

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



STAKEHOLDER MAP UPDATE M28

Deliverable Number:	D7.1.3c (M28)
WP related to the Deliverable:	WP7: Dissemination, Exploitation, Scaling-Up, and Sustainability of Project Results
Date Delivered:	
PARTNER responsible for the Deliverable:	RSCN
WP starting month	M1
WP ending month	M36



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

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

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



1 ABSTRACT:

The overarching objective of NECTAR therefore is to: “deliver an EU Occupational Profile for Chef Gastro-Engineering (CGE) and a flexible Curriculum that meets the needs and requirements from individual regions and countries for this profile.

The successful delivery of the project and its exploitation beyond its completion will require engagement with a wide and diverse range of stakeholders. Stakeholder Mapping and engagement is therefore an important component of the project to ensure they are informed, consulted with, involved and have opportunities to collaborate with and contribute to the co-creation of the CGE Occupational Profile and Curriculum.

NECTAR Stakeholders are defined as those having a stake, or engaged, in Chef and Cook training; employment of Chefs and Cooks working in care homes and hospital settings; certification and awarding bodies responsible for the standards of curricula and training programmes. These can be organisations, groups or individuals that come from government, and the public and private sectors both within NECTAR partner regions and countries as well as those outside the project’s territories.

The document provides an update on the NECTAR Stakeholder Analysis as set out in the original version of D7.3.1, and D7.3.1c (M18).

2 KEYWORDS:

Stakeholder Mapping, Communication, Engagement,

3 REVIEWERS

REVIEWER NAME	EXTERNAL REVIEWER	ORGANISATION	DATE OF APPROVAL
Silvia Bossio	No	Odisee	3/3/2023

4 VERSION HISTORY AND AUTHORS

Version	Name / Organisation	Status*	Date	Provided Content/Comment/ Summary of Changes
1	John Farrell, RSCN	A	28/02/2023	Draft Version 1
2	John Farrell, RSCN	A	3/3/2023	Final Version

*Status indicates if:

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



5 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	ABSTRACT:.....	2
2	KEYWORDS:.....	2
3	REVIEWERS	2
4	VERSION HISTORY AND AUTHORS	2
5	TABLE OF CONTENTS	3
6	INTRODUCTION	4
7	NECTAR STAKEHOLDER MAPPING	¡Error! Marcador no definido.
7.1	Objectives of NECTAR Stakeholder Mapping Activity	4
7.2	Approach Adopted	4
8	NECTAR STAKEHOLDER MATRIX	¡Error! Marcador no definido.
9	MONITORING IMPLEMENTATION	¡Error! Marcador no definido.
	ANNEX 1 – ABBREVIATIONS	8
	ANNEX 2 - Partner Organisation Network Analysis.....	9
	ANNEX 3 – QUALITY CONTROL CHECK LIST	10

6 INTRODUCTION

To increase NECTAR's visibility and facilitate the implementation of our dissemination, sustainability and exploitation plans we have continually reviewed and analysed the relevant stakeholders. Additionally, we have reviewed along with the pilot sites their levels of engagement with stakeholders to determine if the foreseen relationship continues to be correct, and if they have identified additional stakeholders.

As previously reported the original NECTAR Stakeholders (D7.3.1) provided an extensive analysis of the different organisations both at pilot site and project levels that would have an interest in the project, particularly in enabling the scaling-up and exploitation. The analysis considered stakeholders under the categories set out at Figure 1.

Figure 1: Stakeholder Influence / Interest Matrix



7 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS

7.1 Objectives

The primary objectives from the stakeholder analysis were to:

- Identify organisations engaged in the employment of Chefs and Cooks.
- Identify organisation engaged in training and validation of programmes for Chefs and Cooks.
- Capture information on the key stakeholders, their roles and connectivity in relation to NECTAR and its value chains where appropriate.
- Introduce the Stakeholder approach as part of evidence-based decision making.
- Introduce NECTAR to targeted Stakeholders at each pilot region to facilitate engagement and discussion.
- Capture baseline information for the project
- Conduct Partner Organisation Network Analysis (PONA)

7.2 Approach Adopted

We adopted a 2 Stage approach to the stakeholder analysis:

