



share and move to face nasty bugs

TITLE: WP8 EVALUATION

SUBTITLE: EX POST EVALUATION REPORT 1

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); The International Emergency Management Society AISBL (P10 TIEMS).**

Nature: **Report**

Dissemination: **PU**

Contractual delivery date: **2015-06-30 (m18)**

Submission Date: **2015-10-14 (m22)**

This project has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no 612236



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	03/09/2015	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	-
V2	Final	12/10/2015	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	Revisions needed in the document



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	5
1. INTRODUCTION.....	6
1.1 Project data	7
1.2 Project Intervention Logic.....	7
2. FINDINGS	9
2.1 Relevance	9
Relevance of the Project.....	9
Quality of Design.....	9
2.2 Efficiency	10
2.3 Effectiveness.....	11
2.4 Impact Prospects.....	11
2.5 Potential Sustainability.....	12
3. KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	12
3.1 Key observations.....	12
3.2 Recommendations	12
3.3 Follow up required	13
3.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER2	13
ANNEXES	15
Annex A: List of documents consulted.....	15
Annex B: Persons interviewed	15
Annex C: Tentative Logical framework proposed by ASSET Scientific Coordinator	16
Further comments	23
Overall objective.....	23
Specific objective – purpose	23
Results.....	23
Risks and assumptions.....	24



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.



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASSET	Action plan in Science in Society in Epidemics and Total pandemics
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DFR	Draft Final Report
DoW	Description of Work
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
ER	Evaluation Report
FP	Framework Programme
FR	Final Report
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
IEE	Independent External Evaluator/Evaluation
IR	Inception Report
LF	Logical framework (Logframe)
MMLAP	Mobilisation and Mutual Learning Action Plans
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PI	Principal Investigator
PM	Programme Management
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”
ToR	Terms of Reference
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader



1. INTRODUCTION

This document is the first Ex Post Evaluation Report (ER1) of the Independent External Evaluation (IEE) that is prepared with the objective to look at the achievements of the project during its implementation in the the first reporting period. The results achieved are particularly important, as they set the ground and the conditions of success for the development of the Action Plan in WP3 that has been initiated 4 months before the end of the first reporting period.

This first assessment is based on deliverables that have been finalised and submitted within the first reporting period. The list includes:

- D1.2 Glossary and Terminology
- D2.1 Governance Report
- D2.2 Reference Guide on Scientific Questions
- D2.3 Crisis Participatory Governance Report
- D2.4 Ethics, Law and Fundamental Rights Report
- D2.5 Report on Gender Issues
- D2.6 Report on Intention Caused Outbreaks
- D6.1 HLPF Report 1
- D8.1 Quality Report 1

The ASSET Description of Work (DoW) and the IEE Inception Report were also used for the assessment work.

Beside the systematic and objective evaluation of the project, the IEE has put additional emphasis on identifying practical, constructive and forward-looking recommendations that could guide possible future interventions on the research topics and approaches related to epidemics and pandemics.

In close cooperation with the Consortium, a logical framework is being developed for ASSET, along with the associated indicators (see Annex C Tentative Logical framework proposed by ASSET Scientific Coordinator). The report is concluded with additional comments and recommendations by the IEE to improve the construction of the logical framework.



1.1 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	1.904.275,33 EURO
Total budget spent	353 981 EURO
Financial data as at:	February 2015

1.2 Project Intervention Logic

The logframe template below is the one also included in the IR of the IEE. The Consortium has produced a tentative project logframe that is provided in Annex C. This template will be further developed in close cooperation with the consortium members and will be used as a management tool to be reported against by IEE. It should also take into account the comments of the IEE provided in the present ER 1 report.

	Indicators	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Overall objective To contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness.			
Specific objective / purpose			



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • develop a partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management; • explore and map SiS-related issues in global pandemics; • develop a participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed; 			
<p>Results Higher level deliverables in the DOW and in the Work Packages</p>			
<p>Activities Tasks and lower level deliverables in the DOW and in the Work Packages</p>			



2. FINDINGS

2.1 Relevance

The evaluation criterion Relevance is composed of two aspects, i.e. the Relevance of the project and the Quality of the project design.

