



Alliance for Innovative Learning Environment in Advanced Agriculture through Technology and Management Project 101187399 - AGRITECH

D2.4 AGRITECH EDUCATIONAL ECOSYSTEM

Partners
#DDTG



Co-funded by
the European Union

Version 1.1
September 2026

INNOVATION



Dissemination level	Public
Coordinating partner	DDTG
Editors	Emoke HOLBLING (DDTG)
Authors	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)
Contributors	Dr. Georgios NTINAS (ELGO), Dr. Ioannis GIANTSIS (AUTH), Paolo CHIABERT (POLITO), Franco LOMBARDI (POLITO), Giulia CARRABINO (LAND), Petr UHLÍŘ (WRLS), Tomáš GAGO (ZŠČR), Prof.Dr. Mihai GIDEA (USAMV), Laura PARDAVI (GK), Dr. Krisztina TOTH (MATE), Alexandra THOMAIDOU (OECON), Antonis MONTANARIS (SACT), Fabrizio PAVANELLO (AUTOM)
Due date of deliverable	31/05/2026
Actual date of deliverable	30/09/2026
Status (F: final, D: draft)	F
File name	D2.4 AGRITECH EDUCATIONAL ECOSYSTEM

Document Change Control

Version Number	Date of Issue	Author(s)	Brief Description of Change
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in English
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in Czech
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in Greek
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in Italian
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in Hungarian
Version 1.1	30.09.2026	Sebo SANTA (DDTG), Dr.Eng. Daniel AMARIEI (PAMEA)	Final version in Romanian

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Index

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	5
1. Task scope and evidence basis	8
1.1. Task and deliverable scope	8
1.2. Relationship with D2.2, D2.3 and other project activities	8
1.3. Evidence basis and reporting rules	9
2. HUB NETWORK AND GOVERNANCE	11
2.1 HUB network and implementation settings	11
2.2 Education and enterprise settings	12
2.3 Applied governance and responsibilities	13
2.4 Country-level governance arrangements	14
2.5 Operational flow	14
3. HUB establishment and readiness	16
3.1 MS3 compliance and partner-level establishment status	16
3.2 HUB locations and readiness	17
3.3 Actual risks, mitigation measures and status	18
3.4 Physical and digital setup	19
3.5 Staff preparation and test-run evidence	20
3.6 Official launch and formal establishment	20
4. HUB operation and implemented learning activities	22
4.1 Evidence of operational HUB use	22
4.2 Documented curriculum-linked operation	22
4.3 Operational evidence in the other national HUBs	23
4.4 Learning formats implemented through the HUBs	24
4.5 Practical orientation and interaction with professional needs	25
4.6 Digital technologies and collaborative tools used	25
4.7 Current operational evidence assessment	26
5. Enterprise and stakeholder engagement	28
5.1 Verified stakeholder engagement	28
5.2 Greece	29
5.3 Hungary	30
5.4 Czech Republic	30
5.5 Italy	31
5.6 Romania	32
5.7 Forms of enterprise interaction	32
5.8 Networking and outreach directly linked to HUB operation	33
5.9 Evidence status and remaining data needs	33
6. Results, monitoring and continuous improvement	35
6.1 Consolidated implementation results	35
6.2 Participation, sessions and usage	36
6.3 Enterprise engagement results	36
6.4 Participant feedback	37
6.5 Continuous improvement and corrective actions	38
6.6 Feedback-to-improvement evidence	40
6.7 Overall result assessment	41
7. Sustainability and incubator adoption	42
7.1 Continuity of the Educational HUBs	42



7.2 Continuation responsibilities.....	42
7.3 Adoption and local adjustment by the established Educational HUBs	43
7.4 Transfer lessons from implementation.....	44
7.5 Sustainability and adoption status.....	46
8. Conclusions and outstanding evidence.....	47
8.1 Verified main results	47
8.2 Ongoing operational monitoring	48
8.3 Overall conclusion	48
References.....	49
Annexes	51



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Deliverable D2.4, **AgriTech Educational Ecosystem**, presents the results of Task 2.4, *Educational HUBs establishment within education and enterprises*, and documents the successful establishment of the AGRITECH Educational HUB network. The document aims to demonstrate that the consortium reached the third milestone on May 15, 2026, and that AGRITECH Education Hubs have been established in five participating partner countries; it also seeks to outline further expectations regarding the operation of these Hubs and provide templates for continuous monitoring.

The implementation of the HUBs represents an important milestone for the project by translating the conceptual Learning Ecosystem developed in D2.2 and the AgriTech Curriculum developed in D2.3 into concrete educational, professional and collaborative environments.

The central objective of Task 2.4 was successfully achieved through the establishment and formal launch of AGRITECH Educational HUB structures in Greece, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy and Romania. Across these five countries, the implementation covers **13 assessed physical HUB locations**, hosted within universities, research organisations, enterprises, training facilities and other stakeholder-oriented environments. The established network demonstrates that the AGRITECH HUB concept can be successfully implemented through different institutional models while maintaining a common purpose and operational framework.

The establishment process followed a structured approach covering site identification, readiness assessment, governance arrangements, physical and digital setup, risk assessment and formal launch. The documented locations were generally assessed as suitable for AGRITECH activities, with the majority of HUBs making effective use of existing institutional infrastructure, equipment, staff capacity and stakeholder networks. This approach strengthened the feasibility and sustainability of the HUB model and avoided the need to create completely new facilities.

The national HUBs were formally launched between March and May 2026 through face-to-face, hybrid and online events. These launches successfully mobilised a broad range of stakeholders, including higher-education and VET institutions, agricultural enterprises, SMEs, technology providers, farms, researchers, professional organisations and public-sector actors. The events therefore served not only as formal establishment milestones, but also as the starting point for national AGRITECH communities connecting education, technology and agricultural practice. The Greek HUB launch, organised during AGROTICA 2026, attracted approximately 100 participants and provided particularly strong visibility and stakeholder mobilisation for the national HUB.

A major achievement of the HUB establishment process is the creation of operational interfaces between education and enterprises. The Hungarian HUB formalised stakeholder participation through declarations of intent, the Czech HUB directly connected its launch with the start of testing-phase activities, the Italian HUB linked establishment with territorial skills and labour-market discussions, the Greek HUB used AGROTICA 2026 to strengthen cooperation between academia, industry and policy actors, while the Romanian HUB connected a university-based physical HUB with a broad network of agricultural and professional stakeholders.

The Educational HUBs also provide the organisational and physical basis for implementation of the AGRITECH curriculum and for the use of practical and collaborative learning approaches. The Czech implementation demonstrates the full transition from HUB establishment to curriculum-linked educational operation, with all seven VET modules M01–M07 completed during the testing phase. Across the wider HUB network, practical orientation, stakeholder discussions, skills-needs analysis,



networking and interaction with enterprises provide the basis for continued curriculum delivery, mentoring, demonstrations and other forms of applied learning.

Digital technologies and collaborative tools also form part of the established HUB environment. Digital readiness and connectivity were assessed during establishment, while hybrid and online formats were already applied during the Hungarian and Romanian launch processes. The HUB framework therefore supports a combination of physical, digital and blended interaction, allowing the AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem to respond flexibly to local circumstances and participant needs.

A common governance and monitoring framework has been established to support the operation of the HUB network. It defines responsibilities at project and local level and introduces common indicators covering sessions delivered, unique participants, enterprise engagement, participant satisfaction and evidence completeness. The framework also incorporates mechanisms for continuous improvement by linking participant feedback, operational issues, corrective actions and follow-up measures.

The establishment process generated positive early feedback. Participants particularly valued the opportunities for collaboration, knowledge exchange, networking and stronger links between training and real professional needs. The Italian launch, for example, achieved an average usefulness rating of **4.2 out of 5**, while feedback from the Czech implementation highlighted the relevance of digitalisation and the connection between training and business needs.

The implementation also confirms the transferability of the AGRITECH HUB concept. Rather than requiring one standardised facility, the model has been successfully embedded in university environments, enterprise facilities, distributed multi-site arrangements and community-oriented training locations. This flexibility provides a strong basis for continued operation, local adaptation and future replication.

In line with the Application Form's concept of "incubators within educational institutions", the established Educational HUBs also demonstrate adoption and local adjustment of the AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem, with the common model embedded in different university, enterprise, research and training environments according to national and institutional conditions.

A key achievement of Task 2.4 was the successful attainment of **Milestone MS3, "AgriTech Educational HUBs launched"**, which marked the completion of the Educational HUB establishment phase. The milestone was reached on **15 May 2026**, when the Czech AGRITECH Educational HUB was formally launched, completing the sequence of national HUB launches that had started in March 2026. By this date, AGRITECH Educational HUB structures had been established and formally launched in **Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania and the Czech Republic**, supported by **13 assessed physical locations** across university, research, enterprise and training environments. The achievement of MS3 demonstrates that the AGRITECH Learning Ecosystem progressed from conceptual design to practical implementation, providing the project with an operational network of locations, responsible organisations, governance arrangements and stakeholder communities capable of supporting training, enterprise cooperation and further curriculum-linked activities.

Overall, Task 2.4 has successfully delivered the establishment of a functioning AGRITECH Educational HUB network. The project has moved from ecosystem design to real institutional implementation by creating identifiable HUB structures, assessing and preparing physical locations, establishing governance arrangements, formally launching the national HUBs and mobilising the stakeholder communities required for their operation. The established HUBs now provide the practical foundation for the continued delivery of AGRITECH learning activities, enterprise cooperation,



stakeholder engagement, digital collaboration and continuous improvement throughout the subsequent stages of project implementation.



1. Task scope and evidence basis

1.1. Task and deliverable scope

Task 2.4, Educational HUBs establishment within education and enterprises, is concerned with the practical establishment and operation of AGRITECH Educational HUBs in educational and enterprise-related environments. According to the Application Form, the HUBs are intended to support hands-on learning, workshops and seminars, mentoring, professional training, technology demonstrations, networking and interaction between education and industry. D2.4, AgriTech Educational Ecosystem, documents how these requirements were implemented and supported by evidence.

The deliverable therefore focuses on six implementation questions:

- what HUBs were established;
- where they were established and which organisations were responsible;
- what operational and learning activities were implemented through them;
- which learners, enterprises and other stakeholders participated;
- what evidence and results were generated;
- what corrective, continuation or adoption actions followed.

The related MS3 milestone requires the establishment of at least one Educational HUB per partner organisation, together with an agreement or equivalent institutional confirmation for its operation. Section 3.1 summarises the evidence supporting achievement of this milestone.

D2.4 also has several specific content requirements. The Educational Ecosystem should incorporate innovative pedagogical approaches, digital technologies and collaborative platforms, include mechanisms for continuous improvement, and provide materials that can be adopted and adjusted by the established incubators.

These elements are reported in this deliverable only where they can be linked to actual HUB implementation. The report therefore prioritises dated activities, participant and stakeholder records, operational evidence, documented feedback, corrective actions and adoption records rather than general descriptions of how a HUB could theoretically operate.

