



share and move to face nasty bugs

TITLE: WP8 EVALUATION
SUBTITLE: EX POST EVALUATION REPORT 2

ASSET Project • Grant Agreement N°612236

ASSET

Action plan on SiS related issues in Epidemics And Total Pandemics

7th RTD framework programme

Theme: [SiS.2013.1.2-1 Sis.2013.1.2-1]

Responsible partner: **Absiskey (P1 ABSISKEY)**

Contributing partners: **External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted); Istituto Superiore di Sanità (P8 ISS);**

Nature: **Report**

Dissemination: **PU**

Contractual delivery date: **2016-12-31 (m36)**

Submission Date: **2017-06-06 (m40)**

This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh

Framework Programme for research, technological development and



co-funded by the EU, GA: 612236

www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu



DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

PROJECT FULL TITLE	Action plan on SiS related issues in Epidemics And Total Pandemics
PROJECT ACRONYM	ASSET
	Coordination and Support Action: project funded under Theme SiS.2013.1.2 “Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans”
GRANT AGREEMENT	612236
STARTING DATE	01/01/2014
DURATION	48 months
D8.5 Ex Post Evaluation Report 1 Task: T8.2 Ex-post Evaluation Leader: Absiskey (P1 ABSISKEY) – Other contributors: Istituto Superiore di Sanità (P8 ISS)	

History of changes:

Vn	Status	Date	Organisation / Person responsible	Reason for Change
V1	Draft	04/03/2016	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	-
V2	Draft	15/03/2016	P01 AK	Revisions needed in the document, version sent to the Scientific Coordinator P08 ISS
V3	Draft	05/04/2016	P01 AK/P08 ISS	Revision in the document sent to Crossxculture for revision
V4	Draft	14/04/2016	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	Integration
V5	Draft	10/06/2016	P01 AK	A first version has been submitted unofficially to the PO related to the first part of the evaluation that will be merged with the second part later on.
V6	Draft	31/03/2017	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	Second part of the evaluation sent to AK



funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

V7	Draft	03/05/2017	P01 AK/P08 ISS	Revision in the document sent to Crossxculture for revision
V8	Draft	10/05/2017	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	Integration
V9	Final	06/06/2017	P01-AK	Submission to the EU – Merge of both evaluations (ER2+ER3) as informed to the ASSET PO last August.



List of abbreviations

ASSET	Action plan in Science in Society in Epidemics and Total pandemics
DoW	Description of Work
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
ER	Evaluation Report
GP	General Practitioner
H1N1	Influenza-A-Virus H1N1
HEG	H1N1 Expert Group set up by the European Commission to clarify the SiS-related questions raised by the H1N1 pandemic and associated crisis management. The HEG report was produced in June 2011.
HLPF	High Level Policy Forum
IEE	Independent External Evaluator/Evaluation
IR	Inception Report
LF or logframe	Logical framework (model used for outlining a project's intervention logic)
MMLAP	Mobilisation and Mutual Learning Action Plan
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PI	Principal Investigator
PM	Project Management
PPRB	Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin
QO	Quality Officer
RTD	Research and Technological Development
SiS	Science in Society
SWOT	Strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats
TELL ME	FP7 project implemented in 2012 – 2014, entitled: "Transparent communication in Epidemics: Learning Lessons from experience, delivering effective Messages, providing Evidence"
TL	Task Leader
ToR	Terms of Reference
WHO	World Health Organisation
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader



CONTENT

I. EVALUATION REPORT 2.....	7
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	8
1 Project Information.....	9
1.1 Project Data.....	9
1.2 Project Intervention Logic.....	9
1.3 Review of evaluation scope and time-plan.....	10
2 FINDINGS	11
2.1 Relevance	11
2.2 Efficiency	13
2.3 Effectiveness	15
2.4 Impact Prospects.....	16
2.5 Potential Sustainability	17
3 KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	18
3.1 Key observations	18
3.2 Recommendations	18
3.3 Follow up required.....	19
3.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER3	19
4 *Comments on the report from the Manager and Scientific coordinators	21
ANNEX A: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	26
ANNEX B: PERSONS INTERVIEWED	27
ANNEX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSET.....	28
ANNEX D: INDICATORS DEFINITION FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES	33
II. EVALUATION REPORT 3.....	35
5 Project Information.....	36
5.1 Project Data.....	36
5.2 Project Intervention Logic.....	36
5.3 Evaluation scope and time-plan.....	37



6 Findings	38
6.1 Relevance	38
6.2 Efficiency	42
6.3 Effectiveness	44
6.4 Impact Prospects.....	45
6.5 Potential Sustainability	45
7 Key observations and recommendations	46
7.1 Key observations	46
7.2 Recommendations	47
7.3 Follow up required	48
7.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER4	48
ANNEX A': DOCUMENTS CONSULTED	50
ANNEX B': PERSONS INTERVIEWED	51
ANNEX C': LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSET.....	52
ANNEX D': INDICATORS DEFINITION FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES	57



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

I. EVALUATION REPORT 2

ER2 scheduled on month 26 (February 2016), based on deliverables produced till month 25 (January 2016): the period is characterised by the end of WP3 – Action Plan Definition, and the launch of WP4 – Citizen Consultation and WP5 – Mobilisation and Mutual Learning. So, in addition to progress in other fronts, the focus is on how the Action Plan that has been developed supports the objectives of WP4 and WP5.



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The present evaluation assignment deals with the provision of Independent External Evaluation (IEE) Services that determine as objectively as possible the relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact and sustainability of the ASSET project, in the light of its objectives, throughout the remaining implementation period of the project¹.

The ex post evaluation of the project has been entrusted to Crossxculture consulting, following a call for tenders published on the website of the European Evaluation Society (EES). Two very experienced consultants have undertaken the work of the IEE: Dr Monika Zabel and Dr Odysseas Cartalos.

¹ The project has officially started with its kick off meeting in May 2014.



1 PROJECT INFORMATION

1.1 Project Data

Grant agreement/contract signed	21/11/2013
Start date – planned	01/01/2014
End date – planned	31/12/2017
Start date – actual	01/05/2014
End date – likely	31/12/2017
Grant Value	3.939,880 EURO
Other Funding/Contribution	0 EURO
Total budget	4.496.454,00 EURO
Total EC grant funds received to date	2.908.449.66 EURO
Total budget spent	1.516.493,43EURO
Financial data as at:	March 2016

1.2 Project Intervention Logic

The Project Management (PM) and the Independent External Evaluator (IEE) have cooperated in the last quarter of 2015 to review and clarify the intervention logic of ASSET. The final form that was agreed is shown in the project logframe representation given in Annex C. It was also agreed by the PM and the IEE that this logframe would be used as a basis for the remaining external evaluations in the framework of Task 8.2, starting with the one of the present report.

The project also produced indicators to measure the degree to which extent activity outputs have been achieved. These are presented in Annex D. It is with these indicators and some others the project is



advised to include (sections 2.1 and 3.2 below) that the internal monitoring of the project will be conducted (WP8, Task 8.1).

1.3 Review of evaluation scope and time-plan

In view of the delays encountered during the first period of ASSET, the project and the IEE agreed to re-organise the scope and time-plan of evaluations as follows:

- ER1 scheduled (and concluded) on month 21 (September 2015), based on deliverables produced till month 20 (August 2015): the report focused on the need to determine the different levels of effects, which would enable, in particular, to examine how project progress after the conclusion of WP2 – Study and Analysis would influence the work planned in WP3 – Action Plan Definition.
- ER2 scheduled on month 26 (February 2016), based on deliverables produced till month 25 (January 2016): the period is characterised by the end of WP3 – Action Plan Definition, and the launch of WP4 – Citizen Consultation and WP5 – Mobilisation and Mutual Learning. So, in addition to progress in other fronts, the focus is on how the Action Plan that has been developed supports the objectives of WP4 and WP5.
- ER3 scheduled on month 38 (February 2017), based on deliverables produced till month 37 (January 2107): the key project development planned at this time is the conclusion of WP4 - Citizen Consultation. A primary objective of the evaluation will, therefore, be to assess how the feedback from important stakeholder groups in WP4 can be used during the last year of the project in order to maximize the outcomes of ASSET.
- ER4 scheduled towards the official end of the project based on all remaining deliverables: the report will look at the overall effects and lessons learned from ASSET. The timing will be decided by September 2017, taking into account project progress and related forecasting for the production of deliverables, as well as the contractual time frame, within which project costs remain eligible.



