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# Introduction

The present deliverable concerns the first sub deliverable to be implemented within the framework of the 24/09/2018 contract between the National Confederation of Disabled People of Greece - Branch of Ioannina and IDIMON – Development Consultants under the project deliverable D1.1.3 “Internal Evaluation and Quality Control”, and presents the proposed methodology to be used for the project’s quality assessment. Through this external service a Quality Manager was assigned to the Project for setting up an internal evaluation procedure of the project and for monitoring the quality of all project outcomes and activities.

This quality assessment effectively is a form of an internal evaluation focused on the quality auditing of the project outputs submitted as official deliverables in the framework of the implementation of the Interreg IPA CBC «Greece – Albania 2014-2020 project titled «Public awareness, Preparedness, Participation and Coordination for Civil Protection for All» with acronym «4PLUS» being co-funded by the European Fund for Regional Development and national funding resources of Greece and Albania. The quality assessment will be conducted in two phases one leading to a separate evaluation report the interim and the final report respectively.

The first part of the present document explains the aim of the evaluation / quality assessment. The second part describes what is to be evaluated namely the project deliverables to be prepared per Work Package and per Partner, and in the third part, the materials and tools used for the evaluation are mentioned. The next section outlines the main steps of the assessment exercise itself and the forth part presents the methodology framework which concerns the auditing processes that will be followed for assessing the quality of each and every deliverable submitted as part of the implementation against the specifications defined in the official project documents especially in the Application Form (project objectives) and in the Specification of Budget (description of activities) as well as against the quality standards formulated herein. Also, a time plan of is elaborated and presented concerning the scheduling of the two evaluation reports.

# Aim of the Evaluation

Evaluation is an integral part of the monitoring and reporting that feeds the decision-making process and supports organizational learning. The project team, the partners involved in the project and the wider stakeholders benefit from this continuous learning process. A weak evaluation exercise is a lost opportunity for all to learn and to use this knowledge to improve.

On one hand, one essential purpose of the evaluation process is learning, on the other hand, it is also expected to produce substantive ideas on how to improve the reviewed activities. Although learning, in itself, may be regarded as valuable, its real importance lies in the translation of new knowledge into better practice. If learning is not expected to enhance the project’s performance or contribute to practical improvement in some other way, there would hardly be a justification for spending money and effort on evaluations.

Organizational learning does not just happen only during the evaluation process but takes place also during the implementation and feeds back into the entire project cycle. A monitoring and evaluation system should be established during the project design stage to gather information that helps partners and project management to continuously learn together and improve their development interventions.

The evaluation is instrumental in the achievement of the following aims:

* Providing project partners and possible key stakeholders with the information needed to guide the project strategy towards achieving set goals and objectives
* Providing early warning of activities and processes that need corrective action
* Helping empower project partners by creating opportunities for them to reflect critically on the project’s direction and decide on improvements
* Building understanding, motivation and capacity amongst those involved in the project
* Assessing progress to enable reporting requirements to be met
* Assessing distribution of benefits among different beneficiaries

What the present evaluation assigned to the Quality Control Manager seeks to find out is if and to what extent the intervention (4PLUS project) has produced the outputs (deliverables) that it was intended to produce and to what degree the quality standards have been met. It involves a quality review and assessment of the project deliverables and hence of the actual implementation and overall project performance.

# The Evaluated Intervention (what is to be evaluated)

In this section the evaluated intervention is presented in more detail namely, the project’s aim and purpose, the project rationale, its anticipated outcomes, and its activities per work package and per partner that should be accompanied with a specific deliverable.

The National Confederation of Disabled People of Greece - Branch of Ioannina, participates as the second project beneficiary (PB2) in the implementation of the project under the title **«Public awareness, Preparedness, Participation and Coordination for Civil Protection for All»** and acronym **4PLUS**. The rest of the project beneficiaries are the Urban Research Institute) participating as Lead Beneficiary, the Regional Union of Municipalities of Epirus (PB3), the Municipality of Berat (PB4) and the Management Agency of Northern Pindos National Park (PB5).