There are AGRITECH national HUB structures in Greece, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy and Romania. Across these five countries, D2.4 identifies 13 assessed physical locations.

1.2. Relationship with D2.2, D2.3 and other project activities

D2.4 builds directly on D2.2 Report on Learning Ecosystem Design and D2.3 AgriTech Curriculum, but does not repeat their detailed content.

D2.2 provides the conceptual and organisational basis for the AGRITECH Learning Ecosystem, including the role of engagement HUBs, collaboration between education and industry, digital learning environments and continuous improvement. D2.3 provides the structured AGRITECH curriculum and the learning and delivery requirements to be implemented through the HUBs. The role of D2.4 is to document how these earlier outputs were translated into actual operating environments and activities.

The relationship can therefore be summarised as follows:

DELIVERABLE	MAIN FUNCTION	RELEVANCE TO D2.4
D2.2	Defines the Learning Ecosystem and HUB concept	Provides the model implemented through the Educational HUBs
D2.3	Defines the AGRITECH curriculum and delivery requirements	Provides the learning content and activity framework used in HUB operation
D2.4	Reports HUB establishment and use	Demonstrates practical implementation through verified evidence

Table 1. Relationship between D2.2, D2.3 and D2.4

Detailed descriptions of ecosystem architecture, individual curriculum modules, assessment methodology and generic pedagogical theory are therefore not reproduced in this deliverable unless they are necessary to identify a specific implemented HUB activity.

A similar scope boundary applies to other work packages.

WP4 testing records are used in D2.4 where they demonstrate that a HUB was actually used for learning activities. However, detailed evaluation of learning outcomes, training effectiveness or full pilot impact belongs primarily to WP4 and is not duplicated here.

For consistency with the revised RP1 reporting terminology, educational activities implemented during RP1 and reported in D2.4 are referred to as the testing phase. The term “pilot implementation” is reserved for the subsequent full pilot stage of the AGRITECH project.

Likewise, communication and dissemination activities are included only where they directly supported HUB establishment, participant recruitment, stakeholder engagement or continued HUB operation. Wider visibility and dissemination activities remain within the scope of WP6.

This scope distinction keeps D2.4 centred on its contractual purpose: **verified establishment, operation, use, stakeholder interaction, continuous improvement and adoption of the Educational HUB model.**

1.3. Evidence basis and reporting rules

D2.4 applies an evidence-led reporting approach. The activities are reported as completed only where implementation is supported by appropriate project documentation.

The principal evidence sources used for this deliverable include:

- national HUB establishment and readiness reports;
- site and readiness assessments;
- operation agreements or institutional confirmations where available;
- governance and responsibility records;
- setup documentation;
- launch-event reports;
- agendas and attendance records;
- Activity Logs;



- training or test-run records;
- participant feedback;
- enterprise and stakeholder engagement records;
- photographs, screenshots, videos and selected activity outputs;
- risk, incident and corrective-action records;
- sustainability and continuation arrangements;
- incubator adoption or adaptation records where available.

The national HUB reports for Greece, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy and Romania provide the principal evidence for site selection, readiness, launch and initial stakeholder mobilisation. This deliverable uses these reports to describe the selected locations and establishment processes.

D2.4 applies the following reporting rules consistently across countries.

Launch evidence and operational-use evidence are reported separately. Participation in a launch event demonstrates formal establishment and stakeholder mobilisation but is not automatically counted as curriculum delivery, repeated HUB use or recurring enterprise engagement.

Scheduled and completed activities are distinguished on the basis of verified implementation evidence. In the Czech Republic, the earlier establishment report recorded Modules M01–M02 as completed and Modules M03–M07 as scheduled. The subsequent WRLS/ZSČR implementation confirmation reports that all seven VET modules, M01–M07, were delivered; the corresponding completed Activity Logs are to be retained in the project evidence package.

Participant and organisation totals are used only where internally consistent. For Romania, more than 20 launch participants are documented, but the number of organisations represented should not be included in consortium-level totals until the summary field and attendance evidence are reconciled.

Testing-phase records are used only as evidence of HUB use. They are not used in D2.4 to evaluate educational impact or learner performance.

Continuous improvement is demonstrated through an evidence chain. Where records are available, D2.4 reports: issue or feedback → action taken → responsible HUB/partner → status/result → evidence reference.

Incubator adoption is interpreted in accordance with the terminology of the Application Form, which describes the AGRITECH Educational HUBs as incubator-type structures established within educational and related institutional environments. Adoption and adjustment are therefore demonstrated through the establishment of the national HUB structures and through documented local adaptations of the common AGRITECH governance, learning, stakeholder-engagement, digital and monitoring arrangements.

For public reporting, personal-data-bearing evidence should be minimised. Consolidated totals, anonymised participation information and selected non-sensitive evidence may be included in the public deliverable, while full attendance lists, consent forms and similar raw records should remain in the controlled project repository. This evidence rule provides the basis for the following chapters.

2. HUB NETWORK AND GOVERNANCE

2.1 HUB network and implementation settings

The AGRITECH Educational HUB network was implemented through a combination of educational, research, enterprise and training environments rather than through one standard physical model. The available verified establishment documentation covers national HUB structures in Greece, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy and Romania. Across these five countries, the current evidence identifies 13 assessed physical locations.

The number of physical locations should not be interpreted as the number of independent national HUB organisations. In several countries, one national HUB operates through more than one complementary site. The implementation model therefore combines a national or partner-level organisational structure with physical locations selected according to the activities to be hosted.

COUNTRY	DOCUMENTED HUB STRUCTURE	PHYSICAL LOCATIONS DOCUMENTED	MAIN SETTING	MAIN ORGANISATIONS IDENTIFIED IN ESTABLISHMENT EVIDENCE
Greece	Greek AGRITECH Educational HUB	5	Research, university and training/stakeholder facilities	ELGO-DIMITRA, AUTH, OECON Group, ScientAct
Hungary	Hungarian AGRITECH Educational HUB	3	University, enterprise and partner/training facilities	MATE, DDTG, Gazda Kontroll and wider stakeholder network
Czech Republic	Czech AGRITECH Educational HUB	2	Technology/innovation and VET/SME-oriented settings	Wirelessinfo, ZSČR
Italy	Italian AGRITECH Educational HUB	2	Social-enterprise, community and training environments	LAND, with POLITO and AUTOM involved in establishment
Romania	AgriTech_RO_HUB	1	University-based	USAMV Bucharest and participating stakeholder organisations

Table 2. Overview of the AGRITECH Educational HUB Network

- Greece**

The Greek implementation uses a distributed multi-site structure. The establishment documentation identifies several locations associated with ELGO-DIMITRA, AUTH and other participating organisations. The assessed sites include facilities suitable for smaller educational activities, collaborative work, larger presentations and stakeholder events.

This model demonstrates that one national HUB can operate through several physical settings where different functions are assigned to different facilities.



- **Hungary**

The Hungarian implementation combines educational and enterprise-related environments.

The documented locations include:

- MATE in Gödöllő;
- Gazda Kontroll in Gödöllő;
- DDTG in Pécs, with larger training activities relying on external rented training capacity.

The Hungarian structure therefore directly reflects the Task 2.4 requirement to connect education and enterprises. MATE provides an educational and academic setting, Gazda Kontroll represents an enterprise-related environment, while DDTG provides organisational and coordination capacity.

- **Czech Republic**

Two Czech locations are documented, in Litovel and Prague. The implementation is coordinated through Wirelessinfo and ZSČR and connects technology-oriented capacity, training delivery, SMEs and VET stakeholders.

The Czech model is particularly relevant because establishment and operational training were closely linked. The national launch was integrated with the initial testing-phase activities rather than being organised solely as a stand-alone establishment event.

- **Italy**

The Italian implementation documents two locations associated with LAND, including Borgo Danilo Dolci in Trappeto and LAND Impresa Sociale in Palermo. These facilities provide training, stakeholder-engagement and collaborative capacity within an existing territorial and social-enterprise environment.

The Italian structure therefore illustrates how the HUB model can operate outside a conventional university environment while remaining connected to educational and professional-development activities.

- **Romania**

The Romanian implementation is more geographically concentrated. The AgriTech_RO_HUB is anchored at USAMV Bucharest, using a university-based classroom environment as the principal physical location while connecting this site with a wider network of farms, enterprises, research organisations and other agricultural stakeholders.

The Romanian case demonstrates that a single institutional location can serve as the physical anchor for a broader multi-actor HUB network.

2.2 Education and enterprise settings

The documented HUB network confirms that AGRITECH implementation did not require partners to create identical facilities. Existing institutional and partner infrastructure was used where it met the operational requirements.

The locations fall broadly into three implementation settings:

SETTING	DOCUMENTED EXAMPLES	MAIN FUNCTION
Educational/research	MATE, USAMV Bucharest, AUTH, ELGO-DIMITRA	Training, curriculum delivery, practical learning, research and stakeholder interaction
Enterprise/professional	Gazda Kontroll, technology-oriented and SME-linked organisations	Enterprise interaction, demonstrations, professional input, practical cases
Mixed/shared training and stakeholder facilities	LAND locations, DDTG external training arrangements, Greek multi-use facilities	Workshops, events, mentoring, networking and training

Table 3. Educational HUB Implementation Settings and Main Functions

These settings are complementary rather than separate systems. A curriculum activity can take place in a university with an enterprise expert, an enterprise can provide a demonstration or practical case, and mentoring or stakeholder interaction can take place online or at an external site.

The evidence therefore supports a **functional definition of the HUB**. A HUB is characterised by the capacity to host or coordinate AGRITECH learning and stakeholder activities, not by a prescribed building type.

2.3 Applied governance and responsibilities

The national HUBs operated within the common governance framework established for Task 2.4. The Governance Manual defines a lightweight structure with responsibilities distributed between consortium-level coordination and local HUB management. D2.4 identifies three operational levels: Project Coordination, HUB Steering Check-ins and Local HUB Teams.

The governance model can be summarised as follows:

GOVERNANCE LEVEL	MAIN RESPONSIBILITY
Project Coordination	Common T2.4 requirements, cross-HUB alignment and resolution of issues affecting shared standards
HUB Steering Check-in	Monitoring implementation, reviewing progress and KPIs, discussing recurring issues and exchanging lessons
Local HUB Team	Day-to-day scheduling, access, activity delivery, stakeholder coordination, evidence collection and local compliance

Table 4. AGRITECH HUB Governance Levels and Responsibilities

At local level, the common model requires the following functions:

HUB Manager. Responsible for institutional oversight, local compliance, resource allocation, continuity and validation of the HUB evidence package.

HUB Coordinator. Responsible for day-to-day operation, scheduling, participant and trainer coordination, evidence collection and KPI reporting.

Facilitators or Trainers. Responsible for delivering learning activities, maintaining attendance and feedback records and documenting relevant activity outputs.



IT or Platform Contact. Responsible for access to the required digital tools, connectivity, user support and technical issues.