2 FINDINGS

2.1 Relevance

According to the WHO², influenza activity continued to increase in the northern hemisphere during the winter of 2015-16, with the predominance of H1N1 virus in European countries: Belarus, Greece and Ireland reported high-intensity influenza activity; Finland, the Russian Federation and Ukraine reported very high activity. At the same time, global concern for the spread of the Zika virus gathers momentum as the outbreak observed since the last months of 2015 has already affected 34 countries³. Both aspects deal with the ability of the civil society to efficiently respond to situations that may lead to epidemics and pandemics. ASSET aims to address this topic, by facilitating the incorporation of Science in Society issues in relation to preparedness in facing such situations.

The project contribution to the overall objective will be demonstrated by progress in three main areas⁴: (a) increased cross-sectoral studies on pandemic influenza; (b) increased research funding; and, (c) improved response and preparedness plans in EU countries, as a result of work produced by ASSET. In view of the current state of affairs, and taking into account the above-mentioned facts about influenza, such achievements can be considered to constitute adequate responses to the problems that motivated the initiation and financial support of the ASSET project.

The project work is divided in 10 Work Packages (WP), each having a specific role within the project intervention logic, as discussed below.

- WP1 and WP2 aim to develop the background knowledge and infrastructure that will enable the project to: (a) define the key questions to be addressed; and then, (b) interact with the key stakeholders involved in preventing and managing threats related to epidemics and pandemics. WP3 aims to develop the strategy, roadmap and action plan that will guide these interactions.
- In WP4 a series of consultation meetings will be conducted with citizens in selected countries, with the dual objective of: (a) inciting the participation of different actors in public debates on questions related to epidemics and pandemics; and, (b) developing specific examples of coordinated consultation that may give concrete input to policy making. The Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) actions will be launched in WP5. These include the use of social media as a source of information and mobilisation, the identification and promotion of best practices

² http://www.who.int/influenza/surveillance_monitoring/updates/latest_update_GIP_surveillance/en/

³ <http://www.who.int/emergencies/zika-virus/situation-report/who-zika-situation-report-12-02-2016.pdf?ua=1>

⁴ According to the ASSET logframe – indicators at the level of the overall objective



and the organisation of local initiatives aiming to transfer/enrich the most effective policies and practices.

- The MML actions of WP4 and WP5 are supported by a series of communication activities in WP7, as well as actions targeting high-level policy making. The latter are grouped in WP6, where a High Level Policy Forum (HLPF) is planned to be formed in order to comment/enrich/promote project findings, in addition to policy watch actions that collect and disseminate to a wide audience relevant developments in the policy sphere.
- Two further WPs deal with project management (WP10) and Monitoring & Evaluation (WP8), whereas the post-project strategy and associated actions will be designed in WP9 during the last year of the project.

The logframe in Annex C defines the results to be achieved in each WP, along with associated qualitative and quantitative indicators. Through the logframe it is also possible to establish the linkages between results and the specific, as well as the overall objectives. For the purposes of the present evaluation the two linkages discussed below are of particular importance.

One basic result of WP2 is the identification of key problem areas in the main crosscutting themes identified by the project. These should be utilised in WP3 to develop the strategy and action plan, but also serve as the knowledge base to be used in all other communication and promotion activities of the project*. It is this knowledge base that will set the foundations for achieving the specific objective B2 of “exploring and mapping the SiS-related issues”. The other linkage has to do with attaining the specific objective B3, namely “participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed developed”: the action plan resulting from WP3 should guide the design of actions in WP4 (citizen workshops) and WP5 (local initiatives) in a way that such actions lead to concrete policy recommendations.

As already mentioned, there is a full task in WP8, task 8.1, dedicated to monitoring progress at the level of activities. The IEE notes that the corresponding indicators that have been defined by the project and shown in Annex D refer to quantitative aspects. While additional indicators should be included to measure progress in other activities that have not been taken into account, an effort should be made to have a qualitative assessment of the activities output. Indicative examples of indicators* that should be included are given below:

- number of HLPF members recruited/participating in ASSET actions, taking into account the specifications defined in the DoW (page 26, first paragraph in T6.1) and the kind of stakeholders to be addressed by ASSET (Task 6.1),



- in addition to following the number of stakeholders receiving the Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin (PPRB), the degree to which the information presented responds to topics of interest of the target groups (Task 6.2)⁵,
- characteristics of attendance and degree to which thematic objectives of the different workshops have been met (related tasks in WPs 4, 5 and 6), instead of just reporting whether such workshops have been organised or not (indicator D5 in Annex D),
- the number of ASSET scientific publications targeted in task 7.5,
- the number of participants in the summer schools and the expected benefits for the implementation of ASSET (e.g. in terms of feedback received) and for reaching selected target groups (task 7.6), and,
- the outreach to the GP community targeted by task 7.7.

2.2 Efficiency

The Commission accepted the second request to amend the Grant Agreement and the revised DoW in September 2015. The new work plan foresaw that the initial delay of 6-8 months that came from changes in the partnership structure at project start would be absorbed by extending deadlines for certain deliverables of WP 2 and WP3 by up to 3 months. The bulk of the work has followed the new time schedule, but further delays have been encountered, notably*:

- D1.6: Scientific Coordination Report delivered in month 22, instead of month 18,
- D2.7: Trans-disciplinary Workshop Report delivered in month 17, instead of month 15,
- D3.1: Strategic Plan delivered in month 24, instead of month 21*,
- D3.3: Action Plan to be delivered in month 24, rescheduled to 15 March 2016 (month 27), due to the delay in D3.1, and,
- D7.7: Science Communication Report planned for month 24, not yet delivered (No indication was provided as to the intended time of production of this deliverable).

Further examination of the deliverables showed the following differentiations with respect to the specifications defined in the DoW.

Deliverable 2.7: according to the DoW (page 11 and 12) and D1.6 (page 20), T2.7 aims to consolidate WP2 outcomes, to cross-fertilise research and to progress in the establishment of an original, transdisciplinary common approach. Also the D2.7 should present a “conclusive chapter” enlightening

⁵ WP5 (and task 6.2) leaders informed the IEE that the PPRB was sent to about 3,000 stakeholders. It is very positive that starting with the 3d edition, the persons receiving the bulletin are also asked to give feedback via a simple questionnaire. So far very limited responses have been provided, meaning that ways should be explored to increase the feedback on the information provided, as well as suggestions on other topics of interest.



the main findings, including points of agreement and disagreement. D2.7 is in fact a workshop report that presents the agenda and a very brief overview of the topics discussed. It would help if more evidence could be presented that the set objectives of consolidating WP2 outcomes and obtaining a common approach among specialists of different fields were effectively reached.

Deliverable 3.1: this is a key deliverable as it is intended to translate the knowledge base developed in WP2 into strategic directions. The corresponding task will “...set goals, decision making processes and will map an explicit path between the present and a vision for the future” (DoW, page 14). Accordingly, the deliverable was scheduled to present “...strategies for the accomplishment of goals, and criteria for assessing results” (DOW, page 16). In its current version, the deliverable presents a rather generic vision* for ASSET⁶ followed by strategic directions for each of the crosscutting themes developed in WP2⁷. For the deliverable to meet its specifications, it would be necessary to:

- set out the criteria for defining priorities in the areas to be addressed by the strategy,
- define targets to be achieved over well specified periods of time, along with criteria to measure degree of achievement*,
- describe primary and secondary responsibilities (partners and/or external entities) and related decision making processes for each strategic direction⁸, and*,
- indicate how the project strategy builds on the results achieved by TELL ME and in particular in the area of communication strategy guidelines⁹ or the use of the proposed “integrated Pandemic Threat Index”¹⁰. Also discuss strategic aspects of cooperation and synergies that can be achieved with other FP7 or H2020 projects dealing with similar topics.

A further issue concerns the crosscutting topic of unsolved scientific questions¹¹ that was extensively studied in WP2. It is mentioned in D1.6 (page 15) that a number of problems and open questions have been identified in Task 2.2 and that related conclusions have been confirmed by questionnaires to experts and a dedicated workshop at the end of this task. But the conclusion of D3.1 is that “...due to the many and sometimes very different issues it is not possible to design a unique and consistent strategy for the project ASSET to carry out, but restricted to this section, the unsolved question will be tackled prospectively from the point of view of the different MMLAP instruments available to the ASSET project”. As this particular topic is closely related to research funding whose increase is a measure of ASSET

⁶ The vision is defined as promoting MML to broad categories of stakeholders (decision makers, researchers, healthcare workers and citizens) and increasing preparedness and response capacity in the field of pandemics and crisis management

⁷ Please refer to result C3 in Annex C

⁸ This part can be incorporated in D3.3, provided that care is taken for minimizing the effects of delayed definition of responsibilities in actions already planned.

⁹ <http://www.tellmeproject.eu/node/390>

¹⁰ <http://www.tellmeproject.eu/node/426>

¹¹ This is one of the topics that was highlighted in the HEG report.



contributing to its overall objective, it would be important to at least define a list of priority themes that should be included in other parts of the ASSET strategy.

