

**Final Beneficiary Report for 2014-1-NL01-KA202-001225****Erasmus+**

Stichting Nordwin College

- **Erasmus+**
- **National Agency Erasmus+**
- **Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices**
- **Strategic Partnerships**
- **Strategic Partnerships for vocational education and training**
- **Call 2014**
- **Round 1**
- **Grant Agreement Number 2014-1-NL01-KA202-001225**
- **Report Type Final**
- **Date of submission 12/01/2017**

**Ton Stierhout**  
Name of legal representative

Main content:	Report Form
Number of attachments:	<b>1</b>

## General Information

This report form generated from the Mobility Tool+ consists of the following main sections:

- **Inactive Organisations within Project Activities**
- **Context:** this section resumes some general information about your project;
- **Project Summary:** this section summarises your project and the organisations involved as partners;
- **Description of the Project:** in this section, you are asked to give information about the objectives and topics addressed by your project;
- **Project Management**
- **Implementation:** this section asks for information about all the stages of the project: implementation of main activities including practical arrangements, participants' profile, impact, dissemination of the results and future plans;
- **Follow-up**
- **Budget:** this section gives a detailed overview of the final amount of the EU grant you request;

For your convenience, some parts of this report are prefilled with information from the Mobility Tool+

---

## 1. Context

this section resumes some general information about your project;

Programme	Erasmus+
Key Action	Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices
Action	Strategic Partnerships
Action Type	Strategic Partnerships for vocational education and training
Call	2014
Report Type	Final
Language used to fill in the form	NL

### 1.1. Project Identification

Grant Agreement Number	2014-1-NL01-KA202-001225
Project Title	Taste of Life, regional healthy food in schools
Project Acronym	TOL
Project Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	01/11/2014
Project End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	31/10/2016
Project Total Duration (months)	24
	Stichting Nordwin College

## 1.2. National Agency of the Beneficiary Organisation

Identification	National Agency Erasmus+
----------------	--------------------------

For further details about the available Erasmus+ National Agencies, please consult the following page:

[https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/contact\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/contact_en)

## 2. Project Summary

this section summarises your project and the organisations involved as partners;

Please provide a short summary of the completed project.

Please recall that this section [or part of it] may be used by the European Commission, Executive Agency or National Agencies in their publications or when giving information on a completed project. It will also feed the Erasmus+ Dissemination platform (see annex III of Programme Guide on dissemination guidelines). Main elements to be mentioned are:

- Context/background of the project;
- Objectives;
- Number and profile of participating organisations;
- Description of undertaken main activities;
- Results and impact attained;
- If relevant, longer-term benefits.

Please be concise and clear.

### Context and background

In many European countries young consumers do not eat healthy and they have bad nutrition habits, with all consequences of that. Also the meals prepared in schools are not always balanced. Students also do not have a good knowledge about nutrition. Ingredients used for schoolmeals are not always good. Regional products could be a good alternative. This project aims to contribute to better and healthy meals in schools and to a promotion of the use of regional products.

### Objectives

The above formulated aim can be split up in a number of (summarized) more concrete objectives:

1. School canteens will provide healthy food, delivered by regional suppliers/producers,
2. To realise that lessons in healthy food and nutrition habits are implemented and becomes part of the curriculum in schools,
3. Each region develops a community of practice with relevant stakeholders, for dissemination and exploitation,
4. An exchange of best practices and additional mobilities of actors (teachers, trainers, others) and pupils are expected to contribute to a better understanding and to the development of networks,
5. To present recommendations about adjustments of regional policy on healthy regional food on schools will be realised.

### Number and profile of participants

Participants are on different levels: Teachers/trainers, students, staff in school canteens, regional producers, regional government. Indirectly also parents can be involved. The total number of participants will be over 250, partly in international meetings, mainly in national dissemination events.

### Description of activities

Main activities are:

Development of intellectual outputs:

- Good Practices in the participating countries.
- Learning materials for young consumers
- Training manual for trainers: how to use the learning materials.
- Manual Quality Assurance

Also the set-up of national/regional Communities of Practice (CoP) will be foreseen, as well as a website. In the CoP, all relevant actors will meet and work on better meals and the use of regional products.

Apart of meetings of the Core Unit, and some other transnational meetings (including a big training event), the focus will also be on the national multiplier events.

### Methodology

The core unit will coordinate the project; project management will use basic principles of QA and HACCP

Experts from different nationalities will work on the development of intellectual outputs

Learning material will be competency based (learning outcomes related to national qualifications profiles) For that it will be very practical, with a direct link to changes in school canteens. It will stimulate and invite students to participate in these improvements

The CoP will be characterised by an open structure, where all actors can meet and work together.

**Results and impact**

At the end of the project there will be a number of active CoP's on national level. The relevant stakeholders will continue to meet, also after the project has ended.

On a number of schools, the new developed learning materials will be used and become a part of the regular curriculum

On a number of schools regional products will be used for the preparation of school meals.

In general the project (hopes to) contribute to a better health of the young generation and a more sustainable agriculture.

Please provide a translation in English.

does not apply; see above

**2.1. Summary of participating organisations**

Role of the Organisation	PIC of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Type of Organisation	Accreditation of organisation (if applicable)	Activation Start Date	Activation End Date
Beneficiary	947953162	Stichting Nordwin College	Netherlands	Other		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	945528744	EUROPEA - Europe de l'Enseignement Agronomique	Belgium	Other		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	999513900	USTAV ZEMEDELSKE EKONOMIKY A INFORMACI	Czech Republic	Other		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	943190753	Agrarmarketing Mecklenburg-Vorpommern e.V.	Germany	Other		01/11/2014	09/12/2016

Partner	949250246	Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.	Germany	Non-governmental organisation/association/social enterprise		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	941674158	ANDREAS HERMES AKADEMIE im BILDUNGSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN LANDWIRTSCHAFT EV	Germany	School/Institute/Educational centre – Adult education		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	946172339	RGBConsultancy	Netherlands	Counselling body		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	946988012	Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul"	Romania	Other		01/11/2014	31/10/2016
Partner	999858444	UNIVERSITATEA DIN ORADEA	Romania	Other	RO ORADEA01	01/11/2014	31/10/2016

<b>Total number of participating organisations</b>	<b>9</b>
--	----------

### 2.1.1. Associated Partners

This section doesn't apply for this project

### 3. Description of the Project

in this section, you are asked to give information about the objectives and topics addressed by your project;

Were all original objectives of the project met? How were they reached? Please comment also on any objectives initially pursued but not achieved in the project.