Additional functions such as Enterprise Liaison, Communication Focal Point and Quality Focal Point may be assigned where relevant, but they are supporting rather than mandatory structures.

2.4 Country-level governance arrangements

The national reports demonstrate that the common governance framework was adapted to different institutional structures.

COUNTRY	APPLIED GOVERNANCE FEATURE
Greece	Core establishment coordinated through ELGO-DIMITRA, AUTH, OECON Group and ScientAct, with responsibilities for education, training and stakeholder engagement
Hungary	MATE and DDTG acted as founding organisations within a wider stakeholder network; participation by additional organisations was supported through declarations of intent
Czech Republic	Wirelessinfo and ZSČR applied complementary responsibilities, with Wirelessinfo focused on technical coordination, digital tools and training delivery and ZSČR on stakeholder engagement and SME outreach
Italy	LAND coordinated the HUB structure with POLITO and AUTOM involved in establishment and governance discussions
Romania	USAMV Bucharest coordinated the national HUB and provided the principal institutional and physical anchor

Table 5. Country-level Governance Arrangements of the AGRITECH HUBs

These arrangements demonstrate that governance was not implemented through one legal structure across all countries. Instead, the common Task 2.4 responsibilities were incorporated into the institutional structures of the participating organisations.

The Hungarian model provides the clearest example of flexible stakeholder participation. Declarations of intent allowed organisations to confirm their willingness to contribute professional opinions and support according to their available capacity without creating mandatory financial commitments.

The Czech model provides a particularly clear division of implementation responsibilities between technical/training functions and stakeholder/SME engagement.

These examples demonstrate how the common governance framework was applied in practice. Generic descriptions of decision rights, asset rules, privacy procedures and incident-management processes can be referenced to the Governance Manual rather than repeated in this chapter.

2.5 Operational flow

The applied HUB operating flow can be summarised in five steps:



1. Activity planning.

The responsible local team identifies the activity, participants, facilitator, venue or digital format and any required enterprise or stakeholder contribution.

2. Access and preparation.

The HUB confirms availability of the location, equipment, connectivity and responsible staff.

3. Activity delivery.

The learning, mentoring, demonstration, stakeholder or enterprise activity is implemented.

4. Evidence collection.

Attendance, activity information, feedback and relevant outputs are recorded.

5. Review and follow-up.

Implementation issues, participant feedback and stakeholder follow-up are reviewed and, where evidence exists, converted into corrective or adaptation actions.

Detailed access, safety, asset, data and incident procedures remain governed by the separate HUB Governance Manual and do not need to be reproduced procedure by procedure in the main deliverable.



3. HUB establishment and readiness

3.1 MS3 compliance and partner-level establishment status

The establishment process was assessed against both the requirements of Task 2.4 and the related MS3 milestone. MS3 requires at least one Educational HUB per partner organisation together with an agreement or equivalent institutional confirmation for its operation. The reporting approach therefore distinguishes national HUB structures and physical locations from partner-level evidence of operational coverage.

The establishment process was implemented in line with the requirements of Task 2.4 and the related Milestone MS3, “AgriTech Educational HUBs launched”, which required the establishment of Educational HUBs within the partner organisations and formal arrangements for their operation.

MS3 was successfully achieved on 15 May 2026, when the Czech AGRITECH Educational HUB was formally launched, completing the sequence of national HUB launches initiated in March 2026. By this date, AGRITECH Educational HUB structures had been established and launched in Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania and the Czech Republic, supported by 13 assessed physical locations across university, research, enterprise and training environments.

The established national HUB structures reflect the participation of the relevant AGRITECH partner organisations through hosting, coordination, training, stakeholder engagement, technical support and other operational responsibilities. In several countries, more than one partner contributes to a shared national HUB structure, while in others the HUB is anchored within one principal institutional location and supported by a wider partner and stakeholder network.

The national reports and supporting establishment documentation provide evidence of:

- identified HUB locations and hosting organisations;
- readiness assessments;
- governance and operational responsibilities;
- formal launch events;
- stakeholder and enterprise involvement;
- initial operational or curriculum-linked activities where applicable.

Accordingly, MS3 was reported as achieved on 15 May 2026 through the completion of the national HUB launch sequence. The partner-level mapping below shows how the organisations participating in Task 2.4 are covered by the established national HUB structures and identifies the evidence that is already consolidated.

Partner-level MS3 coverage is summarised below:

Task 2.4 partner	HUB / national structure	Location / platform	Operational role / confirmation	Status	Evidence reference
DDTG	Hungarian AGRITECH Educational HUB	Pécs / Hungarian HUB network	Founding organisation; coordination and training arrangements documented	Verified	Hungarian HUB establishment /readiness report

Task 2.4 partner	HUB / national structure	Location / platform	Operational role / confirmation	Status	Evidence reference
ELGO-DIMITRA	Greek AGRITECH Educational HUB	Distributed Greek HUB locations	Core founding organisation; operational framework agreed during launch	Verified	Greek HUB establishment report
POLITO	Italian AGRITECH Educational HUB	Trappeto / Palermo shared national HUB	Formally involved in establishment and governance	Verified	Italian HUB establishment report
AUTOM	Italian AGRITECH Educational HUB	Trappeto / Palermo shared national HUB	Formally involved in establishment	Verified	Italian HUB establishment report
GK (Gazda Kontroll)	Hungarian AGRITECH Educational HUB	Gazda Kontroll, Gödöllő	Enterprise-based HUB location and stakeholder participation	Verified	Hungarian HUB establishment /readiness report
SACT (ScientAct)	Greek AGRITECH Educational HUB	Distributed Greek HUB locations	Core founding organisation; operational framework agreed during launch	Verified	Greek HUB establishment report

Table 6. Partner-level MS3 Coverage and Evidence Status

3.2 HUB locations and readiness

The establishment process began with identification and assessment of concrete locations capable of supporting AGRITECH learning and stakeholder activities. The available evidence confirms 13 assessed physical locations across the five documented countries.

COUNTRY	DOCUMENTED LOCATIONS	MAIN SETTING	READINESS OUTCOME
Greece	5	Research, university and stakeholder/training facilities	Locations generally assessed as suitable; scheduling and shared-space coordination identified as manageable issues
Hungary	3	University, enterprise and partner/training facilities	MATE and Gazda Kontroll suitable; DDTG suitable for operation with a continuity issue linked to reliance on an external training venue



COUNTRY	DOCUMENTED LOCATIONS	MAIN SETTING	READINESS OUTCOME
Czech Republic	2	Technology/innovation and VET/SME-oriented facilities	Both locations assessed as appropriate
Italy	2	Social-enterprise/community and training facilities	Both locations suitable; shared-space scheduling identified as a manageable issue
Romania	1	University classroom at USAMV Bucharest	Assessed as appropriate and sufficiently equipped

Table 7. HUB Locations and Readiness Status by Country

The Hungarian sites provide three clearly differentiated examples. The MATE location in Gödöllő uses university facilities with suitable equipment and staff capacity. Gazda Kontroll provides an enterprise-related location in Gödöllő. The DDTG location in Pécs uses its own office for organisational functions but relies on an external rented venue for training. The latter was assessed as appropriate overall, while sustainability and post-project continuity were rated only partly appropriate because continued training depends on external venue access. A framework rental arrangement was recommended.

The Czech implementation documents two locations, in Litovel and Prague, both assessed positively in relation to site readiness, safety, digital infrastructure, staffing, equipment and continuity.

The Italian implementation uses Borgo Danilo Dolci in Trappeto and LAND Impresa Sociale in Palermo. Both were considered suitable for training and stakeholder activities, with shared use of the facilities creating a need for advance scheduling and booking.

The Romanian HUB is physically anchored at USAMV Bucharest. The documented classroom includes a video projector, smart board and whiteboard and was assessed as adequate for AGRITECH training and presentation activities.

The Greek structure is distributed across several facilities associated with the participating organisations, allowing different spaces to support smaller learning activities, larger presentations and stakeholder events. The reports identify scheduling and shared-space availability as practical issues requiring local coordination rather than as barriers to establishment.

3.3 Actual risks, mitigation measures and status

D2.4 reports the risks that were identified in the HUB implementation evidence. Generic risk categories and procedural descriptions are covered by the separate Governance Manual and are not repeated here.

HUB / COUNTRY	RISK OR ISSUE IDENTIFIED	MITIGATION / CORRECTIVE ACTION	STATUS
Greek shared facilities	Potential scheduling conflicts and high demand for shared spaces	Advance booking and coordination with institutional staff	Manageable



HUB / COUNTRY	RISK OR ISSUE IDENTIFIED	MITIGATION / CORRECTIVE ACTION	STATUS
Greek facilities	Need to ensure equipment and staff availability before activities	Pre-activity checks and staff coordination	Manageable
Hungary, DDTG Pécs	Training depends on an external rented venue	Recommended framework agreement for venue rental	Partly resolved / follow-up required
Italy, Trappeto and Palermo	Shared premises may create scheduling conflicts	Booking and coordination arrangements	Manageable

Table 8. Identified HUB Risks, Mitigation Measures and Current Status

The DDTG Pécs case is the clearest documented location-specific continuity issue. The partner owns its office, but educational activities require rented external space. The recommended mitigation is to secure the training venue through an advance framework arrangement.

No major site-level barrier is reported in the available national establishment reports for the other documented locations. Identified issues are primarily related to scheduling, shared use, venue continuity and completeness of supporting evidence rather than fundamental unsuitability of the locations.

3.4 Physical and digital setup

The setup phase focused on confirming that the selected locations had the minimum infrastructure needed for AGRITECH activities. The available national reports show that the majority of the HUB locations could operate using existing equipment and institutional resources.

The documented physical resources include training and meeting spaces, computers and presentation equipment, connectivity and other resources appropriate to the planned activities. The Romanian location, for example, is explicitly documented as having a projector, smart board and whiteboard. Hungarian MATE and Gazda Kontroll facilities were reported as having modern equipment suitable for training and administrative activities.

The evidence does not demonstrate that every HUB acquired the same equipment package, nor was such uniformity required. Setup reflected local infrastructure and the type of activities planned at each site.

Digital readiness was assessed through connectivity and ability to access the relevant AGRITECH resources and digital environments.

For the Czech Educational HUB, the digital environment is directly documented. The Czech AgriTech HUB is operated by Wirelessinfo and is accessible at <https://edu.agrihub.cz>, while curriculum delivery was supported through the AGRITECH Moodle learning platform at <https://agritech.cardetprojects.com>.

Where separate procurement records, IT access logs or screenshots are available, these should remain in the controlled evidence package or selected annex material rather than expanding the main narrative.

3.5 Staff preparation and test-run evidence

The T2.4 implementation process included preparation of the staff responsible for HUB-related learning delivery. For the Czech Educational HUB, staff preparation was completed before the testing-phase activities. The trainer team consisted of Petr Uhlíř, Pavel Gnip, Karel Charvát and Jan Macura, while Ing. Jiri Kvapil acted as assessor.

