



share and move to face nasty bugs

**TITLE: WP8 EVALUATION**

**SUBTITLE: EX POST EVALUATION REPORT 3**

ASSET Project • Grant Agreement N°612236

# ASSET

Action plan on SiS related issues in Epidemics And Total Pandemics

7<sup>th</sup> 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: **2017-12-31 (m48)**

Submission Date: **2017-12-31 (m48)**



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236

[www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu](http://www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu)



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## DOCUMENT MANAGEMENT

<b>PROJECT FULL TITLE</b>	<b>Action plan on SiS related issues in Epidemics And Total Pandemics</b>
<b>PROJECT ACRONYM</b>	<b>ASSET</b>
	<b>Coordination and Support Action: project funded under Theme SiS.2013.1.2 “Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans”</b>
<b>GRANT AGREEMENT</b>	<b>612236</b>
<b>STARTING DATE</b>	<b>01/01/2014</b>
<b>DURATION</b>	<b>48 months</b>
<p><b>D8.6 Ex Post Evaluation Report 3</b></p> <p><b>Task: T8.2 Ex-post Evaluation</b></p> <p><b>Leader: Absiskey (P1 ABSISKEY) – Other contributors: Istituto Superiore di Sanità (P8 ISS)</b></p>	

### History of changes:

Vn	Status	Date	Organisation / Person responsible	Reason for Change
V1	Draft	08/12/2017	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	-
V2	Draft	13/12/2017	P01 AK	Revisions needed in the document, version sent to the Scientific Coordinator P08 ISS
V3	Draft	15/12/2017	P01 AK/P08 ISS	Revision in the document sent to Crossxculture for revision
V4	Draft	15/12/2017	Crossxculture - External Independent Evaluator (subcontracted)	Integration
V5	Final	31/12/2017	P01 AK	



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## List of abbreviations

ASSET	Action plan in Science in Society in Epidemics and Total pandemics
CoP	Community of Practice
DoW	Description of Work
EC	European Commission
EU	European Union
ER	Evaluation Report (External, in the frame of Task 8.2)
GP	General Practitioner
HLPF	High Level Policy Forum
IEE	Independent External Evaluator/Evaluation
IR	Inception Report
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LF or logframe	Logical framework (model used for outlining a project's intervention logic)
MMLAP	Mobilisation and Mutual Learning Action Plan
PM	Project Management
QO	Quality Officer
RTD	Research and Technological Development
SwafS	Science with and for Society
ToR	Terms of Reference
WP	Work Package
WPL	Work Package Leader



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## Contents

<b>1 Project Information</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Project Data	5
1.2 Project Intervention Logic	5
1.3 Evaluation scope and time-plan	6
<b>2 Findings</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Relevance	7
2.2 Efficiency	9
2.3 Effectiveness	10
2.4 Impact Prospects	11
2.5 Potential Sustainability	11
<b>3 Key observations and recommendations</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1 Key observations	13
3.2 Recommendations	13
<b>Annex A: Deliverables of the final year of the project</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Annex B: Persons interviewed</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Annex C: Logical framework for ASSET</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Annex D: Indicators definition for project activities</b>	<b>21</b>



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## 1 Project Information

### 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 EURO
Total EC grant funds received to date	3,348,898 EURO <sup>1</sup>
Total budget spent	3,308,688 EURO <sup>2</sup>
Financial data as at:	31 October 2017

### 1.2 Project Intervention Logic

The project logframe representation in Annex C is the basis for the external evaluations in the framework of Task 8.2.<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>1</sup> A request to receive updated information was made to ABSISKEY on 08 December 2017.

<sup>2</sup> Same as previous footnote.

<sup>3</sup> Evaluation Report ER2, March 2016.



### 1.3 Evaluation scope and time-plan

The independent external evaluation was 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 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), based on deliverables produced till month 37 (January 2017): the key project development during the reporting period was the conclusion of WP4 - Citizen Consultation. The evaluation assessed the results of WP4 and examined how activities in the last year of the project could maximize the outcomes of ASSET.
- ER4 scheduled on month 48 (this deliverable): the report looks at the overall effects and lessons learned from ASSET. The timing was decided in October 2017<sup>4</sup>, taking into account project progress and related forecasting for the production of deliverables, as well as the contractual time frame. The main source of information is the one coming from interviews with WPLs of WPs that were active in the final year of the project.