1. School canteens will provide healthy food, delivered by regional suppliers/producers, For those partners where this was relevant it has been reached.

Nordwin College

Nordwin Heerenveen has improved the school canteen. They received a national certificate for that: "Gezonde Schoolkantine". This is an initiative of the Dutch "Voedingscentrum". See their website <http://gezondeschoolkantine.voedingscentrum.nl/nl.aspx>.

Nordwin also took measures to reduce the waste in the school canteen and most important they developed a school garden. Here the students produce vegetables and herbs, which can be used in the canteen. In the theoretical lessons about horticulture, there is a link to healthy food and organic production.

RGB

As a result of this project, RGB has close contacts with the King William I College (KWIC) in 's Hertogenbosch. This school has modernised the school canteen in a very impressive way. There is a big variety of healthy meals available and in the lectures, students learn more. During the final meeting in Berlin, RGB gave a presentation of the achievements (see Dropbox) They also received a national certificate for the "Gezonde Schoolkantine".

RGB/Koning Willem I College now has contacts with different caterers. They want to play a more active role in school policy not only regarding healthy food in school canteens but also on creating more awareness on a healthy lifestyle in general.

University of Oradea

Not relevant

Mihai Viteazul

The school has started a project where old traditional meals are rediscovered and produced in a modern way by the students in the school canteen. Products are mainly regional.

SBW

As the replacer of Agrarmarketing, SBW has a canteen for their trainees, where biological meals are produced. Participants of the RME could taste these meals and see how students produced them. As much as possible they use regional products. SBW also organized a student and teacher exchange around the topic of healthy food with partner Mihai Viteazul from Romania via an Erasmus KAI project.

Andreas Hermes Akademie (AHA)

As such AHA has no school canteen. In their training program they offer courses related to this topic. Their main target group are teachers and other adults.

UZEI

This question is not applicable for UZEI. However, in the RME, the topic was on the agenda and discussed with participants, including members of the CoP.

Europea

Since EUROPEA is a union of more than 1000 agricultural schools in 28 EU member states, it is not

realistic to expect that all members have implemented innovations in their canteens. During the lifetime of TOL, EUROPEA has organised 4 meetings, with an average of 100 participants each. Were appropriate, TOL has been presented, both in the meetings and on their website.

2. To realise that lessons in healthy food and nutrition habits are implemented and becomes part of the curriculum in schools,

Nordwin Yes, see also objective nr 1.

RGB Yes, in King William I College, see also objective nr.1

EUROPEA Not relevant

UZEI Not relevant

SBW SBW offers training activities about this topic

AHA AHA offers training activities about this topic

Mihai Viteazul Yes, see also objective nr.1

University of Oradea Not relevant

Apart of that, Andreas Hermes Akademie has made a set of materials for training of teachers. See results in the Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs 02: "Teaching TOL".

3. Each region develops a community of practice with relevant stakeholders, for dissemination and exploitation,

Yes, all partners, except EUROPEA, have organised a CoP.

See their results (members, meetings, plans, etc.) in the Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs, IO 05: "Communities of Practice".

4. An exchange of best practices and additional mobilities of actors (teachers, trainers, others) and pupils are expected to contribute to a better understanding and to the development of networks,

The partners have described Best Practices. Transnational project meetings have been used to present these Best Practices. Also on the TOL website ([www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu)), these were presented. And finally a booklet contains the most relevant ones. See the Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs, IO 03: "Best Practices in TOL".

Additional mobility has not been realised, since the partners had no KA1 funds for mobility.

5. To present recommendations about adjustments of regional policy on healthy regional food on schools will be realised.

During the final meeting in Berlin, in close cooperation with the Dutch Agricultural Attachee on the Netherlands Embassy, the main conclusions and recommendations have been formulated and shared among the partners. Each partner takes these results with them to present it on national level to relevant stakeholders. In some countries, it is not so easy to have such a big influence on the national government to change the curriculum.

What were the achievements of the project? Please provide a detailed description of the project results (if they are not listed in the sections "intellectual outputs", "multiplier events" or "learning, training, teaching activities"). Please describe achievements exceeding the initial expectations, if relevant.

Additional to the results of our Intellectual Outputs, Regional Multiplier Events and Communities of Practice, there were some additional achievements that were not described in the original proposal:

As an extra chapter of the Management manual, SBW produced "Organisation of CoP's in TOL". See Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs, IO 01, chapter 5.

Project Manual, by RGB. During the project, this manual has been developed, as it was a living

document. See Dropbox: project documents, 02 project management: "Project Manual".

Evaluation of the project by an external evaluator. Special guidelines for the evaluator were developed and discussed with the evaluator (by Nordwin). Mrs Dr. Ines Coldeway from Germany joined also the final meeting. After that, she wrote her report. See Dropbox: project documents, 02, project management: "Guidelines for Evaluation" and "Evaluation Report."

Supporting Document "Scenario's for the Communities of Practice (CoP) and the Regional Multiplier Events (RME)", by Nordwin. See Dropbox: project documents.

Supporting document "Overall evaluation of CoP's and RME's", by Nordwin. See Dropbox: project documents.

Supporting document "Project Quality Management", by Nordwin. In this document was the focus on the Quality Management of the project activities and not on Quality Management as a topic in the production of food (see IO 01, chapter 3) See Dropbox: project documents.

As indicated, all these documents can be found in the Dropbox. Our National Agency has access to this. The complete Dropbox has been placed on a USB-stick and sent to the NA. Further products are described under Intellectual Outputs.

In what way was the project innovative and/or complementary to other projects already carried out?