This preparation provided the trainer and assessment capacity required for delivery of the AGRITECH VET curriculum through the Czech HUB. The subsequent completion of all seven VET modules provides operational confirmation that the prepared staff structure was successfully applied in practice.

For the other national HUBs, staff preparation is reported where corresponding preparation, attendance, training or equivalent implementation evidence is available.

3.6 Official launch and formal establishment

Formal launch events were documented in each of the five countries currently included in the verified establishment package.

COUNTRY	LAUNCH DATE	LOCATION / FORMAT	VERIFIED PARTICIPATION EVIDENCE	MAIN ESTABLISHMENT EVIDENCE
Greece	14 March 2026	Thessaloniki, AGROTICA 2026	Approximately 100 participants	Agenda, stakeholder discussion, photos, establishment description
Italy	25 March 2026	Trappeto, face-to-face	16 participants, 10 organisations	Event programme, attendance, photos, evaluation
Hungary	27 March 2026	Gödöllő, hybrid	23 participants, 20 in person and 3 online; 11 organisations represented	Attendance, declarations of intent, GDPR documentation, photos, video
Romania	1 April 2026	Online, coordinated by USAMV Bucharest	More than 20 participants	Agenda, attendance list, screenshots/photos, stakeholder records
Czech Republic	15 May 2026	Prague, face-to-face	10 participants, including VET, SME and innovation stakeholders	Agenda, event report, testing-phase launch evidence, participant records

Table 9. Official Launch and Formal Establishment of the National HUBs

The Hungarian launch provides the most detailed establishment evidence. It records 23 participants from 11 organisations, with ten organisations reported as formally establishing the HUB through eight declarations of intent together with MATE and DDTG as founding organisations.



The Italian report records 16 participants representing ten organisations and identifies LAND, POLITO and AUTOM as organisations formally involved in establishment.

The Romanian report documents more than 20 participants.

The Czech launch is distinctive because it was integrated with the start of the testing phase. The event was attended by 10 participants and provided direct evidence that the Czech HUB was transitioning from formal establishment into operational use. The subsequent WRLS/ZSČR confirmation reports completion of all seven VET modules, M01–M07, with Activity Logs retained as supporting evidence.

The launch events demonstrate formal establishment and stakeholder mobilisation. They are **not counted as evidence of recurring training delivery or repeated enterprise interaction unless the corresponding operational activity is separately documented.**

4. HUB operation and implemented learning activities

4.1 Evidence of operational HUB use

Following establishment and launch, Task 2.4 required the Educational HUBs to move into real operation. The T2.4 Action Plan defined the operational phase as the period in which curriculum or ecosystem activities should be implemented with students, educators and enterprise participants, supported by Activity Logs, participant feedback and other evidence of actual use. The plan foresaw at least two curriculum-related activities per HUB, potentially including workshops, mentoring, hackathons or enterprise visits.

In D2.4, operational use is reported only where a completed activity can be supported by an Activity Log, attendance record, training record, feedback record or equivalent documentation. Launch events are reported separately and are not automatically treated as evidence of recurring HUB operation.

Based on the evidence currently available for consolidation, the level of documented post-launch operation differs considerably between countries.

COUNTRY	ESTABLISHMENT / LAUNCH EVIDENCE	POST-LAUNCH OPERATIONAL EVIDENCE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE
Czech Republic	Verified	Verified curriculum-linked operation; all seven VET modules M01 – M07 completed during the testing phase
Hungary	Verified	Future consultation, training and testing-phase involvement described
Italy	Verified	Launch used to present training programme and recruit participants for later testing activities
Greece	Verified	Launch and stakeholder interaction documented
Romania	Verified	Launch supported stakeholder mobilisation and preparation for subsequent testing activities

Table 10. Operational Use Evidence by National HUB

The current source documentation supports a strong claim for establishment and launch across the five documented national HUBs. For the Czech Republic, the evidence also demonstrates completed curriculum-linked operation through all seven VET modules; operational evidence for the remaining countries is reported according to the records currently available.

4.2 Documented curriculum-linked operation

Curriculum-linked operation is most comprehensively documented for the Czech HUB, where the testing phase was organised around the seven-module AGRITECH curriculum.

The Czech VET testing phase followed the seven-module AGRITECH curriculum. The delivery schedule and final status are summarised below:

Module	Delivery date	Final status	Evidence
M01	15.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record

Module	Delivery date	Final status	Evidence
M02	19.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record
M03	22.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record
M04	25.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record
M05	27.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record
M06	29.05.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record
M07	01.06.2026	Completed	WRLS/ZSČR Activity Log / testing-phase record

Table 11. Czech VET Testing Phase Module Delivery Schedule

The completed delivery of Modules M01–M07 demonstrates that the Czech HUB progressed beyond formal establishment into structured curriculum-linked educational operation during the testing phase.

4.3 Operational evidence in the other national HUBs

For Hungary, Italy, Greece and Romania, the establishment reports clearly demonstrate preparation for continued educational activity but do not provide a complete consolidated set of post-launch Activity Logs in the current evidence package.

• Hungary

The Hungarian launch established a stakeholder network and introduced future cooperation around training content, testing courses and micro-credentials. Participating organisations were invited to provide professional feedback and contribute to subsequent Educational HUB activities.

The report therefore demonstrates:

- establishment of the cooperation structure;
- stakeholder commitment;
- preparation for educational and testing-phase involvement;
- links between education and agricultural enterprises.

These intentions are therefore not reported as completed curriculum sessions without supporting Activity Logs, attendance records or equivalent evidence.

• Italy



The Italian launch presented the AGRITECH training programme and was used to mobilise participants for subsequent testing activities. It therefore provides evidence of the transition from HUB establishment towards educational operation.

The current establishment report, however, does not contain a complete set of subsequent session-level records that would allow reliable calculation of total curriculum activities, operational participants or repeated HUB usage.

- **Greece**

The Greek launch connected academic, professional, industry and policy stakeholders and established the organisational basis for educational and training cooperation. The report documents stakeholder interest in skills development, knowledge exchange and continued HUB activity.

Operational totals are based on the subsequent Activity Logs rather than inferred from launch participation or intended activities.

- **Romania**

The Romanian HUB launch established a collaborative network involving agricultural businesses, farms, researchers, technology-related organisations and other stakeholders. The event also supported engagement for subsequent learning and testing activities.

As with the other national reports, preparation and recruitment are distinguishable from documented delivery. Operational results are updated from the corresponding implementation records.

4.4 Learning formats implemented through the HUBs

Innovative pedagogical approaches form an integral part of the AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem and are reflected in the way learning, stakeholder interaction and curriculum-related activities have been organised through the Educational HUBs. Rather than relying exclusively on conventional classroom teaching, the HUB model combines practice-oriented learning, interactive discussion, collaborative problem exploration, enterprise engagement and flexible physical/digital participation.

The strongest documented example is the Czech HUB, where the launch was directly connected with the start of the VET testing phase. The programme combined structured curriculum delivery with interactive discussion on Digital and Ecological Transition in Czech MSMEs and a dedicated session on Skills Needs and Market Expectations. This format connected theoretical learning with real business challenges and enabled learners and stakeholders to discuss the practical application of digital and ecological competences. Participant feedback specifically highlighted the connection between digitalisation and real business needs.

The Italian HUB also applied participatory learning and engagement formats during its launch and preparation for subsequent training activities. The programme included a round table on labour-market challenges and a World Café on skills required by enterprises. These methods encouraged active participation, peer exchange and collaborative identification of competence needs instead of relying only on one-way presentations.



In Hungary, the HUB launch was organised in a hybrid format, enabling both physical and online participation. Stakeholders were invited to discuss future agricultural competence needs, including artificial intelligence, precision agriculture, sustainability and ESG-related knowledge, and to provide professional feedback on forthcoming testing activities and micro-credentials. This approach supported co-creation between education providers and professional stakeholders.

The Greek implementation similarly used an interactive stakeholder discussion focusing on digital transformation, skills development, sustainable farming and cooperation between academia, industry and policy actors. This created a collaborative learning environment in which professional and institutional perspectives could be integrated into the further development of HUB activities.

The Romanian HUB demonstrated the flexibility of the model through an online collaborative format involving farms, agricultural enterprises, technology and equipment suppliers, research organisations and public-sector actors. The event supported knowledge exchange, discussion of future HUB operation and interaction among geographically dispersed stakeholders.

These approaches demonstrate that the AGRITECH HUB model already incorporates active, collaborative and practice-oriented pedagogical methods, rather than postponing pedagogical innovation to a later project phase. The established HUBs provide environments in which learning can be linked to real professional needs, stakeholder experience and enterprise practice, while physical, hybrid and online formats allow delivery to be adapted to local circumstances.

As the HUBs move further into curriculum implementation, these approaches can be expanded through mentoring, demonstrations, practical challenges, enterprise contributions and other applied formats, with their use documented through Activity Logs and participant feedback.

4.5 Practical orientation and interaction with professional needs

The documented Czech implementation provides the clearest evidence of practice-oriented delivery. Its launch programme included a dedicated session on **Digital and Ecological Transition in Czech MSMEs** and an interactive session on **Skills Needs and Market Expectations**. Participant feedback highlighted the connection between digitalisation and real business needs and the practical orientation of the AGRITECH initiative.

This interaction is relevant to D2.4 because it demonstrates the HUB's role in connecting training with the professional environment. The evidence should be reported as a factual implementation feature rather than expanded into a general description of challenge-based or employer-led pedagogy.

Similar links between education and professional practice were established during the Hungarian, Greek, Italian and Romanian launch processes through participation by companies, agricultural organisations, technology actors and professional bodies. These interactions are described in greater detail in Chapter 5.

Where operational records demonstrate that enterprise representatives contributed to curriculum sessions, mentoring, demonstrations or practical challenges, those activities are reported as part of the corresponding HUB evidence.

4.6 Digital technologies and collaborative tools used



Digital technologies and collaborative platforms are explicit elements of D2.4.

First, digital connectivity and access were assessed as part of HUB readiness. This confirms that the documented locations were prepared to support digital learning and collaboration.

Second, the Hungarian launch was delivered in hybrid form, with 20 participants attending physically and three participating online. This provides direct evidence that digital participation was used within the national HUB establishment process.

Third, the Romanian launch was organised online, demonstrating use of digital communication to establish and connect the national stakeholder network.

Fourth, the Czech digital environment is directly documented. Wirelessinfo operates the Czech AgriTech HUB at <https://edu.agrihub.cz>, while the AGRITECH Moodle learning platform at <https://agritech.cardetprojects.com> was used to support learning delivery. Wirelessinfo also holds responsibility for technical coordination, digital tools and training delivery within the Czech HUB.

