European Council of Leading Business Schools

ECLBS

ECLBS Self-Assessment Report (SAR) Guidelines

How to prepare, evidence and submit the self-assessment report

All cycles

To be read together with the ECLBS Accreditation Handbook (General) and the applicable cycle handbook

1. Purpose of these Guidelines

The self-assessment report (SAR) is the foundation of the accreditation procedure. It is the document from which the review panel forms its first and most durable impression of the programme, the document against which the visit is planned, and the document the assessment report answers point by point.

These Guidelines explain how to plan, write, evidence and submit the SAR. They apply to Bachelor, Master and doctoral procedures. The **content** required is set by the applicable cycle handbook; these Guidelines govern **form, method, evidence and process**.

2. Six drafting principles

2.1 Commence early. Experience consistently shows that reports assembled at the last minute contain internal inconsistencies, are unknown to the people who must speak to them at the visit, and are poorly coordinated with other parts of the institution. Allow **four to six months** for a first-time SAR. A report that surprises your own staff at the visit will damage the outcome more than any single weakness it might have concealed.

2.2 Stay informed about the current regulations. The accreditation framework evolves with national and international developments. Standards that were adequate a decade ago are now threshold requirements. Confirm that you are working from the **current edition** of the cycle handbook and that every regulation you cite is the version currently in force. Where a regulation is under revision, say so and give the expected approval date.

2.3 Do not assume institution-specific knowledge. The panel is external by design. Its members do not know your committee names, your internal abbreviations, your historic reorganisations or your local legal terminology. Explain them once, clearly, at first use. Provide a list of abbreviations.

2.4 Ensure consistency of information. Every figure that appears more than once — credits, contact hours, staff numbers, intake, duration — must be identical everywhere it appears, including in the appendices. Conclusions must follow from information already presented. Inconsistency is the single most common cause of avoidable conditions, because the panel cannot tell which version is true and must assume the less favourable one.

2.5 Substantiate essential information. Assertions require evidence. Where you state that something happens regularly, supply the schedule, the minutes or the records. Where you state that a rule applies, supply the rule. Missing attachments will be requested, which delays the procedure.

2.6 Focus on essential facts. The SAR is not a marketing document, a strategic plan or an anthology of everything the institution does. Give precise information on the facts that bear on the criteria and reference the appendices for detail. Length is not evidence of quality; the panel reads for substance.

3. Form, length and language

Requirement	Specification
Length	**Maximum 80 pages excluding appendices.** In a cluster procedure, **20 additional pages per further programme**
Language	English, unless another language has been agreed in the contract; regulations in the original language must be accompanied by a translation of the parts relied on
Format	Searchable PDF for the main report; appendices as separate, individually named files
Structure	Follows the chapter and criterion numbering of the applicable cycle handbook, without omission or renumbering

Requirement	Specification
Pagination and headers	Continuous page numbering; programme name and date in the header
Version	A single, final, version-controlled document; drafts are not submitted
Signature	Signed by the legal representative of the institution and by the programme director
Data currency	Data current as at a stated reference date, no more than three months before submission

Do not submit the SAR as a set of loose slides, a website link in place of text, or a document that answers only some criteria. **Do** answer every criterion in the applicable handbook, in order, including those you consider not relevant — stating, in that case, why.

4. Structure of the report

Section	Content
Cover page	Institution, programme, degree, cycle, type of accreditation sought, reference date, version
Table of contents	With page numbers
List of abbreviations	Every internal term, committee and acronym used
Executive summary (2–3 pages)	The programme in brief: objectives, target group, structure, staffing, distinctive features, main developments since the last procedure
Chapter 0	General information, institutional context, statistical data, development and implementation of previous recommendations
Chapters 1–5 (Bachelor, Master) or D1–D6 (doctoral)	One section per criterion, in the handbook's numbering
Self-affirmation	The declarations in §8 below
List of appendices	Numbered, cross-referenced to the criteria they evidence

5. How to write a criterion section

Each criterion section should be short, factual and structured. A workable pattern:

- **What we do.** The factual description, in the present tense, of the arrangement as it currently operates.
- **Where it is regulated.** The precise document, article or section — with the appendix number.
- **How we know it works.** The evidence: data, evaluation results, minutes, examples.
- **What we are developing.** Any known weakness and the concrete measure, owner and deadline addressing it.

A section written this way is normally between a third of a page and one and a half pages. Sections that run longer are usually describing intentions rather than arrangements.

