with the aim of completing the total amount of hours within the deadline. So, the course is scheduled to be finished on time.</p> <p>BELGIUM PILOT PROJECT:</p> <p>The specified end date of the pilot course (no later than end of June) is agreed in advance with Odisee University College and CFG. The course design, including the schedule, will be made accordingly.</p> <p>The working students in the Belgian pilot follow the lessons together with the regular students (HAO-students) in the Facility Management course at Odisee University College. Exams are scheduled for all students in June. However, those who have not passed the first examination period may resit</p>			

	<p>in September 2023. The latter therefore falls outside the allowed time frame of NECTAR.</p> <p>ITALY LIGURIA PILOT PROJECT</p> <p>We are not concerned by risk n.4, since the Ligurian pilot started on December 5th, 2022, is progressing smoothly and is scheduled to be completed on June 23rd, 2023.</p> <p>PORTUGAL PILOT PROJECT</p> <p>The specified end date of the pilot course (end of June at the latest) is agreed upon in advance. Course design, including timetable, will be made accordingly.</p> <p>Students who work on the Portugal -SCMA pilot follow classes on a b-learning basis. Exams are scheduled for all students in June. However, those who failed the first exam period can retake in July 2023</p>
Risk responsibility	Each Pilot project leader + WP5 leader

Table V

Risk	5 - The occupational profile is not integrated in ESCO			
Description	Contacts and negotiations with ESCO Secretariat have been carried out but there is no positive feedback.			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>The necessary contact within ESCO Secretariat is found and the high quality of the occupational profile is recognized so, the positive impact is gained.</p> <p>There exist in principle two ways to integrate NECTAR results in ESCO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Integration in the ESCO occupation pillar 2. Integration in the ESCO qualification pillar <p>Integration in the ESCO occupation pillar:</p> <p>It will be necessary to contact the ESCO Secretariat and ask for inclusion. A main challenge in this regard is to contact the right person at ESCO, who must be a responsible decision-maker. For a first contact, Heidemarie Müller-Riedlhuber has received three contacts from a labor market expert cooperating with the ESCO Secretariat on a regular basis in the field of occupation and skills matching. These contacts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OLSEN Hilde: Hilde.OLSEN@ec.europa.eu • LOSAPPIO Francesco: Francesco.LOSAPPIO@ext.ec.europa.eu • SYLLY Aikaterini: aikaterini.sylla@esco-support.eu <p>In addition, it should be considered to ask Pavol Krempasky, the responsible Project Officer of the European Commission, for support in finding and addressing the right person for the NECTAR application for inclusion in the ESCO occupations.</p> <p>It is foreseen to contact the decision-making person with a short description of the NECTAR project and of the occupational profile of a Gastro Engineer</p>			

	<p>as well as first information on the requirements of the market and the planned scaling-up activities in the different partner countries (e.g., concrete agreement perspectives in Italy, Austria, Portugal and Belgium). To do so, a precise description must be provided by the Project Management and the Dissemination Team together with an English name of the Occupation that is easy to understand and to contextualize at first glance. – So, possibly, the English term “Gastro Engineer” might not fulfill these requirements and hinder a successful application for inclusion into the ESCO occupational profiles. This means that possibly an alternative English name has to be found that can also be easily translated into other European languages.</p> <p>In order to convince the ESCO Secretariat of the importance of an inclusion of the occupation into ESCO, it could also be considered to involve Associated partners and other Associations from the field of health, care and nutrition by providing supportive statements that could be shared with the ESCO Secretariat (to be collected by the Project Management).</p> <p>If the occupational profile is included in ESCO it will be necessary to provide information on the main tasks and required skills of the occupation. This information can be taken from the existing Occupational Profile which has already been defined similarly to ESCO occupations.</p> <p>All necessary information requested by ESCO will be provided to ensure the integration of the occupational profile.</p> <p>Integration in the ESCO qualification pillar:</p> <p>National qualifications that are included in the National Qualification Frameworks of European countries are usually linked to the ESCO qualification pillar to support better comparability between European qualifications. So, another way to include NECTAR into ESCO can be to apply at national level for an inclusion in the National Qualification Framework. This alternative option will however take some time and can probably not be achieved within the time span of the NECTAR project.</p>
Risk responsibility	WIAB, Si4life & ODISEE

