**A1a: INSTRUCTIONS  
  
A1a1. SUB-DIVIDE LARGE GROUPS**  
If your group has 8 or more participants, and there is enough space in the breakout room, then you should sub-divide into two smaller groups for this activity; this will make discussions easier and will allow every participant to share their thoughts and perspectives.  
  
**A1a2. APPOINT RAPPORTEUR**A spokesperson is needed to share the results of your group discussion. If you have sub-divided into two smaller groups, then each group will need their own rapporteur.  
  
**A1a3. SHARE PERSPECTIVES**  
The method of working is your choice but it is important that each member of the group has an opportunity to share their opinion on the proposal. You might begin by asking everybody to state whether they perceive the QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP to be Very Good, Good, Fair or Weak, briefly justifying their decision according that that which is written in the proposal. Alternatively, you could work one-by-one through the different sub-elements, but it is important to stay on schedule and to keep your discussions focused on the QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP.  
  
**A1a4. AGREE SCORE**  
Having identified the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, with a specific focus on the QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP, it is time to consider what this means in terms of scores. Individual scores are less important at this stage as you are scoring the proposal based on a common opinion. Consider the scoring ranges and descriptions in the table below and agree on a single score.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **VERY GOOD (17-20):** The application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion, convincingly, and successfully. The answer provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness. | **GOOD (14-16):** The application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. The answer gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed. |
| **FAIR (10-13):** The application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear. | **WEAK (0-9):** The application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. The answer does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information. |

**A1a5. GROUP RECAP AND REVIEW**If working in a single group, this is a chance to recap all that you have discussed and confirm agreement. If working in two sub-groups, this is a chance to internally compare the results of the exercise before returning to the plenary feedback session. The rapporteur should make a short input in plenary, providing a single score and perspective for QUALITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP and briefly referencing the process as well as any difficulties encountered. Sub-divided groups can choose for one or both rapporteurs to provide feedback in plenary but each field-based groups will have a maximum of 5 minutes for feedback.

**A1b: SCHEDULE**

A total of 80 minutes is allowed, with the following timetable suggested:

* Sub-divide Large Groups and Appoint Rapporteur/s (5 minutes)
* Share Perspectives (45 minutes)
* Agree Score (10 minutes)
* Group Recap and Review (20 minutes)