



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This communication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

ENSEC: Development of a European study program: International
Master's Degree for the Environmental Security Sector
Agreement Number: 2017-1-UK01-KA203-036521

TRANSNATIONAL MEETINGS

Main Author: Florin Ioras (BNU)

Contributing Authors:

<https://ensec-project.eu/>

“ENSEC” has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



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

Acronym of partner responsible for publication	BNU
Title of publication and authors	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Transnational Meetings• Florin Ioras
Date of publication	
Language of publication	English
Magazine name / website name	-
Link (if applicable)	-
Short description (applicable for scientific papers)	-

Table of Contents

ENSEC: Development of a European study program: International Master's Degree for the Environmental Security Sector	1
• Transnational Meetings.....	2
1. PARTNERS.....	4
2. Project Meetings Evaluation	5
3. Transnational Meeting 1: High Wycombe (UK).....	6
4. Transnational Meeting 2: Transylvania University of Brasov	13
5. Transnational meeting 3: University of Madeira	18
6. Transnational meeting 4: High Wycombe (The UK).....	23

1. PARTNERS

P1	BUCKINGHAMSHIRE NEW UNIVERSITY (Coordinator)	<i>BUCKS</i>	<i>UK</i>
P2	UNIVERSIDADE DA MADEIRA	<i>UMA</i>	<i>PT</i>
P3	ASSOCIACAO COMERCIAL E INDUSTRIAL DO FUNCHAL - CAMARA DE COMERCIO E INDUSTRIA DA MADEIRA	<i>CCIM</i>	<i>PT</i>
P4	UNIVERSITATEA TRANSILVANIA DIN BRASOV	<i>UTB</i>	<i>RO</i>
P5	EVM PROJECT MANAGEMENT EXPERTS SL	<i>EVM</i>	<i>ES</i>
P6	EESTI METSAKESKUS OÜ	<i>OEM</i>	<i>EE</i>
P7	UNIVERSIDAD POLITECNICA DE MADRID	<i>UPM</i>	<i>ES</i>
P8	PROJECTS ABROAD EUROPE LTD	<i>PA</i>	<i>UK</i>

2. Project Meetings Evaluation

Project meeting evaluation was based in 14 questions related to different aspects of the meeting about the host and the agenda items. The consortium had to value if the undertakings about that aspects were useful or not for the right development of the project and that consortium meeting.

The evaluation was made with a Likert scale where “9” means that the actions in that aspect during the Transnational Meeting were very useful, “5” means they were useful and “1” means they were not useful. In case that some aspect had an appraisal below 5, the consortium analysed it and proposed corrective measures for the following meetings. Moreover, partners give further comments and suggestions in order to improve that items.

The aspects to be analysed about the host and the contents in each TM were the following:

- 1) Booking & pre-event organisation (Host).
- 2) Organisation on the day (Agenda and other things) (Host).
- 3) Venue facilities (Host).
- 4) Relevance of topics covered (Contents).
- 5) Usefulness of presentations (Contents).
- 6) Communication skills of presenters (Contents).
- 7) Presentation of management and administrative rules (Contents).
- 8) Overview of all the activities and the responsibilities of the partners (Contents).
- 9) Overview of O1: status and tasks (Contents).
- 10) Overview of O2: status and tasks (Contents).
- 11) Overview of O3: status and tasks (Contents).
- 12) Overview of O4: status and tasks (Contents).
- 13) Plans for project promotion and dissemination (Contents).
- 14) Allocation of tasks, pending issues, next project meeting, discussion (Contents).