Table VI

Risk	6 - Not enough stakeholders who sign the memorandum of understanding			
Description	<p>The Memorandum of Understanding must be signed by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the VET providers and regulatory bodies who are all full partners in the Alliance - at least 10 stakeholders who are not full partners of the project, - at least 6 competent institutions in 6 different EU countries who can provide positive feedback on the MoU. <p>The Alliance couldn't be able to reach these quantitative indicators.</p>			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	Partners agree that “competent institutions” for MoU include both VET providers and regulatory bodies.			

	<p>Partners will work in advance in order to identify how the MoU will be structured and which agreement it will include so that they could check in advance who are the proper stakeholders to be involved in the signature.</p> <p>Then each partner which is a “competent institution” will participate in the drafting and review of the MoU in order to be sure that they could sign it.</p> <p>Once estimated the number of partners who could sign the MoU, each partner will take the task to find other possible interested stakeholders outside the Alliance, in order to comply with the project success indicators.</p>
Risk responsibility	WP7 leader + SI4LIFE + PC + all partners

Table VII

Risk	7 - The EU Curriculum is not delivered on time in order to assure its proper integration in the MoU and its proper dissemination			
Description	<p>According to the project proposal the final version of the Curriculum should be delivered at M35, a month before the end of the project.</p> <p>This short time may not enhance the project results dissemination and, above all the integration of the Curriculum in the MoU since:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The template of the MoU should be available by M35 ready for being signed. - The signed version of the MoU should be published on the project website by M36. <p>Such schedule may rise a risk concerning the delivery of the signed MoU.</p>			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>During Sorrento meeting, partners agreed that the final version of the Curriculum should be delivered before M35, in order to save time for dissemination and for the integration into the MoU template.</p> <p>T3.1 leader (Si4life) in collaboration with T6.3 leader (UALG) will set up a process for curriculum review which would end in May 2023. Feedback from pilot teachers will be collected by UALG in May and then integrated in D6.3 which will be delivered in advance. In such a way a final version of the curriculum could be ready by June/July 2023 and properly integrated in the MoU.</p>			
Risk responsibility	S4LIFE + UALG			

Table VIII

Risk	8 - Scaling up actions don't reach the expected results			
Description	<p>The impact of the project will be multiplied thanks to the scaling up strategy to ensure the continuity of the project after the end. To do so, at least 1 target group or potential beneficiary per region and country involved in the project and at least 3 across countries together with 5 twinning partners from regions outside the project have to be addressed, but the results are not the expected.</p>			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely

Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>A plan for scaling up within organizations is included in the Sustainability Strategy and the scaling up actions are based on the identified partnerships for scaling up facilitated during step 4.</p> <p>To mitigate against the risk the following actions will be taken in the project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All Pilot Sites will develop a Scaling Up Plan, aligning it with the key objectives in the Scaling-Up and Sustainability Plan • Pilot Sites will meet and liaise with the key stakeholders and decision makers in their region to secure the implementation of the NECTAR curriculum after the project ends. • Pilot Sites will complete a Survey to identify policy, organisational, financial barriers, etc., in implementing the curriculum and actions to overcome these as learning for potential scaling-up adopter regions. • An evaluation of the CGE curriculum delivered within each pilot site to validate it a good practice for scaling-up will be undertaken. • Pilot Sites will provide regular progress reports on scaling-up actions they are undertaking. <p>A conference will be organised at the end of the project targeting health and care providers, education providers, accreditation bodies, and policy makers to facilitate the transfer and scaling up of NECTAR CGE good practice CGE curricula to other regions</p>			
Risk responsibility	RSCN + all partners			