A point related to the efficient use of resources arises when examining the report on the first summer school (D7.9). The team that participated in the preparation and organisation of the summer school counted 24 members (D7.9, page 7). The summer school had 7-8 participants, which is about one third of the targeted number¹². As indicated by the scientific coordinator, there has been a problem of coordination with other programmes of the organizing University, which, combined with costs associated to spending a full week in the place chosen for the event (Rome) may account for the reduced participation. While some of the effort spent for this first summer school was used to address more general aspects that will facilitate the implementation of the following editions, the consortium is advised to review the whole concept, by taking into account criteria related to efficiency and impact prospect¹³: redefine target groups considering multiplying effects from participation to the event and approach them accordingly (addressing for example professional associations).

2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness looks first into the degree/likelihood of achievement of project results and how the way these results are achieved contributes to specific objectives.

The Glossary and Terminology (D1.2), together with the deliverables produced in WP2 (D2.1 through D2.6) are important constituents of the project knowledge base. Their completion, together with the development of the project infrastructure that supports interactions within the consortium (D1.3) provide evidence that progress has been made in achieving results C1 – facilitation of multi-actor cooperation and knowledge transfer, C2 – common terminology adopted and used, and C3 – base knowledge developed and key problem areas identified. The degree to which these results are effectively reached depends on the corresponding indicators (number of topics debated and concluded, cases where differences in interpretations persist, references of WP2 conclusions in deliverables of WPs 3, 4 and 5). These indicators should be examined in the next evaluation, when related data become available by the project¹⁴.

¹² As indicated in the interview with the scientific coordinator, the targeted participants so far have been health professionals currently enrolled in a post graduate course. No information is available regarding the profile of the participants of the first summer school

¹³ To address the cost issue the project decided to reduce the duration of the event to 3 days and to provide financial support for travel expenses to a certain number of participants (e.g. 3)

¹⁴ In ER1 it was pointed out that the deliverables of WP2 were largely based on the expertise of individual partners assigned to provide the deliverables, which was fully in line with the objective of creating a common understanding of the different issues involved within the Consortium. The Consortium was invited to develop synergies amongst the different practise areas that are represented in the Consortium, since the IEE considered that such approaches are particularly important for the preparation of



The delays in D3.1 and D3.3 do not seem to have affected the launch of WP4 and WP5. But as pointed out in section 2.2, the current form of the strategy document has not addressed the key question of what criteria of success should be used in the different strategic lines. As a result, such criteria still remain to be developed by the teams that are in charge of WP4 and WP5^{15*}.

As indicated in ER1, effectiveness also analyses the extent to which information and services made available, have been requested and used. Information enabling the IEE to examine such questions will become available at later stages of project implementation, especially in WPs 4, 5, 6 and 7.

2.4 Impact Prospects

An initial appreciation of impact prospects will be feasible at the later stages of implementation of WP4 and WP5, when concrete input will be available from the interactions with the different actors of the civil society that are targeted by the project. As also pointed out in ER1, some indication of impact can be obtained by looking at the composition of the High Level Policy Group, which still remains quite limited for influential stakeholders* outside the Consortium Members, meaning that an opportunity to create a channel for the high-level promotion of ASSET may be missed.

During the first reporting period, the task 6.1 leader has taken initiative and has involved the Academie Diplomatique International in Paris in the discussion about the future strategy for the HLPF. A representative of ADI attended the meeting in Copenhagen. Furthermore the contacts established with the Health Security Committee have rendered results. University of Haifa has also recommended and engaged a high-ranking representative in Israel's Health Ministry.

In the second physical meeting held on month 25 (January 2016), 4 HLPF members attended, while the other 4 send their representatives. Efforts should be pursued to recruit more HLPF members with contributions from all consortium members. An effort should also be placed on developing a list of topics that are relevant for inclusion in the agenda of the HLPF. Such topics will need to be backed up by evidence-based conclusions from other WPs of ASSET.

More generally, the impact prospects will largely depend on the originality and supporting evidence of work accomplished by the project, especially those coming from interactions with the targeted stakeholders. It is through such results that a wider uptake of participatory approaches in epidemics and pandemics management could be effectively achieved.

the next project milestones like the Action Plan (WP3), and also for the attraction and involvement of stakeholders (WPs 4 and 5) and members of the High Level policy Group (WP6). It was indicated in ER1 that aspects related to multi-disciplinary interactions could be assessed in deliverables D2.7 and D3.1, but the current form of these deliverables does not enable to conclude on the topics in question.

¹⁵ The scientific coordinator informed that this is an ongoing process through the Community of Practice



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

2.5 Potential Sustainability

As indicated in ER1, activities related to sustainability are foreseen in WP9 – Legacy. These are expected to start only in month 37 (January 2017). The plans of the project with regards to sustainability will be examined in ER3.



3 KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Key observations

Key characteristics of the reporting period were the conclusion of WP3 – Action Plan Definition together with the launch of WP4 – Citizen Consultation and WP5 – Mobilisation and Mutual Learning. At the same time, the project management and the external evaluator reviewed the project intervention logic, in a way that better highlights the interrelations between outputs, results, specific objectives and overall objective, providing in this way a means to assess how progress in certain areas affects other activities and the overall advancement of the project.

Delays have been observed in the production of the deliverable D3.1, which entailed delayed delivery of the associated action plan (D3.3). Activities in WPs 4 and 5 have started with limited feedback from WP3*. A crucial task in both these WPs is to define detailed workplans by also defining very quickly concrete targets to be reached and criteria to measure success. The project knowledge base developed in WP2 should be used for this purpose, and also for the activities relating to the different communication actions.

At present, no major factors outside the reach of the project can be identified that would have a negative effect on the **achievement** of the specific objectives. On the contrary, publicity related to the H1N1 and Zika recent outbreaks creates a very positive environment for the project to effectively attract the different stakeholder groups in the MML actions planned during the remaining period.

3.2 Recommendations

- Closer attention should be paid to sticking to agreed deadlines and content of deliverables, especially for those that are needed for programming/initiating important tasks that are interlinked.
- The indicators at the level of activities should be enriched* to include tasks that are not currently accounted for and also to measure qualitative aspects, as discussed in section 2.1.
- To continue and intensify the contacts established by the TL 6.1 HLPF and to introduce online formats like skype conferences or webinars.
- The new project Logframe should be communicated within the Consortium and adopted by all members, especially the parts related to the Overall and Specific Objectives and corresponding indicators with the objective of linking activities to all higher levels of effects*.
- The remaining actions in WPs 4, 5 and 6 should be designed taking into account the expected results and specific objectives of ASSET that each of them contributes to.



- The Summer School concept should be revised, taking into account the specific needs of targeted participants and also the multiplying effect of their participation for ASSET.
- Share the Action Plan with all WP leaders involved in its current first draft version to allow for comments and discussion*.

3.3 Follow up required

- Share with IEE the overview of financial expenditure by end of month 24.
- Review D3.1 taking into account specifications defined in the DoW*.
- Provide clarifications for the delay of D7.7. *
- Ensure that a proficient English speaker properly edits all project deliverables. Moreover, pay closer attention to the identification of deliverables: the deliverable number has to appear on the front page of all deliverables (this is extremely important for the fast identification of hard copies). Also, the table showing the history of changes as foreseen by the project quality assurance system has to be duly filled-in in order to serve its purpose.

3.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER3

The next period for the evaluation covers the time from January 2016 to January 2017. The assessment will be based on deliverables that have been finalised by month 37 (January 2017). The list includes:

- D1.4 Project Infrastructure Report 2,
- D1.7: Scientific Coordination Report 2,
- D3.3 Action Plan Handbook,
- D3.4: ASSET Tool Box,
- D4.1: Citizens Meeting Preparatory Material,
- D4.2: Citizens Meeting National Material,
- D4.3: Policy Report on Pandemic Consultation & Public trans-national synthesis report,
- D6.2 High Level Policy Forum Report 2,
- D6.5 Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin Report 2,
- D7.7 Science Communication Report 1,
- D7.15: Geneva Music & Science Festival Report, and,
- D8.2 Project Quality Report 2.

