ERASMUS+ VET

ACTION SELECTION CHECKLIST 2027

A practical checklist for choosing between KA220-VET, CB-VET, CoVE - or reconsidering your project.

PRACTICAL CHECKLIST



Erasmus+

VET • Mobility • Cooperation • Skills

Serhii Kosov • Dmytro Yurkovskyi

B2C Digital Edition - EN

START HERE

Before choosing an action

Do not start with the application form. Start with the architecture of your project.

Finding a call first and then forcing your project to fit it is the logic in reverse.

YOUR PROJECT	ACTION FIT	OFFICIAL CHECK	APPLICATION

THE MAIN QUESTION

Not “Which application should we write?” but “What project are we actually trying to build?”

ACTION FIT
Does the action fit the logic of our project?

ELIGIBILITY
Do we meet the formal rules of the call?

APPLICATION
How do we submit an already coherent project within the selected action?

CONTROL RULE
Do not choose an action because of the budget, familiarity or perceived simplicity. Project first - Action Fit second.

STEP 1

A short profile of your project

First understand what kind of project you actually have.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

At this stage, you are not choosing between KA220-VET, CB-VET or CoVE. First describe your idea honestly: what is wrong now, who the project is for, what must change, where the change should happen, who is genuinely needed in the partnership, and why transnational cooperation is necessary at all. If you cannot answer these questions, it is too early to choose an action.

Step 1 in this checklist is the “Short project profile”.

In very simple terms, its purpose is this: do not choose an Erasmus+ action yet. First understand what kind of project you actually have.

At this stage you are not yet thinking: **KA220? CB-VET? CoVE?**

You answer six simple questions about your idea.

SIX QUESTIONS THAT FORM YOUR PROJECT PROFILE

1. What is wrong now?

For example: students are not sufficiently confident in carrying out practical diagnostics of modern agricultural machinery.

2. Who is this project for?

For example: students in agricultural programmes, teachers, and several VET providers.

3. What must change?

Not “buy equipment”, but the actual change. For example: students should perform diagnostic operations more effectively.

4. Where should the main change happen?

In one institution only? Across several institutions? In a VET system in another country? Or in a wider sectoral ecosystem?

5. Who is genuinely needed in the project?

Not “who can we invite”, but which organisations are essential for the project to work. For example: VET providers, employers, sector associations, a university.

6. Why is transnational cooperation necessary?

This is a critical question. You need to explain what cooperation with partners from other countries makes possible that cannot be achieved adequately within one country alone.

Example:

Three VET providers have a problem with practical training in digital machinery diagnostics. We need partners from other countries because they already have more developed approaches, equipment, assessment methods and employer-cooperation practices that can be adapted and tested in our context.

After this, Step 1 should give you not the name of a programme, but a clear understanding of your project.

You should now understand: **the problem → for whom → the required change → where it must happen → who is needed → why transnational cooperation is necessary.**

If you still cannot answer at least three of these questions, especially:

- what must change,
- where the change should happen,
- why transnational cooperation is necessary,

then the correct result for now is: NOT READY TO DECIDE - it is still too early to choose an action.

The simplest formula for Step 1:

Describe the project in your own words first. Do not force it to fit Erasmus+.

COMPLETE A SHORT PROFILE OF YOUR PROJECT

1. What is wrong now - or what genuinely needs to change?

2. Who is this project for?

3. What exactly should become different if the project succeeds?

4. Where should the main change happen?

☐ Within the participating organisations

☐ In VET institutions or systems in another eligible context

☐ In a wider regional or sectoral ecosystem

☐ It is not clear yet

5. Which organisations are genuinely needed - and why?

6. Why is transnational cooperation necessary?

STEP 1 RESULT
You should now understand: problem → for whom → what change → where → who is needed → why transnational cooperation. If you do not, the correct status for now is NOT READY TO DECIDE.

STEP 2

What type of project are you building?