On acknowledging weaknesses. Institutions sometimes fear that naming a weakness invites a condition. The opposite is true in practice. A panel that discovers an unacknowledged weakness at the visit questions the reliability of the whole report. A weakness that is named, analysed and already being addressed — with an owner and a date — demonstrates a functioning internal quality system, which is itself an assessed criterion. Self-critical honesty is the strongest evidence you can offer under Chapter 5 (or D6).

6. Evidence: what counts

Weak evidence	Strong evidence
“Staff meet regularly to coordinate the curriculum”	Meeting schedule for the last two years, with minutes as an appendix and an example of a curriculum change resulting from a meeting
“Workload is appropriate”	The workload calculation per module, the student survey item on workload with results, and the action taken where results were poor
“Graduates find good employment”	Tracking survey with response rate, destinations, salary or role level where available, and the year of the cohort
“The library is well equipped”	Subscription list, opening hours, remote-access arrangements, and the acquisition budget for the programme’s field
“We take student feedback seriously”	The survey instrument, the results, the published action list and evidence of closure of at least two actions
“Quality is assured by our QA system”	The QA regulation, the committee’s terms of reference, its membership including students, its meeting record and two documented decisions affecting this programme

Rule of thumb. For every statement in the SAR, a panel member should be able to ask “how do you know?” and find the answer either in the sentence or in a named appendix.

7. Statistical data

Data are presented for the last three years (five for doctoral provision), or since inception where shorter, using the tables in the cycle handbook. Additionally:

- state the **definition** used for each indicator — a success rate can be calculated several ways, and the panel must know which you used;
- state the **reference date** and the source system;
- where the programme has no graduates, say so explicitly rather than leaving cells empty;
- **interpret** the data. A table without commentary is not an analysis. Where a figure moves adversely, explain the cause and the response;
- do not suppress unfavourable years. Panels reconstruct trends from other sources, and a gap is more damaging than a poor figure.

8. Self-affirmation

The SAR concludes with signed declarations that:

- the **formal configuration** of the programme conforms to the relevant regulations in their **current** version;
- the **configuration of the content** of the programme conforms to the relevant regulations in their **current** version;

- the institution holds current **ECLBS membership** in good standing and will maintain it throughout the procedure and any accreditation period;
- the institution holds the necessary **state approval or authorisation**, or is in a documented process of obtaining it, and is legally entitled to deliver the programme and award the qualification;
- all information given in the report and appendices is **accurate and complete** as at the reference date;
- the institution undertakes to bear the **costs of the procedure**, comprising the submission fee, the process fee, the visit costs, the expert fees and, upon a positive decision, the accreditation fee, as set out in the accreditation contract, the amounts being those published on the ECLBS website, www.eclbs.eu, at the date the contract is concluded;
- the institution acknowledges that charges are **not contingent on outcome**, that on a refusal no charge is refunded, and that on withdrawal of the application no sum paid is refunded;
- the institution consents to **publication of the complete assessment report** and of the register entry on the ECLBS website;
- the institution acknowledges that ECLBS offers **programmatic accreditation only**, and that no decision, seal or certificate constitutes accreditation of the institution as a whole;
- the institution will notify ECLBS without undue delay of any **substantial change** as defined in the General Handbook.

9. Checklist — Bachelor and Master procedures

9.1 Self-affirmation

Item	Done
Formal configuration conforms to current regulations	☐
Content configuration conforms to current regulations	☐
Membership, state approval and cost declarations signed	☐

9.2 Self-assessment report — chapters elaborated

Chapter	Done
0 General information, institutional context, statistical data	☐
1 Objectives	☐
2 Admission	☐
3 Contents, structure and didactical concept	☐
4 Academic environment and framework conditions	☐
5 Quality assurance and documentation	☐

9.3 Appendices

Appendix	Chapter	Done
Organigram	0.2	☐
Statistical data	0.3	☐
Evidence of ECLBS membership and of state approval/authorisation	Eligibility	☐

Appendix	Chapter	Done
Regulations for admission, if not integrated in the study and examination regulations	2	☐
Curriculum overview / course timetable	3.1 / 3.2	☐
Module descriptions / syllabi	3.1 / 3.2	☐
Study and examination regulations, including credit transfer and recognition	3.2.2	☐
Diploma Supplement, where applicable (specimen)	3.2.2	☐
Learning Agreement, where applicable (specimen)	3.2.2	☐
Regulations for practical training / internship, where applicable	3.1.3	☐
Thesis regulations and assessment criteria	3.1.7	☐
Curricula vitae of lecturers (full-time and part-time), with module assignment	4.1.1	☐
Cooperation, partnership, franchise or validation agreements	4.3	☐
Multi-year programme budget	4.6	☐
Regulations of quality management	5	☐
Evaluation sheets / survey examples and recent results	5.2	☐
Results of accreditation or evaluation procedures in the last three years	0.3	☐
Public information on the programme, including agent and partner material	5.3	☐
For MBA/EMBA: mapping against the EQUAL MBA Guidelines	3.1.1	☐