The verified digital and collaborative use is summarised below:

HUB	VERIFIED DIGITAL / COLLABORATIVE USE	PURPOSE	EVIDENCE BASIS
Hungary	Hybrid participation combining physical and online attendance	Extend stakeholder access to the HUB launch and cooperation activities	20 participants in person and 3 online; hybrid launch documented
Romania	Online HUB launch and online stakeholder participation; technical preparation for online streaming; digitally equipped HUB classroom	Remote stakeholder engagement, presentations and collaborative interaction	Online launch documented; readiness checklist; projector and smart board documented
Czech Republic	Czech AgriTech HUB (edu.agrihub.cz) and AGRITECH Moodle learning platform (agritech.cardetprojects.com)	HUB information, learning access and curriculum delivery	Wirelessinfo; Czech HUB testing-phase records
Greece	Digitally ready institutional facilities supporting HUB learning and stakeholder activities	Support presentations, learning activities and stakeholder cooperation	HUB readiness and establishment documentation
Italy	Existing digitally enabled training and collaborative facilities	Support learning, stakeholder engagement and territorial cooperation	HUB readiness and establishment documentation

Table 12. Verified Digital and Collaborative Use within the AGRITECH HUBs

4.7 Current operational evidence assessment

Based on the national HUB reports currently, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- **the five documented national HUB structures were established and formally launched;**



- Hungary, Italy, Greece and Romania demonstrate preparation for continued educational activity and stakeholder participation, but their current establishment reports do not provide a complete cross-country set of operational Activity Logs;
- practical, interactive and stakeholder-oriented formats are documented, particularly in the Czech implementation and national launch activities;
- digital participation is directly documented through hybrid and online launch formats, while the Czech HUB additionally provides named public HUB and Moodle learning-platform links;
- planned methods such as mentoring, enterprise visits, hackathons and enterprise challenges should not be reported as implemented until dated activity evidence is available.



5. Enterprise and stakeholder engagement

5.1 Verified stakeholder engagement

Enterprise and stakeholder interaction is a central function of the AGRITECH Educational HUBs because Task 2.4 is intended to connect education with agricultural practice, technology providers, enterprises and other actors in the wider AgriTech ecosystem.

The stakeholder engagement is reported where it is connected to a **dated HUB activity or documented establishment process**. General descriptions of stakeholder categories and theoretical benefits have therefore been removed.

The available national reports demonstrate stakeholder mobilisation in all five currently documented national HUB structures. However, most of the strongest evidence concerns **launch events, consultation and network formation**. More intensive forms of enterprise interaction such as mentoring, challenge-based activities, placements or site visits should be reported as completed only where corresponding Activity Logs or equivalent records are available.

The consolidated engagement picture is summarised below.

COUNTRY / HUB	DATE	STAKEHOLDER / ENTERPRISE INVOLVEMENT	DOCUMENTED ROLE OR CONTRIBUTION	FOLLOW-UP / STATUS	EVIDENCE
Greece	14 March 2026	AGRITECH partners, public authorities, professional bodies, agricultural machinery sector and other stakeholders	HUB launch, discussion on digital agriculture, skills, sustainable farming and academia-industry-policy cooperation	Continued cooperation foreseen through Greek HUB framework	Agenda, attendance documentation, photos, evaluation
Hungary	27 March 2026	Universities, agricultural enterprises, technology actors, professional organisations	HUB establishment, discussion of competence needs, feedback on future training and testing activities	Declarations of intent created a basis for continued participation	Attendance, declarations of intent, photos, video, GDPR documentation

COUNTRY / HUB	DATE	STAKEHOLDER / ENTERPRISE INVOLVEMENT	DOCUMENTED ROLE OR CONTRIBUTION	FOLLOW-UP / STATUS	EVIDENCE
Italy	25 March 2026	Public and private organisations, MSME-oriented stakeholders, AGRITECH partners	HUB launch, training-programme presentation, skills discussion, networking and testing-phase recruitment	Participants expressed interest in future activities	Programme, participant records, photos, evaluation
Romania	1 April 2026	Farms, agricultural companies, input/equipment suppliers, research and public-sector actors	HUB presentation, stakeholder contributions and discussion of future operation	Cooperation and future participation discussed	Attendance list, agenda, screenshots/photos
Czech Republic	15 May 2026	10 participants: VET representatives, SMEs, innovation stakeholders and sector experts	HUB launch linked to testing-phase start, skills-needs discussion and training participation	Testing phase completed through M01–M07	Agenda, event report, participant feedback, testing-phase records

Table 13. Verified Enterprise and Stakeholder Engagement by National HUB

5.2 Greece

The Greek AGRITECH Educational HUB was launched on **14 March 2026 during AGROTICA 2026 in Thessaloniki**. The event combined formal establishment with structured stakeholder engagement. Core AGRITECH organisations included ELGO-DIMITRA, AUTH, OECON Group and ScientAct.

The launch event was attended by approximately 100 participants, as confirmed by the event attendance records. Participants included representatives of the AGRITECH partners, public authorities, professional organisations and other agricultural and agri-food stakeholders.

The launch also involved representatives of public authorities and professional organisations. The documented programme included contributions from the Ministry of Rural Development and Food, the Geotechnical Chamber of Greece and the Agricultural Machinery Manufacturers' Association of Greece.

A dedicated stakeholder discussion focused on:

- digital transformation in agriculture;
- skills development for farmers and agricultural professionals;
- adoption of innovative and sustainable farming practices;



- cooperation between academia, industry and policy actors.

The event therefore provides verified evidence of stakeholder consultation and knowledge exchange directly linked to the establishment of the Greek HUB.

The national report states that the participating organisations agreed on a collaboration framework and that the HUB's operational structure and stakeholder network were presented during the launch.

The evidence available at this stage is strongest for establishment and initial stakeholder mobilisation. Subsequent mentoring, enterprise challenges and other operational interactions are reported only where corresponding Activity Logs provide supporting evidence.

5.3 Hungary

The Hungarian HUB provides particularly strong evidence of structured stakeholder participation during establishment.

The hybrid launch held at MATE in Gödöllő on **27 March 2026** involved **23 participants representing 11 organisations**. Ten organisations were reported as formally establishing the HUB through eight declarations of intent together with the two founding organisations, MATE and DDTG.

The stakeholder network included agricultural and technology-related actors such as:

- Gazda Kontroll;
- KITE;
- ABZ Drone;
- the Hungarian Chamber of Agriculture;
- higher-education and professional organisations.

The launch discussion addressed future agricultural competence needs, including artificial intelligence, precision agriculture, sustainability and ESG-related knowledge. Participants were also invited to provide professional feedback on testing activities and the planned micro-credential programme.

The declarations of intent provide an important element of stakeholder continuity. Signatory organisations expressed willingness to contribute professional opinions, feedback and other forms of support within their areas of expertise and available capacity. The declarations did not impose compulsory financial or professional-service obligations.

This distinguishes the Hungarian evidence from simple launch-event attendance. It demonstrates a documented mechanism for continued stakeholder involvement.

At the same time, the establishment report describes several later interactions, including consultation on training content and testing courses, primarily as next-phase activities. These should not be counted as completed enterprise engagements without the related operational evidence.

5.4 Czech Republic



The Czech implementation provides the clearest link between stakeholder engagement and the beginning of actual HUB operation.

The Czech HUB launch was held on 15 May 2026 in Prague and was organised jointly by Wirelessinfo and ZSČR as part of the initial testing-phase activities. The event was attended by 10 participants representing VET, SME, innovation and sector stakeholder communities.

The programme included:

- introduction of AGRITECH and the Czech HUB;
- presentation of the VET testing programme;
- discussion of digital and ecological transition in Czech MSMEs;
- an interactive session on skills needs and market expectations;
- networking and discussion with project partners.

Participant feedback highlighted the connection between digitalisation and real business needs and the opportunity for direct interaction with the project partners.

The Czech governance structure also assigns explicit stakeholder responsibilities. ZSČR is responsible for stakeholder engagement, SME outreach and dissemination, while Wirelessinfo leads technical coordination, digital tools and training delivery.

This division of responsibilities created a direct organisational link between enterprise engagement and learning delivery.

Because the launch was integrated with the start of the testing phase, the Czech case provides strong evidence of the transition from stakeholder mobilisation to operational use. The completed Activity Logs confirm delivery of all seven VET modules (M01–M07), providing a verified record of curriculum-linked HUB operation.

5.5 Italy

The Italian Educational HUB was launched on **25 March 2026 in Trappeto, Palermo**, within the *Transforming Territories – Tools and Training for MSMEs and Staff in the Ecological and Digital Transition* Infoday.

The event involved organisations from the public and private sectors and addressed ecological and digital transformation in fields including agriculture, food, energy and tourism. The AGRITECH HUB launch was deliberately incorporated into this broader event to reach stakeholders already engaged with skills development and territorial innovation.

The programme included:

- launch of the AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem and HUB;
- presentation of the AGRITECH training programme;
- a round table on current labour-market challenges;
- a World Café on skills required by enterprises;
- networking with territorial stakeholders.



The report records **16 participants representing 10 organisations**. LAND, POLITO and AUTOM are identified as the organisations formally establishing the Italian HUB.

The event also supported recruitment for later testing activities. LAND representatives used the event for networking and informal discussions with relevant territorial stakeholders.

Participant feedback was positive. Based on 16 responses, the average rating for usefulness was **4.2 out of 5**, and the report records strong interest in future activities.

This feedback demonstrates stakeholder interest and relevance of the launch event. It should not, however, be interpreted as evaluation of later learning activities. Launch feedback and curriculum-session feedback remain separate evidence categories.

5.6 Romania

The Romanian AgriTech_RO_HUB was launched on **1 April 2026** in an online format coordinated by USAMV Bucharest.

The event brought together a broad stakeholder group including:

- farms and agricultural producers;
- agricultural businesses;
- machinery and equipment suppliers;
- input suppliers;
- digital-agriculture actors;
- research organisations;
- public-sector organisations.

The detailed attendance evidence includes organisations such as TimacAgro, Agro Brava, Lemken, Agri Drone Romania, INMA and the Romanian Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, among a wider group of agricultural and professional participants.

The event included presentation of the AGRITECH project and Romanian HUB, contributions from invited organisations and discussion of the future operation of the HUB. The establishment discussions addressed cooperation, knowledge transfer, exchange of good practices, responsible data sharing and longer-term sustainability.

More than 20 participants are documented. However, the number of organisations represented is **not aggregated in this deliverable** because the summary information and broader attendance evidence are not internally consistent. This figure should remain excluded from consortium-level organisation totals until reconciled.

The Romanian launch therefore demonstrates broad stakeholder mobilisation but does not by itself provide evidence of repeated post-launch enterprise interaction. Subsequent engagements should be incorporated from Activity Logs where available.

5.7 Forms of enterprise interaction



The Governance Manual recommends at least two enterprise interactions per HUB during implementation and identifies possible formats including guest experts, practical challenges, mentoring, site visits and placements.

The consortium will consistently observe this aspect throughout the implementation of the project when conducting the training sessions.

5.8 Networking and outreach directly linked to HUB operation

The report includes outreach only where it directly supported establishment, recruitment or operation of the HUB. Broader project communication belongs to WP6 and is not repeated here.