1. Identify Stakeholders: This was undertaken in 3 phases:



Deliverable D7.1.3: M16 Update – Stakeholder Map

Phase 1: an initial analysis undertaken to identify the types of stakeholders and understand their benefits to them from the project Table 1:

Table 1: Initial Stakeholder Analysis

Stakeholder Type	Benefit from the Project
VET Providers	The NECTAR curriculum and all accompanying materials such as the guidelines, e-learning materials, and other documents and plans dedicated to enable advanced teaching and learning. This Group is represented by project partners: MP, ITS-BACT, MUG, ODISEE and SMCA (as pilot leaders), and also STYCC and UALG and the VET Provider included in the RSCN.
Chefs/Cooks working in health and social care settings	Enhancing their work-related skills, knowledge and qualifications therefore improving employment opportunities.
Decision-makers at local, regional and national level and their umbrella organisations	Implementing the curriculum in order to train their workforce and develop health and social care systems towards an integrated and inter-professional care approach as recommended by WHO.
Service Providers	Implementing the NECTAR curriculum and other project outputs. The qualification and recognition of highly skilled chefs/cooks will enhance the match of demand and supply sides in the job market.
Service Users	Those with high care need or those at risk of malnutrition (e.g. older adults, dysphagia patients and patients recovering from chemo-therapy), including their potential caregivers, will be the ultimate beneficiary of this project. The outcomes of NECTAR will lead to more responsive, flexible, person-centred and individualized services in terms of Chef Gastro-Engineering (CGE) and will directly address the complex needs and requirements of the service users, which are older adults and their (in) – formal carers
Other actors in Human Health and Social Work activities sector	The NECTAR project can have a pioneering role for other actors in health and social care not directly addressed in the previous target groups. Whilst the project directly addresses the need for a highly skilled workforce of chefs/cooks, it also demonstrates the need for high-quality services in health and social care in general and therefore may initiate other initiatives.

Phase 2: Using this Table partners and pilot sites then identified relevant organisations and contact points, along with any existing relationships. Information gathered allowed us to identify relevant organisations and key decision makers in the employment, or training, of Chefs and Cooks. The Analysis used during the project is set out at Annex

2 and was continually reviewed and updated during the project as any new stakeholders emerged. – Phase 3.

Phase 3: An ongoing analysis to identify new or emerging organisations that could influence, or have an interest in, the project as it develops; and which could support wider exploitation of the project’s results.

2. Analysis of Stakeholders

Stakeholders were then analysed on the level of influence or impact on the project. The purpose of this was to ensure they received the level of engagement representative of their interest in the project. Stakeholders were analyzed against the following determinants:



During the project, partners and pilot sites continually reviewed the relationships with stakeholders to ensure the type and level of engagement continued to be appropriate; particularly preceding and during the developing the CGE Curriculum and its validation.

Table 2 sets out the classification of stakeholders against each of the 4 determinant categories:

Table 2: NECTAR Stakeholder Matrix

Keep Satisfied	Manage Closely
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Health and Social Care Providers ➤ 3rd Party Providers ➤ Policy Makers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ VET Providers ➤ Qualification and Accreditation Bodies
Monitor	Keep Informed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Primary Food Care Organisations ➤ End Users (Patients/Carers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Influencers ➤ Umbrella Organisations ➤ Professional Bodies ➤ Chefs and Cooks

Stakeholder organisations identified have been categorised against each of these quadrants. The current version, which is continually updated as new stakeholders emerge or their classification changes is set out in the project’s TEAMS folder and is available to all partners and pilot sites: <https://hubkaho.sharepoint.com/:x:/r/sites/NECTAR/Gedeelde%20documenten/General/Workpa>



[ckages/WP7%20Dissemination,%20exploitation,%20scaling-up%20and%20sustainability%20of%20project%20results/T7.1%20Dissemination/NECTAR%20-%20Stakeholder%20Map%20-%20Organisation%20by%20Category.xlsx?d=w3fc09a1bf80549d0808a84f45fd9d877&csf=1&web=1&e=aB2UXI](https://www.nectar-project.eu/ckages/WP7%20Dissemination,%20exploitation,%20scaling-up%20and%20sustainability%20of%20project%20results/T7.1%20Dissemination/NECTAR%20-%20Stakeholder%20Map%20-%20Organisation%20by%20Category.xlsx?d=w3fc09a1bf80549d0808a84f45fd9d877&csf=1&web=1&e=aB2UXI)

