



# **D1.9 - 1st Monitoring report by external evaluator**

**01/05/2017**



**Best practices for EUROpean COORDination on investigative measures and evidence gathering**



**EUROCOORD**

**Version FINAL**

**Preparation date 05/2017**

**Deliverable D1.9**

**Work Package WP1**

**Authors:** Sandra Vilaplana Llin, Kveloce I+D+i

**Approved by Coordinator on:** 31/05/2017

**Dissemination level:** CO



## **INTRODUCTION**

As part of the project evaluation (attached in Annex I), this report aims at monitoring the implemented activities during the 6 first month of project execution to assure the highest standards

This is a practical report which is part of a series of deliverables that will be developed throughout the project to ensure the correct implementation of the project, with maximum quality. Specifically, four monitoring reports are expected in the 6, 12, 18 and 24 months of the project, corresponding to the deliverables D1.9, D1.10, D1.11 and D1.12.

The aspects that will be controlled as described in the Evaluation framework are project management, research framework and results, quality of training activities (expected at the end of the project) and External communication. Other aspects such as impact will also be considered.



# 1ST MONITORING REPORT BY EXTERNAL EVALUATOR

Date **25 05 2017**

Autor **Sandra Vilaplana**

<b>PROJECT</b>	EUROCOORD
<b>COORDINATING ENTITY</b>	Universidad de Burgos
<b>COORDINATOR</b>	Mar Jimeno Bulnes

## 1. SUMMARY OF THE SITUATION OF THE PROJECT

Starting date	<b>01 12 2016</b>
Ending date	<b>30 11 2018</b>

The Project is in its **6** months of execution, since December 2016 until May 2017.

This report shows the status of each of the activities that are in the work packages and their respective deliverables. Also, a quality implementation tasks review is performed

		dic-16	ene-17	feb-17	mar-17	abr-17	may-17
		1	2	3	4	5	6
		Lead Organisation					
<b>Workstream 0 (Management and Coord.)</b>		UBU					
1 Brussels Kick-off meeting	UBU	x	→		x		
2 Project kick-off meeting	UBU	x	→	x			
3 2nd Project meeting	UOP						x
4 3rd Project meeting	UCM						
5 4th Project meeting	JU						
6 Final Project Meeting	UBU						
7 Project monitoring and steering committee	UBU		D		x		
8 Administrative and financial management	UBU						
9 Ethics management	UBU						
10 Preliminary and final evaluation	UBU					x	
<b>Workstream 1 (National and European legislation)</b>		UOP					
1 Comparative research methodology	UOP		→				
2 Jurisprudence analysis	UOP. All partners						
3 Interviews	UOP. All partners						D
4 Analysis and assessment of the results	UOP						
<b>Workstream 2 (legal protection)</b>		UBU					
1 Qualitative research methodology	UBU				→		
2 Interviews and focus groups	UBU, UCM, UOP, UJ						
3 Comprehensive and qualitative analysis	UBU, UOP, UJ						
<b>Workstream 3 (Code of Best Practises)</b>		UCM					
1 First draft	UCM						
2 Discussion groups	UCM. All partners						
3 Final version	UCM						
4 Training courses planning and syllabus	UBU						
<b>Workstream 4 (Dissemination and training)</b>		JU					
1 Main website and updates	UBU		D	→			
2 Online debate and communication	UJ						
3 Offline communication campaigns	UJ						
4 Training courses and resources	UBU						
5 European Observatory for the EIO	UJ, UBU, UOP						
6 Dissemination to policy makers	UJ, UBU, UOP						
7 Scientific dissemination	UJ, UBU, UOP						
8 Events and conferences	UCM						

During the 6 months of project execution, most activities have focused on the WS1, and start working on the WS2 and WS4.

Concerning WS1:

- To attend Kick off meeting with the European Commission, Justice Programme division
- To organize and held the Kick off Project meeting among all partners, with the aim at:
  - o To introduce the team, understand the project background, understand what needs to be done and agree on how to work together effectively. We will try to give an answer to the following questions:
    - Scope – what are we doing?
    - Approach – how are we going to make this happen?



## EUROCOORD

- Roles – who is doing what? who's responsible for what?
  - Teamwork – how are we going to work together?
  - DoW Review – what are we doing, when, how, and what will we produce?
  - Legal & financial- Which are the legal and financial issues that we need to take in consideration in this programme?
  - To- do list. Which are next steps?
  - AOB – anything else that we need to discuss?
- To present the evaluation project framework
  - To prepare the project Handbook. This corresponds to D1.1 submitted in 21/03/2017
  - Also, a project repository was set (in dropbox)

### Concerning WS2:

- Partners has started activities 1 (comparative research methodology) and 2 (Jurisprudence analysis)

### Concerning WS4:

- Work is being done on the design and content of the website and on the project communication and dissemination plan.

Besides, the evaluation group was established formed by the external evaluator and the PC.