The main aim of the 4PLUS project is to improve the accessibility of natural and cultural heritage in the cross-border (CB) area, and collect and promote internationally accurate information for senior tourists and tourists with disabilities and their families. Since accessibility is directly linked to sustainability, the project will also help to improve capacity to sustainably use of natural and cultural resources in the CB area. Moreover, it will promote cultural and natural assets (indirectly) and contribute to growth in the tourist business sector.

The project is aiming to develop a series of actions and tools to support the improvement of the tourist product and relevant services of both areas by developing the heritage resources and improving their accessibility to persons with disabilities and reduced mobility in general, in the frame of the common goal of the CB region for sustainability. As it is mentioned in the Diagnostic Analysis-Environment of the present Programme, important natural resources have not been sufficiently exploited for development purposes in the past.

The proposed actions of the Project through the improvement of the accessibility of the significant natural and cultural heritage of the CB region aim to attract a so far underestimated but now emerging tourism market's segment; that of tourists with disabilities and reduced mobility in general -already recognized at international level as qualitative and loyal tourists - who thus could enjoy a complete and memorable tourist experience and boost local economy as well.

The proposed interventions aim at transforming the Municipalities of the region into model destinations for Tourism for All, with a strong branding of Universal Access to infrastructure, communication-information and services, resulting ultimately into a clear contribution to the economy, social inclusion, and sustainable development across the Programme area.

The main outputs of 4PLUS include:

• Preliminary actions (lists of cultural assets, natural beauty, relative infrastructure/services/activities, accessible structures of tourist interest of the closest communities) and assessment of their accessibility to PwD.

• Joint study and pilot actions, common management plans, strategies and approaches for the protection and sustainable development of assets in the CB (including accessible foot/road routes design)

• Development of cultural assets and natural environment accessibility standards and of a good practices manual for their sustainable development

• Innovative actions based on the “Design For All” concept in Berat (see BoQ of PB4) and across the Park of Pindos (see BoQ of PB5)

• Promotional systems and tools: including (a) the Creation of two multilingual fully accessible to People with Disabilities (PwD) portals (one for Epirus, and one for Berat), offering interactive tour material and accessibility information to potential and actual visitors, (b) two mobile apps for offering navigation support and accessibility information of the visitors of Berat and Pindos, and (c) a Printed guide of accessible to PwD routes and points of interest within the CB area, to be distributed to businesses, agents, etc. – reproduction of the guide in multiple alternative formats accessible to different types of disability.

• Awareness and capacity building actions:

• disability awareness campaign towards the local population and entrepreneurs

• workshops for tourism professionals of the CB area

• workshops for authorities and organizations in the CB responsible for the protection management and promotion of assets of cultural and natural heritage

• creation of a policy recommendation paper for the best support of senior tourists and tourists with disabilities.

• Methodologies to collect data about tourism statistics, activities, motives and visitor management systems

The table that follows presents all the implementation activities linked to a specific deliverable that is to be submitted and included in the quality assessment process. Some of the activities are not separate deliverables and are combined with others in order to formulate a joint deliverable with more than one partners involved in which case there is one partner leading the joint activities and who is responsible for submitting the final version of the deliverable as well as for its quality reporting.

Eight out of total 53 deliverables are included in the table. The selection of the deliverables to be evaluated was based on the rationale of efficiency namely, minimizing the time and effort put by the Quality Control Group members while at the same time maximizing the quality and the of the assessment results. Moreover, the deliverables to be selected should be the most representative and significant between all project deliverables in terms of project implementation performance. Therefore, the WP1 deliverables which deal with the project management and administration were all left out because this project implementation aspect will be already assessed by other means such as the official progress reports and the meetings minutes. Also, the WP2 i.e. the publicity and communication deliverables were not included in the analysis due to their nature meaning the absence of a final tangible deliverable such as a document or a tool etc. (with the exception of D2.x.1 – communication plan which although being a document has to a large extent a standardized form).