3. Transnational Meeting 1: High Wycombe (UK)

- **Venue**: Buckinghamshire New University, UXBRIDGE
- **Date**: 18th and 19th January 2018
- **Agenda**:

Day 1–Thursday 18th January

Arrival

10.45–11:00 Coffee/Tea

11.00–11:30 Introductions, Project Overviews and Project Responsibilities Incl. Grant Agreement and Application feedback (Bucks)

11.30–12:00 Introductions (2 min) and Project Responsibilities (3 min)

- Bucks
- UTB
- EVM
- UPM
- PA
- UMA
- OEM
- CCIM

12.05–12:45 Grant Administration, incl. Partner responsibilities, Partner Agreement, Communication Plan (Bucks)

12.45 – 14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 14.45 Financial budget and reporting, incl. mobility+ tool (Bucks)

14.45–15:00 Coffee/Tea

15.00 – 15.30 Quality Assurance (EVM)

15.30 – 17.00 Intellectual Outputs (1) IO1–IO6 Overview (Z)
IO1 incl. Expectations of Output Partners (Z)

17.00 Close

Day 2 – Friday 19th January

09.45–10.00 Coffee/Tea

10.00–11:00 Intellectual Outputs (2)

IO2 incl. Expectations of Output Partners (X) IO3 incl. Expectations of Output Partners (Y) IO4 incl. Expectations of Output Partners (Z)

11.00-11.45 Multiplier events (all partners)

11.45–12:00 Coffee/Tea

12.00 – 12.30 Review of Gantt chart and Timeline (Bucks and Z).

12.30–13:00 Dissemination: Project Website, etc. – incl. completion dates (X and Y)

13:00–13:15 Transnational Meetings x 4 (Bucks)

1. Date set for Meeting 2

13:15–13:20 'Comfort' Break

13:20–14:10 Action sheet review - Items to Resolved by Meeting 2 (Z) 14:10–14:50 Project impact (Bucks) and sustainability (Z) 14:50–15:00 Any Other Business (Bucks)

15:00 Lunch (incl. unresolved AOB)

17:00 Close

- **Listofattendees:**

Organisation	Country	Staff
BUCKS		- Florin Ioras
PA		- Zack Senderson
OEM		-Henn Korjus

UTB		- Ioan Vasile Abrudan
UPM		- Maria Paz
EVM		- Ricardo Tavio
CCIM		-Marco Vieira
UMA		-Eduardo Marques
TOTAL		8

- **Evaluation:**

9- means the actions were **very useful**. **5-** means the actions were **useful**.
1- means the actions were **not useful**.

Item	TOTAL (with punctuation of all attendees)	Final Punctuation
1-Booking & pre-event organisation (Host)	72	9
2 - Organisation on the day (Agenda and other things) (Host)	72	9
3 - Venue facilities (Host)	72	9
4- Relevance of topics covered (Contents)	68	8,5
5- Usefulness of presentations (Contents)	72	9
6- Communication skills of presenters (Contents)	72	9
7 - Presentation of management and administrative rules (Contents)	60	7,5
8- Overview of all the activities and the responsibilities of the partners (Contents)	68	8,5
9 - Overview of O1: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
10 - Overview of O2: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
11 - Overview of O3: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
12 - Overview of O4: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
13 - Plans for project promotion and dissemination (Contents)	56	7

14- Allocation of tasks, pending issues, next project meeting, discussion (Contents)	64	8
---	----	---

Partners were satisfied with the activities carried out on the first Transnational Meeting (KO meeting) with the maximum possible score in 5 questions. The minimum score (but not it was a bad evaluation) was in plans for project promotion and the presentation of management and administrative rules. It was recommended to add specific points to speak about that points in the next transnational meeting and develop a dissemination plan which would be available for all the partners. Finally, about the comments, it was recommended the final meeting will take place in London as it is mentioned in the proposal.