9.4 Doctoral and non-degree procedures

For **non-degree procedures** — short courses, micro-credentials, certificates, awards, diplomas and vocational or advanced diplomas — use the chapter list N0–N6 and the appendix list in Annex B of the *ECLBS Accreditation Handbook — Non-Degree Programmes*. Note that the page limit for Categories A and B is **40 pages** excluding appendices, not 80, and that the appendices required depend on the category. All public information, including material published by agents, franchisees and licensed centres, must be attached.

For **doctoral procedures**, use the chapter list D0–D6 and the appendix list in Annex B of the *ECLBS Accreditation Handbook — Doctoral Programmes*, which additionally requires the supervisor register with current loads, the five-year research output of the hosting unit, the supervisory agreement specimen, the progress review instrument, the research integrity and ethics documentation, the examination and examiner appointment rules, the repository and embargo policy, and a sample of three recently examined theses with anonymised examiner reports.

10. Preparation for the visit

10.1 Dates and organisation

Item	Done
Internal agreement on visit dates	☐
Agreement of dates with ECLBS	☐
Members of the institution advised of the procedure in good time	☐
Hotel rooms booked near the institution (on-site visit)	☐

Item	Done
Restaurant booked for the experts’ working dinner (on-site visit)	☐
Refreshments organised for experts and for the interviews (on-site visit)	☐
Wi-Fi accounts set up for the experts (on-site visit)	☐
Schedule agreed with ECLBS: start and duration of each meeting	☐

10.2 Rooms and access

Item	Done
Adequate conference room booked within the institution, seating at least 15	☐
Separate room available for the panel’s closed sessions	☐
Building and rooms signposted	☐
Tour of teaching rooms, laboratories and library arranged	☐

10.3 Interlocutors

Item	Done
Composition of the interview groups agreed with ECLBS	☐
Participants informed of time, place and purpose	☐
Different interlocutors chosen for each interview; duplication avoided	☐
Students selected who are **not employed by the institution** in any capacity, and selected without involvement of the staff who assess them	☐
Graduates and employer/partner representatives invited, where applicable	☐
Name tags or plates prepared, if needed	☐

10.4 Documents to be available at the visit

Item	Done
Study and teaching materials (selection)	☐
Examinations and final examinations, including marking, with good, mediocre and weak scripts for each	☐
Final theses/projects with assessments, at three grade levels	☐
Internship reports, where applicable — 6–8 per programme, differently graded, with assessments	☐
Case studies used in the programme	☐
Information leaflets and public-facing programme information	☐
Activity or annual report	☐
Information folder for students on block-teaching programmes combined with employment, where it exists	☐
Evaluation results from the previous two to three years	☐
Minutes of the programme committee and of the QA committee	☐
For doctoral procedures: progress review files, examiner reports, supervisory agreements (anonymised)	☐

10.5 Online and hybrid visits

Item	Done
Platform tested with ECLBS in advance; contingency channel agreed	☐
Separate secure link for each interview group; no observers in student sessions	☐
Live or recorded facilities tour prepared	☐
Documents in §10.4 supplied electronically in advance or available in a secure data room	☐
Technical host identified who is not a participant in the interviews	☐

11. Submission

- Submit the SAR and appendices to the assigned ECLBS project manager by the agreed date, in the agreed electronic form.
- ECLBS checks the report for **completeness**. Missing documents or information are notified, with a deadline for supply.
- The evaluation opens once the report is complete and the charges then due have been settled.
- The panel may request **additional information** at any point up to the visit; requests are routed through the project manager and should be answered within ten working days.

12. Common causes of avoidable conditions

The following account for a large share of conditions imposed on otherwise sound programmes. Each is preventable at the drafting stage.