All these deliverables when completed and officially submitted are essentially what needs to be reviewed in terms of quality standards by the responsible partner and eventually be included in the evaluation reports prepared by the Quality Manager.

***Table 1.*** *Deliverables to be evaluated*

| **Del. number** | **Partner** | **(sub)Deliverables Description (specification)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **WP 2** | **LB** |  |
| D2.x.1 | **PB2** | **Project Communication Manager.**  PB2 will be overall Activity Leader. This expert will be required to cover the position of the Project Communicaiton Manager, gathering all partners' input and elaborating of the final project communication plan and monitoring the proper implementaiton of the plan by all partners throughout the project lifecycle. The Communication Strategy identifies stakeholders, lists communication channels and provides a framework for disseminating project results. Its purpose is to ensure a continuous, formalised information flow to stakeholders in order to maximise awareness on the project and to establish links with other projects & networks as well as fine-tuning of the project’s communication plan presenting the communication and dissemination strategy |
| D2.x.5 | **PB2, PB3** | **One (1) Joint Advocacy & Lobbying Event.**  This service is about the organisation of one (1) 1-day Advocacy & Lobbying event in Corfu to promote a paradigm shift towards inclusive CP practices, and towards addressing the following issues:  For Direct Beneficiaries: Low awareness of inclusive CP practices, while information and lessons learned are not shared across agency lines and therefore, experience does not enlighten the development of new practices.  For target groups: Lack of awareness is one of the major factors causing PwD and elderly not to understand / comprehend disaster and its consequences.  **Joint Advocacy & Lobbying Campaign.**  This service will undertake the responsibility to organise and conduct educational visits to schools, universities, special care centers, etc. in Ioanian Islands.  **Joint Advocacy & Lobbying Campaign.**  This service will undertake the responsibility to (a) organise and conduct educational visits to schools, universities, special care centers, etc. in West Macedonia, (b) to organize a media campaign (radio-spot, spot for local TV). |
| **WP 3** |  |  |
| D3.x.1 | **LB, PB6** | **Joint Cross-Border Study.**  LB1 will be the overall Activity Leader, gathering all partners' input by providing coordination, methodology, administration and compiling the final study-report entitled "Joint Cross-Border Study". The purpose of this study is to provide the Consortium with a critical analysis and recommendations which will enable it: (a) to assess the need and potential added-value of an inclusive multi-hazard strategy on disaster prevention within the CB area; (b) to identify the potential basic requirements of such a strategy; and; (c) to localize persons with disabilities and reduced mobility living in the area autonomous or in institutions (special concentrations) and their real needs in relation to existing supporting facilities and rescue means (d) to localize available relevant infrastructure and define possible needs for accessibility’s improvement as well as needs for accessible temporary accommodation and; (d) to suggest possible policy options. The activity involves (a) Telephone survey in Greece (over 1000 people), (b) Web/mail survey addressed to target group members in Greece, (c) questionnaire based survey for Greek-side CP stakeholders, (d) data consolidation and analysis for both countries (e) Translation of final report in Greek and Albanian.  **Telephone-based Survey.**  PB6 will provide data collection from own territory, translation, input and review the produced materials, for the compiling the final study-report entitled "Joint Cross-Border Study". The activity involves a telephone-based survey in Albania (over 1000 people), including reporting in English. |
| D3.x.5 | **PB4** | **One (1) Infoday in Gjirokastër.**  PB4 will be responsible for the organization of one Infoday (general public in Gjirokastër), with broadcasting online,  **Three (3) 2-days courses for CP authorities.**  This special course will be for CP authorities – local governments and public agencies (Vlore, Gjirokaster, Berat, Korce), including instructions about preparedness as well as checklists and disability-specific planning information. responsibilities, behaviour, meeting points, pre- or post-disaster evacuations arrangements and accessible collective centres (emergency camps/shelters, rest centres and temporary dormitories), Occupant Emergency Plan (OEP) for major buildings, etc.  **Four (4) 1-day workshops for citizens and families.**  These workshops (Vlore, Gjirokaster, Berat, Korce) will offer instructions about preparedness as well as checklists and disability-specific planning information, information about local emergency services, municipal pre-registration programs, particular local or regional warning systems and hazards, evacuation plans and procedures, and where to turn for instructions in the event of an emergency, recommendations on how families can manage emergencies and work on their own rescue plan, especially in the presence of persons with disabilities and the elderly) - focus on emergency preparedness for persons with disabilities in the workplace, at home and in school, self-assessment tools related to specific disabilities, social environment and social networking.  **One (1) 5-days workshop for helpers in Gjirokaster.**  In this workshop, PB4 will be dealing with the issue of rescue procedures in general and with the rescue of the persons with disabilities in particular:  - how to respond to visual, cognitive, mobility, illness, speech and psychiatric impairments in case of different hazards  - rescue workers need to receive training on how to provide specific assistance to persons with disabilities (Rescuing Injured Disabled Persons in case of Disasters)  - Rehabilitation & Post-disaster challenges (ad-hoc activities, fundraising, psychotherapy, post-traumatic therapy and workshops for victims, as well as support for their families)  - Rapid assessment forms -focus on minimalising risk to the giver or receiver of assistance  - Emergency responders and other carers must be required to maintain a correct, professional and non-discriminatory attitude to people with disabilities at all times |