4. Transnational Meeting 2: Transylvania University of Brasov


- **Venue:** Bulevardul Eroilor 29, Braşov 500036, Romania
- **Date:** 03/07/2018 to 05/07/2018
- **Agenda:**

09:00	Coffee and welcome
09:10	Registration
09:40	Detailed overview of IO - updates Bucks New University <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allpartners
10:00	IO1 Discussion
10:30	Coffee break
10:45	IO1 – Survey update
11:15	IO2 discussion
11:35	Overview of the first project year: work plan, tasks and obligations of partners <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bucks New University
12:15	Tasks and obligations for next 6 months Bucks New University

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allpartners
13:15	Communication Bucks New University
13:30	Lunch
14:45	Quality Assurance Plan EVM <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants
15:15	Project management – Justification rules. Consortium agreement. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florin Ioras
15:45 – 16:15	General discussion. Pendent tasks. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants
20:30	Project Dinner

- **Listofattendees:**

Organisation	Country	Staff
BUCKS		- Florin Ioras
PA		- Zack Senderson
OEM		-Henn Korjus

UTB		- Ioan Vasile Abrudan
UPM		- Maria Paz
EVM		- Ricardo Tavio
CCIM		-Marco Vieira
UMA		-Eduardo Marques
TOTAL		8

- **Evaluation:**

9- means the actions were **very useful**. **5-** means the actions were **useful**.
1- means the actions were **not useful**.

Item	TOTAL (with punctuation of all attendees)	Final Punctuation
1-Booking & pre-event organisation (Host)	72	9

2 - Organisation on the day (Agenda and other things) (Host)	72	9
3 - Venue facilities (Host)	72	9
4 - Relevance of topics covered (Contents)	68	8,5
5 - Usefulness of presentations (Contents)	72	9
6 - Communication skills of presenters (Contents)	72	9
7 - Presentation of management and administrative rules (Contents)	72	9
8 - Overview of all the activities and the responsibilities of the partners (Contents)	68	8,5
9 - Overview of O1: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
10 - Overview of O2: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
11 - Overview of O3: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
12 - Overview of O4: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
13 - Plans for project promotion and dissemination (Contents)	56	7
14 - Allocation of tasks, pending issues, next project meeting, discussion (Contents)	64	8

- Further comments:

- Excellent (...Host).

- Shortened and more compact one day meeting - I would suggest to leave in this way.

Analysis:

Partners were satisfied with the activities which was made on this Transnational Meeting with a score below 8 in 9 of 12 questions. Moreover, the two aspects that it was mentioned as the worse ones in previous meeting were improved in the valuation of partners. In spite of this, the aspects about dissemination had the lowest score – 7. It was stated the necessity to dedicate a longer part of the meeting to speak about the dissemination strategy. Finally, about the comments, it was recommended to take into account the possibility of the concentration of the next meeting in one day if it is possible, but always if the quality and the right development of the project was not affected.



5. Transnational meeting 3: University of Madeira

- **Venue: Rua dos Ferreiros Colégio dos Jesuítas, 9000-082 Funchal, Portugal**
- **Date: 10/02/2019 to 13/02/2019**
- **Agenda:**

9.00-9.15 - Detailed overview of IO – updates. BUCKS,

9.15-9.45 - IO2. UPM is the leader (30 minutes).

- UTB could explain Report of O2-A2 (10 minutes)
- ACIF the harmonization (10 minutes)

9.45-10.30 - IO3, advances in platform. EVM (30-40 minutes)

10.30-11.00 - IO4, template of the modules/units. BUCKS. 30 minutes

11.00–11.30 Coffee/Tea

11.30-13.00- IO4, discussion about the structure and the contents inside each module and units. 1h and 30 minutes. UMA or BUCKS (partners explaining units inside subjects)

13.00-14.00 - Lunch

14.00-14.30 - Project management. Progress and interim reports. BUCKS, 30 minutes

14.30-15.00 - Dissemination activities. BUCKS, 30 minutes

15.00-15.30 - Project management. Next payment and rules for receiving it, BUCKS 30 minutes

15.30-16.00 Coffee/Tea Break

16.00-16.15 - Results of Quality Assurance, EVM 15 minutes

16.15-17.00 – Visit to UMA facilities

19.00 - Consortium dinner – UMA

- **List of attendees:**

Organisation	Country	Staff
BUCKS		- Florin Ioras
PA		- Zack Senderson
OEM		-Henn Korjus

UTB		- Ioan Vasile Abrudan
UPM		- Maria Paz
EVM		- Ricardo Tavio
CCIM		-Marco Vieira
UMA		-Eduardo Marques
TOTAL		8

- **Evaluation:**

9- means the actions were **very useful**. **5-** means the actions were **useful**.
1- means the actions were **not useful**.