- **Credit and workload arithmetic that does not add up** — module credits not summing to the stated total, or a workload-per-credit ratio applied inconsistently across modules.
- **Module descriptions without intended learning outcomes**, or with outcomes that are content lists rather than statements of what the student will be able to do.
- **Assessment not aligned to outcomes** — a single examination format used throughout, or outcomes referring to skills never assessed.
- **Regulations supplied in draft**, or in a superseded version, or not supplied at all.
- **Recognition rules absent or inconsistent** with the Lisbon Recognition Convention where it has been ratified.
- **No ECTS grading table**, or a Diploma Supplement specimen that is out of date.
- **Staffing overview without module assignment**, so that the panel cannot verify that each module has a qualified teacher.
- **QA described as a system but not evidenced as an activity** — no minutes, no action lists, no closed loops.
- **Evaluation results presented without any consequence** — surveys run, results filed, nothing changed.
- **Previous recommendations not addressed** at re-accreditation, or addressed only by assertion.

- **Public information inconsistent with the SAR** — the website says something different about duration, credits, entry requirements or the awarding body.
- **The institution presented as ECLBS-accredited** — in a website footer, on letterhead, in a social media bio or in agent material — where only a programme is accredited. ECLBS offers programmatic accreditation only, and the panel reviews public information for this specifically.
- **Partner arrangements without written agreements**, or agreements that do not allocate responsibility for academic standards.
- **Financing shown for one year only**, where the cohort will take three or four years to complete.
- **For doctoral procedures:** supervisory loads exceeding the institution's own rule; no independent element in progress review; the supervisor sitting as sole assessor; no external examiner; no published thesis deposit arrangement.

13. After submission

Stage	What is expected of the institution
Completeness check	Supply any missing item promptly
Panel questions	Answer within ten working days, through the project manager
Visit	Provide the interlocutors and documents agreed; ensure availability of senior management
Draft report	Submit a written statement within the deadline set, correcting factual error and addressing assessments considered unsound, with evidence
Decision	Receive report and, where applicable, certificate and conditions
Conditions	Supply proof of fulfilment within the deadline, normally twelve months, on Form C1
Accreditation period	Notify substantial changes on Form M1; supply the annual monitoring return on Form M2 where required

The statement on the draft report is a substantive right, not a formality. It is the last point at which a factual error can be corrected before the decision, and panels do amend reports in response to well-evidenced statements. Address each contested finding separately, identify the evidence, and distinguish clearly between factual correction and disagreement with judgement.

14. Planning and producing the report

14.1 An indicative project plan

Stage	Timing before submission	Activity
1. Mandate	6 months	Senior management appoints a named author and a working group; allocates time; confirms the budget and the target EACC meeting
2. Scoping	5½ months	Working group reads the applicable cycle handbook criterion by criterion and assigns an owner to each; identifies which appendices already exist and which must be created
3. Evidence audit	5 months	Owners locate the evidence for their criteria. **This is the stage that determines the outcome.** Every criterion with no evidence behind it is recorded on a gap list

Stage	Timing before submission	Activity
4. Gap remediation	4–2 months	The gap list is worked through: minutes written up, regulations approved, surveys run, agreements signed, budgets prepared. Gaps that cannot be closed before submission are documented for honest disclosure
5. First draft	2½ months	Sections drafted to the pattern in §5, with appendices referenced
6. Consistency check	6 weeks	One person checks every recurring figure across the whole document and its appendices. See §14.3
7. Internal review	4 weeks	Read by someone not involved in drafting — ideally someone who has sat on a panel — against the criteria, not against the prose
8. Interlocutor briefing	3 weeks	Everyone who will be interviewed reads the sections concerning them. A report nobody has read is the most common cause of a poor visit
9. Sign-off	2 weeks	Legal representative and programme director sign the self-affirmation
10. Submission	—	With the appendix set complete

Institutions that begin at stage 5 produce reports that describe intentions. The value of the exercise is in stages 3 and 4.

14.2 Who should write it

The report should have **one named author** with editorial authority, supported by owners for each chapter. Reports assembled by circulating a template to twelve people and pasting the returns together are recognisable at once: the register shifts, the same fact appears in three versions, and no section refers to any other.

The author must have access to senior management, to the registry data, and to the authority to require an owner to produce evidence.

14.3 The consistency check

Before submission, one person checks the following across the main report **and** every appendix:

Item	Check
Total credits	Identical everywhere; module credits sum to it
Workload per credit	The same ratio applied in every module
Contact hours	Report figure matches the timetable
Duration	Identical in the report, regulations, website and prospectus
Number of modules	Report matches the curriculum overview matches the module description set
Staff numbers	Report matches the staff list; every module has a named teacher
Intake and enrolment figures	Report matches the statistical annex; census dates stated
Programme and degree title	Identical in the report, regulations, certificate specimen and public information

Item	Check
Delivery locations	Identical everywhere, including partner locations
Accreditation claims	Public information refers to the accredited programme, never to the institution as ECLBS-accredited
Regulation versions	Every regulation cited is the version attached, and is current
Cross-references	Every appendix referenced exists; every appendix attached is referenced

This check takes about a day and prevents more conditions than any other single activity.