MILESTONES						
Milestones number	Milestone title	WS number	Lead Beneficiary	Due Date	Date	Means of verification
MS1	Project Kick-off meetings (Brussels and Burgos)	WS0	1-UBU	1	dic-17	Two kick-off meetings will take place: the first session will be organised in Brussels, joining the entire consortium and the European Commission (Project Officer). The second one will be held at Burgos.
MS2	Preliminary evaluation	WS0	1-UBU	3	feb-17	Introductory research into the current situation regarding the EIO application and standard practices, state of the art, main communication and networking strategies and channels, adequateness of the workstream and timestream, etc.
MS3	Dissemination and Communication strategy, plan and implementation	WS3	4-UJ	4	mar-17	Plans developed, and Targeted audience reached through the specific and planned activities. Establishment of presence, communication and debate. At least, four peer-reviewed articles should be published. It includes online and offline activities.
MS4	Final data collection and comparative research into the EOI judicial framework, legal protection and analysis of the current situation from stakeholders	WS1, WS2	3-UNIPA	9	ago-17	Interviews addressed to judicial authorities, practitioners, and any other stakeholder involved (e.g., NGOs, police officers, etc.). Analysis of the national legislation on the implementation of the EIO, legal cooperation practices, EU legal instruments, the intervention of the leading institutions, etc.
MS5	Long-life training: courses and seminars implementation	WS4	1-UBU	24	nov-18	Introduce and assess the online courses, their syllabus, resources and seminars in the field of the European Investigation Order.
MS6	Development of a Code of Best Practices and Evaluation report on the first draft and final version	WS3	2-UCM	24	nov-18	Final analysis of stakeholders contribution. Focus groups and coordination to elaborate the first draft and the final version of the Code Of Best Practices, marking the beginning of the European Observatory
MS7	Launch of the European Observatory on EOI and beyond on criminal matters	WS4	4-UJ	24	nov-18	Open the debate about the EIO, involve the entire community of stakeholders and establish the conditions for a collaborative, scientific driven, networking approach and its success and sustainability over time
MS8	Final evaluation	WS0	1-UBU	24	nov-18	Plans to ensure the long-term viability of the European Observatory on EOI and to fix the potential gaps that have arisen within the project lifecycle

## EVALUATION

PM item	Tools	Activities done
Risks and changes	Risk monitoring Mitigation procedures Deviations of chronograms	A risk assessment has been carried out, as well as the mitigation measures have been defined for: low participation of the target groups, delay in the deliverables and low quality of the outputs.
Research framework and results	Deliverables and milestones Research methodology	A quality deliverable review among partners has been established: peer review.



		D1.1 Project Handbook with internal procedures is detailed.
Quality of the training activities	Satisfactory questionnaire	N/A
External communication	List of KPI	KPI already defined following the Annex III of EUROCOORD project

No deviations detected





**EUROCOORD**

## Annex I – Evaluation framework



# EUROCOORD EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

01/04/2017



**Best practices for EUROpean COORDination on  
investigative measures and evidence gathering**

## Table of Contents

Abbreviations and Acronyms .....	3
1. INTRODUCCION.....	4
1.1: SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT .....	4
1.2: GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION .....	5
2 ACTIVITIES TO BE EVALUATED AND METHODS.....	5
2.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE.....	5
2.1.1: Description of the action and its activities .....	5
2.1.2. Quality reviews and approval process .....	5
2.1.3 External evaluation criteria .....	6
2.2 Project Management .....	7
2.2.1 Description of the action and its activities.....	7
2.2.2 External evaluation criteria .....	7
2.2.3 Processes.....	8
2.3 Research framework and results .....	8
2.3.1 Description of the action and its activities.....	8
2.3.2 Ethics:.....	8
2.4 Quality of the training activities.....	9
2.4.1 Description of the action and its activities.....	9
2.4.2 External evaluation criteria .....	9
2.5 External Communication.....	10
2.5.1 EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION.....	10
2.6 Impact of the project .....	11
2.6.1 Description of the action and its activities.....	11



## Abbreviations and Acronyms

WS	Work Stream
EIO	European Investigation Order
M	Month
PO	Project Officer
PC	Project Coordinator
QA	Quality Assurance
GA	Grant Agreement
IPR	Intellectual Protection Results

## 1. INTRODUCCION

Meeting the quality expectations of the European Commission is critical: that is because of the external evaluation must ensure a precise definition of quality indicators for monitoring the work flow and evaluating the results achieved within the project through qualitative and quantitative measurements. It is particularly crucial for the outputs. The evaluation framework is established at the beginning of the project, and the methodology will be revised in collaboration with the consortium. The Evaluation Group joins together the internal and external evaluators, combining the benefits of each type of assessment without losing the first-hand technical knowledge.

The present document defines what quality means in terms of EUROCOORD and list clear and unambiguous quality targets for each output.

### 1.1: SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT

EUROCOORD main objective is to promote judicial cooperation by developing systematic research and generating specific knowledge and tools addressed to the different stakeholders to contribute to the efficient and coherent application of the Directive 2014/41/EU on the European Investigation Order (EIO) in criminal matters and other relevant regulations.

Concretely, the specific objectives of the project are a) to generate the required knowledge to optimise the implementation of the EIO in criminal matters, specifically, the transmission of evidence and its admissibility; b) to provide relevant stakeholders with the competencies and protocols needed in order to make easier the cooperation and admissibility of evidence across different countries and c) to raise awareness, disseminate the knowledge generated and train professionals with a multiplying potential.