Relevance of the Project

The project aims to contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation in relation to pandemic or epidemic preparedness. As shown by the admittedly low level of readiness to respond to crisis situations, such as the H1N1 pandemic in 2009, observed at the level of supranational organisations as the EC and the WHO, as well as national governments, further work in this area is fully justified. The overall objective and ASSET's specific objectives are therefore valid and relevant.

Quality of Design

ASSET is a complex project with a large number of consortium members contributing to its input and being reliable and accountable for the joint results to be achieved. Thus it was indicated from the very start of the IEE assignment and duly noted in the IR submitted in March 2015 that the project needs to develop a complete logic model as a management tool that is understood by all consortium members.

This logic model should describe the different levels of effects, starting from activities and leading to the specific and overall objectives. It is commonly accepted that a project should reach the set goals at the specific objective level and should contribute to the overall objectives by the end of the intervention.

The Logframe (LF) approach was suggested by the ASSET quality management and coordination at an early stage of the project, but was not taken up by the majority of the consortium members.²

The LF is particularly useful to manage, implement and evaluate a complex project such as ASSET, as it provides a means to determine the relative importance of each of the 59 project deliverables, and providing evidence for the degree of progress made compared to what was anticipated and the results achieved. Furthermore it is a means to clarify how the different tasks are combined in a way that enables the project to achieve the expected results, outcomes and impact.

Following the Geneva consortium meeting in February 2015, it was agreed that the Consortium will develop the Project LF according to the template provided in section 1.2 above. The main reason for the decision to have the LF prepared by the Consortium was that the partners have to assume ownership (and accountability) for the deliverables they are responsible for or jointly contributing to, and for the specific objectives/purpose the project aims to achieve. This is a key enabling factor to effectively achieving objectives shared within a multi-partner Consortium striving for transdisciplinary results.

² Critical reference was made also by the quality manager within D 8.1, Quality Report 1 of August 2015: "The Logical Framework Analysis table included in the questionnaire was completely ignored".



A draft LF³; received by IEE on 30 April 2015, is attached as version commented by IEE in Annex C. The IEE has asked for clarification with regards to the involvement of other Consortium members in the elaboration of this document; the scientific coordinator confirmed that the version was circulated to the consortium members; it remained unclear which consortium members actively contributed to the result.

As the quality of design dimension of the evaluation is very closely related to questions regarding the clarity of objectives, purpose and results, as well as appropriateness of the project design in relation to the needs to be addressed, the comments of the IEE to the LF are presented in this section.

The quality of the design as it stands, in particular its indicators and sources of verification and the lack of risks and assumptions, is not up to standard and needs further improvement without further delay.

2.2 Efficiency

The project has suffered a delay of 6-8 months due to changes in the partnership structure that occurred shortly after the official project start date (January 2014). The kick off meeting took place in Month 6 / June 2014 and a revised work plan was submitted to the Commission thereafter. The IEE was informed by the project management⁴ that in July 2015 the Commission gave unofficially a positive signal regarding the revised DoW submitted. The official letter of approval is expected to be received shortly.

The revisions mainly concern the durations of WP 2 and 3 that are extended by three months, while the remaining WPs are unchanged in their timeline.

The project scientific coordinator considers the use of the Community of Practice (CoP), the project's electronic cooperation platform, by a significantly increasing number of project team members as a very positive sign for the efficiency of cooperation.

The first Quality Report submitted under WP8, D 8.1, expressed generally a positive assessment on the project implementation, nevertheless called for improvements in the following areas:

- The project Quality Forms are currently not being used by all project partners in charge of tasks and WPs; this point relates to the discussion on the Logframe (mentioned in section 2.1 above), part of the quality forms; such information would be very useful in establishing links between the activities, WP results and the different levels of effects;
- Several deliverables were submitted to QO and PI already as a completed/final drafts, restricting the peer reviewer to few amendments rather than allowing them an in-depth revision;
- Available competences as provided in the DOW proved to be insufficient to complete certain tasks at the highest possible level.⁵

³ A "tentative final version of the proposed indicators to the ASSET objectives/purposes and results, plus sources of verification"; email received by ABSISKEY.

⁴ Interview of 28 August 2015 with project manager Emmanuel Muhr and project scientific coordinator Alberto Perra

⁵ As indicated in D8.1.



The deliverables of WP2 already submitted are largely based on the expertise of individual partners assigned to provide the deliverables, which is fully in line with the objective of creating a common understanding of the different issues involved within the Consortium. What is now needed is to process and analyse this information to develop and apply transdisciplinary approaches for the SiS issues involved.