Several national activities meet this criterion.

In Greece, integration of the HUB launch into AGROTICA provided access to agricultural, professional and public-sector stakeholders and supported establishment of the national collaboration network.

In Italy, the Transforming Territories Infoday provided a platform for introducing the HUB, recruiting participants and networking with organisations working on digital and ecological transition.

In Hungary, the launch created an initial formal stakeholder community supported by declarations of intent.

In the Czech Republic, professional networks and direct outreach were used to engage VET organisations, SMEs and innovation stakeholders in both the launch and testing activities.

In Romania, the online format enabled a geographically and institutionally diverse set of agricultural stakeholders to participate in establishment discussions.

These activities are included because they had a direct role in establishing, populating or activating the HUB network rather than simply generating project visibility.

5.9 Evidence status and remaining data needs

The existing evidence demonstrates that the Educational HUBs successfully created initial interfaces between educational institutions, enterprises and other professional stakeholders.

The strongest verified results are:

- establishment of multi-actor stakeholder networks in all five documented national HUB structures;
- direct involvement of agricultural enterprises, technology actors, professional organisations and research institutions;
- documented discussion of skills needs and professional requirements;
- formalised stakeholder participation in Hungary through declarations of intent;
- explicit SME and VET engagement linked to the initial Czech testing phase;
- labour-market and enterprise-skills discussions in Italy;



- broad participation by farms, companies, suppliers, research organisations and public actors in Romania;
- academia-industry-policy dialogue during the Greek launch.

For subsequent monitoring and follow-up, the following types of enterprise interaction should be recorded where available:

- enterprise participation recorded in Activity Logs;
- guest-expert contributions;
- mentoring activities;
- demonstrations;
- practical challenges;
- site visits or placements;
- enterprise contributions to curriculum delivery;
- follow-up actions resulting from stakeholder consultation.

The consortium will use the following table for monitoring purposes:

DATE	HUB	ORGANISATION / STAKEHOLDER	ACTIVITY	ROLE / CONTRIBUTION	FOLLOW-UP	EVIDENCE REFERENCE
[Date]	[HUB]	[Organisation]	[Activity]	[Expert input / mentoring / consultation / demonstration / etc.]	[Action/status]	[Evidence]

Table 14. Enterprise and Stakeholder Engagement Monitoring Template

6. Results, monitoring and continuous improvement

6.1 Consolidated implementation results

This deliverable reports results where they are supported by verified implementation evidence. The current evidence base is strongest for HUB establishment, readiness, launch and stakeholder mobilisation. Evidence of post-launch operation is available in more limited and uneven form across countries.

The common monitoring framework defines five core indicators for each HUB:

- sessions delivered;
- unique participants;
- enterprise engagements;
- participant satisfaction;
- evidence completeness.

These indicators are retained because they provide a direct test of whether the HUBs were actually used, reached relevant participants, involved enterprises, generated participant feedback and produced sufficient evidence for verification.

The status is as follows:

INDICATOR	CURRENT EVIDENCE STATUS	CONSOLIDATED RESULT
HUB establishment	Strong	Five national HUB structures verified in current evidence package
Physical locations	Strong	13 assessed locations across Greece, Hungary, Czech Republic, Italy and Romania
Formal launch	Strong	Verified in all five documented countries
Launch participation	Medium	Numerical launch-participation data available for Greece, Hungary, Italy, Romania and the Czech Republic.
Enterprise engagements	Medium	Strong launch and consultation evidence; recurring operational engagements require Activity Logs
Participant satisfaction	Medium	Launch feedback available in several countries; session-level learning feedback is monitored during continued HUB operation
Evidence completeness	Medium	Establishment evidence strong; post-launch evidence uneven
Continuous-improvement actions	Medium	Several readiness-related preventive/corrective actions documented; feedback-to-action records are incorporated as operational evidence becomes available

Table 15. Consolidated AGRITECH HUB Implementation Results

The current evidence therefore supports a clear distinction between **verified establishment results** and **operational KPI results still requiring continuous follow-up**.



6.2 Participation, sessions and usage

Participation should be reported separately for launch events and operational learning activities. The two categories demonstrate different aspects of Task 2.4 and should not be combined into one attendance figure.

Launch participation

The strongest quantitative launch data currently available are:

COUNTRY	LAUNCH PARTICIPATION EVIDENCE
Hungary	23 participants, representing 11 organisations
Italy	16 participants, representing 10 organisations
Romania	More than 20 participants; organisation total not consolidated pending reconciliation
Greece	Approximately 100 participants at the Greek AGRITECH HUB launch during AGROTICA 2026
Czech Republic	10 participants; VET, SME, innovation and sector stakeholders represented

Table 16. Launch Participation by National HUB

The Romanian organisation count should remain excluded from consortium-level totals until the inconsistency between the summary field and attendance record is resolved.

Operational sessions

The Czech Republic provides directly verified evidence of curriculum-related HUB use. All seven VET modules, M01–M07, were completed during the testing phase and are reported through the corresponding testing-phase records and Activity Logs. This constitutes the most comprehensive curriculum-linked operational evidence currently documented in D2.4.

For Greece, Hungary, Italy and Romania, the current establishment reports do not provide a complete set of operational Activity Logs sufficient to calculate reliable cross-country session totals.

6.3 Enterprise engagement results

Enterprise and stakeholder engagement is well documented during HUB establishment, but the current evidence does not yet support a complete consortium-wide count of recurring operational enterprise engagements.

Verified examples include:

- participation of agricultural and technology companies in the Hungarian HUB launch and establishment network;
- SME and business-needs discussions linked directly to the Czech testing-phase launch;
- labour-market and enterprise-skills discussions in Italy;
- participation by farms, suppliers, companies and research actors in Romania;
- interaction among academic, industry, professional and policy stakeholders in Greece.



The Governance Manual defines enterprise engagements as meaningful interactions such as guest-expert contributions, challenges, placements or mentoring.

6.4 Participant feedback

Participant feedback is available from several national launch processes, but launch feedback and learning-activity feedback must remain separate.

- **Greece**

The Greek launch report records positive participant feedback. Participants highlighted the HUB's relevance for collaboration, knowledge exchange and skills development, while networking was considered useful for creating new contacts and possible cooperation.

This feedback demonstrates stakeholder interest in the HUB concept. It should not be treated as evaluation of later curriculum delivery unless session-specific feedback is available.

- **Italy**

Italy provides the clearest quantitative launch evaluation. Sixteen evaluation responses were recorded and the average usefulness rating was **4.2 out of 5**. Participants also expressed strong interest in future AGRITECH activities.

Feedback on location, presentations, facilitation and organisation was also positive. These results support the effectiveness of the establishment event and stakeholder mobilisation, rather than learning-outcome evaluation.

- **Czech Republic**

Czech participants highlighted:

- the clear structure of the training programme;
- the connection between digitalisation and real business needs;
- the opportunity to engage directly with project partners;
- interest in continuing with testing activities and future HUB initiatives.

Because the Czech launch was linked to the beginning of testing-phase delivery, this evidence is particularly relevant to the transition from establishment to operation.

- **Hungary**

The Hungarian evidence demonstrates stakeholder interest through discussion of future competence requirements and through declarations of intent supporting continued involvement.

The current report does not provide a comparable numerical satisfaction result for later curriculum sessions.

- **Romania**



The Romanian establishment evidence demonstrates broad stakeholder participation and interest in future cooperation, but a consolidated quantitative feedback result is not available in the current evidence package.

Overall, the available feedback supports four recurring findings:

- the HUB concept was positively received as a cooperation mechanism;
- participants valued links to practical and professional needs;
- networking was considered useful;
- stakeholders expressed interest in continued participation.

These findings should be reported as establishment-phase results, not as claims regarding learning impact.

6.5 Continuous improvement and corrective actions

Continuous improvement forms an integral part of the AGRITECH Educational HUB model. During HUB establishment and initial operation, feedback from participants, readiness assessments and operational observations was used to identify areas requiring adjustment and to define preventive or corrective measures.

The common improvement process applied within the HUBs can be expressed as:

issue or feedback → action or adaptation → implementation result/status → supporting evidence

This mechanism was already applied during the establishment and launch phase. The documented examples demonstrate that implementation issues were not only identified but were translated into concrete management actions.

HUB / COUNTRY	FEEDBACK OR ISSUE IDENTIFIED	ACTION / ADAPTATION	RESULT / CURRENT OUTCOME	EVIDENCE
Greece, ELGO-DIMITRA	Shared facilities created potential scheduling and availability constraints	Advance scheduling and coordination were introduced together with equipment and IT-support monitoring	The risk was classified as manageable and the location remained suitable for HUB activities	Readiness assessment
Greece, AUTH	Activities within a large institutional environment required stronger scheduling and technical coordination	Institutional scheduling procedures and continued technical/administrative coordination were applied	Operational constraints were addressed through preventive arrangements and the site remained suitable for planned HUB activities	Readiness assessment

HUB / COUNTRY	FEEDBACK OR ISSUE IDENTIFIED	ACTION / ADAPTATION	RESULT / CURRENT OUTCOME	EVIDENCE
Hungary, DDTG Pécs	Larger training activities depend on an external rented venue	A framework rental arrangement was recommended to secure predictable access to training space	The site remained suitable for HUB coordination and training, while long-term venue access was identified as a specific continuity action	Readiness assessment
Italy, LAND facilities	Shared premises and high demand created possible scheduling conflicts	Shared booking arrangements, equipment checks and continued IT support were introduced	Scheduling risk was considered manageable and both locations remained suitable for training and stakeholder activities	Readiness assessment
Czech Republic	Participant feedback emphasised the importance of practical relevance and connection with real business needs	Training and stakeholder activities were continued through the testing phase, maintaining the focus on MSME needs and practical application	The HUB progressed directly from launch into curriculum-linked delivery, with all seven VET modules M01 – M07 completed	Launch and testing-phase documentation / Activity Logs
All HUBs	Risk of inconsistent documentation across activities	Common Activity Logs, attendance records, feedback requirements and evidence references were introduced	A common evidence structure was established for monitoring sessions, participation, enterprise engagement and feedback	Governance Manual and T2.4 monitoring framework

Table 17. Feedback, Corrective Actions and Results within the AGRITECH Educational HUBs

These examples demonstrate that continuous improvement was embedded in the establishment and initial operation of the HUB network. The process combined readiness assessment, stakeholder and participant feedback, preventive action and operational follow-up rather than relying solely on retrospective evaluation.

The Greek and Italian cases demonstrate how operational risks related to shared infrastructure were converted into scheduling, booking and equipment-management measures. In Hungary, the DDTG readiness assessment identified dependence on an external training venue and translated this into a specific continuity recommendation. The Czech implementation provides a particularly clear example of feedback influencing subsequent operation: participants emphasised the importance of practical



and business-relevant learning, and the HUB continued directly into curriculum-linked testing-phase activities focused on these needs, culminating in completion of all seven VET modules.