The next evaluation report ER3 is planned for month 38 (end February 2017), provided that all documents above – especially D1.7 and D8.2 that discuss progress made and degree to which targets



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

are met — become available in their final version by end of month 37 (30 January 2017). A list of interviews will be agreed beginning of February 2017.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

4 *Comments on the report from the Manager and Scientific coordinators

Page Number	Statement in the report	Comments and remarks from the coordination team
p9	<i>One basic result of WP2 is the identification of key problem areas in the main crosscutting themes identified by the project. These should be utilised in WP3 to develop the strategy and action plan, but also serve as the knowledge base to be used in all other communication and promotion activities of the project</i>	Priorities were decided by the particular frame of RRI (concerning only the 6 RRI areas) and the topics for each of these lines by each responsible of the 6 WP2 reports in one page final summary, then discussed on platform and finally used in the section “challenges” of the strategic plan.
	<i>Indicative examples of indicators* that should be included are given below</i>	For the consortium, the scientific coordinator and the quality manager, the discussions on the indicators and LF seemed to have been closed and validated by all in November 2015 in Copenhagen. Note: New indicators are being developed at the moment within the D3.3 Action Plan Handbook and recommendations from the IEEs will be taken into account in this deliverable.
P10	<i>The bulk of the work has followed the new time schedule, but further delays have been encountered, notably*</i>	Despite the 8 months of delay, 24 deliverables have been submitted so far which proves that the project has worked on catching up the initial delay.
	<i>D3.1: Strategic Plan delivered in month 24, instead of month 21</i>	We would like to stress out that the first workable version of the Strategic Plan was available on that CoP platform during the last week of August and a good shared version by the first week of



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

		<p>September even if the final version of the deliverable was transmitted only in December.</p> <p>The numerous exchanges on the CoP about the evolution of one deliverable are needed to obtain a qualitative document which can sometimes delay the date of submission.</p>
P11	<i>In its current version, the deliverable presents a rather generic vision* for ASSET followed by strategic directions for each of the crosscutting themes developed in WP2.</i>	<p>Request for sentence reformulation.</p> <p>It sounds as a judgement. What is the ideal format to express the idea of vision? It took time making a synthesis of the vision and the Consortium finally decided to express a few ideas in the vision to be adequately developed into the following strategic lines</p>
	<i>define targets to be achieved over well specified periods of time, along with criteria to measure degree of achievement*</i>	<p>1. If the SP is expected to be delivered grossly at the end of the second year of the project and the action plan with the tool box 4-5 months later, how should we intend “multi-year view of objectives” (from Dow) or over well specified period of time (ER2)? The strategic plan should cover less than 2 year time and it is difficult as 2 year time is covered by the action plan and not by a strategic plan. for example the SP “gender issues” chapter sets up “short time” (meaning in the next 18 months, up to the end of the project) and “long time” (after the end of the project) .This will need further discussions with the IEEs.</p> <p>2. It was decided to detail strategic lines within the action plan (D3.3) and to identify the criteria and indicators consequently, because more practical and realistic.</p>
	<i>describe primary and secondary responsibilities (partners and/or external entities) and related</i>	<p>Request for sentence removal</p> <p>Primary and secondary responsibilities were not treated because not required in the Dow. It seems</p>



	<i>decision making processes for each strategic direction¹⁶, and*</i>	not appropriate in the framework of the SP because of the mentioned problem of time (18 month left to the end of the project) but more relevant to establish primary and secondary responsibilities towards the Action Plan.
P13	<i>As a result, such criteria still remain to be developed by the teams that are in charge of WP4 and WP5¹⁷.*</i>	Remark and request for reformulation Besides the criteria indicated by the Dow, some general criteria are however indicated in the strategic plan and developed, as established by the consortium, within the action plan. Informal discussions on general and specific criteria were (and are) going on on the web based CoP. From 1 September 2015 up to 29 February 2016, 12,069 is the total number of views and posts of its members (on average 49). Consequently, WP4 and WP5 members started working on their proposal according to the time indicated by the Dow. Indeed, the first version of the global WP4 plan appeared on the platform the 26th August.
	<i>at the composition of the High Level Policy Group, which still remains quite limited for influential stakeholders*</i>	Remark and request for reformulation To be moderated. It seems that after the Forum n°2 took place, there has been improvement of recruiting influential stakeholders and it has been indicated during the interview with Alberto Perra, Absiskey and the IEEs. It is rather difficult to gather 11 high representatives at the same time in the same place. TIEMS is working on proposing alternatives such as gathering representative persons from these high directors. The organisation of the next forums is being discussed with TIEMS. This work is ongoing at the moment of the report preparation. A new and potentially more effective approach will be based on a open questionnaire to be administered to the current or potential members of the HLPF to get information and recommendations, A synthetic document is available on Asset platform.

¹⁶ This part can be incorporated in D3.3, provided that care is taken for minimizing the effects of delayed definition of responsibilities in actions already planned.

¹⁷ The scientific coordinator informed that this is an ongoing process through the Community of Practice



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

P15	<i>Activities in WPs 4 and 5 have started with limited feedback from WP3*.</i>	Besides the criteria indicated by the Dow, some general criteria are however indicated in the strategic plan and developed, as established by the consortium, within the action plan. Informal discussions on general and specific criteria were (and are) going on on the web based CoP. From 1 September 2015 up to 29 February 2016, 12,069 is the total number of views and posts of its members (on average 49). Consequently, WP4 and WP5 members started working on their proposal according to the time indicated by the Dow. Indeed, the first version of the global WP4 plan appeared on the platform the 26th August.
	<i>The indicators at the level of activities should be enriched*</i>	For the consortium, the scientific coordinator and the quality manager, the discussions on the indicators and LF seemed to have been closed and validated by all in November 2015 in Copenhagen.
	<i>The new project Logframe should be communicated within the Consortium and adopted by all members, especially the parts related to the Overall and Specific Objectives and corresponding indicators with the objective of linking activities to all higher levels of effects*.</i>	Request for sentence removal This has been done through the CoP in November 2015.
	<i>Share the Action Plan with all WP leaders involved in its current first draft version to allow for comments and discussion*.</i>	Request for sentence removal Same. Discussions have been initiated early December on the CoP



P16	<i>Review D3.1 taking into account specifications defined in the DoW*.</i>	Request for sentence removal According to what said above: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The priority for the SP were identified by the same RRI lines and, among the many challenges studied by the 6 WP2 reports, by 1 page synthesis available on CoP 2. The Dow was re-interpreted by the Consortium about the articulation between the SP and the Action Plan. The SP should cover the last 2 years of project (short term) with some theoretical projections (long term) of the strategic lines for the following years while it looked more appropriate for the Action Plan to complete the MML planning detailing targets, outcome, indicators, responsibilities
	<i>Provide clarifications for the delay of D7.7. *</i>	Request for sentence removal This has been already provided to the evaluators.



ANNEX A: DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- IEE Inception Report
- First Evaluation Report (ER1)
- ASSET Document of Work (DoW) – revised version received 3 September 2015
- D1.3 Project Infrastructure Report 1,
- D1.6: Scientific Coordination Report 1,
- D2.7 Transdisciplinary Workshop report,
- D3.1 Strategic Plan,
- D3.2 Roadmap to Open and Responsible Research and Innovation in Pandemics,
- D6.4 Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin Report 1,
- D7.3 Web Portal Report 1,
- D7.5 Media Report 1, and,
- D7.9 Summer School Report 1.

Two further documents have been provided by the Task 6.1 leader:

- excerpt of D6.2 High Level Policy Forum Report 1, and,
- a report on the 2nd meeting of the HLPF – Copenhagen, 15 January 2016.

The following deliverables have been included in the first evaluation period (ER1):

- D6.1 High Level Policy Forum Report 1, and,
- D8.1 Project Quality Report 1.

The following deliverables have not been received by the cut-off date of 5 February 2016:

- D3.3 Action Plan Handbook (New deadline is 15 March 2016, due to delayed submission of D3.1), and,
- D7.7 Science Communication Report 1

They will be included in the next evaluation period (ER3).



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

ANNEX B: PERSONS INTERVIEWED

- Alberto Perra (ISS), scientific coordinator – 23 February 2016
- Celine Blanchon (ABSISKEY), project management – 23 February 2016
- Roberta Villa (ZADIG), Task 3.3 leader – 25 February 2016
- John Haukeland and Lise Bitsch (DBT), WP4 leaders – 1 March 2016
- Barbara de Mei and Valentina Possenti (ISS), WP 5 leaders – 3 March 2016
- Harald Drager (TIEMS), Task 6.1 leader – 4 March 2016
- Thomas Robertson (TIEMS), WP3 leader – 4 March 2016