Such approaches constitute the anticipated uniqueness and added value of the project. They are particularly important for the preparation of 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). This aspect can be assessed through deliverables D2.7 and D3.1 (Strategy of the Action Plan) that will be examined in the next evaluation report (ER2).

2.3 Effectiveness

Effectiveness relates to the extent to which set results are achieved or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. It also reflects the degree to which services and products provided by the project have been made available and been demanded by relevant target groups. In this respect, questions of effectiveness can be addressed in a meaningful way once the Logframe has been finalised.

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 aspect that relates to impact at this stage of project implementation is the recruitment of the members of the High Level Policy Group, which remains quite limited for influential stakeholders outside the Consortium Members. If such recruitment remains low, the opportunity to create a channel to efficiently enhance project impact will have been missed.

In the course of interviews with the scientific coordinator and the corresponding task leader it was mentioned that a major difficulty is associated with the resources allocated for compensating travel and subsistence expenses, which does not provide sufficient motivation for distinguished professionals to devote time to ASSET. A new approach is currently being elaborated, based on interactions with the EU Health Security Committee, a high-level forum of the EU Commission. Other forms of strategic cooperation that can foster the impact prospects of the HLPF and help overcoming the perceived financial bottleneck are planned to be elaborated, for example with the Academie Diplomatique International in Paris.⁶

The first HLPF in Brussels had 15 participants, of whom ten were ASSET team members and five external participants. Given that the HLPF should attract high level decision makers in policy, and funds are rather limited, a mix towards external high level decision makers shall be targeted and

⁶ As suggested by the IEE. Contact details have been shared with WP leader and Project Scientific Coordinator.



ASSET team members reduced to a minimum as long as financial resources are scarce, unless ASSET team members are paying via their institutional budget.

2.5 Potential Sustainability

Sustainability shall be ideally engrained in the project implementation from its outset. Activities related to sustainability, called legacy in the DOW, are expressed in WP 9, WT 9.1 will start only in months 37 and will be delivered in month 48.

IEE will discuss potential sustainability when more deliverables are available, in one of the next evaluation reports.

3. KEY OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Key observations

Due to problems associated with changes in the Consortium structure including replacement of the project scientific coordinator, the project started with about half a year delay. The current Evaluation Report assesses progress and perspectives based on management practices already in place and the 8 plus 1⁷ reports already prepared and considered in their final version. It is too early to assess the way these deliverables contribute to project results and objectives as little respective evidence is available.

The IEE regards the elaboration of a Logic Model as an important tool to support project management in monitoring progress and assessing the relative importance of tasks and deliverables with regards to the different levels of effects that are expected to be produced.

The project has gained momentum and partners are engaged in the effort to cover for the time lost. At present, in month 20 of project implementation, it is estimated that by month 30 all deliverables will be available as planned in the original DOW. The new workplan got informally a positive response by the EU Commission, but still needs formal approval by the client. It was discussed with all Consortium partners and is being followed.

3.2 Recommendations

- Project management should include the finalisation of the project logframe in its immediate priorities, and share with the consortium partners, as agreed with the IEE during the discussions prior to the finalisation of the IR. The indicators and corresponding sources of verification proposed in Annex C would need to be reviewed accordingly.
- Specific attention should be given to developing synergies amongst the different practise areas that are represented in the Consortium. Common approaches should be applied in the elaboration of forthcoming deliverables D2.7 and D3.1, which are crucial for the implementation of most of the subsequent WPs.

⁷ HLPF Report 1



- The IEE suggests exploring the possibility to form strategic alliances with organisations that are active in the field of pandemics and would be more closely related to planned objectives of ASSET. One example is the Forum for New Diplomacy of the Academie Diplomatique International (ADI) in Paris, or Agence France de Developpement (AFD) also in Paris, which organised high-profile events on Ebola.⁸ In this way, the lack of financial sources to invite high profile speakers expressed by ASSET / WP leader could be outbalanced, and the direct access to high profile participants could be agreed to on mutually beneficial terms. In any case, attracting influential policy makers should be enhanced by the appropriate promotion of the added value of the project, which is mentioned above, relies on its ability to develop transdisciplinary and inclusive approaches to efficiently address a vital societal risk.
- The deliverables produced so far have undergone the QA process for their internal acceptance. It is noted that enhanced efforts should be made by providing a good quality of the initial drafts.
- The overview in the Quality Report on Quality Indicators (at output level) shall be extended by information about the base line for each of the indicators and reference (% of what baseline?) and by intermediate goals for the WP in particular those running for a longer period. Only in this way measures can be taken in the case of non-achievement. The report should not only provide quantitative results (for ex one report received, or x meetings held), but also information about their quality. The set of indicators should be quantitative and qualitative.