Item	TOTAL (with punctuation of all attendees)	Final Punctuation
1-Booking & pre-event organisation (Host)	65	7,22

2 - Organisation on the day (Agenda and other things) (Host)	57	6,33
3 - Venue facilities (Host)	73	8,11
4- Relevance of topics covered (Contents)	73	8,11
5- Usefulness of presentations (Contents)	77	8,56
6- Communication skills of presenters (Contents)	60	7,50
7 - Presentation of management and administrative rules (Contents)	41	4,56
8- Overview of all the activities and the responsibilities of the partners (Contents)	65	7,22
9 - Overview of O1: status and tasks (Contents)	59	8,43
10 - Overview of O2: status and tasks (Contents)	77	8,56
11 - Overview of O3: status and tasks (Contents)	59	8,43
12 - Overview of O4: status and tasks (Contents)	55	7,86
13 – Plans for project promotion and dissemination (Contents)	57	6,33
14- Allocation of tasks, pending issues, next project meeting, discussion (Contents)	65	7,22

- **Analysis:**

Partners were convinced about the activities in the third Transnational Meeting with a score below 8 in 6 of 14 questions. The aspects that highlighted for having less assessments were the organization of the agenda and the plans for project promotion and dissemination, which needed to improve and to have it into account for next Transnational Meetings. It was still necessary to dedicate more time of the meeting to speak about the common strategy in dissemination. It is important to remark that the worst score was for the presentation of management and administrative rules with a score of 4,56. Finally, about the comments, it was recommended to use actions with definite solutions for the correct development of the project.



6. Transnational meeting 4: High Wycombe (The UK)

- Venue: Bucks New University, Queen Alexandra Road, HP11 2JZ
- Date: 26/09/2019 to 28/09/2019

- **Agenda:**

PLACE OF MEETING: Bucks New University, Queen Alexandra Road, HP11 2JZ, Tel 0044 1494 522141	
9:00-10:50	<p>1. Welcome and presentation of the aim of the meeting-DF (20 minutes)</p> <p>2. Situation regarding the Outputs in IO1 –Report needs of industry and educational offer (30 minutes) Leading organization Points for discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What was the plan and the deadlines? (please refer to the approved work- plan) -Present each of the outputs produced to date and explain partners’ contribution. -To what extent the outputs have been achieved to date? IO1-A1 Partner’s current practices for the environmental security. TUB <p>IO1-A2 Study of the current educational offer existing in the EU, taking especial attention to HE programmes. UPM,</p> <p>IO1-A3 Definition of the current competences in the environmental security sector. UMA,</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">-Each partner in the project to present their contribution to the IO1 and proposed activities for the remaining time in the project</p> <p>3. Situation regarding the IO2 Training path, learning content, structure and guide for teachers (50 min) Lead partner UPM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What was the plan and the deadlines? (please refer to the approved work- plan) -Present each of the outputs produced to date and explain partners’ contribution. -To what extent the outputs have been achieved to date? <p>IO2-A1 Training Paths definition UPM</p> <p>O2-A2 Definition of learning content modules UTB</p> <p>O2-A3 Harmonisation and validation of learning modules and training path/s UMA</p> <p>A4 Development of the guidelines for trainers ACEF.</p>