---

<sup>4</sup> Correspondence between ABSISKEY and the IEE



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## 2 Findings

### 2.1 Relevance

The Mobilisation and Mutual Learning Action Plan (MMLAP) is a mechanism introduced by the EC in the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme for RTD in order to approach research and innovation related challenges through partnerships with complementary perspectives, knowledge and experiences. ASSET was one of the MMLAPs that was launched focusing on health; it aimed to address the research questions raised by the specific case of H1N1 pandemic and associated crisis management. The project should, among others, contribute to the implementation of "Science in Society"<sup>5</sup> issues in health, namely: public engagement, ethics, gender perspectives, science education, communication and access to and dissemination of scientific information.

The need to develop different forms of dialogue and cooperation between science and society to define adequate policies in the health sector still exists today, as shown by the fact that pandemic and epidemic threats in recent years have received very controversial coverages in the international press, as well as by the very limited scientific background often characterising public discussions on topics such as vaccination and associated gender issues in different EU countries and other parts of the world. In this respect, it is still relevant to invest in MMLAP projects like ASSET that encompass real societal needs and concerns.

The adequacy of project design is a key aspect of the Relevance criterion. While their broad aim is helpful in understanding the purpose of MMLAPs, such projects may sometimes lack detail concerning how certain objectives should be understood, or which characteristics should be embodied in the engagement activities and outputs. As new concepts, MMLAPs do not have clearly prescribed methods and activities, which may lead to different interpretations of what projects should actually achieve. It is for this reason that the IEE has quite extensively worked with the project scientific coordinator to develop the logframe presented in Annex C, in an effort to establish clear links between the different tasks and the higher-level effects ASSET aims to produce<sup>6</sup>.

According to the logframe agreed, ASSET overall objective to contribute to incorporating Science in Society issues into the system of Research and Innovation related to pandemic or epidemic preparedness would be achieved, if three specific objectives could be met: (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.

<sup>5</sup> The topic continues as Science with and for Society (SwafS) in H2020.

<sup>6</sup> Please refer to the IR of the IEE assignment (March 2015) for a detailed presentation of the logframe approach



These specific objectives have been linked to specific tasks of the work programme:

- For B1: effectively addressing identified scientific and societal challenges means that the project work is referenced in strategic documents and actions relating to R&I policy in epidemics/pandemics, which relates to WP2 (identification of topics), the communication actions (WP7), especially science communication (Task 7.5) and the policy actions (WP6).
- For B2: the success in exploring and mapping the identified Science in Society topics is measured by the effectiveness of the MMLAP strategy to create stakeholder mobilisation and participatory approaches (WP3) that, in turn, stimulate the engagement of the targeted stakeholder groups in the actions of WP4 and WP5.
- For B3: the identified Science in Society topics are efficiently addressed if the implementation of the ASSET action plan (WP4, WP5 and WP6) leads to visible effects in actual policy making.

Still on the theme of project design, a detailed KPI system has been developed by the project QO to monitor the implementation of tasks (presented in Annex D). However, as pointed out in ER2 and ER3, the project design should have been further improved by (a) including KPIs for certain activities that, due to their importance, should be followed more closely (for example: number of HLPF members recruited/participating in ASSET actions in WP6, number of ASSET scientific publications targeted in task 7.5, number of participants in the summer schools in task 7.6), and (b) assigning the KPI target values beforehand, so as to have a measure of the degree of achievement when the corresponding action is over. But, more crucially, it was stressed that other indicators had to be included, providing a more qualitative assessment of the activities, like the ones below<sup>7,8</sup>:

- 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 the number of such workshops having been organised (for example, indicators D4 and D9 in Annex D).
- The targeted channels for ASSET scientific publications (for example journals with high impact factor so as to have strong contributions to ASSET impact) other than the ones communicated in the ASSET website.
- The concrete outputs of actions in WPs 4, 5 and 6 in terms of (recommendations for) policy making.

<sup>7</sup> Such qualitative effects should be at least discussed in the deliverables presenting overall progress, like D1.7 and D8.2, as well as the matching deliverables D1.8 and D8.3 that are to be produced at the end of the project.

<sup>8</sup> The IEE was informed that following comments made in ER3, deliverable D7.10 that presents and discusses the II and the III summer school editions includes comments on the qualitative outcomes of these actions.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## 2.2 Efficiency

As indicated by the interviewees (Annex B), all project activities have been concluded, or are expected to be concluded by month 48 (December 2017). Deliverables produced in the first 3 years of the project have been commented upon in the previous evaluation reports. The main achievements out of the numerous actions conducted during this fourth and last year are summarised below.