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

ANNEX C: LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSET

cod	Overall Objective	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
A1	To contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness	Increased population cross-sectoral studies published on pandemic influenza	US National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health (Pubmed) Standards: biennial (2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2014-2015, 2016-2017)	
		Increased research funding in topics related to epidemics/pandemics citizen knowledge, attitudes and practices	EU research budget, national budgets for research Measured at midterm assessment of 2007 to 2013 and end of 2007 to 2013 term; and mid-term assessment 2014 to 2020 term = > 2010, 2014 and 2018	
		National pandemic response and preparedness plans In EU Member States and Associated Countries have included the strategic areas identified by ASSET MMLAP	National pandemic preparedness plans including the strategic areas in EU member states and associated countries Target: 5 plans improved (50% of the member countries represented in the ASSET consortium)	



cod	Specific Objective	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/Assumptions
B1	A partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management is developed	Number of references of ASSET work in strategic documents relating to science, research and policy	High level documents in the area of pandemics in the EU, member States and Accession Countries	ASSET MMLAP is supported by national governments and international organisations dealing with health policy and management, including pandemics
		Number of actions related to ASSET that have been implemented		
B2	SiS-related issues in global pandemics explored and mapped	Number of topics identified in the strategic plan that receive massive response in mobilisation actions (WP4 and WP5)	36 months' scientific coordinator report	Scientific community and health experts adopt recommendations
		Degree of acceptance of the MMLAP conceptual map by the civil society	Social Media quarterly and interim report	
B3	Participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed developed	Topics and terminology introduced by ASSET extensively used in the social dialogue	Social network reports (<i>Facebook, Twitter</i>)	Social dialogue is structured in a way to lead to concrete recommendations
		Number and degree of influence of policies produced with input from citizens (coming from project events and/or use of social networks) (WP5)	Local initiatives attendance database	Local stakeholders carry out an effective mobilization campaign



	cod	Results	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
WP1	C1	Transparent and participatory discussion facilitated, allowing multi-actor cooperation and transfer of knowledge among partners	Number of topics debated and concluded in the ASSET web platform <u>Computation</u> Topics where broader consensus is reached over number of open discussion threads in ASSET platform <u>Value</u> 30% each year	Moodle statistics for the ASSET web platform	Partners use common approaches and cooperation to promote ASSET conclusions
	C2	Common terminology adopted and used	Cases where differences of interpretations persist (to be minimised) <u>Computation</u> Number of scientific/technical terms for which different meanings are attributed by consortium experts <u>Value</u> Below 0.5% of ASSET Glossary entries		
WP2	C3	Baseline knowledge on state of the art developed - key problem areas identified in the cross-cutting topics of WP2 ¹⁸	References to key findings (of WP2 deliverables) made in Strategic Plan and other policy related work <u>Computation</u> Major themes developed in deliverables of WPs 3, 4 and 5 that are closely linked to key findings of WP2 <u>Value</u> On average 3 per deliverable for deliverables of WPs 3, 4 and 5	Project deliverables, especially those of WP3, 4 and 5	Baseline knowledge is disseminated and used by research and policy making stakeholders in epidemics and pandemics
WP3	C4	Strategic plan (SP) and action plan to address the main problematic issues identified in WP2	Subsequent actions in the project are based on the ASSET strategy and action plan <u>Computation</u> Per cent of project actions based on the ASSET strategy and action plan <u>Value</u> ≥60%	18 -36 months' SC report Monitoring reports	Targeted stakeholders adhere to strategic objectives and participate/contribute to the implementation of the action plan

¹⁸ (1) governance of flu pandemics, (2) unsolved scientific questions in influenza and pandemics, (3) Research results and democratic institutions, (4) Ethical, legal and societal aspects, (5) gender issues, and, (6) risk on intentional outbreaks.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

	cod	Results	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
WP6	C5	Consensus achieved within the HLPF on the main strategic lines identified in the SP	Strategic Plan main lines endorsed by the HLPF <u>Computation</u> Per cent of strategic lines endorsed by HLPF <u>Value</u> $\geq 75\%$	HLPF reports	The majority of the MS participating in ASSET are represented within the HLPF
WP4	C6	Workshops in the 8 countries planned in the DoW lead to recommendations for policy making	Concrete recommendations to policy makers in each of the 8 countries <u>Computation</u> Number of concrete recommendations at the level of policy makers per country <u>Value</u> On average 5 per country	Citizens' consultation meetings database, D.4.2 and D.4.3	National stakeholders in the 8 countries use results of consultations and debates in their work
WP5	C7	ASSET strategic findings and conclusions are used in social media to strengthen actions of participatory decision making	Changes in approaches in social media Policy recommendations coming from Social networks Best practices identified and used for replication <u>Computation</u> Numbers of above <u>Value</u> ≥ 10 on average during third and fourth year	36-48 months' SC report and D5.1	Best practices and recommendations are used to guide policy work in the area of pandemics across the EU
WP6	C8	Through its composition (outcome of activity level), High Level Policy Forum exerts positive influence on policy-makers at regional, national and EU levels, key decision makers in health agencies and pharmaceutical industry, and civil society organizations	Outreach of reports issued from HLPF meetings <u>Computation</u> Number of reports communicated to high level decision makers <u>Value</u> More than 50 high level decision makers receive each report	D6.1, D6.2, D6.3	Policy makers and other high-level stakeholders use and promote ASSET findings and conclusions
WP8	C9	Independent External Evaluation (IEE) results contribute to attaining ASSET results and specific objectives	Percentage of IEE recommendations that are adopted <u>Computation</u> Per cent of recommendations of IEE adopted <u>Value</u> $\geq 80\%$	18-36-48 months' SC report	Open minded exchanges and trust established between project and IEE



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

	cod	Results	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
WP9	C10	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan developed	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan receives commitment by Consortium Partners <u>Computation</u> Number of partners engaged to implement ASSET sustainability and exploitation plan <u>Value</u> $\geq 90\%$	D9.1, D9.2, 48 months' SC report	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan is endorsed by HLPF and other high-profile stakeholders



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

ANNEX D: INDICATORS DEFINITION FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES

WP	cod	Indicator Definition	Value	Verification Source	2014	2015	2016	2017
WP1	D1	Percent increase of glossary items in the final list compared to initial	≥50%	D1.2 Glossary (initial vs. final version m11)	33%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
WP7	D2	Annually relative percentage increase of accesses to the ASSET website	≥15% Accesses (average) in mm 1-6 to the ASSET Website	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	+49%	XX	XX
WP5	D3	BPP/social network significant exchanges of posts and resources	≥100 p/year	Web portal reports and statistics	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP4	D4	ASSET participating countries having carried out the standardized approach to the public consultation	≥80%	D4.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP4	D5	The WS has been held	N of WS effectively released = 8	D4.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP5	D6	Short monitoring reports on social contents are regularly available	≥80% N of monitoring reports expected	-36-48 months' SC report -D5.1	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP5	D7	Annually relative percentage increase of accesses to the SH portal	≥15% N of accesses in mm 1-6 to the SH portal	D7.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP5	D8	Best practice collection and analysis from all ASSET participating countries	≥70% N of ASSET participating countries	D7.7	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP5	D9	Local initiatives gender sensitive/centred carried out in participating countries	≥70% N of ASSET participating countries	D5.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP6	D10	Annual increase of stakeholders receiving the Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin	≥15% N of stakeholders receiving the PPRB on t ₀ (1st Issue)	D6.4, D6.5, D6.6	n.a.	2762 contacts	XX	XX

www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

WP	cod	Indicator Definition	Value	Verification Source	2014	2015	2016	2017
WP7	D11	Annual increase overall of accesses to the ASSET web portal	≥15% N of accesses to the ASSET web portal in mm1-6	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	+49%	XX	XX
WP7	D12	Annual web portal updates	≥15% N of updates of the ASSET web portal in mm1-6	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	16,6%	XX	XX
WP7	D13	Annual increase in total of views at the ASSET posts/communications on the main social media	≥20% N of views at the ASSET posts on social media in mm1-6	Software statistics	n.a.	+21%	XX	XX
WP7	D14	Periodical publication of the paper series	N of Periodical publication of the paper series = ≥5	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP7	D15	Annual increase in total of accesses to the Gender Platform	≥25% N of accesses to the gender platform in mm1-6	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP8	D16	Project Quality Reports made available in due time for the ASSET CoP	≥15% Total N of PQ reports	Project quality report D8.1, D8.2, D8.3	n.a.	*	XX	XX

- Those indicators are not yet calculated due to the late start of project activities and corresponding lack of data.



II. EVALUATION REPORT 3

ER3 scheduled on month 39 (March 2017 – present report), based on deliverables produced till month 37 (January 2107)⁴: the key project development during the reporting is the conclusion of WP4 - Citizen Consultation. The evaluation assesses the results of WP4 and examines how activities in the last year of the project can maximize the outcomes of ASSET.



5 PROJECT INFORMATION

5.1 Project Data

Grant agreement/contract signed	21/11/2103
Start date – planned	01/01/2104
End date – planned	31/12/2017
Start date – actual	01/05/2014
End date – likely	31/12/2017
Grant Value	3.939,880 EURO
Other Funding/Contribution	0 EURO
Total budget	4.496.454,00 EURO
Total EC grant funds received to date	2.908.449.66 EURO ¹
Total budget spent	1.516.493,43 EURO ²
Financial data as at:	March 2016

5.2 Project Intervention Logic

The project logframe representation in Annex C is the basis for the external evaluations in the framework of Task 8.2.³ The indicators presented in Annex D and some others the project was advised to include (please refer to ER2 - sections 2.1 and 3.2) are used to measure the activity outputs for the internal monitoring of the project (WP8, Task 8.1).