The project refers to some main concerns (Both on European and national level) about eating habits of young people. It is innovative to create Communities of Practice, where relevant actors come together and discuss the possibilities to do something on it. Since these CoP's are regional, they respect the big differences per region/country. Stakeholders of these CoP's were also invited for the Regional Multiplier Events. See also the Original project document. Dropbox: Project Documents.

In our Intellectual Output nr 01, we included chapters about marketing (chapter 2) and management of change (chapter 3). We hope that future users can have profits of these chapters. We realised that processes of change and marketing are essential for many projects. Change is difficult, especially in education and marketing is often underestimated. See Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs 01 "Managing TOL"

The food production and food presentation in school canteens has changed dramatically in several countries. This is a first step towards better food habits of youngsters. There was a close connection with national activities such as Smaaklessen (NL) and Vitalmenü (D). Also the development of Qualitätsstandards für die Schulpflege by the German Bundesministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Verbraucherschutz gave valuable additional information. Also in Germany, in Niedersachsen, is an on-going project about school milk. It is advised to look for further connection with national developments. In The Netherlands, The certificate Healthy Canteens has a follow-up: The healthy school. This includes all aspects of health. Internationally, Eco-schools become more important. The same for smoke-free school environments. TOL has spread this information among the partners. See also the website [www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu) and the Dropbox: project documents, "Project Content."

What were the most relevant priorities addressed by your project?(multiple selection possible)  
× Promoting healthy lifestyles (incl. participating in outdoor activities and grassroots sports) × Aligning VET policies with national, regional or local economic development strategies

•

- Promoting healthy lifestyles (incl. participating in outdoor activities and grassroots sports)
- Aligning VET policies with national, regional or local economic development strategies

In case the selected priorities are different from the ones in the application, please explain why.

TOL has realised many different activities related to the second priority. Especially in the CoP's, strategies were developed on local or regional level. An example is the regional activity in Romania, where traditional foods (from grandparents) were reintroduced for the younger generation, but in a more healthy way. This was in close cooperation with local/regional producers.

In Mecklenburg-Vorpommern parents are closely related to a caterer, who produces school meals with as much as possible, regional products.

In The Netherlands, Smaaklessen stimulates the Week of the Breakfast, where school children have breakfast in school. See for all Good Practices, the Dropbox: Intellectual Outputs 03, "Best Practices in TOL".

In general, consumers and producers met in the RME's, where this topic was one of the important ones.

Healthy lifestyle promotion, the first priority, was a bit different. To have outdoor activities for children, was limited to some excursions to regional producers. Outdoor activities are part of the regular program for gymnastics and it is not always easy to change that.

Interesting was the discussion about "health". This is not the same for everybody. Also per country/region, it may differ. So during the project, there were many activities related to healthy food, but without mentioning it as such.

There were no complete different priorities in the project. Looking at the description of the original results, we conclude that most of these results have been realised. Such as using the IO's Manual Managing, Manual Teaching, Best Practices and the website. The CoP's have been realised on a regional level. They still are active and most of them will continue to exist, also after the completion of the project. Interesting was that in some countries schools got a certificate for having a healthy canteen, or being a healthy school. This was not foreseen, but very interesting, also for the other partners.

What were the most relevant topics addressed by your project?(multiple selection possible)

× Health and wellbeing × Agriculture, forestry and fisheries × Regional dimension and cooperation

- 
- Health and wellbeing
- Agriculture, forestry and fisheries
- Regional dimension and cooperation

In case the selected topics are different from the ones in the application, please explain why.

As mentioned before, it is obvious that the first topic had a central position in most of the activities. See the different Intellectual Outputs and the website [www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu).

Since in the CoP's, also agricultural producers were represented, also agriculture was relevant. Forestry and fisheries was automatically connected to agriculture, but it is also clear that these two were less important.

All CoP's had a strong regional character. So the regional dimension and cooperation have been realised. See Dropbox for the CoP reports and the Good Practices, Intellectual Outputs 03 "Best Practices" and 05 "Communities of Practice."



## 4. Project Management

Which activities and indicators of achievement (quantitative and qualitative) did you put in place in order to assess whether and to what extent did the project reach its objectives and results? How did you measure the level of success?

We introduced an external evaluator, dr. Ines Maerkle-Coldewey. Her report can be found in the drop box: Project documents -> Evaluation of Erasmus TOL project by external evaluator.

Out of the quality system set up by our quality managers Hans Blankestijn and dr. Elke Halm a Supporting Document for Communities of Practice (CoP's) and their Regional Multiplier Events (RME's) was introduced. Each of the 6 CoP's and 7 RME's were evaluated and the results can be found in the drop box: CoP's and their activities -> 1. Regional Multiplier Event RME CoP W Mecklenburg DE + 2. "" Brabant NL + 3. "" Friesland NL + 4. "" Bihor County RO + 4a. "" Oradea Bihor County RO + 5. "" Central Bohemia CZ + 6. NR Westphalen DE.

End evaluations can be found in the drop box: Project documents -> TOL Project Quality Management Report and TOL Project Quality Report CoP's and their RME's.

All the transnational project meetings were evaluated. See the drop box: Meetings -> 1. 1th CU Earnewolde NL minutes + 2. Kick-off Berlin DE minutes + 3. 2th CU Prague CZ minutes + 4. General Training Oradea RO minutes + 5. End meeting Berlin DE minutes.

How were the quality, effectiveness and efficiency of the project monitored and evaluated (include budget control and time management)? Please mention the involved staff profiles and frequency of such activities.

Budget control, time management etc. was monitored and evaluated by way of the interim report, on the spot check and end report by Dutch NA. See drop box: Project documents -> Interim report (final version) + Interim Report Evaluation + On the spot check + End report (when finished to be put in the drop box).

The doings of the CoP's and their RME's were monitored by other project partners. They also made a description by way of an article for the TOL website. The evaluations can be found in the drop box (see above) as well as the articles: CoP's and their activities -> 1. Article about RME W Mecklenburg DE + 2. "" Brabant NL + 3. "" Friesland NL + 4. "" Bihor County RO + 4a. "" Oradea Bihor County RO + 5. "" Central Bohemia CZ + 6. NR Westphalen DE.