### Mobilisation and Mutual Learning

Important progress was made in the following areas:

- social media analysis for topics related to health, including mobilization in pandemic emergencies and other relevant topics,
- enrichment of the best practice platform with more policy examples coming from consortium member and other countries,
- local actions, following the example of mobilisation workshops in WP4 or other communication actions; local initiatives have been held in the following cities: Athens, Brussels, Bucharest, Dublin, Geneva, Haifa, Lyon, Milan, Oslo, Rome, Sofia.

### High Level Policy Forum (HLPF)

The HLPF final composition was of 14 members, coming from Bulgaria, Denmark, France, Greece, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Romania, Sweden and the UK. The third physical meeting was held in Brussels and continued discussions on the 3 main topics chosen for the forum, namely: Participatory governance in public health, Ethical issues in pandemic preparedness planning and Vaccination hesitancy.

### Dissemination

The project implemented an ambitious dissemination strategy, enabling to make available a large number of documents, in the form of articles, videos, data-visualisations and news related to the themes elaborated by ASSET. Most of the material has been accessible online through the ASSET website, including its dedicated parts for the Gender Platform and the Scientific Publications.

The ASSET website has been extensively followed over the project duration, especially during the final year where the number of unique visitors was constantly very close and frequently above 10,000 per month, reaching about 15,000 unique visitors in May 2017 to be connected with the organisation of the local actions mentioned above. It is important to note the large share of visitors from the USA, China and India<sup>9</sup>.

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.asset-scienceinsociety.eu/pages/asset-analytics>



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

The CoP, the project online collaboration tool, was also extensively used, having an average monthly use by more than 1,600 times.

### Scientific communications

Overall, ASSET collected 28 papers in English and 6 in other languages, plus a book published by the Haifa University partner.

### Summer school

The third edition of the ASSET summer school was held at ISS in Rome from 30 May to 1 June 2017. It was attended by 30 participants, presenters and attendees from 11 countries. These covered a wide range of health professionals, including general practitioners, public health officers, researchers, medical students and PhD candidates, biostatisticians, journalists and sociologists from public research institutes and private companies.

The main focus of the event was the management of Public Health emergencies of international concern, using different teaching methods, including the analysis of concrete case studies on topics such as vaccination and current vaccine hesitancy, risk assessment applied to Yellow Fever and the impact of risk communication on Ebola Virus Disease spreading in Western Africa. The teaching curriculum and experience gathered could be further utilised by introducing such types of courses in the partner institutions of ASSET.

## **2.3 Effectiveness**

Effectiveness essentially deals with the extent to which project results have been achieved, taking into account their relative importance on the way to attaining the project specific objectives.

Project activities in the last year had a clear focus on results C7 and C8 (Annex C).

For C7, the key issue is to use ASSET strategic findings and conclusions in social media to strengthen actions of participatory decision-making. Taking into account the outcome of WPs 4 and 5, it can be said that ASSET has introduced a concept of how to organise a participatory process to debate on key health policy issues and to analyse related trends. It is clear that more effort would be needed to take into account the specific characteristics of the particular participating groups, so as to be in position to make the transition from observations and exchanges of ideas to recommendations to be considered for policy making.

For C8, the main question is on the level of influence the High Level Policy Forum can exert on policy-makers at regional, national and EU levels. Such question can only be answered on a longer-term basis, depending on the use of the HLPF recommendations in actual decision/policy making at these levels.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

The IEE considers that an missed opportunity, not discussing the continued engagement of HPLF members and participants to pursue such objectives after the project.

## 2.4 Impact Prospects

The expected impact of ASSET essentially concerns citizen awareness and knowledge transfer. Specific positive effects are in the following directions:

- Methods and tools to conduct citizen consultation, following the example of work conducted in WP4
- Information on best practices, analyses and other scientific contributions of ASSET that can be used by scientists, health practitioners and policy makers in their work
- Increased scientific skills and networking of most ASSET partners that may lead to follow-up research work.

