



Criteria for the identification and selection of course participants

We ask you to please use the below table as a guide for identification, evaluation and nomination of course participants. The table highlights the specific competencies and background information desired from participants and is used to screen whether the training activity will be a key element for improving their daily work, and will be beneficial to their institution as a whole through further training and dissemination activities. In relation to their overall ranking: the lower their score, the more suitable their profile to attend the training session.

Category	Detail	Ranking
1.) Institution	Is the applicant engaged by the Competent Authority in the relevant MS responsible for control of undertakings of the EU's Organic and/or protected designations legislation, or in a public institution at sub-national level?	<p>1 – Applicant works for National Competent Authority.</p> <p>2 – Applicant works for Regional authority involved in Quality Scheme controls.</p> <p>3 – Applicant works for local administration implicated in Quality Scheme's control.</p> <p>4 – Applicant works for private certification body.</p> <p>5 – Applicant works for entity only loosely related to Quality Scheme's control</p>
2.) Position	Does the applicant occupy a post for which the training would have a direct impact on his daily work?	<p>1 – Applicant would greatly benefit from participation in the training, and would utilise information gained regularly.</p> <p>2 – Applicant might benefit from training and could use the information sporadically.</p> <p>3 – Applicant would rarely use the specific information from the training.</p>
3.) Years of Relevant Experience	Does the applicant have sufficient relevant experience to understand training content and benefit from the training as much as possible?	<p>1 – Applicant's experience is highly relevant and applicant would greatly benefit from participation in the training.</p> <p>2 – Applicant's experience is moderately relevant and applicant could benefit from participation in the training.</p> <p>3 – Applicant's experience is minimally relevant and applicant is not likely to benefit from participation in the training.</p>



Funded by
the Better Training for Safer Food
Initiative of the European Union

4.) Dissemination	Could the applicant be counted on to further disseminate the training materials through obligatory national trainings including train-the-trainer, submitting articles for publication in the press and/or distributing training materials to colleagues?	1 – Applicant is responsible for training/communications within his/her institution and would be doing attending as part of their job requirements. 2 – Applicant does not formally do so, but in the past has taken similar initiatives and so would be likely to do so. 3 – Applicant does not have a remit to do so and/or would be unlikely to further disseminate training materials and information.
5.) Language	Does the applicant speak the language which the training will be conducted in? (specifically, English, French, German or other).	1 – Applicant speaks the primary training language fluently/very well, and will not encounter any issues with the course. 2- Applicant speaks the secondary language of the training fluently/very well OR speaks the primary language of the training to a medium level. 3 – Applicant speaks neither of the training languages sufficiently to fully understand the technical content of the training.
6.) Previous Training	Would the applicants' attendance to similar previous recent training on this subject result in duplication and waste?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>