| **WP 4** |  |  |
| D4.x.2 | **PB2, PB6** | **GIS-enabled Decision Making Platform.**  PB2 will be the overall Activity Leader (with PB6 to be involved from the Albanian side). This service is about the development and establishment of a common GIS-enabled Decision Making Platform. GIS, training and decision making modules: (a) Data Consolidation for GIS (b) GIS maps (Hazards potential, Vulnerability, Preparedness, Overall risk), (c) Observatory (indicators and stats) - Reliable, comprehensive and regular surveillance and monitoring systems should be established - Monitoring systems at regional and local levels in order to assess progress - measures to monitor, evaluate, and deal with discrimination against people with disabilities if it occurs during emergency, disaster or crisis situations and (d) Virtual simulations/training module.  **GIS-enabled Decision Making Platform.**  PB6 will provide consulation, data collection from own territory, translation, input and review the produced materials, for the development of the GIS-enabled Decision Making Platform |
| D4.x.4 | **PB4** | **Mobile Application for Citizens and Tourists.**  PB5 will be the overall Activity Leader, aiming to develop a Mobile Application for Citizens and Tourists  For information, alert and emergency guidance in both typical and accessible formats involving: (a) Pre-impact mode (Prevention): Information & Set-up personal plan (information about local emergency services, municipal pre-registration programs, particular local or regional warning systems and hazards, evacuation plans and procedures, and where to turn for instructions in the event of an emergency) (b) During impact mode (Emergency): Alert system (Portal), Localization, Receiving guidance, etc. - Rapid assessment forms -risk and emergency communication, location and assistance provision (c) After impact mode (c) Exercise mode. The application shall be compatible with all main platforms (Android, iOS, etc.) and accessible to persons with disabilities according to W3C/WAI standards and guidelines |
| **WP 5** |  |  |
| D5.x.2 | **PB4** | **Local Risk Assessment (Identification & Preparedness).**  PB4, with PB6, will co-conduct a Pilot assessment of local preparedness and facilities/services for PwD and elderly persons in Kolonje, in order to identify key issues and gaps. The activity involves collection and expert-based reviewing of Plans and Procedures, Assessment of Infrastructures, Systems, Information Resources, and Services, Interviewing of local disaster management teams, etc. A key aspect of this work, is the set-up of a local team of inspectors, training the inspectors, conducting the field inspections and interviews, and reporting on the findings of the inspections. |
| D5.x.3 | **PB5** | **Pilot Community-based Risk Reduction Measures.**  PB5 will be the overall Activity Leader, aiming Pilot Community-based Risk Reduction Measures. Emphasis on community and human environment, volunteers, and personalised plans will be placed on (a) Pilot migration plans and activities for fragile areas and citizen groups; (b) Local Preparedness and Emergency Plan (3rd Version, i.e., final version), with information on Personalised Alert / Notification / Communication plans (in order to ensure that it is effective, the process of sending out an alarm should be studied in relation to the cognitive and sensorial capacities of each person to be alerted, or the needs of his or her carers); (c) formulation of Pilot personal plans (a Safety specialist to conduct, in cooperation with permanent staff of PB5, hazard risk assessment of fire, earthquake and flood-prone households and lots and provide suggestions for personal plans); (d) pilot local support service (help line- pilot operation 6 months), (e) special information and guidance resources |
| D5.x.5 | **PB3** | **Project sustainability study.**  This service is about planning and specifying the sustainability plan for all project outcomes (services, resources and tools), based on multiple sources fund raising, for ensuring an adaptive and effective policy among the project beneficiaries that will achieve and maintain desired long-term results. Capacity is not strengthened and maintained at CB level without attention and effort, determined to: Identify the capacities needed by the coalition and the broader community; Plan to strengthen those capacities; Implement the planned capacity strengthening strategies; Evaluate their effects. |
| **WP 6** |  |  |
| D6.x.1 | **LB** | **Import of Good Practices & Know-How.**  LB1 will be the overall Activity Leader, aiming to import valuable Good Practices & Know-How. This service is about a study based on two study visits, for the Project members (and other interested parties to be invited, such as local authorities, MA member(s), etc.) at two European cities that have been recognised for their good practices in civil protection for disabled people (e.g., in Verona, Italy and Kardzhali, Bulgaria). These study visits will facilitate the exchange know-how with local authorities & stakeholders and the expert review of the project's foreseen tools and actions. The outcomes of each study will be presented in the two individual visit's final reports, which will be made available in multiple digital accessible formats |