¹ A request to receive updated information was made to ABSISKEY on 16.3.17 but was not delivered until the date of ER3 submission.

² Same as previous footnote.

³ Evaluation Report ER2, March 2016.



5.3 Evaluation scope and time-plan

The independent external evaluation is organised as follows:

- ER1 concluded on month 21 (September 2015), based on deliverables produced till month 20 (August 2015): the report focused on the need to determine the different levels of effects, enabling to examine how project progress after the conclusion of WP2 – Study and Analysis contributed to the work planned in WP3 – Action Plan Definition.
- ER2 conducted on month 26 (February 2016), based on deliverables produced till month 25 (January 2016): the period was characterised by the end of WP3 – Action Plan Definition, and the launch of WP4 – Citizen Consultation and WP5 – Mobilisation and Mutual Learning. Particular attention was paid to the ways the Action Plan that was produced supported the objectives of WP4 and WP5.
- ER3 scheduled on month 39 (March 2017 – present report), based on deliverables produced till month 37 (January 2107)⁴: the key project development during the reporting is the conclusion of WP4 - Citizen Consultation. The evaluation assesses the results of WP4 and examines how activities in the last year of the project can maximize the outcomes of ASSET.
- ER4 scheduled towards the official end of the project based on all remaining deliverables: the report will look at the overall effects and lessons learned from ASSET. The timing will be decided by September 2017, taking into account project progress and related forecasting for the production of deliverables, as well as the contractual time frame, within which project costs remain eligible.



6 FINDINGS

6.1 Relevance

The project enters its final year of implementation. The focus is on the Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) actions of WP5 that aim to use social media as a source of information and mobilisation, to identify and promote best practices and to organise local initiatives for transferring/enriching the most effective policies and practices to deal with pandemics. WPs 6 and 7, dealing respectively with Policy Watch (including the HLPF) and Communication actions will continue to run in parallel, whereas WP9 will set out the post-project strategy and associated actions. Three more WPs are still open, one dealing with Scientific Coordination (WP1), one with Project Management (WP10) and one with Monitoring & Evaluation (WP8).

According to the logframe presented in Annex C, ASSET overall objective is to contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness. This is a topic of relevance and continued importance for the EU: the Health Societal Challenge of H2020 highlights the need to ensuring a high level of protection of human health, effective prevention, treatment, and management of disease outbreaks and emerging access to an effective and efficient health system. Crucial components in this endeavour are increased citizen's awareness and involvement that are both targeted by ASSET. This overall objective will be reached if the following specific objectives are achieved: (B1) strong multidisciplinary research partnerships are put in place to effectively address identified scientific and societal challenges, (B2) related Science in Society topics are explored and mapped, and (B3) participatory and inclusive strategies are developed to efficiently address these topics.

The project design links outcomes produced from the tasks to the higher-level effects ASSET aims to produce. The main purpose of WP2 was to develop the knowledge base and the associated crosscutting themes to be addressed by the project, leading to the strategy and action plan (WP3) for the Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) process to be implemented by the project. The results from these two work packages are highly relevant to the above specific objectives, as they guide the targeted interactions with the EU citizens (WP4 and 5), the policy actions (WP6) and the overall communication effort (WP7) of the project.

In summary, the project design draws attention to the following relations:

- For B1: ASSET work is referenced in strategic documents and actions relating to R&I policy in epidemics / pandemics, which is strongly connected to the success of communication actions, especially the science communication actions (D7.7) and the outreach of policy actions (WP6).



- For B2: the topics identified as those to be addressed (WP2) and the methods designed to create stakeholder mobilisation and participatory approaches (WP3) are largely accepted and adopted by the targeted stakeholder groups in WP4 and WP5.
- For B3: the different actions of ASSET have a visible effect on the social dialogue, as well as on actual policy making (WP4, WP5 and WP6).



In view of progress made in the different areas, especially in the very successful organisation of the citizen consultations in WP4, the specific objectives are considered to be achievable within the time frame of the project. However, a point initially raised in ER2, referring to the indicators used to monitoring progress at the level of activities, should be stressed again as it has not been taken into account. The list of indicators (shown in Annex D) first needs to be increased to include outputs of activities that have not been considered, for example:

- The number of HLPF members recruited/participating in ASSET actions, in view of the specifications defined in the DoW (page 26, first paragraph in T6.1) and the kind of stakeholders to be addressed by ASSET (Task 6.1).
- The number of ASSET scientific publications targeted in task 7.5.
- The number of participants in the summer schools (task 7.6).
- The outreach to the GP community targeted by task 7.7 (for example, the number of GPs to be informed, or the number of GPs participating in ASSET events, including the ones related to social media).

Some of these indicators may have been included in D3.3 Action Plan Handbook together with others that are relevant to the progress of other ASSET activities. A general remark for these indicators is that the target values should be defined beforehand, so as to have a measure of the degree of achievement when the corresponding action is over.

But, more crucially, other indicators need to be included, providing a more qualitative assessment of the activities, like the ones below:

- The characteristics of attendance and degree to which thematic objectives of the different workshops have been met (related tasks in WPs 5 and 6), instead of just reporting whether such workshops have been organised or not (indicator D9 in Annex D).
- The number of ASSET scientific publications targeted in task 7.5, to which it would be very useful to specify the publication channels (targeted journals, preferably the ones with high impact factor that are more likely to contribute to ASSET impact) other than the ones of the project (ASSET website).
- The expected benefits that the summer schools can have for the implementation of ASSET (e.g. in terms of feedback received) and for reaching selected target groups (task 7.6).
- A measure of how the GP community targeted by task 7.7 received and adopted ASSET messages.

In any case, qualitative effects as those above should be at least discussed in the deliverables presenting overall progress, such as D1.7 and D8.2, as well as the matching deliverables D1.8 and D8.3 that will be produced at the end of the project. Taking the case of the summer school task as an example, it would be extremely useful to contact attendees from previous years to learn in what ways the training received has



co-funded by the EU, GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

helped them in their professional activities, and to compare ex post perceptions to those reflected in the course evaluations provided by the participants directly after the end of the summer school.



6.2 Efficiency

In general, a good account of progress in the reporting period is given by the 12 deliverables produced.

The implementation of WP4 can be considered as one of the very successful parts of ASSET. The WP concerned the organisation of citizen consultations in 8 EU countries (Denmark, France, Switzerland, Ireland, Norway, Italy, Bulgaria, Romania) with the same standardised method, based on the “World Wide Views” method combining simultaneous national face-to-face citizen consultations with a web-based transnational comparison of national results. The 8 citizen consultations were conducted with balanced citizen samples of about 50 persons in each country, in total 425, with a near representative gender balance. These workshops are very good examples of engaging citizens in debates on issues dealing with pandemics. The information received and the subsequent analysis of corresponding data was used to obtain policy-making recommendations along the 6 broad topics chosen for the workshops.

It is also worth mentioning that the project has produced a large number of documents, in the form of articles, videos, data-visualisations and news related to ASSET that have been disseminated through the ASSET and the international science web portals. The project also obtained an ISSN number for the ASSET paper series: ISSN 2532-3784 ASSET paper series⁵.

Some specific comments on certain deliverables are provided below.

Deliverable D3.3: the deliverable puts together remaining project activities and follow-up actions for each of 6 main target groups: authorities in charge of healthcare, healthcare professionals, scientific community, industry, media and the general public. The actions refer to the main thematic areas that the project explored. The way the deliverable is structured addresses some of the weaknesses pointed out previously (ER2) for D3.1, in that it presents concrete actions in response to specific challenges.

Deliverable D3.4: following the specifications set out in the DOW, the deliverable presents a toolbox, i.e. a series of specific methods that support the processes identified in the ASSET Handbook (D3.3). There are 8 tools that are presented for very diverse processes: (1) a checklist helping healthcare workers in Influenza vaccination, (2) a glossary on epidemics, including Zika and other emerging virus infections, (3) an online interactive course on infectious outbreaks, (4) data visualisation techniques (referring to data enabling for example to assess the geographic extent of certain features of relevance to a situation of pandemics), (5) citizen participatory meetings, (6) reporting health issues by journalists, (7) response to radiological, biological, and chemical threats by healthcare, and (8) checklists for researchers. There are more or less detailed descriptions and examples for the use of the tools. Ways to further increase the usefulness of the document would be to (a) indicate which specific processes of the ASSET handbook are facilitated with the tools, and (b) provide concrete examples on the (actual or prospective) use of the tools within ASSET, as is done for the tool on citizen participatory meetings (section 8.6 of the report).



