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Overview

• based on Evaluation Model

• 3 evaluation reports:
  First Interim Evaluation Report – June 2012
  Final Evaluation Report – February 2014
Methodology

Second Interim Evaluation Report is based on:

• EPAAC Grant Agreement
• Interim Technical Report submitted by EPAAC Project Management Team to EAHC
• First Evaluation Report
• Interviews with WP leaders
• Questionnaires distributed to Associated Partners
• Questionnaires distributed to Collaborating Partners and Member States representatives
Evaluation **focused on:**

- processes
- results
Objectives

The following **main objectives** were taken into consideration:

• To evaluate the functioning of the partnership
• To detect delays at implementation of activities as well as at achieving outputs and results
• To assess the quality of outputs and results
• To determine the visibility of EPAAC
Functioning of the partnership

• The **functioning of the partnership** was assessed as **good**.

• **Synergy among different WPs** was assessed mostly as **fair**.
Main conclusions of survey

• **Strong points:**
  - Distribution of responsibilities
  - Exchange of experience
  - Communication among WP leaders
  - Overall management of the Lead Partner

• **Areas for improvement:**
  - Weak horizontal communication
  - Interaction and synergy among WPs
  - Sharing of information
  - Involvement of patients and pharma partners
Delays at implementation of activities

• No specific delays
• **Two milestones were not achieved** in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} year of project implementation:
  o Baseline situational analysis
  o Clinical guideline for nutritional care for cancer patients
• **Protocol for the data diffusion** was achieved only at 90\% due to adaptation of the planned work organisation.
• **None of these delays** is considered **crucial** for further project implementation.
Quality of outputs and results

- All already achieved **deliverables and milestones** were assessed as **good** or **very good**.
- A large majority of respondents assessed the overall progress of all Work Packages as good or very good, especially WP 5, 6 and 9 received only positive assessments.
- **70%** of respondents think that the **overall progress** of the project is **good**. **95%** think that the Joint Action will achieve the set objectives.
Other: EPAAC visibility

- Very few respondents use the **EPAAC website** often; most of them use it **sometimes** or **seldom**. Some comments were that the website is **not updated enough** and that some meetings were not mentioned on the website.

- Majority of respondents use **Project Place** **seldom**, few of them even **never**. Some of them find it **confusing** or **too difficult** to use. It is perceived as very useful for financial reporting and document sharing.
Other: EPAAC visibility

- Most of respondents are aware of EPAAC activities within different **social networks**, especially Facebook and Twitter. But only **28%** of those actually **use** them.
- **52%** are aware of the EPAAC “I’m a fan of life” **campaign** but only **62%** of those have already visited it.
- Engagement of EPAAC in social networks and the campaign were mostly assessed as **good** or **very good**.
Recommendations for WP leaders

- WP implementation plan
- better inclusion of collaborating partners (through SC meetings, workshops on specific themes, etc.)
- WP4: partners should be asked to invite even more relevant participants
- WP10: invite all WP leaders to Working Group and Core Working Group meetings
Recommendations for the Project Management Team

• thematic project coordinator
• Joint Action implementation plan
• circulate programmes of meetings more in advance
• more detailed meeting minutes
• bimonthly reports summed up and available on epaac.eu
• administrative co-workers for “problematic” partners
Recommendations for European Commission

• contact person for constant content-related support
• more time available for development of Joint Actions
• allocation of resources to Joint Actions
Final evaluation report – plan

• Preparation of questionnaires for partners and other target groups (dec13)
• Harmonisation of questionnaires with WP leaders (dec13/jan14)
• Questionnaires sent to partners and other target groups (jan14)
• Preparation of final evaluation report focused on results and impacts (feb14-apr14)