

PR2 RobinFood – Clarifications

1	As far as the activity part of the report is concerned the quality of the information provided is poor. First, the content of the different sections should avoid simply repeating information as much as possible, and instead go into depth on the specific question asked. Second, the information provided in section 1.1 'Overview' should not overlap with activities to be reported in section 1.3 'Work plan'. Finally, we would appreciate if you could be as specific as possible when it comes to reporting on the project's activities, good practices and main outcomes. This kind of content-related information as well as the description of the main lessons learnt and results achieved will become more and more important as we approach the end of phase 1. This explains some of the clarification requests below.
2	Thank you for the information provided in section 1.1 Overview, involvement of partners. However we would appreciate if you could provide additional details about how the partners were involved in the preparation of the meeting. Finally, it seems that PP3 could not attend the meeting and we would like to know the reasons behind and the solutions proposed. Please add the relevant information directly in section 1.1 of the progress report.
3	Thank you for the information provided in section 1.1 Overview, policy learning process. However we would appreciate if you could provide additional details about the 3 good practices selected (name and country). Finally we would like to know how concretely the difficulties experienced in the first interregional event in Riga have been solved. Please add the relevant information directly in section 1.1 of the progress report.
4	Thank you for the information provided in section 1.1 Overview, stakeholders involved. We would appreciate if you could detail which stakeholders attended the meeting and some of the topics discussed. In addition, the organisation of the stakeholder meeting in Hungary took place outside the reporting period. Please remove this information and include it in the next PR. Thanks for amending the progress report accordingly.
5	Thanks for the information provided in section 1.1 related to your participation in the Policy Learning Platform (PLP) activities. There is however a confusion between the PLP activities and the activities directly organised by the programme/JS. Indeed, the activity mentioned in the report (i.e. action plan webinar in June 2019) was directly organised by the programme. We understand that the difference between programme and PLP activities is not always easy. The PLP is a strategic project of the programme and it focuses exclusively on thematic capitalisation related work through thematic workshops, publication of policy briefs and peer reviews. For future progress reports, we would be grateful if you could take this distinction into consideration to ensure that only the participation in PLP activities (if any) are mentioned in this section. We also thank you for your suggestion on sending the dates of the PLP events that we will pass to the PLP colleagues.
6	Thanks for completing section 1.2 on storytelling. The aim of this section is to highlight a particularly remarkable aspect of the project, which the programme may use to showcase its activities and achievements. Although interesting, the information currently provided in this section remains rather short and general. For future reports, we would be grateful if you could take this remark into consideration and ensure this section is completed only in case a particularly interesting aspect of the project can be described in sufficient detail.
7	Thank you for the information provided in section 1.3.1 Main outputs. However, indicators and activities are not fully corresponding. A figure of '5' is reported under the indicator 'no of good practices identified' but it seems that only 3 good practices were selected according to section 1.1 Overview. Please clarify and revise report accordingly, to ensure full consistency. Please start submitting these practices so that from the next progress report, the number corresponds to the practices available on your website. Finally, in the outputs section of the application form it was foreseen to identify 1 practice from each region (5). Please explain why only 3 were finally selected in section 'changes from the original plans'.
8	In section 1.3.1 Main outputs, it is stated that 10 policy learning events have been organised. However these figures are not precisely justified in the report in relation to the stakeholder group meetings. We would be grateful if you could revise section 1.3.2 Reporting per semester, a) Exchange of experience, by providing a clear quantification of each stakeholder meeting (place, date and number of participants). In addition, if several bilateral meetings take place in a partner region and the objective of the meetings is similar they should be counted only as one meeting. Thank you in advance for revising the relevant sections of the progress report accordingly.
9	In section 1.3.2 Reporting per semester, a) Exchange of experience, we would appreciate if you could include additional qualitative information about the main issues discussed during the interregional meeting. In addition, it seems that some information included in section 1.1 is again repeated in section 1.3.2. Please review and edit both sections to avoid this.
10	The quality of the reporting in section 1.3.2 Reporting per semester, b) communication and dissemination, is very poor. It seems that the objective of the activity reporting is misunderstood there. The text provided is identical to the information in the application form except for the tense of the verb. This is very artificial considering that the application form only gives the overall plans while the progress report should provide a detailed picture on what was actually achieved. The description should therefore be fully revised with concrete and relevant information. In addition, please clarify if the 2nd newsletter was produced as planned. If not, please justify under 'changes from the original plans'. Thanks for amending the progress report accordingly.
11	In section 1.3.2 Reporting per semester c) Project management, we would appreciate if you could include additional qualitative information about the main issues discussed during the Steering Committee. Moreover, please add the date and number of participants in this meeting. Thank you for amending the progress report accordingly.
12	In section 1.1 Overview, you mention that PP3 could not attend the interregional meeting. Please justify this in section 'changes from the original plans'. Thank you in advance.