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

⁵ As per information communicated by the scientific coordinator on 4 April 2017.



Compared to previous periods, there have been less delays in the production of deliverables, which in most cases were of the order of two months or less, except for:

- D3.3 Action Plan Handbook, delivered in month 28 instead of month 24.
- D3.4 ASSET Tool Box, delivered in month 32 instead of month 27.
- D7.7 Science Communication Report, delivered in month 30 instead of month 24.

The delays in D3.3 and D3.4 have not affected the implementation of WP4, because relevant information has been exchanged among the different team members through workshops or other means of communication. A similar situation is likely to occur for WP5. The delay in D7.7 does not seem to affect other activities of the project.

6.3 Effectiveness

Work during the reporting period essentially concerned Result C6: Workshops in the 8 countries planned in the DoW were supposed to lead to recommendations for policy making⁶. This result has been largely achieved as concrete policy recommendations have been formulated (D4.3) on themes that have been identified in the Strategy WP3 and these recommendations will be presented to the European Parliament in April 2017.

The focus now is on results C7 and C8. The former relates to using ASSET strategic findings and conclusions in social media to strengthen actions of participatory decision-making. The related activities in WP5 are on-going with good progress made in exploiting social media for citizens' and stakeholders' mobilization in pandemic emergencies (Task 5.1), developing the Best Practice Platform (BPP) and Stakeholder Portal (SP) (Task 5.2) and organising local initiatives to promote mobilization and mutual learning at local level. The focus of these actions should be on converting the information collected to concrete messages and recommendations for policy making, taking into account that one of the criteria of overall project success is the footprint of ASSET on policy making across the EU

C8 deals with the influence the High Level Policy Forum can exert on policy-makers at regional, national and EU levels, key decision makers in health agencies and pharmaceutical industry, and civil society organizations. Such aspects need to be addressed in the final physical meeting of the HLPF so that corresponding actions are defined and monitored till the end of the project.

⁶ As per ASSET logframe in Annex C.



6.4 Impact Prospects

In the observation period of ER3 some deliverables with impact prospects have been observed. One example is the WP4, citizen consultation, which has shown the potential to be replicated and rolled out. Another example is the interest raised through the different communication activities of the project, especially those related to electronic communication channels used by the project, as detailed in D8.2.

More generally, the impact prospects will largely depend on the originality and supporting evidence of work accomplished by the project, especially those coming from interactions with the targeted stakeholders: citizens involved in the workshops of WP5 and their contribution in developing targeted policy recommendations, follow-up agreed with MEPs after the session in the European Parliament, as well as the post-project support that the HLPF can provide. It is through such results that a wider uptake of participatory approaches in epidemics and pandemics management could be effectively achieved.

It should be pointed out that the successful implementation of WP4 enabled DBT, the partner in charge of organising and conducting the citizen consultations, to validate their methodologies in promoting inclusiveness and citizen engagement. Through this work, the organisation further developed internal skills and competencies in the particular thematic area. This capacity building is highly relevant for DBT as it offers the opportunity to increase its involvement in Responsible Research and Innovation, a topic of growing importance for Europe.

6.5 Potential Sustainability

Activities related to sustainability are foreseen in WP9 – Legacy that were scheduled to start in January 2017. The IEE has drawn attention to the need to start related activities earlier, as this would allow ASSET partners to better plan post-project actions. With the present time table the sustainability plan can be only realistically assessed in ER4, at the very end of the project.

It would be extremely beneficial for the project to have early drafts of such a plan already by the end of the first semester 2017, as these drafts could be used to secure partner commitments for further joint actions and to initiate related fund searching activities. The IEE volunteers to comment on such drafts as soon as they become available.



7 KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Key observations

ASSET remains highly relevant to the need to enhance participatory approaches in the development of efficient policies and measures at the level of the EU and its Member States to address situations of epidemics / pandemics.

The project design as represented in the logframe of Annex C clearly identifies the links between project activities and higher-level effects. Based on the good progress achieved so far in the different WPs, ASSET is expected to reach its specific objectives.

The reporting period was characterised by the conclusion of WP4 - Citizen Consultation and the start of WP5 - Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML). WP4 was very successful in mobilising citizens from 8 EU countries and in developing concrete policy recommendations in 6 areas of strategic importance for the purposes of the project. The implementation of MML in WP5 goes according to plan, which is also the case for the remaining activities in WPs 6 and 7, dealing respectively with Policy Watch and Communication.

Attention is drawn to the fact that the project impact depends on the qualitative effects produced by actions, and much less on quantitative aspects. Examples that may further strengthen this approach are provided in the recommendations that follow.



7.2 Recommendations

- The indicators at the level of activities should be enriched to include tasks that are not currently accounted for and also to measure qualitative aspects, as discussed in section 2.1.
- Remaining activities in WP5 should focus on developing concrete messages and recommendations for policy making.
- In order to increase the attractiveness of tools presented in D3.4, concrete examples should be given on the (actual or prospective) use of the tools within ASSET, as is done for the case of the tool on citizen participatory meetings (section 8.6 of the report).
- Commitments at the level of HLPF to exert influence at different levels of policy making should be ensured by the project team, by defining and agreeing to follow up actions enhancing the impact of ASSET⁷.

⁷ It has been stressed in previous reports (ER1 and ER2) that the HLPF can be a powerful tool in the effort to increase impact and ensure sustainability of ASSET achievements. The HLPF members have followed the project and should be fully aware of the long-term objectives, as these are defined in the project log frame (Annex C). Their contribution in supporting the efforts to achieve specific objectives B2 and B3 should be discussed and agreed during the project lifetime.



- Attention should be given to prepare advanced drafts of ASSET Legacy by the end of the first semester of 2017, as this would give sufficient time to interested ASSET partners to plan post-project activities. The IEE volunteers to comment on such drafts as they become available.

7.3 Follow up required

- Project management to provide requested project financial data (Section 1.1).
- Scientific coordinator to ensure that the Intervention Logic (as presented in Annex C) is reflected in upcoming deliverables, especially D1.8.
- Scientific coordinator and Quality Officer to include indicators to measure the qualitative effects of activities in addition to quantifying outputs, as discussed in section 2.1. For all indicators, target values should be defined.
- WP9 Leader and partners involved developing draft legacy plan to be discussed with consortium partners in the course of the first semester of 2017. The IEE is available to provide comments on such draft as soon as it becomes available.

7.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER4

The next period for the evaluation covers the time from March 2017 to December 2017. The assessment will be based on deliverables that have been finalised by month 48 (December 2017). The list includes:

- D1.5 Project Infrastructure Report 3,
- D1.8 Scientific Coordination Report 3,
- D5.1 Social Media Mobilization Report,
- D5.2 Best Practice Platform and Stakeholder Portal Report,
- D5.3 Local Initiative Report,
- D6.3 High Level Policy Forum Report 3,
- D6.6 Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin Report 3,
- D7.4 Web Portal Report 2,
- D7.6 Media Report 2,
- D7.8 Science Communication Report 2,
- D7.10 Summer School Report 2,
- D7.11 GP Award Report
- D7.12 Liaison with the Comenius Programme Report,
- D7.13 Gender Issue Platform Report,



- D7.14 Research and Innovation Newsletter Report,
- D7.16 Final publishable Summary Report,
- D7.17 Final Conference Report,
- D8.3 Project Quality Report 3,
- D9.1 Financial Sustainability Plan, and,
- D9.2 Brokerage Event Report.

The next evaluation report ER4 is planned at the end of the project, at a time to be confirmed in September 2017, taking into account the schedule for the production of deliverables and the contractual time frame, within which project costs remain eligible.



ANNEX A': DOCUMENTS CONSULTED

- IEE Inception Report
- First Evaluation Report (ER1)
- Second Evaluation Report (ER2)
- ASSET Document of Work (DoW) – revised version received 3 September 2015
- D1.4 Project Infrastructure Report 2,
- D1.7 Scientific Coordination Report 2,
- D3.3 Action Plan Handbook,
- D3.4 ASSET Tool Box,
- D4.1 Citizens Meeting Preparatory Material,
- D4.2 Citizens Meeting National Material,
- D4.3 Policy Report on Pandemic Consultation & Public trans-national synthesis report,
- D6.2 High Level Policy Forum Report 2,
- D6.5 Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin Report 2,
- D7.7 Science Communication Report 1,
- D7.15 Geneva Music & Science Festival Report, and,
- D8.2 Project Quality Report 2.