Define the project logic before the programme name.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Here we do not ask “Which action do we like?”. We identify the logic of the project: Cooperation - develop or improve something together; Capacity Building - strengthen an organisation or system’s ability to perform better; CoVE - build a wider vocational excellence ecosystem. If the type is unclear, do not guess.

The purpose of Step 2 is to understand the logic of your project before selecting a specific Erasmus+ action.

There are three basic options.

Option A - Cooperation

Several organisations want to develop, test, improve, adapt or exchange practices together.

Simple example: three VET providers and two employers want to jointly develop a new practical training model and test it in several countries.

Key question: Do we need cooperation between organisations in order to create or improve a practice together?

If yes, this is a signal towards KA220-VET.

Option B - Capacity Building

The main issue is not simply a lack of cooperation, but the fact that a VET institution or system does not yet have sufficient capacity to perform its function well.

Examples: a weak practical training system; weak labour-market links; underdeveloped management processes; a weak quality system; insufficient capacity to implement modern programmes.

Key question: Do we need not just activities, but a genuine strengthening of the organisation or system’s ability to perform better?

If yes, this is a signal towards CB-VET.

Option C - Vocational Excellence Ecosystem

This is a broader logic.

One VET institution, or even several VET institutions, are not enough. The project requires an ecosystem: VET providers; employers; local or regional authorities; universities; research organisations; sector bodies; and other partners.

The project should relate not only to training, but also to sectoral or regional development, innovation and a long-term vocational ecosystem.

Key question: Does the challenge require a broad network of different actors rather than a standard project partnership?

If yes, this is a signal towards CoVE.

The simplest Step 2 logic:

- Cooperation = develop and improve together.
- Capacity Building = strengthen the capacity of an organisation or system.
- CoVE = build a broad vocational excellence ecosystem.

If you cannot yet say confidently which type your project belongs to, that is not a mistake. The result is: **UNCLEAR / NOT READY TO DECIDE.**

First understand the project better rather than choosing an action at random.

A - COOPERATION ARCHITECTURE

☐ Several organisations have a shared or complementary need.

☐ Practices must be jointly developed, adapted, tested or transferred.

☐ The intended change can realistically be achieved through a focused partnership.

☐ YOUR SIGNAL: ☐ Strong ☐ Possible ☐ Weak ☐ Insufficient information

B - CAPACITY-BUILDING ARCHITECTURE

☐ There is a clear institutional or system-capacity gap.

☐ More than training is needed: the capacity of a VET organisation or system must be strengthened.

☐ The strengthened capacity should remain after the project ends.

☐ YOUR SIGNAL: ☐ Strong ☐ Possible ☐ Weak ☐ Insufficient information

C - VOCATIONAL EXCELLENCE ECOSYSTEM

☐ VET providers alone are not sufficient.

☐ Employers and other stakeholders have structural roles.

☐ A long-term sectoral or regional ecosystem is required.

☐ YOUR SIGNAL: ☐ Strong ☐ Possible ☐ Weak ☐ Insufficient information

STEP 2 RESULT
You have not selected a programme. You have only understood which type of project architecture your idea most closely resembles. This prepares you for Step 3.

STEP 3

Should you investigate KA220-VET further?

Check whether your project resembles a Cooperation Partnership.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

Now compare your project with three actions. Do not look for a winner by counting ticks. The goal is to see which architecture best explains the whole project. A strong signal means “worth investigating further”, not “you have already chosen the right programme”.

In Step 1 you described the project, in Step 2 you understood its type, and now in Step 3 you ask: which of the three options does my project genuinely resemble most?

Do not choose on the basis of “where I have the most ticks”. Look at the overall picture.

The checklist gives you three separate screens: KA220-VET, CB-VET and CoVE. For each one, mark: strong signal / possible / weak / insufficient information.