# Materials (resources) & Tools

The material used for conducting the interim evaluation of the project as a whole included the main project’s deliverables/outputs produced over the first year of implementation which are the following:

* Quality assurance and evaluation methods, practices and examples found in literature
* The Project’s progress and financial reports
* The Minutes of the Project Meetings
* The Regular communication between the partners
* The data and information exchanged between the partners
* The Application Form, Specification of Budget, Procurement Plans and Milestones
* The Deliverable Reporting Sheets
* Personal communication with the partners

# Main Steps of the Evaluation Process

The evaluation process takes place in 5 distinct steps:

**Step 1 - Formulation of the Quality Control Group**

A Quality Control Group (QCG) has been nominated by the Project Monitoring Committee (PMC) at the 1st project meeting. This group consists of one or two persons allocated from each project beneficiary. The QCG members are responsible for the internal assessment of the project outcomes (peer review of deliverables) and for performing an internal assessment of the project on an annual basis and according to a Interreg IPA Cross-border Cooperation Programme “Greece – Albania 2014-2020” multi-criteria approach, using a concise assessment methodology. The QCG is coordinated by the QCM Quality Control Manager.

**Step 2 - Assignment (contracting) of the Quality Manager (Internal evaluator)**

PB2 who is the partner responsible for the activity D1.2.4 “Internal Evaluation & Quality Control” assigns the Quality Manager to undertake the task. The Quality Manager is responsible for ensuring that all project documents and particularly all project deliverables are controlled and revised effectively.

**Step 3 – Development of the Evaluation Methodology**

The Quality Manager develops the evaluation methodology together with the relevant templates (e.g. evaluation questionnaires, reporting sheets etc.). The methodology document explains the rationale behind the assessment study (evaluation), defines what the elements of the evaluation are (i.e. the deliverables), how these will be evaluated (i.e. the quality standards used as benchmarks and the process of reviewing the deliverables) and when the two (interim and final) integrated reports should be handed to PB2.