6.6 Feedback-to-improvement evidence

The AGRITECH HUB model uses participant feedback and operational monitoring as inputs for subsequent activities. Feedback is collected through launch evaluations, activity records, stakeholder discussions and readiness assessments and is reviewed by the responsible HUB teams.

The implementation evidence shows three types of response:

- **preventive improvement**, where a potential operational issue is identified before it disrupts an activity;
- **corrective improvement**, where an identified weakness results in an adjustment to the operating arrangement;
- **content or delivery improvement**, where participant or stakeholder feedback informs subsequent training and engagement activities.

For example, scheduling risks identified in Greece and Italy resulted in improved booking and coordination arrangements, while the external-venue dependency identified in Hungary generated a specific recommendation for more stable contractual access. In the Czech Republic, feedback concerning practical relevance and business needs was carried forward into subsequent testing-phase activities and curriculum-linked delivery.

The established monitoring framework supports continuation of this process through the five core indicators used across the HUB network: **sessions delivered, unique participants, enterprise engagements, participant satisfaction and evidence completeness**. Regular review of these indicators provides a mechanism for identifying emerging problems and adjusting HUB activities accordingly.

- **completed action**, where the change is documented;
- **action agreed / in progress**, where follow-up is recorded but completion is not yet evidenced;
- **feedback only**, where no subsequent action record is available.

The documented feedback-to-improvement actions are summarised in the following table:

HUB	FEEDBACK / ISSUE	AGREED OR COMPLETED ACTION	RESPONSIBLE ORGANISATION	STATUS	EVIDENCE
Greece	Scheduling/shared-space issue	Updated scheduling and coordination	Local HUB team	Preventive action defined	Readiness report
Hungary , DDTG	External venue continuity	Framework rental arrangement recommended	DDTG	Follow-up required	Readiness report

HUB	FEEDBACK / ISSUE	AGREED OR COMPLETED ACTION	RESPONSIBLE ORGANISATION	STATUS	EVIDENCE
Czech Republic	Demand for practical, business-relevant training	Testing-phase delivery completed with all seven modules linked to practical and MSME needs	Wirelessinfo / ZSČR	Completed	Launch/testing-phase report and Activity Logs
Italy	Strong interest in future initiatives	Use launch for testing-phase recruitment and continued activities	LAND / partners	Follow-up indicated	Launch report
Romania	Interest in cooperation and future HUB operation	Continue network cooperation and knowledge exchange	USAMV / stakeholder network	Follow-up indicated	Launch report

Table 18. Feedback-to-Improvement Actions by HUB

6.7 Overall result assessment

The AGRITECH partnership successfully established and launched Educational HUB structures in five countries represented in the current evidence package and assessed 13 physical locations for operation. The sites were generally considered suitable and were supported by governance, readiness and evidence requirements.

Initial stakeholder mobilisation was strong and involved educational organisations, enterprises, farms, technology providers, researchers, professional bodies and public-sector actors.

The Czech implementation provides direct evidence of progression from launch into completed curriculum-linked testing-phase delivery across Modules M01–M07, while operational evidence from the remaining countries is reported according to the records currently available.

Participant feedback from the establishment phase was generally positive, particularly regarding collaboration, practical relevance, networking and continued participation.

The monitoring framework itself is clearly established, but complete cross-country KPI totals cannot yet be calculated from the current national establishment reports alone. Comprehensive figures for sessions, unique participants, repeated enterprise engagements and curriculum-session satisfaction require the final Activity Logs and supporting operational records. These indicators will continue to be tracked during subsequent HUB operation through Activity Logs and supporting operational records.

Continuous-improvement mechanisms are visible through documented readiness actions, preventive measures and stakeholder feedback.



7. Sustainability and incubator adoption

7.1 Continuity of the Educational HUBs

D2.4 treats sustainability as a question of whether the established HUBs can continue to function through existing organisations, facilities, staff and stakeholder networks. Generic funding models and theoretical sustainability scenarios are therefore excluded. The focus is on the continuation conditions that are supported by the HUB implementation evidence.

The available evidence indicates that most documented HUBs were established within **existing institutional structures** rather than as temporary stand-alone project facilities. This provides an important basis for continued operation because physical spaces, organisational systems and staff capacity can remain available independently of the Task 2.4 implementation period. The main continuation conditions identified through the establishment process are discussed below.

These implementation arrangements demonstrate both adoption and adjustment of the AGRITECH Educational HUB/incubator model. All national HUBs retained the common AGRITECH principles of institutional hosting, learning and stakeholder interaction, governance responsibilities, digital or physical access and monitoring, while adapting the practical configuration to national and organisational conditions. The adaptations therefore represent implementation of the common AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem within the established incubator/HUB structures rather than the creation of unrelated local models.

The MATE location provides a clear example of institutional embedding. The HUB uses university-owned office and training infrastructure, has identified staff and was assessed positively with regard to sustainability and post-project continuity.

The Romanian HUB is similarly anchored within USAMV Bucharest, using an existing university classroom already equipped for training and presentation activities. This location was also assessed positively from the perspective of sustainability and continued use.

The Czech sites were assessed positively with regard to staffing, equipment and sustainability, indicating that HUB operation is based on existing organisational capacity rather than a temporary infrastructure created solely for the project.

In Greece and Italy, the physical basis of the HUBs is also provided by existing institutional, research, training and community facilities. Continuity therefore depends primarily on maintaining access, scheduling and responsible staff rather than preserving newly created infrastructure.

The main documented exception is the DDTG training arrangement in Pécs. DDTG has its own office capacity but relies on an external rented venue for larger training activities. The readiness assessment therefore identified stable future access to training space as an issue and recommended a framework rental arrangement. Stable future access to training space therefore remains a documented continuation action.

7.2 Continuation responsibilities

The common Governance Manual identifies four practical dimensions of HUB continuity:



- staffing;
- access model;
- assets and equipment;
- partner and stakeholder network.

The following elements form the common framework for monitoring continuation of the Educational HUBs:

CONTINUATION ELEMENT	CONTINUATION ARRANGEMENT / EVIDENCE
Responsible organisation	Institution maintaining the HUB after the initial implementation period
Responsible person / function	HUB Manager, Coordinator or equivalent institutional responsibility
Facility access	Basis for continued access to the relevant rooms, laboratories or training venues
Equipment	Organisation responsible for equipment availability and maintenance
Trainers / facilitators	Staff or institutional pool capable of continuing learning activities
Stakeholder network	Organisations expected to remain involved in training, consultation or enterprise interaction
Planned continued use	Training, workshops, stakeholder activities or other documented follow-up

Table 19. HUB Continuation Responsibilities and Required Evidence

This framework defines the continuation information to be maintained by the national HUB teams during ongoing operation. It covers organisational responsibility, facility access, equipment, trainer capacity, stakeholder networks and planned continued use, allowing sustainability arrangements to be updated as HUB activities develop.

7.3 Adoption and local adjustment by the established Educational HUBs

The AGRITECH Application Form refers to the Educational HUB concept as the establishment of “incubators within educational institutions”, describing the Educational HUBs as collaborative structures connecting education, research and industry. Accordingly, within D2.4 the established national Educational HUBs constitute the incubator structures through which the AGRITECH Educational Ecosystem and its supporting materials are adopted and locally adjusted. The implementation evidence demonstrates that the common AGRITECH HUB model was not reproduced identically in every country, but was integrated into existing institutional structures and adapted to local facilities, organisational responsibilities, stakeholder networks and delivery formats.

COUNTRY / HUB	AGRITECH ELEMENTS ADOPTED	DOCUMENTED LOCAL ADJUSTMENT
---------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

Greece	Educational HUB operating model, governance and stakeholder-collaboration approach	Distributed HUB structure using several existing research, university and training facilities; launch and stakeholder mobilisation integrated into AGROTICA 2026
Hungary	Educational HUB model, governance, stakeholder engagement and monitoring approach	Combination of university, enterprise and partner facilities; hybrid launch; external stakeholder participation formalised through declarations of intent
Czech Republic	Educational HUB model, curriculum-linked learning, digital learning environment and governance arrangements	Two-location structure; complementary responsibilities between WRLS and ZSČR; learning delivery supported through the Czech AgriTech HUB and AGRITECH Moodle platform
Italy	Educational HUB model and stakeholder/training approach	Existing community and social-enterprise facilities used for HUB activities; launch integrated into a wider territorial Infoday
Romania	Educational HUB model, university-based learning environment and stakeholder-collaboration approach	University-anchored physical HUB at USAMV Bucharest combined with a broad external stakeholder network and online launch format

Table 20. Adoption and Local Adjustment of the AGRITECH Educational HUB Model

These examples demonstrate that the common AGRITECH HUB concept was adapted to different existing institutional settings rather than implemented through one identical organisational model.

The Hungarian use of declarations of intent is a particularly clear governance adaptation. It allowed external organisations to formally express willingness to participate and provide professional input without creating compulsory financial or service obligations.

The Czech model adapted responsibilities to the strengths of the participating organisations, with technical coordination, digital tools and training functions separated from stakeholder and SME outreach functions.

The Greek model used a distributed set of institutional spaces instead of one single facility, while the Romanian model relied on one principal university location connected to a wider stakeholder network.

7.4 Transfer lessons from implementation

The documented national implementations provide several evidence-based lessons relevant to continued use and transfer of the HUB model.



- **Existing infrastructure can support HUB establishment**

The five documented national structures were created largely through existing universities, enterprises, research organisations and training or community facilities. The evidence therefore indicates that replication does not necessarily require the creation of new dedicated infrastructure.

The important condition is that the available facility is appropriate for the activities to be delivered and has the necessary access, staff and digital capacity.

- **One physical model is not required**

The implementation demonstrates several workable configurations:

- one university-based anchor location;
- several complementary locations within one national HUB;
- combined educational and enterprise facilities;
- shared or rented training spaces;
- physical locations supplemented by online participation.

This flexibility allowed partners to work within their existing organisational structures while retaining a common HUB concept.

- **Institutional embedding strengthens continuity**

Locations embedded in established universities or other permanent organisations have a clearer basis for continued access to rooms, staff, equipment and organisational systems. The MATE and USAMV examples illustrate this directly.

Where facilities are external or shared, continuity requires more explicit arrangements. The DDTG venue issue and shared-space scheduling in Greece and Italy demonstrate the importance of securing access arrangements in advance.

- **Partner roles should reflect existing capacity**

The Czech implementation shows that different organisations can assume complementary responsibilities rather than every organisation duplicating all HUB functions. Technical delivery, stakeholder engagement and coordination can be allocated according to organisational strengths.

- **Stakeholder networks are part of the operating capacity**

The launch processes in all five documented countries created or activated networks involving education, enterprises, research organisations and professional actors. These networks are relevant to future operation only if they are maintained through actual learning, mentoring, consultation or other HUB activities.

Initial interest should therefore be distinguished from continued engagement, and later interaction should remain supported by Activity Logs or equivalent evidence.