- If your project is mainly about joint development, adaptation, testing, exchange of practices and cooperation between several organisations, that creates signals towards KA220-VET.
- If the project is about genuine institutional or system capacity strengthening in a relevant context, that creates signals towards CB-VET.
- If the project requires a broad ecosystem, employers, public authorities, universities, sector structures, long-term architecture and regional/sectoral development, those are signals towards CoVE.

The most important point in Step 3: you cannot draw a conclusion from one feature.

For example: “We have international partners” is not enough for KA220. “We will train teachers” is not enough for CB-VET. “The project is large” is not enough for CoVE.

Several features must align.

The real question is: which action architecture best explains the whole project, not just one detail?

The outcome does not have to be one of only three actions.

- Potential KA220-VET fit
- Potential CB-VET fit
- Potential CoVE fit
- Multiple possible fits
- None of these
- Not ready to decide

Step 3 does not force you to choose one option.

The simplest formula:

- Step 1 - what kind of project do we have?
- Step 2 - what type is it?
- Step 3 - which Erasmus+ action does it most closely resemble?

STEP 3A - ACTION FIT SIGNAL MAP

Step 3a is where you bring all previous signals together.

Until now you have looked separately at what kind of project you have, what type it is, and how closely it resembles KA220-VET, CB-VET or CoVE.

Now the task is not to look at individual ticks but to test whether they form a coherent system.

The checklist does this through an Action Fit Signal Map.

It uses six parameters:

- Core project logic - what the project is fundamentally trying to do;
- Level of intended change - at what level the change should happen;
- Geographic logic - where the main change is expected to happen;
- Partnership architecture - what partnership is genuinely required;
- Transnational necessity - why international cooperation is needed at all;
- Institutional depth - how deep and durable the intended change needs to be.

For each of the three actions, mark:

- S - Strong
- P - Possible
- W - Weak / contradictory
- ? - Insufficient information

The key rule is simple: do not count points.

For example, five strong signals for KA220 do not automatically mean KA220 is suitable if there is one serious architectural contradiction.

Suppose cooperation logic is strong, partnership is strong and transnational necessity is strong, but the project actually requires systemic capacity-building architecture in a third-country context.

That one serious contradiction may matter more than several ticks.

After the table, use three control questions.

- Coherence - do several parameters point towards the same action?
- Contradiction - is there anything in the project that directly contradicts the action’s core logic?
- Information - do we know enough about our own project to draw a preliminary conclusion?

If not, the correct answer is not “choose at random” but **NOT READY TO DECIDE.**

STEP 3 - KA220-VET

Should you investigate KA220-VET further?

Check whether your project resembles a cooperation partnership.

POSITIVE SIGNALS

☐ The project is fundamentally built around cooperation between organisations.

☐ The organisations have shared or complementary needs.

☐ Joint development, adaptation, testing or transfer of practices is an important part of the project.

☐ Transnational cooperation creates clear added value.

☐ The intended change can realistically be achieved through a focused partnership.

STOP AND CHECK IF...

☐ The main purpose is actually capacity building in an eligible third-country context.

☐ The project requires a broad vocational excellence ecosystem.

☐ KA220-VET was chosen mainly because it feels familiar or easier.

YOUR CURRENT SIGNAL
☐ STRONG ☐ POSSIBLE ☐ WEAK / CONTRADICTORY ☐ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Remember: an international partnership alone does not prove fit with KA220-VET.

STEP 3 - CB-VET

Should you investigate Capacity Building in VET further?

Check whether genuine strengthening of VET capacity is at the centre of the project.

POSITIVE SIGNALS

☐ The main capacity-building need is located in an appropriate third-country context.

☐ VET organisations or systems there are the main beneficiaries of the capacity strengthening.

☐ There is a clearly identified institutional or system capacity gap.

☐ It is important to strengthen quality, governance, inclusion, innovation or labour-market links.

☐ The strengthened capacity should remain after the project ends.

STOP AND CHECK IF...