	<p>-</p> <p>-Each partner in the project to present their contribution to the IO2 and proposed activities for the remaining time in the project</p>
10:50-11:10	<i>Coffee break</i>
11:10-13:00	<p>4. Situation regarding the Outputs in IO3- E-learning Platform: presentation from leader (90 min)</p> <p>-What was the plan and the deadlines? (please refer to the approved work-plan)</p> <p>-Present each of the outputs produced to date and explain partners' contribution.</p> <p>-To what extent the outputs have been achieved to date? IO3-A1 Elaboration of functional and non-functional specifications.</p> <p>IO3-A2 Training Content Integration. Leader</p> <p>. IO3-A3 Test release and platform improvement (M24-M30) WULS.</p> <p>IO3-A4 Guidelines on how to use e-Learning Platform.</p> <p>-Each partner in the project to present their contribution to the IO3 and proposed activities for the remaining time in the project</p>
13:00-14:30	Lunch break
14:30-15.30	<p>5. Situation regarding the Outputs in IO4- Module Materials: presentation led by BUCKS representative (60 min)</p> <p>-What was the plan and the deadlines? (please refer to the approved work-plan)</p> <p>-Present each of the outputs produced to date and explain partners' contribution.</p> <p>-To what extent the outputs have been achieved to date?</p> <p>1. Production engineering – technology, process & maintenance. BUCKS</p> <p>2</p>

15:30-15:50	<i>Coffee break</i>
15:50-17:30	<p>Information Search and Retrieval / Investigation Methodology -ALL</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -What action is required to the partners and the deadline. -Each partner in the project to present their contribution to the IO4 and proposed activities for the remaining time in the project
19:00	Welcome dinner


Wednesday 13 Feb 2019	
PLACE OF MEETING: Bucks New University, Queen Alexandra Road, HP11 2JZ, Tel 0044 1494 522141	
9:00-13:00	<p>1. Presentation of the work-plan for the remaining period in the project and tasks for each partner. Led by BUCKS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Reports regarding PMI (Led by bucks) -Reports regarding TPM (Led by bucks) -Situation regarding the Multiplier Events (Led by bucks) -Situation regarding the dissemination and sustainability (Leader) -Quality assurance (Led by EVM)

	2. Situation of the budget and preparation of documents required for the submission of the Final Report. Led by BUCKS
13:00-14:30	<i>Lunch</i>
14:30-17.30	3. Individual meetings between the Project manager and each partner organisation 15 minutes each
19.00	Farewell dinner

Departure of the participants

- List of attendees:

Organisation	Country	Staff
BUCKS		- Florin Ioras
PA		- Zack Senderson
OEM		-Henn Korjus

UTB		- Ioan Vasile Abrudan
UPM		- Maria Paz
EVM		- Ricardo Tavio
CCIM		-Marco Vieira
UMA		-Eduardo Marques
TOTAL		8

Evaluation:

9- means the actions were **very useful**, 5- means the actions were **useful**,
1- means the actions were **not useful**

Item	TOTAL (with punctuation of all attendees)	Final Punctuation
1-Booking & pre-event organisation (Host)	72	9
2 - Organisation on the day (Agenda and other things) (Host)	72	9
3 - Venue facilities (Host)	72	9
4- Relevance of topics covered (Contents)	68	8,5
5- Usefulness of presentations (Contents)	72	9
6- Communication skills of presenters (Contents)	72	9
7 - Presentation of management and administrative rules (Contents)	60	7,5
8- Overview of all the activities and the responsibilities of the partners (Contents)	68	8,5

9 - Overview of O1: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
10 - Overview of O2: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
11 - Overview of O3: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
12 - Overview of O4: status and tasks (Contents)	68	8,5
13 - Plans for project promotion and dissemination (Contents)	56	7

- **Further comments:**

-

- **Analysis:**

The Fifth Transnational Project Meeting, which was held in High Wycombe (The UK), was good in general terms. One of the items which obtained a lower punctuation was the planning for project promotion and dissemination activities whereas as venue facilities (host). On the other hand, those aspects with more points were the usefulness of presentations, booking and pre- event organisation and the overview of each Output. This was the last meeting before the end of the project and partners were talking about several aspects including activities, Dissemination and Sustainability plans or Project management and implementation needed before the ending of the project.