**Step 4 – Deliverables Quality Reporting**

The members of the Quality Management Team prepare the partner’s quality report (by filling out the reporting sheets) for each deliverable.

**Step 5 – Evaluation Reports Integration**

As soon as there is considerable progress done in the project implementation, the internal evaluator collects the individual reports and compiles two integrated evaluation reports one interim and one final.



*Graph 1. Schematic representation of the evaluation main steps*

# Evaluation & Quality Control Framework

The evaluation and quality control framework is formulated by three different distinct procedures. The first one is establishing and using a system for documents naming, exchanging and housekeeping. The second layouts the process of reviewing the delivered outputs and the third deals with setting out the quality criteria per se and explaining why they are selected for the evaluation process.

## Document identification and versioning

In this section some recommendations on using a simple system for document identification and versioning common for all partners. In the frame of the 4PLUS project, a unique document identifier should be introduced in the document’s electronic name to ensure effective identification and versioning of each document. This identifier should have the following format for deliverable documents:

<Project Name>\_<Del. ID>\_<Del. Name>\_<VX.X>

Example: 4PLUS\_D1.2.4\_Internal Evaluation & Quality Control\_V0.1

For non-deliverable documents the identifier should be as follows:

<Project Name>\_<WPnumber>\_<Doc. type>\_<VX.X>

Example: 4PLUS\_WP2\_PressRelease\_V0.1

When a document is issued for the first time, it has to be defined as a draft (version 0.x), if it requires formal approval.

Usually, the approval process requires that a document will be circulated for comments among the interested partners. Upon receiving the comments by the specified deadline, the author will make the proper modifications, therefore changing the version sub-number, without affecting the main number. The main version number (the first figure before the “.”) is increased by one unit only if a different version of the document is delivered to the MA, or if major modifications have significantly altered the contents of the document. **The editor must not forget to update the version number in all its occurrences in the document**.

It order to avoid by all means distributing two different documents with the same version number, the right to changing the versioning number remains only to the author of the document.

Every time a group of people is working on a document and is making modifications on it, the new version must contain a clear indication of what has been added, modified or removed, and by whom. For this reason every partner working on a document has to use the “track changes” facility offered by most document editing tools.

The partner responsible for the deliverable should take into account realistic timing for the submission of inputs, and therefore propose the plan with sufficient advance, in order to meet the established date for its submission to the Consortium, as per the Contract. Hence, the partner responsible should propose a timetable for the deliverable development, setting deadlines at least for:

> submission of contributions

> production of the first draft (version 0.1)

> internal review (partners’ comments)

> production of final draft of the Deliverable

> submission of the final draft to its Quality Control Group member

> production of final version of the Deliverable

> delivery to the Consortium

## Project Deliverables Reviewing Process

It is recommended that upon their submission by a contractor or by internal staff deliverables reviewing and quality control process should be conducted by following the main steps shown below:

1. A final draft will be prepared by the author and will be sent to the deliverable reviewers (Quality Control Group Members) for the internal review and validation. They check formatting, content and consistency with the technical specifications defined in the contract, and send comments and proposed changes (if any) to the author.
2. Upon receiving those comments, the author incorporates them into the deliverable, produces the final version of it and sends it back to the reviewers for the very final check.
3. The reviewers check if all comments have been applied and send the deliverable to the Author and the work package leader with a declaration of approval.
4. The author sends the deliverable to the Project Coordinator.
5. The Project Coordinator sends the deliverable to the Project Management Team (PMT) for approval.
6. The PMT approves the Deliverable.
7. Finally the Project Coordinator sends the deliverable to the Consortium and the Managing Authority (MA).