3.3 Follow up required

- Share with IEE the overview of financial expenditure by end of second quarter 2015 ASAP;
- In coordination between ASSET management and IEE, define the dates for the next Evaluation Reports (2 to 4) and agree on how many reports shall be produced overall, aligned with the milestone deliverables of the project.

3.4 Preparation of evaluation report ER2

The next period for the evaluation covers the time from August 2015 to January 2016. It is characterized by the end of WP3 (Milestone 3 - finalization of the Action Plan HB) and the beginning of WP5 (MML).

The assessment will be based on deliverables that have been finalised by month 25 (January 2016). The list includes:

- D1.3 Project Infrastructure Report 1,
- D2.7 Transdisciplinary Workshop report,
- D6.1 High Level Policy Forum Report 1,
- D6.4 Pandemic Preparedness and Response Bulletin Report 1,
- D8.1 Project Quality Report 1,

⁸ Ebola: Policy Responses to Medical Threats; with the Special Representation of the UN Secretary General and Head of the UN Mission for Ebola Emergency Response (UNMEER) in March 2015 in Paris; Ebola: comment s'adapter a une epedemie qui dure? in April 2015, with the French Coordinator for the Ebola Response and the head of the Health and Social Protection of ADF. Both interventions have been copied/extended to ASSET management prior to the events' dates.



- D3.1 Strategic Plan,
- D3.2 Roadmap to Open and Responsible Research and Innovation in Pandemics,
- D3.3 Action Plan Handbook,
- D7.3 Web Portal Report 1,
- D7.5 Media Report 1,
- D7.7 Science Communication Report 1, and,
- D7.9 Summer School Report 1.

The next evaluation report ER2 is planned to be submitted in month 26 (28 February 2016).

All documents shall be available in their final version by end of month 25 (30 January 2016).

A list of interviews will be suggested by IEE after receipt of the documents in early February 2016.



ANNEXES

Annex A: List of documents consulted

- IEE Inception Report
- ASSET Description of Work (DoW)
- D1.2 Glossary and Terminology
- D2.1 Governance Report
- D2.2 Reference Guide on Scientific Questions
- D2.3 Crisis Participatory Governance Report
- D2.4 Ethics, Law and Fundamental Rights Report
- D2.5 Report on Gender Issues
- D2.6 Report on Intention Caused Outbreaks
- D6.1 HLPF Report 1⁹
- D8.1 Quality Report 1

Annex B: Persons interviewed

- Alberto Perra (ISS), Scientific coordinator – 20 July 2015 and 28 August 2105
- Harald Draeger (TIEMS), WP3 and Task 6.1 Leader – 7 August 2015
- Emmanuel Muhr and Celine Blanchon, Project Management – 28 August 2015

⁹ This deliverable was added to the list as it relates to an event in the past which was discussed with WP leader and project coordinator.



Annex C: Tentative Logical framework proposed by ASSET Scientific Coordinator

	Indicators	Sources of Verification	Risks and Assumptions
Suggestions of IEE	<p><i>Indicators that can be used to assess how the project contributed in attaining the overall objective need to be defined. It is in this way that evaluation questions dealing with what can be reasonably achieved within the project time frame can be adequately answered. Such indicators could be selected from the indicative list below :</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Increased Research funding in topics related to epidemics/pandemics;</i> <i>• New approaches for addressing epidemics/pandemics established;</i> <i>• Contingency plans to confront epidemics/pandemics at national EU level reviewed.</i> <p><i>The issues that need to be taken into account when defining corresponding indicators at the level of specific objectives should include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• the strength and sustainability of the links formed amongst the partners of the Consortium and other stakeholders that are mobilised in the course of the project;</i> <i>• the thoroughness as well as the degree of acceptability by as many</i> 	<p><i>The corresponding sources of verification for indicators like the ones on the left could be:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• reviews by the WHO, the OECD and the EC;</i> <i>• strategy documents of the EU or at national level on Research & Innovation in relation to Life Sciences and Health Care.</i> 	<p><i>Risks and Assumptions give the opportunity to: (a) identify external factors that may influence the project implementation but remains outside the control of the project; and (b) formulate a number of hypotheses on how factors may affect the different levels of effects.</i></p> <p><i>Risks and assumptions can be defined for each level of the LF other but on the overall objectives level.</i></p>