Engagement, dissemination, and communication activities are aligned with each of the Stakeholder Groupings as defined in the Dissemination and Communication Plan:

- VET-Providers and Qualification and Accreditation Bodies are reached by targeted dissemination activities including bilateral meetings and participation in consensus workshops.
- Providers and Policy Makers through targeted dissemination activities which include feedback loops to inform the development and adaptation of the CGE Occupational Profile.
- Influencers, Umbrella Organisations, Professional Bodies, Chefs and Cooks through through targeted dissemination activities addressing both individuals and trades.
- Primary Food Care Organisations and End Users through targeted dissemination providing information on the project.

In addition, National/Regional conferences were identified in each project partner country to promote NECTAR Curriculum and pilots and support engagement with the various Stakeholders.

In developing their Dissemination and Communication Plans pilot sites referred to the stakeholder analysis and matrix when designing their local communication messaging and engagement activities. Similarly at a project level the Dissemination and Communication Plan is driven by the stakeholder analysis and mapping.

8 CONCLUSION

The Stakeholder Map is formally reviewed quarterly with pilot sites and consortium partners to ensure all relevant organisations and individuals with an interest in the project, or who can influence its adoption, are identified, and categorised appropriately. This helps inform the frequency and type of communications and engagements and allows for follow up with the pilot sites on who they have been engaging with during the scaling-up process and the types of issues emerging.

The comprehensive stakeholder analysis at the outset of the project has meant there have been very limited revisions to the Stakeholder Map.



ANNEX 1 – ABBREVIATIONS

CGE	-	Chef Gastro-Engineering
PFC	-	Primary Food Care
PONA	-	Partner Organisation Network Analysis
SP	-	Service Provider
SU	-	Service User
VET-P	-	Vocational Education and Training - Provider



ANNEX 2 - Partner Organisation Network Analysis

Questionnaire to be completed by NECTAR Partners and Pilot Regions to identify external organizations and individuals they work with, or are in contact with on the employment, or training, of Chefs and Cooks in a health and care setting.

Q. Are there any organizations or individuals that your organization is in contact with on the employment, or training, of Chefs and Cooks in a health and care setting? If yes, please complete the table below.

<p>Name of Organization or person your organization works with or is in contact with on</p> <p>(a) Chef Training,</p> <p>(b) Public Health,</p> <p>(c) Health and Care delivery</p> <p>(d) employment of Chefs/Cooks in a health and care setting</p> <p>(e) Primary Food Care</p> <p>(List each stakeholder in its own line below)</p>	<p>Contact type:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public Sector Policy Maker 2. Health and Care Provider 3. 3rd Party Provider 4. VET Provider 5. Qualification/ Accreditation Body 6. Primary Food Care Organization 7. End User (Patient / Carer) 8. Umbrella Organization 9. Professional Association (e.g. Public Health, Nursing, Chefs/Cooks, etc) 10. Influencer 11. Other (please specify) 	<p>Interaction over:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Policy development 2. Policy implementation 3. Research development 4. Training or curriculum development 5. Delivery of training programmes 6. provision of advice 7. Other (specify) 	<p>Where is the organization or person based (HQ)?</p>	<p>What Business Area or Directorate in your organization interacts with the external organization?</p>	<p>Please provide one or two contact name(s), include position in the organization; contact details; and gender - Male or Female</p>	<p>How valuable is the interaction with this contact to your organization?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very Valuable 2. Moderately Valuable 3. Not very Valuable 	<p>How often do you, or your organization interact with them?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very often (daily or weekly) 2. Often (once or twice per month) 3. Sometimes (2 to 4 times per year) 4. Rarely (about once or twice per year) 	<p>Is information shared:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. From you to them 2. From them to you 3. Both-ways 	

ANNEX 3 – 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: Silvia Bossio Date: 3/3/2023	