If relevant, please describe any difficulties you have encountered in managing the implementation of the project and how you and your partners handled them. What measures were used to handle project risks (e.g. conflict resolution processes, etc.)?

The change of a partner in an early stage of the project was handled by an official Grand Agreement Amendment.

Relevant project information is described in a clear and updated way in a project manual easy to use for the project partners. See drop box: Project documents -> Project Manual V

When necessary extra meetings by daily management (Hans Aartsen, Hans Blankestijn, Peter van der Baan) were held. Decisions were made and communicated directly by e-mail to the partners.



## 5. Implementation

this section asks for information about all the stages of the project: implementation of main activities including practical arrangements, participants' profile, impact, dissemination of the results and future plans;

Please describe the activities organised by your project and elaborate on the methodology you applied. Please provide detailed information in particular about the project activities that were supported by the grant for Project Management and Implementation.

6x CoP's organized marketing and PR activities, including 7 Regional Multiplier Events (RME's). There was policy making with external stakeholders and dissemination activities. The CoP's and RME's were monitored and evaluated by the other project partners.

Deliverables (IO) were made, such as a manual managing TOL, manual teaching TOL, a booklet for PR with best practices and a TOL website.

Partners searched for and evaluated best practices and they contributed to the transnational project meetings (2x CU, kick-off, General Training and an end meeting) with their attendance and presentations.

Reports for Dutch NA were made as contributions for the projects quality system (Supporting Document and Final Quality reports). Also contributions for the TOL website were made.

The methodology used was teach-the-teacher as performed in the General Training.

See for a full description in the drop box: CoP's and their activities + Intellectual Outputs + Materials for the website + Meetings + Project documents.

How did the project partners contribute to the project? Please detail specific competences brought in by the partner organisations.

This is mentioned in the paragraph before, so in summary 6x CoP's, 7x RME's, 4x IO's (manuals, a booklet, a website), best practices, transnational meetings.

The competences brought in are: organizational, analyzing, knowledge & expertise about healthy food in school canteens, presentation techniques, co-operation and management.

Appointments were held, deliveries were on time and the communication (via e-mail) was prompt and good.

What is your qualitative appreciation about the cooperation and communication between the partners and with other relevant stakeholders during the implementation of this project? What are the positive and negative elements of this cooperation process? What are the elements you would improve if you were to carry out a similar project in the future?

The qualitative appreciations are mentioned in the qualitative reports of the CoP's & their RME's and the final quality reports. See drop box: CoP's and their activities -> 1. Regional Multiplier Event RME CoP W Mecklenburg DE + 2. "" Brabant NL + 3. "" Friesland NL + 4. "" Bihor County RO + 4a. "" Oradea Bihor County RO + 5. "" Central Bohemia CZ + 6. NR Westphalen DE.

Project documents -> TOL Project Quality Management Report and TOL Project Quality Report CoP's and their RME's.

Appointments were held, deliveries were on time and the communication (via e-mail) was prompt and good. No negative experiences.

A suggestion for improvement would be to make it a 3 year project with at the end of the last year an evaluation meeting, so there will be a better check if the outcomes of the project are really sustainable.

What target groups were addressed in your activities plan?

Teachers (to be trained) were the main target group. In the CoP's and at the RME's were present:

Students, parents, canteen staff and cooks, school management, caterers, local producers, regional governments and other external stakeholders.

### 5.1. Involvement of Participants With Fewer Opportunities

Did your project involve participants facing situations that make their involvement in the project activities more difficult?

No

### 5.2. Transnational Project Meetings

Please describe the Transnational Project Meetings organised within your project. What was the purpose and frequency of the transnational project meetings and who participated? Please elaborate how these meetings served the purpose of project coordination and implementation and in case there is a difference between what was planned and what was implemented, please explain why.

Not relevant

### 5.3. Intellectual Outputs

Please describe the Intellectual Outputs produced by your project. Please provide detailed information in particular about the nature of the outputs, the significant contribution in terms of impact and transferability (e.g. new curricula, pedagogical materials, IT Tools, analysis and studies, etc.) and in case there is a difference between what was planned and what was implemented, please explain why.

IO 01: Manual Managing TOL consists of 5 chapters: Needs analysis, Regional marketing, Quality assurance, Change and implementation and Organization of a CoP. This manual was used in the CoP's referring to how to organize a healthy school canteen. It has therefore been used as a tool for (school) management.

IO 02: Manual Teaching TOL consists of 5 chapters: Summary, Manual & overview, Handout, PPP presentation, Photo protocol. This manual was used in the CoP's and in the RME's for how to organize lessons/lectures in class for students/pupils.

IO 03: Booklet Good Practices TOL: this booklet was used by the CoP's for marketing and PR and in their RME's.

IO 04: Website TOL: all the activities of the project can be found on the website, such as info about the project partners, the IO's as open source (manuals, booklet), the CoP's and their RME's, a choice of the 'best' best practices and how to contact the project management. The website will exist also after the project has ended. [www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu)

IO 05: There are 6 regional Communities of Practice (CoP's): CoP Friesland NL, CoP West Mecklenburg DE, CoP NR Westphalen DE, CoP Central Bohemia CZ, CoP Bihor County Mihai Viteazul RO and CoP Bihor County Oradea RO. They all organized one or more Regional Multiplier Events (RME's).

You can find the IO's as well as on the website [www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu) as in the drop box:

CoP's and their activities and Intellectual Outputs.

There are no real differences between what was planned and what was implemented.

<b>Output Identification</b>	O1
<b>Output title</b>	Manual "Managing TOL"
<b>Output Type</b>	Methodology/guidelines
<b>Output Description</b>	Manual Managing TOL consists of 5 chapters: Needs analysis, Regional marketing, Quality assurance, Change and implementation and Organization of a CoP. This manual was used in the CoP's referring to how to organize a healthy school canteen. It has therefore been used as a tool for (school) management
<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/10/2014
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	31/10/2016
<b>Available Languages</b>	English
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	Stichting Nordwin College
<b>Participating Organisations</b>	Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V., Agrarmarketing Mecklenburg-Vorpommern e.V., RGBConsultancy
<b>Output Identification</b>	O2
<b>Output title</b>	Manual "Teaching TOL"
<b>Output Type</b>	Learning/teaching/training material
<b>Output Description</b>	Manual Teaching TOL consists of 5 chapters: Summary, Manual & overview, Handout, PPP presentation, Photo protocol. This manual was used in the CoP's and in the RME's for how to organize lessons/lectures in class for students/pupils.