	<p><i>stakeholders as possible of results relating to the mapping of SiS issues identified by the project;</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the capacity of the strategy proposed by the project to efficiently address the SiS issues.</i> 		
<p>Overall Objective</p> <p>To contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness.</p>			
<p>Specific Objective / Purpose</p> <p>1. develop a partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management;</p>	<p>6-8 months initial delay in project activities recovered (STANDARD (ST): delay cancelled by month 30th)</p> <p>activity of web based community of practice for developing project activities and producing timely deliverables (ST: at least 1 access/day/member, at least 1 resource made available/3months/member)</p>	<p>Deliverables release to the EC</p> <p>ASSET Moodle statistics 18-36-48 months' scientific coordinator report</p>	<p>To be filled in</p>



<p>2. explore and map SiS-related issues in global pandemics;</p> <p>3. develop a participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed.</p>	<p>quality and exhaustiveness of the 6 WP2 thematic reports (ST: according to a predisposed evaluation grid)</p> <p>update of a conceptual map coming out by the social media mobilization report (ST: biannual)</p> <p>citizens participating in citizens meetings (WP4) effectively consulted (ST: participating/expected, according to the DOW)</p> <p>participation in the local initiatives (WP5) (ST: participating/expected, according to the DOW)</p>	<p>18 months' scientific coordinator report</p> <p>SM quarterly ad interim report</p> <p>Citizen's consultation meetings database</p> <p>Local initiatives attendance database</p>	
<p>Results</p>	<p>WP1</p> <p>glossary items added to the initial list to get the final version (ST: percentage increase 50% compared to the initial number)</p> <p>average monthly number of messages posted on the web based asset platform (ST: at least 100)</p> <p>annually relative percentage increase of</p>	<p>Initial and final version of the glossary</p> <p>Asset moodle statistics</p> <p>Site statistics</p>	



	<p>accesses registered to the ASSET site (ST: at least 15%)</p> <p>WP2 Issues arisen by the 6 reports and within the TDW effectively exploitable for the strategic plan preparation (ST: at least 50%)</p> <p>WP3 Strategic Plan objectives endorsed by the High Level Policy Forum (ST: at least 70%)</p> <p>Strategic Plan objectives endorsed by the citizens' consultation (ST: at least 70%)</p> <p>Proportion of Strategic Plan objectives endorsed by the Stakeholder portal (ST: at least 70%)</p> <p>WP4 ASSET participating countries' having carried out the standardized approach to the public consultation (ST: at least 80%)</p>	<p>18 -36 months' scientific coordinator report</p> <p>HLPF reports</p> <p>Citizen's consultation meetings database</p> <p>Stakeholders portal reports and statistics</p> <p>Asset Deliverable 4.3 report</p>	
--	--	---	--



	<p>ASSET participating countries' Parliaments being involved with the exercise of participatory governance (ST: at least 60%)</p> <p>WP5 social content produced within the social media mobilization (ST: at least 50)</p> <p>annually relative percentage increase of accesses registered to the stakeholder portal (ST: at least 15%)</p> <p>best practice collection and analysis from all ASSET participating countries (ST: at least 70%)</p> <p>local initiatives women friendly carried out (ST: at least in 70% of participating countries)</p> <p>WP6 Increase of representativeness degree of ASSET participating countries into the HLPF (ST: at least for 60% of participating countries)</p>	<p>Asset Deliverable 4.3 report</p> <p>36-48 months' scientific coordinator report</p> <p>ASSET site statistics</p> <p>D5.2 deliverable report</p> <p>D5.3 deliverable report</p> <p>D6.1, D6.2, D6.3 deliverable report</p>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>Annual increase in the list of stakeholders receiving the Pandemic Preparedness and Response bulletin (ST: at least by 15%)</p> <p>WP7 Annual increase in total accesses to the Asset web portal (ST: at least by 15%)</p> <p>Annual increase of web portal updates (ST: at least 15%)</p> <p>Annual increase in total views of the ASSET posts/communications in the main social media (ST: at least by 20%)</p> <p>Annual increase in total views of the Science Communication site (ST: at least by 15%)</p> <p>Annual increase in total accesses to the Gender Platform (ST: at least 25%)</p> <p>WP8 Project Quality Reports made available in due time for the ASSET CoP (ST: at least 80%)</p>	<p>D6.4, D6.5, D6.6 deliverable report</p> <p>Site statistics</p> <p>Site statistics</p> <p>Software statistics</p> <p>Site statistics</p> <p>Site statistics</p> <p>Project quality report D8.1, D8.2, D8.3</p>	
--	--	--	--