☐ “Capacity building” in practice means only a few training sessions.

☐ The main problem and beneficiaries are actually located within the European partners.

☐ A third-country partner has been added only for superficial action fit.

YOUR CURRENT SIGNAL
☐ STRONG ☐ POSSIBLE ☐ WEAK / CONTRADICTORY ☐ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Remember: training can be an activity. Capacity building is a deeper change in capacity.

STEP 3 - CoVE

Should you investigate Centres of Vocational Excellence further?

Check whether the project genuinely requires a vocational excellence ecosystem.

POSITIVE SIGNALS

☐ The project requires more than a standard partnership of several VET organisations.

☐ Employers and other non-VET actors have meaningful structural roles.

☐ Skills development is linked to sectoral, regional or innovation development.

☐ Long-term cooperation between institutions is necessary.

☐ A smaller standard partnership would be structurally insufficient.

STOP AND CHECK IF...

☐ The project is essentially a course, training activity or learning resource.

☐ Other actors are present only symbolically.

☐ CoVE is being considered mainly because the project is large or ambitious.

YOUR CURRENT SIGNAL
☐ STRONG ☐ POSSIBLE ☐ WEAK / CONTRADICTORY ☐ INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION

Remember: scale alone does not create a vocational excellence ecosystem.

STEP 3 - SUMMARY

Action Fit Signal Map

Bring all the signals together.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

This is the final part of Step 3. Do not count ticks. Check whether several different parameters consistently point towards one action and whether there is any serious contradiction. If the information is insufficient, the correct result may be NOT READY TO DECIDE.

Diagnostic dimension	KA220	CB-VET	CoVE
Core logic			
Level of change			
Geographic logic			
Partnership			
Transnational necessity			
Institutional depth			

S = strong • P = possible • W = weak / contradictory • ? = insufficient information

☐ Do several dimensions point towards the same action?

☐ Is there a significant project characteristic that contradicts the core logic of that action?

☐ Do you know enough about your project to draw a preliminary conclusion?

YOUR CURRENT RESULT
☐ **POTENTIAL KA220-VET FIT**
☐ **POTENTIAL CB-VET FIT**
☐ **POTENTIAL CoVE FIT**
☐ **MULTIPLE POSSIBLE FITS**
☐ **NONE OF THESE**
☐ **NOT READY TO DECIDE**

STEP 3 RESULT

You have not made a final programme choice. You have produced a preliminary answer to the question of which action is worth investigating further - or why it is still too early to choose.

STEP 4

Seven Action Fit red flags

The final check before moving towards the application.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE EXPLANATION

This is the emergency brake. You are not looking for another action here; you are checking whether you are making a typical mistake. If even one of the seven statements accurately describes your situation, stop and return to the project logic instead of trying to fix the problem with better application wording.

The purpose of Step 4 is simple: identify common mistakes before you start writing the application.

The question is no longer “Which action fits?” but “Are we making one of seven dangerous mistakes?”

1. “The budget is attractive, so we chose this action.”

A convenient or large budget does not prove that an action fits your project. Project logic first, funding second.

2. “We have international partners, so this must be KA220-VET.”

Having foreign partners proves nothing by itself. You need to know why they are needed and what function they perform.

3. “We will train teachers, so this is Capacity Building.”

Training is an activity. Capacity Building means the organisation or system is genuinely more capable after the project.

4. “Our project is large and ambitious, so it must be CoVE.”

CoVE is not defined by size. It requires a genuine ecosystem involving VET, employers, public authorities, universities, sector structures and long-term vocational excellence logic.

5. “We found the call first and are now rewriting the problem to fit it.”

This reverses project-design logic. Start with the real problem and project, then identify the appropriate action.

6. “We cannot really explain why we need foreign partners.”

That is a serious signal. Transnational cooperation should not exist “for Erasmus+”; it should perform a function the project genuinely needs.

