

PR2 RobinFood – Clarifications

1	As far as the activity part of the report is concerned the quality of the information provided is poor. 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 the core phase. This explains some of the clarification requests below.
2	In section 1.2 Exchange of experience, a figure of '2' is reported under the indicator for policy learning events organised. However, back-to-back meetings should be counted as 1. Please update the indicator accordingly. Thank you in advance.
3	In section 1.2 Exchange of experience, we would appreciate if you could include additional qualitative information about the main issues discussed during the interregional meeting. Moreover, we would appreciate if you could provide additional details about the 3 good practices selected (name and country). Please review and edit this section accordingly. Thank you in advance.
4	In section 1.2 Exchange of experience, you mention that PP3 could not attend the interregional meeting. Please justify this in section 'Changes from the original plans'. Thank you in advance.
5	In section 1.2 Communication, the objective of the activity reporting is misunderstood. 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. This section 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'. Thank you in advance.