<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/10/2014
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	30/06/2016
<b>Available Languages</b>	English
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	ANDREAS HERMES AKADEMIE im BILDUNGSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN LANDWIRTSCHAFT EV
<b>Participating Organisations</b>	
<b>Output Identification</b>	O3
<b>Output title</b>	Booklet "Best Practices TOL"
<b>Output Type</b>	Policy recommendations/guidelines
<b>Output Description</b>	Booklet Good Practices TOL: this booklet was used by the CoP's for marketing and PR and in their RME's.
<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/02/2015
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/10/2016
<b>Available Languages</b>	English
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	EUROPEA - Europe de l'Enseignement Agronomique
<b>Participating Organisations</b>	
<b>Output Identification</b>	O4
<b>Output title</b>	Website TOL
<b>Output Type</b>	Service/structure
<b>Output Description</b>	Website: all the activities of the project can be found on the website, such as info about the project partners, the IO's as open source (manuals, booklet), the CoP's and their RME's, a choice of the 'best' best practices and how to contact the project management. The website will exist also after the project has ended. <a href="http://www.thetasteoflife.eu">www.thetasteoflife.eu</a>
<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/09/2014
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	31/08/2016
<b>Available Languages</b>	English
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	EUROPEA - Europe de l'Enseignement Agronomique

<b>Participating Organisations</b>	
<b>Output Identification</b>	O5
<b>Output title</b>	Communities of Practice (CoP) of relevant stake holders in each participating region/country
<b>Output Type</b>	Other
<b>Output Description</b>	There are 6 regional Communities of Practice (CoP's): CoP Friesland NL, CoP West Mecklenburg DE, CoP NR Westphalen DE, CoP Central Bohemia CZ, CoP Bihor County Mihai Viteazul RO and CoP Bihor County Oradea RO. They all organized one or more Regional Multiplier Events (RME's).
<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/11/2014
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	31/10/2016
<b>Available Languages</b>	English, Dutch, German
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.
<b>Participating Organisations</b>	EUROPEA - Europe de l'Enseignement Agronomique, Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul", Stichting Nordwin College, USTAV ZEMEDELSKE EKONOMIKY A INFORMACI, UNIVERSITATEA DIN ORADEA, ANDREAS HERMES AKADEMIE im BILDUNGSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN LANDWIRTSCHAFT EV, Agrarmarketing Mecklenburg-Vorpommern e.V.

#### 5.4. Multiplier Events

Please describe the multiplier events carried out in your project in support of the produced intellectual outputs and in case there is a difference between what was planned and what was implemented, please explain why.

The Management Manual and the Teaching Manual as well as the booklet and the website were named and used in the Regional Multiplier Events (RME's). No differences between planning and implementation occurred.

A fine impression of what happened at the RME's you can find in the drop box as well as on the TOL website [www.thetasteoflife.eu](http://www.thetasteoflife.eu) behind the button Communities of Practice.

Drop box: CoP's and their activities ->

1. Article about RME W. Mecklenburg DE
2. Article about RME Brabant NL
3. Article about RME Friesland NL
4. Article about RME Bihor (MV) RO

4a Article about RME Oradea Bihor RO

5. Article about RME Central Bohemia CZ

## 6. Article about RME NR Westphalen DE

<b>Event Identification</b>	E1
<b>Event Title</b>	Regional TOL events
<b>Event Description</b>	In the Netherlands, Germany, Czech Republic, Romania and (via Europea) Denmark, regional events will be organised, with all relevant stakeholders as participant. During these events project results will be disseminated and further input collected.
<b>Country of Venue</b>	Netherlands
<b>Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	01/02/2015
<b>End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)</b>	31/10/2016
<b>Intellectual Outputs Covered (using Output Identification number)</b>	O5
<b>Leading Organisation</b>	Stichting Nordwin College
<b>Participating Organisations</b>	Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V., ANDREAS HERMES AKADEMIE im BILDUNGSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN LANDWIRTSCHAFT EV, UNIVERSITATEA DIN ORADEA, RGBConsultancy, USTAV ZEMEDELSKE EKONOMIKY A INFORMACI, Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul"

**5.5. Learning/Teaching/Training Activities**

This section doesn't apply for this project

## 6. Follow-up

### 6.1. Impact

What was the project's impact on the partners and other organisations involved in the project?

#### Stichting Nordwin College

Nordwin became a school with the certificate "Gezonde School Kantine"

Nordwin started a school garden for the students. Products will be used in the school meals. In the near future, parents will be more involved.

Also other branches of the Nordwin College are interested in the project results.

See Dropbox IO 03.

#### RGB Consultancy

Intellectual Output 01, chapter 3 – Change management – is and will be used also in other activities of this consultancy organisation. See for the results the Dropbox.

Lessons learnt: It is important to have students and their teachers involved in their own canteen. The same is for caterers, canteen staff and management. This has been realised in the Koning Willem I College in Den Bosch.

#### University of Oradea

The University has established better contacts with regional producers and other actors in the production chain. Research has been done in the history of school meals and how to modernise these traditional meals. Also here, the discussion about prices of regional products, availability through the year and governmental subsidy has got a boost and will continue.

#### Colegiul Tehnic "Mhai Viteazul"

This school has improved the quality of the school meals. Main activity was to solve the problem of high prices of regional products. On a high level (Ecological Agriculture National Federation) this was discussed. Now there is a list with regional suppliers, hopefully with financial support in the future. The school is now also involved in the organisation of extra-curricular activities, such as "A day on the farm", for students, but also for Kindergarten and primary schools.

#### EUROPEA

As a network organisation EUROPEA has presented the TOL project during their biannual meetings. This has led to dissemination to over 100 European agricultural schools. Their website mentions it as well. Via the EUROPEA website, the TOL website can be easily found. This connection will stay for many years.

#### Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.

In Mecklenburg-Vorpommern a network was initiated with relevant stakeholders. This is based on the German Action Plan "IN FORM". It seems that this network will stay alive, also after completion of the project. New meetings have been planned. New members will be invited, such as the Landesfrauenverband MV. Also here it was concluded that the involvement of parents is important. Direct involvement of parents can lead to a "parents food licence".

Andreas Hermes Akademie

For AHA it is clear that on one side all target groups (teachers, caterers, farmers) show a high awareness for the value of food, but at the same time, decisions will be made on economic or technical aspects, instead of better food. AHA will continue to work on a general change of ideas in food, or even in our society. To realise that, AHA needs motivated people to “keep the flame burning”.

UZEI Zemedelske Ekonomiky a Informaci

UZEI has created an active CoP, with many different actors. This CoP will continue its activities in the near future. UZEI has developed presentations for trainers (in the Czech language) These materials will be used also in the future. They were based on a series of seminars. In the future UZEI wants to develop healthy – but also attractive – cook books and also to boost the participation of farmers.

Outside of the participating organisations which were the project's target groups and other relevant stakeholders? What was the project's impact on them and how did the results reach them?

In all participating countries CoP's were formed. In these CoP's were also other partners represented: teachers, school management, farmers, producers, governmental organisations, parents, etc. These were also influenced by the project. Composition of these CoP's were different per country; however, a comparable impact was on the parents. They are now more aware; more motivated to play an active role in the schools, to improve the quality of meals.

How has the project contributed to the achievement of the most relevant priorities (as outlined in the description section)? To which extent was the expected impact reached?

The original objectives were:

- To spread our results to other schools and other actors
- To reach more awareness for healthy and regional food and get more of this food into schools.
- To continue with regional multiplier events and CoP's, after TOL has finished.

Looking at the results, the conclusion is as follows:

- Our results have been presented, but mainly via the website and in some cases during RME's. We think that we need a more active dissemination to spread the results in a better way. Some partners will do that in the coming year
- This second objective has been realised. Looking at concrete changes in school organisations or in improvements of school canteens, we can be satisfied about this. See also Dropbox, IO 03 Good Practices.
- Based on the plans of most the partners, CoP's will continue after completion of TOL.

What was the impact of the project at the local, regional, European and/or international levels? Please provide qualitative and quantitative indicators.

Stichting Nordwin College

Difference between local and regional is not so easy to make. Contacts with 6 local/regional producers has been established. Next CoP meeting is planned.

National: certificate for a healthy school canteen has been achieved.

RGB Consultancy

Main impact was on the Koning Willem I College in Den Bosch. This is a secondary vocational school. They have modernised their school canteen completely. Also here the certificate for a healthy canteen has been achieved. Now they work on the concept of "The healthy school"; an overall school concept. See also their PowerPoint presentation in Dropbox.

University of Oradea

Via de CoP, other actors have been involved. See also the overall document about the evaluation of RME and CoP in the Dropbox.

There are on-going contacts with regional authorities.

Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul"

Here many other actors are involved now:

- Mr Aram Fitiu, secretary general of the Ecological Agriculture National Federation ensured that law makers and local producers will discuss the supply of regional products
- Some primary schools and kindergartens agreed with local producers to organise "a day at the farm".

EUROPEA

Via Europea, more than 1000 agricultural schools in Europe have been informed about TOL. Via de EUROPEA website, they have easy access to the TOL website.

Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.

Main results are via the CoP. IN Schwerin, 35 different actors participated: schools, companies, caterers, and farmers, press. It is planned to continue these meetings and to invite new participants, such as the Landesfrauenverband MV. SBW would be happy with a follow-up project, where also more educational material can be developed.

Andreas Hermes Akademie

Contacts with other actors showed also that it is not easy to solve the problem of bad eating habits, bad quality of school meals. Economic arguments are more important than health arguments. To change this, AHA says: "We need a general CHANGE in our ideas about food: a change in our society. We need to work on the image of food". With the results of Intellectual Output 02 (Teaching manual) AHA offers training for teachers to spread this idea.

UZEI Zemedelske Ekonomiky a Informaci

Also here the impact goes via de CoP. Here are students, canteen staff, school management, nutritionists, journalists, etc., represented.

Presentations for trainers, including supporting materials (see Dropbox: CoP's and their activities) helps to influence teachers from different schools in this new philosophy of life, which is also reflected in nutrition.

## 6.2. Dissemination and Use of Projects' Results

To whom did you disseminate the project results inside and outside your partnership? Please define in particular your targeted audience(s) at local/regional/national/EU level/international and explain your choices.

### Stichting Nordwin College

Inside: Members of CoP's, including the parents and students.  
Outside: Via the Nordwin website: a wide range of visitors.

### RGB Consultancy

Inside: developed materials IO 01, will be used in future consultancy activities  
Outside: Koning Willem I College

### University of Oradea

Inside: to own students and staff  
Outside: to other schools and producers

### Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul"

Inside: Mainly to teachers and staff of canteen  
Outside: Local producers and the Ecological Agriculture National Federation

### EUROPEA

Inside: In the daily management group of EUROPEA  
Outside: During biannual meetings to participants (about 100 different schools) and to all 1000 members via de website from EUROPEA and the connected TOL website.

### Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.

Inside: Trainers will use the developed materials in training activities. The canteen has been improved, with more regional products.  
Outside: The on-going CoP in MV

### Andreas Hermes Akademie

Inside: Own trainers are trained with the results of IO 02  
Outside: AHA trainees (including trainers and teachers) have been trained as well.

### UZEI Zemedelske Ekonomiky a Informaci

Inside: Own trainers are more experienced in topics such as varied diet, local market, myths about diet, practical aspects of school canteens, potatoes and school meals, healthy snacks, special projects for elementary schools, use of the healthy school canteen in the marketing of the school and legislation topics.  
Outside: Participants of seminars mentioned above, have new knowledge and use that in their daily work.

What kind of dissemination activities did your partnership carry out and through which channels? Please also provide information on the feedback received.