## 2.5 Potential Sustainability

Sustainable results can be considered to be:

- the information produced and stored in the ASSET website and CoP that will be maintained for one year after the end of the project,
- the material used in the ASSET summer school that could form the basis of a course to be included in the curriculum of the education/training services offered by relevant partners
- some project documents, for example the ASSET tool box, provided that the material is enriched in terms of context and use-cases, so that potential users can readily benefit from it (please refer to ER3, where this aspect was discussed in more detail)
- the ASSET Glossary that has been enriched and was extensively used during the project

The issue of sustainability is currently under examination: a synthesis is being prepared on the basis of the exploitation ideas provided by the Consortium partners following a purpose-built questionnaire. However, it became apparent from the interview with the Task 9.1 Leader that the partners are essentially looking for funding opportunities to continue joint project work, as it is recognised that any follow-up would be dependent on available/secured resources. The IEE considers that the best approach for a sustainable continuation would be to formulate 2-3 commonly acceptable strategic ideas around which sustainability actions could be built<sup>10</sup>. Once such a tentative road map is elaborated, it is possible

---

<sup>10</sup> It has been pointed out in ER3 that the legacy/exploitation process has started very late. It would be extremely beneficial for the project to have early drafts of an exploitation 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 volunteered to comment on such drafts, but the offer was not used.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

to examine different funding sources (for example the philanthropy sector could be solicited, in addition to the European Structural and Investment Funds that support health-related innovation initiatives in a number of EU member states) and appropriate partnering schemes.



## 3 Key observations and recommendations

### 3.1 Key observations

ASSET had the ambitious objective of enhancing participatory approaches in the development of efficient policies and measures to address situations of epidemics / pandemics at the level of the EU and its Member States. The project suffered initial delays due to important changes in the consortium composition (including changing the project coordinator and, at a later stage, the scientific coordinator), but was able to react and reach its timely completion. An efficient administration scheme has supported the project implementation according to the standard EC rules throughout its duration.

The project has produced a large number of outputs that have been useful for the partners and the external stakeholders involved in the project activities. In this respect, it is important to stress the extensive outreach achieved by the project through its communication activities and the citizen consultation events conducted throughout the EU.

The project was successful in demonstrating the feasibility of the participatory processes as inputs to policy making, but less so of their positive effects. This is probably because for the latter much more resources would be needed than those available, but, also, because a stronger focus on results and longer term effects would be needed, as discussed in section 2.1 in relation to the need to include KPIs to assess actions from a qualitative point of view, setting at the same time the measures for success.

Some of the recommendations below could be used for the design of future similar actions, as well as for the finalisation of the ASSET legacy - sustainability that is currently under development.

### 3.2 Recommendations

- The deliverables D1.8 and D8.3 that give overviews of scientific progress and overall achievements should discuss the qualitative aspects of the actions mentioned in point 2.1. The emphasis should be on the originality of approaches and the extent planned results have been achieved, which may provide further input for the impact and follow-up potential of these actions.
- Special attention in the deliverables to be produced should be on outcomes related to policy making: types and importance of recommendations in the general context of epidemics/pandemics, interactions with influential actors and policy makers in the health sector (MEPs, HLPF members, other) and any commitments secured by them.
- Consider the sustainability potential of the summer school. The material could well be used in courses to be offered by one or more partners that offer education/training services.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236

share and move to face nasty bugs

- Develop 2-3 main strategic exploitation areas to be agreed by the consortium and streamline follow-up actions and funding sources around these.
- As in most R&I projects, exploitation plans should be developed early on in the implementation and be updated on the occasion of key project milestones depending on project achievements.
- The logframe methodology is an adequate tool that should be used more often to define the actions and the corresponding levels of effects of MMLAP projects. It enables to assess the relative importance of activities with respect to expected achievements and so to better concentrate effort and direction for maximizing benefits and impact.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## Annex A: Deliverables of the final year of the project

- 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.



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

## Annex B: Persons interviewed

- Veronika Dimitrova (NCIPD), WP 1 leader – 24 November 2017
- Valentina Possenti (ISS), Scientific coordinator and WP 5 & 6 leader – 29 November 2017
- Emmanuel Muhr and Céline Blanchon (ABSISKEY), WP 8 & 10 leaders – 29 November 2017
- Roberta Villa (ZADIG) WP 7 & 9 leader – 29 November 2017
- Olivier de Bardonnèche (ABSISKEY), Task 9.1 Financial Sustainability and Exploitation Plan – 6 December 2017



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



co-funded by the EU. GA: 612236



share and move to face nasty bugs

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 <sup>11</sup>	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

<sup>11</sup> (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
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> $\geq 10$ 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

WP	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> ≥90%	D9.1, D9.2, 48 months' SC report	Financial sustainability and exploitation plan is endorsed by HLPF and other high-profile stakeholders

## 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 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



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
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 <sub>0</sub> (1st Issue)	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%	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