7. “We are already writing the application but still do not understand why this action fits us.”

The team started too early. Understand Action Fit first, then write the application.

The simplest Step 4 formula:

If even one of these seven statements sounds like your situation, stop and return to the project logic.

A particularly strong final control question is:

If the Erasmus+ action name were removed from your project, would a clear problem, objective, change logic and partner role still remain?

If yes, the project exists as a coherent construction in its own right. If not, the project is still built too heavily around the programme rather than around a real problem.

SEVEN RED FLAGS - SHORT CHECKLIST

1. “The budget is attractive, so we chose this action.”

A convenient or large budget does not prove that an action fits your project. Project logic first, funding second.

2. “We have international partners, so this must be KA220-VET.”

Having foreign partners proves nothing by itself. You need to know why they are needed and what function they perform.

3. “We will train teachers, so this is Capacity Building.”

Training is an activity. Capacity Building means the organisation or system is genuinely more capable after the project.

4. “Our project is large and ambitious, so it must be CoVE.”

CoVE is not defined by size. It requires a genuine ecosystem involving VET, employers, public authorities, universities, sector structures and long-term vocational excellence logic.

5. “We found the call first and are now rewriting the problem to fit it.”

This reverses project-design logic. Start with the real problem and project, then identify the appropriate action.

6. “We cannot really explain why we need foreign partners.”

That is a serious signal. Transnational cooperation should not exist “for Erasmus+”; it should perform a function the project genuinely needs.

7. “We are already writing the application but still do not understand why this action fits us.”

The team started too early. Understand Action Fit first, then write the application.

FINAL CONTROL QUESTION
If the Erasmus+ action name were removed from your project, would the problem, objective, change logic and partner roles still be clear? ☐ Yes ☐ Partly ☐ No. If “No”, return to project design.

AFTER THE FOUR STEPS

What should you do next?

The checklist shows what you should investigate next.

IF THERE IS A POTENTIAL FIT

Check the current official requirements: eligibility, countries, consortium, priorities, eligible activities, funding, deadlines and submission rules.

IF THERE ARE MULTIPLE POSSIBLE FITS

Do not choose by budget or simplicity. Compare the actions more deeply against the real architecture of your project.

IF THE RESULT IS NONE OF THESE

Do not force your project to fit KA220-VET, CB-VET or CoVE. Explore other routes.

IF THE RESULT IS NOT READY TO DECIDE

Return to the project: PROBLEM → NEED → REQUIRED CHANGE → INTENDED SCALE → PARTNERSHIP NEED.

DEEPEN THE ANALYSIS WHEN NEEDED

Deeper Action Fit analysis

The Erasmus+ VET Action Fit Manual

Need to design the project

Choosing, Designing and Engineering Evidence-Based VET Projects

Project ready, action selected

Application Manual

CHECK → CHOOSE → DESIGN → APPLY

THIS IS ONLY THE BEGINNING

You have just completed a short introductory route designed to help you see the essential question: does the logic of your project fit the Erasmus+ action you are considering, and what should you verify next? This checklist intentionally avoids overloading you with detail. Its purpose is to provide quick orientation and help you avoid a false start.

In the full book, this analysis goes much deeper. Instead of merely comparing KA220-VET, CB-VET and CoVE, the book shows how to build a coherent project architecture from a real problem - from evidence and needs through required change, objectives, activities, results, indicators, outcomes and impact.

It also shows how to test the internal logic of a project, identify contradictions, build a partnership for the real task rather than “for the application”, and distinguish a strong project construction from text that merely sounds convincing.

The book includes practical tools, control questions, diagnostic matrices, examples and Red Team checks that help you move systematically from an idea to a project architecture, and only then to the choice of an appropriate programme and the preparation of an application.

If this checklist has left you not only with more answers but also with better questions, that is the right outcome. Strong project design begins there. The full book continues this route in much greater depth and with a stronger practical focus.