14.4 Before you submit: a self-test

Answer honestly. Each “no” is a probable finding.

Question	Yes / No
Does every criterion in the applicable handbook have a section, including those we consider not relevant?	
Can we produce, today, the evidence named in every section?	
Do the credit and workload figures reconcile across every document?	
Are all regulations attached in the current approved version?	
Does every module description state assessable learning outcomes?	
Does every module have a named, qualified teacher on the staff list?	
Can we show minutes for the meetings we say take place regularly?	
Can we show two decisions that changed the programme as a result of evaluation?	
Does our website say the same as this report about duration, credits, entry requirements, locations and the awarding body?	
Does any of our public information describe the institution, rather than a programme, as ECLBS-accredited?	
Have we attached a budget covering the whole intended accreditation period?	
For re-accreditation: have we addressed each previous recommendation with evidence, not assertion?	
Has everyone who will be interviewed read the sections concerning them?	
Have we disclosed our known weaknesses, with the measure, owner and deadline for each?	

15. Writing the criterion sections: worked contrasts

The pattern in §5 is easier to apply against examples. In each pair below, the weak version is typical of submitted reports and the strong version answers the criterion.

15.1 Under a quality assurance criterion

Weak. “The institution places great importance on quality. A comprehensive quality assurance system is in place, involving all stakeholders and ensuring continuous improvement of the programme in line with international standards.”

Why it fails. No arrangement is described, no document is cited, no evidence is offered, and nothing

could be verified. A panel cannot rate this.
Strong. “Quality assurance for the programme is governed by the Quality Management Regulation (Appendix 14, approved 12 March 2023). The Programme Committee — the programme director, four teaching staff, two student representatives and one employer representative — meets three times a year; minutes for the last three years are at Appendix 15. The committee reviews module evaluation results, the annual workload analysis and progression data. Two changes resulted in 2024: the assessment in Module 6 was changed from a single final examination to a portfolio plus examination after evaluation identified assessment bunching in week 12 (minute 2024/2/4); and a mathematics support session was introduced after first-year progression fell to 71% (minute 2024/1/7). Progression recovered to 83% in 2025. The committee has not yet established a mechanism for tracking whether measures are reviewed after implementation; a controlling step will be added to the regulation at the June 2026 revision, owned by the head of quality assurance.”
Why it works. Arrangement, regulation, membership, cadence, evidence, two traceable decisions, an outcome, and an acknowledged gap with an owner and a date.

15.2 Under a workload criterion

Weak. “The workload has been carefully calculated in accordance with ECTS principles and is appropriate for the students.”

Strong. “Workload is calculated at 27 hours per ECTS credit, applied uniformly across all 42 modules; the calculation per module is at Appendix 6. The annual student survey asks students to estimate weekly hours (instrument at Appendix 17). In 2024, reported workload in semester 3 averaged 46 hours a week against a planned 40. The Programme Committee attributed this to three group projects falling in the same weeks; the assessment calendar was rescheduled for 2025 (minute 2024/3/2) and reported hours fell to 41. Semester 1 continues to report 43 hours and is under review.”

15.3 Under a staffing criterion

Weak. “The programme is taught by a highly qualified and experienced faculty with strong academic and professional backgrounds.”

Strong. “The programme is taught by 9 full-time staff (7.2 FTE allocated to this programme) and 11 part-time lecturers. Seven of the nine full-time staff hold a doctorate; the two who do not hold a master’s qualification and 15 and 22 years respectively of senior practice in the field, and teach only the applied modules 12 and 19. The full staff list, with qualifications, module assignment, FTE and contract type, is at Appendix 11. Qualifications are verified at appointment against original documents under the Appointment Procedure (Appendix 12, section 4). Two part-time lecturers appointed in 2024 have not yet completed the assessment briefing required by that procedure; both are scheduled for the March 2026 session, and neither acts as a first marker in the interim.”

15.4 Under an employability criterion

Weak. “Graduates of the programme are highly sought after by employers and enjoy excellent career prospects in a wide range of sectors.”