ANNEX B': PERSONS INTERVIEWED

- Valentina Possenti (ISS), Scientific coordinator and WP 5 leader – 10 March 2017
- John Haukeland and Lise Bitsch (DBT), WP4 leaders – 9 March 2017



ANNEX C': LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSET

cod	Overall Objective	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
A1	To contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness	Increased population cross-sectoral studies published on pandemic influenza	US National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health (Pubmed) Standards: biennial (2010-2011, 2012-2013, 2014-2015, 2016-2017)	
		Increased research funding in topics related to epidemics/pandemics citizen knowledge, attitudes and practices	EU research budget, national budgets for research Measured at midterm assessment of 2007 to 2013 and end of 2007 to 2013 term; and mid-term assessment 2014 to 2020 term = > 2010, 2014 and 2018	
		National pandemic response and preparedness plans In EU Member States and Associated Countries have included the strategic areas identified by ASSET MMLAP	National pandemic preparedness plans including the strategic areas in EU member states and associated countries Target: 5 plans improved (50% of the member countries represented in the ASSET consortium)	



cod	Specific Objective	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/Assumptions
B1	A partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management is developed	Number of references of ASSET work in strategic documents relating to science, research and policy	High level documents in the area of pandemics in the EU, member States and Accession Countries	ASSET MMLAP is supported by national governments and international organisations dealing with health policy and management, including pandemics
		Number of actions related to ASSET that have been implemented		
B2	SiS-related issues in global pandemics explored and mapped	Number of topics identified in the strategic plan that receive massive response in mobilisation actions (WP4 and WP5)	36 months' scientific coordinator report	Scientific community and health experts adopt recommendations
		Degree of acceptance of the MMLAP conceptual map by the civil society	Social Media quarterly and interim report	
B3	Participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed developed	Topics and terminology introduced by ASSET extensively used in the social dialogue	Social network reports (Facebook, Twitter)	Social dialogue is structured in a way to lead to concrete recommendations
		Number and degree of influence of policies produced with input from citizens (coming from project events and/or use of social networks) (WP5)	Local initiatives attendance database	Local stakeholders carry out an effective mobilization campaign



WP	cod	Results	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
WP1	C1	Transparent and participatory discussion facilitated, allowing multi-actor cooperation and transfer of knowledge among partners	Number of topics debated and concluded in the ASSET web platform <u>Computation</u> Topics where broader consensus is reached over number of open discussion threads in ASSET platform <u>Value</u> 30% each year	Moodle statistics for the ASSET web platform	Partners use common approaches and cooperation to promote ASSET conclusions
	C2	Common terminology adopted and used	Cases where differences of interpretations persist (to be minimised) <u>Computation</u> Number of scientific/technical terms for which different meanings are attributed by consortium experts <u>Value</u> Below 0.5% of ASSET Glossary entries		
WP2	C3	Baseline knowledge on state of the art developed - key problem areas identified in the cross-cutting topics of WP2 ⁸	References to key findings (of WP2 deliverables) made in Strategic Plan and other policy related work <u>Computation</u> Major themes developed in deliverables of WPs 3, 4 and 5 that are closely linked to key findings of WP2 <u>Value</u> On average 3 per deliverable for deliverables of WPs 3, 4	Project deliverables, especially those of WP3, 4 and 5	Baseline knowledge is disseminated and used by research and policy making stakeholders in epidemics and pandemics
WP3	C4	Strategic plan (SP) and action plan to address the main problematic issues identified in WP2	Subsequent actions in the project are based on the ASSET strategy and action plan <u>Computation</u> Per cent of project actions based on the ASSET strategy and action plan	18 -36 months' SC report Monitoring reports	Targeted stakeholders adhere to strategic objectives and participate/contribute to the implementation of the action plan
WP6	C5	Consensus achieved within the HLPF on the main strategic lines identified in the SP	Strategic Plan main lines endorsed by the HLPF <u>Computation</u> Per cent of strategic lines endorsed by HLPF <u>Value</u> ≥75%	HLPF reports	The majority of the MS participating in ASSET are represented within the HLPF



⁸ (1) governance of flu pandemics, (2) unsolved scientific questions in influenza and pandemics, (3) Research results and democratic institutions, (4) Ethical, legal and societal aspects, (5) gender issues, and, (6) risk on intentional outbreaks.



WP	cod	Results	Indicator Definition	Verification Source	Conditions/ Assumptions
WP4	C6	Workshops in the 8 countries planned in the DoW lead to recommendations for policy making	Concrete recommendations to policy makers in each of the 8 countries <u>Computation</u> Number of concrete recommendations at the level of policy makers per country <u>Value</u> On average 5 per country	Citizens' consultation meetings database, D.4.2 and D.4.3	National stakeholders in the 8 countries use results of consultations and debates in their work
WP5	C7	ASSET strategic findings and conclusions are used in social media to strengthen actions of participatory decision making	Changes in approaches in social media Policy recommendations coming from Social networks Best practices identified and used for replication <u>Computation</u> Numbers of above <u>Value</u> ≥ 10 on average during third and fourth year	36-48 months' SC report and D5.1	Best practices and recommendations are used to guide policy work in the area of pandemics across the
WP6	C8	Through its composition (outcome of activity level), High Level Policy Forum exerts positive influence on policy-makers at regional, national and EU levels, key decision makers in health agencies and pharmaceutical industry, and civil society organizations	Outreach of reports issued from HLPF meetings <u>Computation</u> Number of reports communicated to high level decision makers <u>Value</u> More than 50 high level decision makers receive each report	D6.1, D6.2, D6.3	Policy makers and other high-level stakeholders use and promote ASSET findings and conclusions
WP8	C9	Independent External Evaluation (IEE) results contribute to attaining ASSET results and specific objectives	Percentage of IEE recommendations that are adopted <u>Computation</u> Per cent of recommendations of IEE adopted <u>Value</u> $\geq 80\%$	18-36-48 months' SC report	Open minded exchanges and trust established between project and IEE
WP9	C10	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan developed	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan receives commitment by Consortium Partners <u>Computation</u> Number of partners engaged to implement ASSET sustainability and exploitation plan <u>Value</u> $\geq 90\%$	D9.1, D9.2, 48 months' SC report	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan is endorsed by HLPF and other high-profile stakeholders



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

ANNEX D': INDICATORS DEFINITION FOR PROJECT ACTIVITIES

WP	cod	Indicator Definition	Value	Verification Source	2014	2015	2016	2017
WP1	D1	Per cent increase of glossary items in the final list compared	≥50%	D1.2 Glossary (initial vs. final version m11)	33%	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
WP7	D2	Annually relative percentage increase of accesses to the	≥15% Accesses (average) in mm 1-6 to the ASSET Website	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	+49%	XX	XX
WP5	D3	BPP/social network significant exchanges of posts and resources	≥100 p/year	Web portal reports and statistics	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP4	D4	ASSET participating countries having carried out the standardized approach to the	≥80%	D4.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP4	D5	The WS has been held	N of WS effectively	D4.3	n.a.	n.a.	XX	XX
WP5	D6	Short monitoring reports on social contents are	≥80% N of monitoring reports	-36-48 months' SC report	n.a.	n.a.	X X	XX
WP5	D7	Annually relative percentage increase of accesses to the SH portal	≥15% N of accesses in mm 1-6 to the SH portal	D7.3	n.a.	n.a.	X X	XX
WP5	D8	Best practice collection and analysis from all ASSET participating countries	≥70% N of ASSET participating countries	D7.7	n.a.	n.a.	X X	XX



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

WP5	D9	Local initiatives gender sensitive/centred carried out in participating countries	≥70% N of ASSET participating countries	D5.3	n.a.	n.a.	X X	XX
WP6	D10	Annual increase of stakeholders receiving the Pandemic Preparedness and Response	≥15% N of stakeholders receiving the PPRB on t ₀ (1st	D6.4, D6.5, D6.6	n.a.	2762 contacts	XX	XX
WP7	D11	Annual increase overall of accesses to the ASSET web portal	≥15% N of accesses to the ASSET web portal in mm1-6	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	+49%	X X	XX
WP7	D12	Annual web portal updates	≥15% N of updates of the ASSET web portal in mm1-6	ASSET Website statistics	n.a.	16,6%	X X	XX

WP	cod	Indicator Definition	Value	Verification Source	2014	2015	2016	2017
WP7	D13	Annual increase in total of views at the ASSET posts/communications on the main social media	≥20% N of views at the ASSET posts on social media in mm1-6	Software statistics	n.a.	+21%	XX	XX
WP7	D14	Periodical publication of the paper	N of Periodical publication of the paper	ASSET Website	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP7	D15	Annual increase in total of accesses to the	≥25% N of accesses to the gender platform in mm1-	ASSET Website	n.a.	*	XX	XX
WP8	D16	Project Quality Reports made available in due time for the ASSET	≥15% Total N of PQ reports	Project quality report	n.a.	*	XX	XX

- Those indicators are not yet calculated due to the late start of project activities