- **Transfer should remain evidence-based**

The strongest transferable feature of Task 2.4 is the combination of:



- an identifiable institutional host;
- suitable physical or digital access;
- responsible staff;
- stakeholder and enterprise participation;
- documented activities;
- common monitoring and evidence requirements.

The national implementations demonstrate that these elements can be organised differently while remaining recognisable as part of the AGRITECH HUB model.

The national implementations demonstrate that the AGRITECH Educational HUB/incubator model can be adopted through different institutional configurations while preserving its common operational principles. The documented adaptations provide evidence of transfer from the common AGRITECH model into national and institutional settings. Wider replication beyond the initial AGRITECH HUB network remains a subsequent exploitation and sustainability objective.

7.5 Sustainability and adoption status

Conclusions that can be drawn from the operational processes:

- the majority of documented HUBs are embedded in existing organisations and use existing facilities;
- several locations were specifically assessed positively for sustainability and continuity;
- the Czech sites are supported by existing organisational capacity;
- MATE and USAMV provide particularly clear examples of institutional embedding;
- shared-space and external-venue arrangements require continued coordination or formalisation;
- local organisational adaptations are clearly documented across the five national HUB structures;
- continuation responsibilities are defined through the common governance framework and the national institutional arrangements documented in this deliverable. Named post-project responsible persons and specific continuation commitments will be maintained and updated by the national HUB teams as part of ongoing sustainability monitoring;
- the national Educational HUBs provide documented examples of adoption and local adjustment of the common AGRITECH HUB/incubator model;
- the implementation model was adjusted to national institutional conditions through different combinations of facilities, governance responsibilities, stakeholder-engagement arrangements and physical/digital delivery formats;
- continued use of the common governance, monitoring, learning and stakeholder-engagement resources provides the basis for further adaptation during subsequent AGRITECH activities.



8. Conclusions and outstanding evidence

8.1 Verified main results

Task 2.4 established the practical basis of the AGRITECH Educational HUB network by translating the Learning Ecosystem and curriculum developed under earlier WP2 activities into concrete organisational and physical implementation settings. The evidence base process confirms HUB establishment activities in **Greece, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Italy and Romania**, covering **13 assessed physical locations** across educational, research, enterprise and training environments.

The documented implementation demonstrates several verified results.

First, the HUB concept was implemented through **different institutional configurations** rather than one standard physical model. The national structures include university-based HUBs, enterprise-related locations, multi-site arrangements, shared facilities and community or training-oriented environments. This confirms that the common AGRITECH HUB model can be embedded within existing institutional infrastructure.

Second, the documented locations were subject to **readiness and risk assessment** before operation. The available national reports generally concluded that the selected facilities were suitable for the intended activities. Identified issues were primarily operational, including shared-space scheduling, continuity of access to external venues, equipment availability and evidence completeness. These issues were considered manageable through local coordination, booking arrangements or other corrective measures.

Third, **formal national HUB launches** are documented in all five countries currently included in the verified evidence package:

- Greece on 14 March 2026;
- Italy on 25 March 2026;
- Hungary on 27 March 2026;
- Romania on 1 April 2026;
- Czech Republic on 15 May 2026.

These events established initial stakeholder communities and created links between educational organisations, agricultural enterprises, technology providers, research actors, professional organisations and other relevant stakeholders.

Fourth, stakeholder engagement was substantive during the establishment phase. The Hungarian launch documented 23 participants from 11 organisations and formalised continued stakeholder involvement through declarations of intent. Italy documented 16 participants from 10 organisations and an average launch-event usefulness rating of 4.2 out of 5. Romania documented more than 20 participants from a broad group of agricultural, research and professional actors. Greece and the Czech Republic also provide clear qualitative evidence of multi-stakeholder participation.

Fifth, the HUB model was linked to actual educational use. The Czech implementation provides the strongest verified operational evidence in the current package: all seven modules of the AGRITECH VET curriculum, M01–M07, were completed during the testing phase. This demonstrates the transition from HUB establishment to structured curriculum delivery.



Sixth, the project established a common **governance and monitoring framework** for HUB operation. The framework defines responsible local functions, activity documentation requirements and five core indicators covering sessions delivered, unique participants, enterprise engagements, participant satisfaction and evidence completeness.

Seventh, the available implementation evidence demonstrates that the HUBs can support a combination of physical, hybrid and online interaction. The Hungarian launch used a hybrid format, the Romanian launch was conducted online, and several national structures combined multiple physical locations with stakeholder participation beyond the host institution.

Eighth, the implementation generated practical evidence of **continuous improvement and corrective action**. Examples include scheduling measures for shared facilities, continued IT and equipment checks, mitigation of venue-access risks and recommendations to formalise training-space access where external facilities are required.

The overall verified result is therefore the creation of a functioning organisational framework and initial HUB network capable of supporting AGRITECH learning, stakeholder cooperation and education-enterprise interaction.

8.2 Ongoing operational monitoring

D2.4 confirms the establishment of the AGRITECH Educational HUB network and the recorded achievement of Milestone MS3. Following completion of the partner-level establishment mapping presented in Section 3.1, the remaining follow-up concerns the continued operation and monitoring of the HUB network rather than completion of the establishment deliverable.

This includes continued documentation of HUB activities through Activity Logs, monitoring of repeated enterprise engagement and participant feedback, and updating sustainability and continuation arrangements as HUB activities develop. These monitoring activities will continue during subsequent project implementation and do not alter the establishment results documented in D2.4.

8.3 Overall conclusion

Task 2.4 has established a documented AGRITECH Educational HUB network across the countries currently represented in D2.4. The implementation confirms that the HUB concept can operate through different institutional and physical configurations while retaining common requirements for governance, readiness, stakeholder participation and evidence collection.

The strongest verified results concern the establishment of the HUB structures, readiness of the selected locations, formal launch events and creation of multi-actor stakeholder networks. The Czech evidence additionally demonstrates completed progression into curriculum-based testing-phase operation through all seven VET modules.



References

1. European Commission (2024). Erasmus+ Programme Guide. Retrieved from <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/programme-guide>
2. European Commission (2018). EU Financial Regulation (Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2018/1046). Official Journal of the European Union.
3. Council of the European Union (2022). Council Recommendation of 16 June 2022 on a European approach to micro-credentials for lifelong learning and employability (2022/C 243/02). Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/C/2022/243/02/oj>
4. Council of the European Union (2017). Council Recommendation of 22 May 2017 on the European Qualifications Framework for lifelong learning (2017/C 189/03). Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32017H0615\(01\)](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32017H0615(01))
5. European Parliament and the Council (2018). Decision (EU) 2018/646 on a common framework for the provision of better services for skills and qualifications (Europass). Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/dec/2018/646/oj>
6. European Parliament and the Council (2016). Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (General Data Protection Regulation). Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/679/oj>
7. Article 29 Working Party (2017). Guidelines on Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) and determining whether processing is likely to result in a high risk (WP248 rev.01). Retrieved from https://edpb.europa.eu/our-work-tools/our-documents/guidelines_en
8. European Parliament and the Council (2009). Recommendation on the establishment of a European Quality Assurance Reference Framework for Vocational Education and Training (EQAVET) (2009/C 155/01). Official Journal of the European Union. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/C/2009/155/01/oj>
9. ENQA, ESU, EUA, EURASHE (2015). Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG). Retrieved from <https://www.enqa.eu/publications/esg-2015/>
10. European Commission (n.d.). ESCO: European Skills, Competences, Qualifications and Occupations. Retrieved from <https://esco.ec.europa.eu/en>
11. European Commission (n.d.). European Digital Credentials for Learning. Retrieved from <https://europa.eu/europass/en/european-digital-credentials>
12. European Commission (n.d.). European Learning Model (ELM). Retrieved from <https://europa.eu/europass/en/european-learning-model>
13. 1EdTech Consortium (n.d.). Open Badges Specification. Retrieved from <https://www.1edtech.org/standards/open-badges>
14. Creative Commons (n.d.). Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0). Retrieved from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>
15. Creative Commons (n.d.). Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-SA 4.0). Retrieved from <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>
16. ISO (2018). ISO 31000:2018 Risk Management – Guidelines. International Organization for Standardization.
17. Project Management Institute (2021). PMBOK Guide – Seventh Edition. Project Management Institute.
18. COSO (2017). Enterprise Risk Management: Integrating with Strategy and Performance. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission.
19. OECD (2014). Risk Management and Corporate Governance. OECD Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/corporate/risk-management-corporate-governance.htm>
20. Grant Agreement – GAP-101187399 (2024). AGRITECH Project. Consortium documentation.
21. PROPOSAL_101187399-AGRITECH-ERASMUS-EDU-2024-PI-ALL-INNO (2024). Erasmus+ Application Submission. Consortium documentation.
22. EACEA (2023). Guidelines for Beneficiaries: Implementing Erasmus+ Projects Effectively. European Education and Culture Executive Agency. Retrieved from <https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/resources-and-tools>
23. European Commission (2023). Risk Management Plan Template. European Commission (template/internal guidance).
24. AGRITECH Internal Risk Register (2024). Consortium documentation.



25. AGRITECH Results of online survey regarding AGRITECH MANAGER profile (2025). Consortium documentation
26. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Greece (2025). Consortium documentation.
27. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Italy (2025). Consortium documentation.
28. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Czech Republic (2025). Consortium documentation.
29. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Cyprus (2025). Consortium documentation.
30. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Hungary (2025). Consortium documentation.
31. AGRITECH National Report (VET/HEI) – Romania (2025). Consortium documentation.



Annexes

Annex 1. AGRITECH Educational HUB Creation and Monitoring Template

The following template consolidates the core fields used across national HUB establishment, readiness, launch, operational monitoring and evidence collection.

A1. HUB establishment and readiness record

HUB location ID	
Country / national HUB	
Host organisation	
Physical address / digital platform URL	
HUB Manager / Coordinator	
Implementation setting	Educational / enterprise / mixed / digital
Operational roles and responsibilities	
Overall readiness assessment	Appropriate / action required / not appropriate
Action plan / corrective measures	

A2. Readiness and risk checklist

Readiness / risk element	Status	Action / evidence
Site readiness	Appropriate / action required	
Health, safety, safeguarding and physical security	Appropriate / action required	
Digital infrastructure and cybersecurity	Appropriate / action required	
Staffing and continuity	Appropriate / action required	
Equipment availability and suitability	Appropriate / action required	
Sustainability and post-project continuity	Appropriate / action required	

A3. HUB launch and establishment record

Launch date	
Location / format	
Establishing organisations	
Participants (persons)	
Organisations represented	
Operational agreement / institutional confirmation	
Agenda and attendance evidence	
Photo / screenshot / video evidence	
Feedback / evaluation evidence	

A4. Educational HUB Activity Log

Date	HUB	Session / activity	Module / topic	Facilitator(s)	Participants	Participant profiles	Enterprise involvement	Learning / digital format	Feedback / follow-up	Evidence link



A5. Continuous-improvement record

HUB	Issue / feedback	Action / adaptation	Responsible organisation	Result / status	Evidence