In summary, it is recommended that all deliverables prepared by the 4PLUS consortium, before being submitted to the MA, should undergo a three-step review:

1. Work-package internal review

2. Quality Control Group members’ official review

3. Project Management Team review and approval

## Defining evaluation questions (the quality criteria)

This is probably the most substantial part of the methodology framework because it affects the type, quality and usefulness of the information to be collected by the Quality Control Group members during the deliverable’s reviewing stage.

The project’s two evaluation reports will present the findings of the quality assessment study that examines the quality of the project deliverables by comparing them against standards or benchmarks. Generally, the standards can be defined by either internal or external people or organizations. Similarly, they can either be codified (i.e. written down) or simply be common knowledge among people in the industry (i.e. best practices). In any case, the project Quality Control Group should revise the suggested methodology and provide feedback on the proposed standards in order for the process to take into account the expert opinion of all project partners.

Usually when evaluating projects the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, impact, sustainability and efficiency provide a useful point of departure. These criteria are basic yardsticks for evaluation and can normally be accepted as such by all stakeholders. Each one represents an important general question that is relevant to every development intervention: The most important point of impact evaluation is identifying a metric by which the team can determine whether it achieved the objective. This is the project management way of saying, “How do you know you accomplished what you intended?” we need to define some way of measuring the efficiency of deliverables, and then measure it before and after the project.

One first guiding line for the criteria choice could be the project framework itself meaning, the scope, objectives and features of the intervention that the project is meant to accomplish. Without a good understanding of the intervention and its intended logic, one cannot identify which questions should be answered by the Quality Control Group members when evaluating a final deliverable. Without a preliminary analysis of goals and objectives, indicators and assumptions, etc., it is difficult to pose the right questions in the first place.

Another source of information useful for understanding what needs to be assessed is the evaluation tasks as described in the relevant call for tenders and the subsequent contract with the Quality Manager. The main tasks of the Quality Manager assisted by the Quality Control Group is the internal assessment of the project outcomes (peer review of deliverables) and to perform an internal assessment of the project on an annual basis using a concise assessment methodology. Therefore, it is very important all project partners are involved in the planning (methodology formulation), monitoring (reporting of information) and evaluation (findings) processes. This is why it is crucial to get their feedback before finalizing the evaluation methodology. This will ensure that the evaluation design and plan will include their views and that they feel some sense of ownership of the outputs of the evaluation, and are more likely to put them to use.

Therefore the whole evaluation cycle is based partly on a participatory approach, aiming at collecting relevant feedback and opinions amongst projects’ partners via filling out a deliverable reporting sheet designed for recording information regarding the quality of the deliverables produced. It follows that when formulating the evaluation questions (i.e. the criteria) one needs to consider which information is required in order to satisfy the practical purpose for which the evaluation is undertaken (i.e. the assessment of the project outcomes). The information fields/questions found in the reporting sheet are essentially the quality checking points and refer to the commonly quality criteria categories of efficiency, effectiveness and impact. Each quality criteria category can be further divided into sub-categories with respect to a specific project process and the agent who is responsible (see Table 1). For each sub-criterion a number of representative questions have be selected to be included in the Deliverable Reporting Sheet (see Annex I) aiming to collect the necessary information for the evaluation purpose. These questions are also shown in Table 1.

*Table 2. Deliverable Evaluation Criteria and Related Questions*

| **Evaluation Criteria Categories** | **Questions (information fields to be filled out in the reporting sheet)** |
| --- | --- |
| Beneficiary’s Efficiency | > Estimated Procurement date  > Actual Procurement date  > Reasons for delays (if any)  > Description of staff work in SoB and/or in work contract (if staff is involved)  > Description of staff work done (if staff is involved)  > Were risks / obstacles /delays to the activity identified and addressed? |
| Economic Efficiency | > Estimated Budget  > Procured Budget |
| Contractor’s Efficiency | > Estimated Deliverable Submission date  > Actual Deliverable Submission date  > Progress (% of completion) |
| Deliverable’s Effectiveness | > Deliverable Description in SoB  > Deliverable Description in Tender document (if contractor is involved)  > Deliverable description in Technical Offer  > Reasons for deviations (if any)  > Description of final deliverable  > Reasons for deviations (if any)  > Was there an evaluation committee in place?  > Did the deliverable meet the quality standards? |
| Review Process (Partners’ Feedback) | > Have the other partners reviewed / provided feedback to the final draft?  > Have the stakeholders and/or target groups provided feedback? |
| Impact | > What is the expected short-term impact of the deliverable?  > Has the deliverable achieved its expected short-term impact? |