There was a wide range of activities. Where appropriate, products of these activities are in the Dropbox. Some of these activities did not lead to direct feedback. In case of feedback, some reactions were:

- Positive idea, but can it be realised (price, constant availability of products)
- How far the government will support this idea, or are there blockades?
- How can we increase the involvement of parents

- How can we find enthusiastic teachers, who keep the flame burning
- How can we continue with active CoPs, after this TOL project

Many questions, not always good answers. Certain developments are beyond the influence of the consortium. Nevertheless there were many different activities to disseminate.

- Website TOL
- Partner's websites, including EUROPEA
- Newsletters TOL
- Presentation during RME's and in CoP meetings.
- Articles in regional media (newspapers, etc.)
- Interview on regional radio and TV (mainly in Romania)
- Internal presentations to the teams
- Brochure about a healthy school canteen (Nordwin), nationally spread as a result of the national program "Voorop in de vergroening".

Erasmus+ promotes an open access requirement for all materials produced through its projects. In case your project has produced intellectual outputs/tangible deliverables, please describe if and how you have promoted the free access for the public, through the internet, to a digital form thereof. In case a limitation was foreseen for the use of the open licence, please specify the reasons, extent and nature of this limitation.

Apart of some own activities of the partners – the use of concrete IO deliverables in own training activities - the promotion was mainly in presentations during the regional multiplier events. See also the reports in the Dropbox, including an overall evaluation of all CoP and RME.  
Apart of the RME's, the TOL website played a promotional role.  
Some parts were also used in other on-going Erasmus-projects.

How have you ensured that the project's results will remain available and/or will be used by others?

Main advantage of the partner EUROPEA is their website, with many visitors. They will also host the TOL website – with all documents – for the coming years.  
Our present partners will have permanent access to the TOL Dropbox, where all materials can be found.

How did you see the potential to use this project's approach in other projects on a larger scale and/or in a different field or area?

The concept of CoP's is good and could be used in other projects. A CoP and a related RME respects the regional differences in education in general, and the specific position of school meals in the different countries. That means that in a future project, the overall focus should be on methods, which can be used by most of the partners, where the materials can have a regional character.

### 6.3. Sustainability

Which activities and results will be maintained after the end of the EU funding? How will these activities be implemented and supported?

Stichting Nordwin College

Nordwin has already planned a new meeting with the members of the CoP. It is the idea to make this to a regular event.

In the concept of “De gezonde kantine”, many ideas, related to TOL have been collected in a brochure called “Recept voor een groene, gezonde kantine”. See also in the Dropbox: IO 03 “ Best practices”.

#### RGB Consultancy

The Koning Willem I College will continue its activities towards the “Healthy School”, independent of external funding.

#### University of Oradea

The University will integrate the project results in the own program and will continue their contacts with local producers and governmental organisations. It fits in their tasks and can be financed out of the lump sum financing.

#### Colegiul Tehnic “Mhai Viteazul”

The CoP will continue after ending the project.

The school will stimulate and support farmers and primary schools and kindergarten to organise “a day at the farm”.

#### EUROPEA

EUROPEA is a strong organisation, which will organise every 6 month a conference for the partners. There is room for talking about this topic. Also their website will be a stable and sustainable place for finding materials and exchange ideas.

#### Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.

The CoP will continue, even with extension with new members.  
TOL-training materials will be included in the SBW program

#### Andreas Hermes Akademie

AHA will keep the CoP alive  
They will include the results of IO 02 into their regular training program

#### UZEI Zemedelske Ekonomiky a Informaci

The CoP will continue, with a more important role for farmers.  
UZEI will give advisory to schools to improve the state of Czech school cafeteria's and the possibility to choose local and healthy food.

## 7. Budget

this section gives a detailed overview of the final amount of the EU grant you request;

### 7.1. Budget Summary

PIC of the Organisation	Project Management and Implementation	Transnational Project Meetings	Intellectual Outputs	Multiplier Events	Learning/Teaching/Training Activities			Special Needs Support	Exceptional Costs	Exceptional Cost Guarantee	Total Amount (Calculated)	Total Amount (Adjusted)
					EU Travel Grant	EU Individual Support	Linguistic Support Grant					
947953162	12,000.00	7,475.00	39,283.00	5,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	64,558.00	64,558.00
941674158	6,000.00	5,175.00	14,124.00	5,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	31,099.00	31,099.00
943190753	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
945528744	6,000.00	4,600.00	12,726.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	23,326.00	23,326.00
946172339	6,000.00	6,900.00	4,820.00	2,900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,620.00	20,620.00
946988012	6,000.00	1,725.00	222.00	2,900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10,847.00	10,847.00
949250246	6,000.00	1,725.00	9,630.00	2,900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20,255.00	20,255.00
999513900	6,000.00	4,600.00	1,507.00	5,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	17,907.00	17,907.00
999858444	6,000.00	2,875.00	222.00	2,900.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	11,997.00	11,997.00

<b>Total</b>	54,000.00	35,075.00	82,534.00	29,000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	200,609.00	200,609.00
--------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------------	------------

### 7.1.1. Project Total Amount

Project Total Amount Reported (Calculated)	200,609.00
Project Total Amount Reported (Adjusted)	200,609.00

Please provide any further comments you may have concerning the above figures especially if the adjusted amount differs from the calculated amount.

Opmerking over budgetverschuiving van project meetings naar IO 01 en 05. Most of the multiplier events had more participants as calculated. WE calculated the maximum amount of participants.