Table IX

Risk	9 – Regional and/or national qualifications are not integrated on project results			
Description	Accreditation should be issued by at least 2 regional agencies and 1 national agency, but this outcome is not reached.			
Likelihood	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Unlikely	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unlikely	<input type="checkbox"/> Likely	<input type="checkbox"/> Very Likely
Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Low	<input type="checkbox"/> Medium	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High	
Response/ mitigation strategy	<p>Partners should try to find the way to find potential beneficiaries who can give accreditation at these two levels.</p> <p>IN AUSTRIA:</p> <p>The regional accreditation for the pilot in Austria is the responsibility of the Economic Development Institute (WIFI) as part of the Styrian Chamber of Commerce (WKO). The WIFI certification body is established as a personal certification body, as a product certification body and as an inspection body of the Austrian Chamber of Commerce.</p> <p>Formal as well as non-formal qualifications can be linked to the national qualification register in a next step by applying for such an assignment. For this purpose, an assignment procedure is initiated with the submission of an assignment request, whereby in the case of non-formal qualifications, an NQF service body submits the assignment request together with the qualification provider to the NQR Coordination Unit.</p>			

	<p>MUG called the responsible qualification provider or rather the local agency/representatives (partner aware about the content) and asked for support regarding the accreditation.</p> <p>IN PORTUGAL:</p> <p>Pilot accreditation in Portugal is the responsibility of ANQ - National Qualification Agency.</p> <p>Formal and non-formal qualifications can be linked to the national register of qualifications in a next step by requesting such attribution.</p> <p>For this purpose, a crediting procedure starts with the submission of a crediting request.</p> <p>In terms of qualification in Portugal, the figure of Chef Gastro Engineering is not provided. Specialization in Adapted Cuisine is foreseen.</p> <p><u>At regional level</u></p> <p>IN CAMPANIA:</p> <p>Currently in the Directory of qualifications of the Campania Region is not provided the figure of Chef Gastro Engineering of V level EQF. The figure of restaurant technician- EQF level IV is expected.</p> <p>Following meetings with the representative of the Campania Region, the profile of “Chef di cucina salutistica” and their units of competence has been defined. The qualification will be included in the Repertoire of Qualifications of the Campania Region.</p> <p>IN LIGURIA</p> <p>In Italy, Regione Liguria and Regione Campania should include CGEs in their respective regional registries of professional profiles, preparatory to scaling up in the national atlas.</p> <p>Accreditation will be issued by each region with an official act of the Regional Committee</p> <p>Then, Liguria Region and Campania Region will propose the inclusion in the National Qualifications Atlas.</p>
Risk responsibility	All partners

7 CONCLUSION

Multiple risks have been identified in the NECTAR project in this phase of the project. The risks will be evaluated by the PC and the SC regularly, as early identification and mitigation measures are key for a successful project. Initially, risks have been identified by the PC, reviewed, and supplemented by some WP leaders and discussed in the SC. So, the evolution of these risks has been timely evaluated to guarantee the successful fulfilment of the project and to achieve the short-term results and long-term outcomes successfully.



ANNEX 1 – QUALITY CONTROL CHECK LIST

Quality Control Check	
Generic Minimum Quality Standards	
Document Summary provided (with adequate synopsis of contents)	x
Compliant with NECTAR format standards (including all relevant Logos and EU-disclaimer)	x
Language, grammar and spelling acceptable	x
Objectives of the application form covered	x
Work deliverable relates to adequately covered	x
Quality of text is acceptable (organisation and structure, diagrams, readability)	x
Comprehensiveness is acceptable (no missing sections, missing references, unexplained arguments)	x
Usability is acceptable (deliverable provides clear information in a form that is useful to the reader)	x
Deliverable specific quality criteria	
Deliverable meets the 'acceptance Criteria' set out in the Quality Register:	x
Checklist completed and deliverable approved by Name: Inês Gago Rodrigues Date: 2/11/2023	