## Project Quality Monitoring

The quality monitoring of the whole project implementation is a continuous process conducted regularly by the Quality Manager throughout the life cycle of the project. For the purpose of the monitoring the QM collects relevant information from several sources the most important being the progress reports, the project meetings, the MIS, the ordinary communication among the partners and the various data exchanged between them, and the deliverable reporting sheets. The data gathered is organized and analyzed twice throughout the project duration by the QM in order to prepare two evaluation reports the interim and the final one.

The Quality Manager collects all the individual Deliverable Report Sheets and uses the information recorded therein, in combination with the rest of the information collected for each evaluation period in order to compile an integrated evaluation report with respect to the overall project quality performance. This information synthesis process leading to an evaluation report for the whole project implementation will take place twice through the life cycle of the project according to the time plan presented in section 7.

It should be made clear that for each and every deliverable that has been submitted by the contractor, the Deliverable Report Sheet should be completed and sent to the Quality Manager twice (one for each evaluation period). The second additional completion is needed in case some information was missing at the time of the first completion which might become available at a later stage.

# Time Plan of the Quality Control

The time plan of the quality control and monitoring procedure is divided into two separate periods followed by the evaluation reporting phase. The table below shows these monitoring periods and times of reporting in relation to the implementation time frame.

|  | **2018** | | | | | | | | | **2019** | | | | | | | | | | **2020** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **1** | | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | | **11** | **12** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project duration** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1st evaluation period** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1st evaluation period** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | **implementation** | | | |  | **monitoring** | | | |  | **reporting** | | | |  | |  | | |  | |  | |  | |  | |

# Annex I

**D1.1.3**

**Project Internal Evaluation and Quality Control**

**DELIVERABLE REPORTING SHEET**

To be completed by the Quality Control Group member separately for all accepted final deliverables and submitted (via e-mail) to the Quality Manager at time indicated in the Evaluation Methodology document.

| **Partner:** |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| **Name of respondent:** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **e-mail:** |  |  |

**Please fill in the second column for each deliverable:**

| Deliverable Number |  |
| --- | --- |
| Status (procured, % of completion, submitted) |  |

| **Contractor’s Efficiency** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverable submission deadline |  |
| Deliverable actual submission date |  |

| **Content consistency** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Deliverable Description in SoB |  |
| Deliverable Description in Tender document (if contractor is involved) i.e. technical specifications (standards) |  |
| Deliverable description in Technical Offer |  |
| Reasons for deviations (if any) |  |
| Description of final deliverable |  |
| Reasons for deviations (if any) |  |
| Was there an evaluation committee in place? |  |

| **Economic Efficiency** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Approved Budget |  |
| Contracted Budget |  |

| **Beneficiary’s Efficiency** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contract starting date |  |
| Contract ending date |  |
| Reasons of delays (if any) |  |
| Description of staff work in SoB and/or in work contract (if staff is involved) |  |
| Description of staff work done (if staff is involved) |  |
| Were risks/obstacles/delays to the activity identified and addressed? |  |

| **Feedback** |  |
| --- | --- |
| Have the other partners reviewed / provided feedback to the final draft? |  |
| Have the stakeholders and/or target groups provided feedback? |  |
| **Impact** |  |
| What is the expected short-term impact of the deliverable? |  |
| Has the deliverable achieved its expected short-term impact? |  |