Strong. “The graduate survey is conducted 12 months after award (instrument at Appendix 18). For the 2023 cohort, 38 of 52 graduates responded (73%): 29 were in employment related to the field, 4 in unrelated employment, 3 in further study, 2 seeking work. The most frequently reported entry roles were junior analyst and assistant project manager. Employers on the advisory board identified data-handling capability as the principal gap (minute 2023/2/5); a data analytics module was added to the second year from 2024/25. The first cohort to take it graduates in 2026, so its effect is not yet measurable.”

15.5 The pattern

In each case the strong version does four things the weak version does not: it **names the arrangement**, it **cites the evidence**, it **gives an instance**, and it **states what is not yet resolved**. A report written this way is shorter than one written the weak way, and it produces fewer conditions.

16. Preparing the appendices

Principle	Practice
Number and name them	"Appendix 11 — Staff list with module assignment", not "staff.pdf"
One document per file	Do not combine six regulations into one 200-page file
Reference them from the text	An appendix nobody points to will not be read
Attach current versions	Mark drafts as drafts and state the approval date expected
Translate what is relied on	Where a regulation is in another language, translate the articles cited
Anonymise where required	Student work, progress reviews and examiner reports are supplied with names removed
Supply samples across the range	Where scripts or theses are requested, supply weak, mediocre and strong, with the marking
Keep them current to the reference date	Do not attach a 2019 budget to a 2026 submission

17. Guidance specific to each cycle

17.1 Bachelor and Master submissions

The two documents most often missing or inadequate are the **curriculum-to-outcomes mapping** and the **multi-year budget**. Prepare both first; they take longest and they expose problems elsewhere. The mapping in particular will reveal outcomes that are never assessed and modules that serve no outcome, and it is better to find these yourself.

For Master submissions, prepare the **first-cycle / second-cycle differentiation table** even if the institution offers no related Bachelor; the exercise of stating what makes the provision second-cycle strengthens the section under criterion 1.1.
For MBA and Executive MBA submissions, the **EQUAL mapping** and the **professional experience verification records** are examined in every procedure. Assemble the verification evidence for a sample of admitted students before the visit rather than during it.

17.2 Doctoral submissions

Three items determine the tenor of the whole procedure and should be prepared first:

- the **supervisor register** with qualifications, five-year output, and **current actual loads** against the institution's own cap;
- a sample of **completed annual progress review files**, anonymised, showing the independent element and a real outcome;
- **three recently examined theses with examiner reports**, showing appointment records and conflict screening.

If these three are strong, most of Chapters D3, D4 and D5 follow. If any is weak, no amount of drafting will conceal it, and it is better to disclose and remediate.

17.3 Non-degree submissions

Two exercises should precede drafting:

- **Assemble every piece of public information** about the provision — your website, brochures, social media, search advertising, and everything published by agents, franchisees and licensed centres — and read it against the certificate you actually issue. Any divergence is a probable finding under N1.5, and N1.5 is non-negotiable.

- **Reconstruct the notional hours** from the delivered timetable rather than from the marketing copy, and check that the category you claim is the category the hours support.

Remember the page limit: **40 pages for Categories A and B**, 80 for Categories C and D.

18. Frequently asked questions about the SAR

How long should each criterion section be? Between a third of a page and one and a half pages. Longer usually means intentions are being described.

May we cross-reference between sections rather than repeat? Yes, and you should. "See section 3.2.1" is preferable to restating.
May we reference our website instead of describing an arrangement? No. The report must stand alone. You may attach a print-out as an appendix.
What if a criterion genuinely does not apply? Write the section, state that it does not apply, and explain why. Do not omit it.
What if we cannot meet a criterion? Say so, explain why, and set out what you are doing about it with an owner and a date. This is materially better than concealment, and it is evidence under the quality assurance criteria.
Can we submit in our own language? Only if agreed in the contract. Otherwise English, with translations of the regulation passages relied on.
Can we update the report after submission? Material submitted after the completeness check is at the panel's discretion. Substantial post-submission changes to the programme may require a revised report and a rescheduled visit at your cost.
Who sees the report? The panel, the project manager and the EACC. It is not published; the **assessment report** is.
Where do we find the charges? The amounts, currency, payment schedule and cancellation terms are published on the ECLBS website, www.eclbs.eu. The amounts applicable to your procedure are those published at the date the contract is concluded, and the contract records them.
How much does the SAR matter relative to the visit? They are not separable. The visit tests the SAR. A weak report produces a defensive visit; a candid, evidenced report produces a constructive one.