### 7.2. Project management and implementation

PIC of the Organisation	Role of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Total Amount (Adjusted)
947953162	Beneficiary	Stichting Nordwin College	12,000.00
941674158	Partner	ANDREAS HERMES AKADEMIE im BILDUNGSWERK DER DEUTSCHEN LANDWIRTSCHAFT EV	6,000.00
943190753	Partner	Agrarmarketing Mecklenburg-Vorpommern e.V.	0.00
946988012	Partner	Colegiul Tehnic "Mihai Viteazul"	6,000.00
945528744	Partner	EUROPEA - Europe de l'Enseignement Agronomique	6,000.00

946172339	Partner	RGBConsultancy	6,000.00
949250246	Partner	Schweriner Bildungswerkstatt e.V.	6,000.00
999858444	Partner	UNIVERSITATEA DIN ORADEA	6,000.00
999513900	Partner	USTAV ZEMEDEL'SKE EKONOMIKY A INFORMACI	6,000.00
<b>Total</b>			<b>54,000.00</b>

**7.3. Transnational Project Meetings**

PIC of the Sending Organisation	Total No. of Meetings	Total No. of Participants	Distance Band	Grant per participant	Total Amount (Calculated)	Total Amount (Adjusted)
941674158	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
941674158	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
941674158	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
941674158	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
941674158	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
943190753	1	0	100 - 1999 km	575.00	0.00	0.00

943190753	1	0	100 - 1999 km	575.00	0.00	0.00
943190753	1	0	100 - 1999 km	575.00	0.00	0.00
943190753	1	0	100 - 1999 km	575.00	0.00	0.00
943190753	1	0	100 - 1999 km	575.00	0.00	0.00
945528744	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
945528744	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
945528744	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
945528744	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
945528744	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
946172339	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
946172339	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00	1,725.00

946172339	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
946172339	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00	1,725.00
946172339	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00	1,725.00
946988012	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
946988012	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
946988012	1	4	0 - 99 km	0.00	0.00	0.00
946988012	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00
947953162	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00	1,725.00
947953162	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00
947953162	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00	2,300.00
947953162	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00	2,300.00
949250246	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00

949250246	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00	
949250246	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00	
999513900	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
999513900	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
999513900	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
999513900	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
999858444	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00	575.00	
999858444	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
999858444	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00	1,150.00	
<b>Total</b>						35,075.00	35,075.00

**7.4. Intellectual Outputs**

PIC of the Organisation	Output Identification	Staff Category	Country	No. Of Working Days	Grant per Day	Total Amount (Calculated)	Total Amount (Adjusted)
-------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	---------	---------------------	---------------	---------------------------	-------------------------

947953162	O1	Managers	Netherlands	0	294.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		141	241.00	33,981.00	33,981.00
		Technicians		0	190.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	157.00	0.00	0.00
949250246	O1	Managers	Germany	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		39	214.00	8,346.00	8,346.00
		Technicians		0	162.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00
943190753	O1	Managers	Germany	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		0	214.00	0.00	0.00
		Technicians		0	162.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00
946172339	O1	Managers	Netherlands	0	294.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		20	241.00	4,820.00	4,820.00
		Technicians		0	190.00	0.00	0.00

		Administrative support staff		0	157.00	0.00	0.00
941674158	O2	Managers	Germany	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		60	214.00	12,840.00	12,840.00
		Technicians		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
945528744	O3	Managers	Belgium	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		30	214.00	6,420.00	6,420.00
		Technicians		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
945528744	O4	Managers	Belgium	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		6	214.00	1,284.00	1,284.00
		Technicians		31	162.00	5,022.00	5,022.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00
945528744	O5	Managers	Belgium	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		0	214.00	0.00	0.00

		Technicians		0	162.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00
946988012	O5	Managers	Romania	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		3	74.00	222.00	222.00
		Technicians		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
947953162	O5	Managers	Netherlands	0	294.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		22	241.00	5,302.00	5,302.00
		Technicians		0	190.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	157.00	0.00	0.00
999513900	O5	Managers	Czech Republic	0	164.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		11	137.00	1,507.00	1,507.00
		Technicians		0	102.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	78.00	0.00	0.00
		Managers		0	0.00	0.00	0.00

999858444	O5	Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker	Romania	3	74.00	222.00	222.00
		Technicians		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
941674158	O5	Managers	Germany	0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		6	214.00	1,284.00	1,284.00
		Technicians		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	0.00	0.00	0.00
943190753	O5	Managers	Germany	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		0	214.00	0.00	0.00
		Technicians		0	162.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00
949250246	O5	Managers	Germany	0	280.00	0.00	0.00
		Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Worker		6	214.00	1,284.00	1,284.00
		Technicians		0	162.00	0.00	0.00
		Administrative support staff		0	131.00	0.00	0.00

<b>Total</b>	378		82,534.00	82,534.00
--------------	-----	--	-----------	-----------

**7.5. Multiplier Events**

PIC of the Organisation Organising the Event	Event Identification	No. of Local Participants	Grant per Local Participant	No. of Foreign Participants	Grant per Foreign Participant	Total Amount (Calculated)	Total Amount (Adjusted)
949250246	E1	23	100.00	3	200.00	2,900.00	2,900.00
941674158	E1	32	100.00	13	200.00	5,800.00	5,800.00
999858444	E1	29	100.00	0	200.00	2,900.00	2,900.00
946172339	E1	29	100.00	0	200.00	2,900.00	2,900.00
999513900	E1	58	100.00	0	200.00	5,800.00	5,800.00
947953162	E1	58	100.00	0	200.00	5,800.00	5,800.00
946988012	E1	29	100.00	0	200.00	2,900.00	2,900.00
<b>Total</b>		258		16		29,000.00	29,000.00

**7.6. Learning/Teaching/Training Activities**

This section doesn't apply for this project

**7.7. Special Needs Support**

This section doesn't apply for this project

**7.8. Exceptional Costs**

This section doesn't apply for this project

**7.9. Exceptional costs - Guarantee**

This section doesn't apply for this project

## Annexes

in this section, you need to attach additional documents that are mandatory for the completion of the report;

Please note that all documents mentioned below need to be attached here before you submit your form online.

Before submitting your report to the National Agency, please check that:

- All necessary information on your project have been encoded in Mobility Tool+
- The report form has been completed using one of the official languages of the Erasmus+ Programme Countries.
- You have annexed all the relevant documents:
  - The Declaration of Honour signed by the legal representative of the beneficiary organisation.
  - The necessary supporting documents as requested in the grant agreement.
  - you have saved or printed the copy of the completed form for yourself.
- You have uploaded the relevant results on the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform: <http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/projects/>

[DOWNLOAD Declaration of Honour](#)

### List of uploaded files

- [Declaration of Honour \(getekend\).pdf](#) DOH  
0.15 Mb  
24 dagen geleden