	<p>Timely and thorough discussion of the list of IEE recommendations on Asset CoP platform after evaluation report delivery (ST: according to a predisposed evaluation grid)</p> <p>WP9 Quality and efficiency of the financial sustainability plan (ST: according to a predisposed evaluation grid)</p>	<p>18-36-48 months' scientific coordinator report</p> <p>48 months' scientific coordinator report</p>	
Activities			To be filled in

Further comments

Further comments for developing the logframe are presented below.

Overall objective

The project aims to contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation in relation to pandemic or epidemic preparedness. As shown by the admittedly low level of readiness to respond to crisis situations, such as the H1N1 pandemic in 2009, observed at the level of supranational organisations as the EC and the WHO, as well as national governments, further work in this area is fully justified. The overall objective of ASSET is, therefore, valid.

Specific objective – purpose

The project largely builds on the conclusions of the HEG report that called for a multidisciplinary approach to better understand the issues involved not only in terms of scientific research, but also in the various degrees of interactions that may strongly influence governance approaches, with special attention to efficient crisis management practices.

In this respect, it is fully justified to define the following specific objectives:

- develop a partnership with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences to address effectively scientific and societal challenges raised by pandemics and associated crisis management;
- explore and map SiS-related issues in global pandemics; and develop a participatory and inclusive strategy to succeed.

Results

For the purposes of the LF results should be defined in a way to assess how work conducted in each WP serves its purpose in relation to linked activities in other WPs and/or in achieving the project specific objectives.

By illustrating the proposed approach, when dealing with an important project workshop the result should be linked to the degree of knowledge shared or impact of decisions taken and not to the mere fact that the workshop has taken place.

The following observations that specifically focus on WP1 and 2 could be used by the project partners to propose a concise set of expected Results and associated Indicators.

WP1 aims at creating a common approach for partners coming from different disciplines. This is to be achieved first by the elaboration of a common Glossary and Terminology (Deliverable D1.2) and then by continuous interaction on different topics as these emerge from the different project activities. Conducted in parallel for the first year of the project, WP2 sets the baseline knowledge in different dimensions of epidemics that have been pre-selected to include patterns of governance in pandemics



and epidemics with special attention to participatory governance in crisis management, unsolved scientific questions, ethics and gender issues, as well as a taxonomy of issues related to intentionally caused outbreaks. The independent investigations on these topics lead to a transdisciplinary workshop and a corresponding deliverable D2.7, whose conclusive chapter “enlightens the main findings, included points of agreement and disagreement” as stated in the DoW.

Key results from the two WPs should relate to:

- the degree to which transdisciplinary teams come to work together, as measured, for example, by the importance of the topics and the common approaches that are developed,
- the degree of acceptance of conclusions within the consortium and by external stakeholders,
- the positive contribution of deliverables such as D1.2 and D2.7 for the work to be conducted in the other WPs and more particularly WP3, 4 and 6.

Risks and assumptions

In the LF representation the column Risks and Assumptions gives the opportunity to: (a) identify external factors that may influence the project implementation but remain outside the control of the project; and (b) formulate a number of hypotheses on the way such factors may affect the different levels of effects.

Hypotheses on risks and assumptions can be defined for each level of effect other but on overall objective level - as the highest level in the LF hierarchy - in a way to adapt to the logical process indicated below:

- once certain preconditions are met, the project activities can start;
- once the activities have been carried out and the formulated hypotheses/assumptions hold true, results will be achieved;
- once the results and the hypotheses at this level are fulfilled, the project specific objectives will be achieved;

once the specific objectives are achieved and the assumptions made at this level hold true, also contributions to the achievement of the overall objective are expected to have been made by the project.