In order to reach the mentioned objective, the activities proposed are: a) desk and qualitative research on the EOI judicial framework; b) development of a Code of Best Practices, c) training courses and seminars addressed to different target groups and d) launch of the European Observatory on EOI and beyond on criminal matters.

The final beneficiaries will be more than 300 researches in the field of Criminal Law -300 prosecutors and judges, 800 law enforcement officers (100 people directly), 28 EU National Authorities, 400 defence lawyers, more than 30 NGOs (100 people directly) an even 200 accused individuals The main expected results of the project will be

- a) Research reports on national and cross-border criminal proceedings;
- b) Code of Best Practices for the EIO in criminal matters;
- c) Open debate for assessment and implementation of the EIO and beyond through the European Observatory;
- d) Syllabus, training resources and training seminars addressed to target groups; f) Websites (4), Communication campaigns (2) -Press releases (4) -Newsletters (2) -Peer-reviewed articles (4) - Conference (1)

## 1.2: GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE EXTERNAL EVALUATION

The main aim is **to outline a plan of evaluation activities which will assure that the highest standards will be met and identifying the techniques to be used for controlling the actual level of quality of each output as it is built in collaboration with the whole project consortium.** As the project advances, this document should be updated, considering not only the deliverables or outcomes but also the managerial processes undertaken during its execution.

The evaluation will monitor the project work flow (as described within Section 1.10), evaluate the results achieved with respect to the project objectives using performance, qualitative and quantitative measures, and assess the outputs quality. The **evaluation framework** will be established at the beginning of the project (M5); specific roles will be established in order to perform the evaluation tasks. In particular the evaluation strategy and the consequent methodology will be developed with the collaboration of project partners and support of an external evaluator. For this reason, a specific Evaluation Group will be established including representatives from the partners and external evaluators.

Furthermore, an **external evaluation on the training activities** will be performed, based on satisfaction questionnaires elaborated by the Evaluation Group and the evaluator, who will be also in charge of the data collection and analysis, and shared among participants.

The **final evaluation** will include a Recommendations section, including the internal and external evaluation output, in order to nurture future projects and initiatives in the field.

This evaluation activities will be carried within the WS 0.6 activity and coordinated by UBU.

Actions shall be evaluated according to their nature. Academic actions shall be evaluated depending on their publication in peer review journals, edited by prestigious publishers in the case of specific books or collective works and presented in international and national conferences as it takes now place. Questionnaires addressed to other participants such as judges, lawyers, prosecutors... must take place in relation with their practice as well as the improvement suggested by present research.

## 2 ACTIVITIES TO BE EVALUATED AND METHODS

### 2.1 QUALITY ASSURANCE

#### 2.1.1: Description of the action and its activities

EUROCOORD will deliver a series of outputs as explained in the project proposal. Deliverables or outputs should accomplish the highest quality standard for satisfying the European Commission requirements. In order to ensure the quality of public documents and articles published during the project, a process of Quality Assurance has been drafted. External evaluations should revise these outputs following the evaluation criteria below.

#### 2.1.2. Quality reviews and approval process

Quality review will be performed every 6 months and applied to research outcomes, research activities, project managerial processes, verification and validation and training or capacity building related tasks.

It has been put in place a quality check for the outputs and deliverables, detailed below.

### 2.1.3 External evaluation criteria

#### 2.1.3.1 General criteria

1. Project and financial managerial processes are responsibility of the University of Burgos
2. All reports – including the management and deliverables ones – must conform to a common format and identity.
3. Each workstream leader shall share their internal progress with the Project Coordinator (PC) and any deviation and corrective action to be considered must be presented to the PC will decide if it is required to be agree by the EC project officer (PO)
4. Regular tracking of progress must be carried out through regular meetings and reports, being defined by the PC the procedures for identifying, collecting, indexing, accessing and filling all documents containing information relating to the project.

#### 2.1.3.2 Deliverables: QA procedures

1. In order to guarantee the quality of the deliverable, each partner will be requested to review a specific deliverable, agreed beforehand between that partner and the PC
2. The partner leading the deliverable will send a review request to the reviewer one month before its submission.

The external evaluation of deliverables submitted responds to these criteria:

1. Relevance to objectives → Does the deliverable or output match the objectives listed in the GA and the Proposal?
2. Presentation of results → Are being considered all necessary chapters, subjects and results for reporting an specific activity?
3. Structure of the deliverable: Are contents, format and grammar structured in an adequate way? Are these clear and understandable?

#### 2.1.3.3 QA procedures for Scientific publications

1. For guaranteeing the quality of scientific publications, including articles published in Journals, position papers, conference proceedings and posters, a quality review has been put in place: the partner aiming at publishing an outcome should send to the PC and the Dissemination Manager the draft of this publication, at least, 1 month before the deadline for submission; these will approve or reject the request within 2 weeks, consulting all partners if needed. If the publication shows results reached by the whole consortium, all partners should be informed on time about the data disclosure.

The external evaluation will consider:

1. Type of Congress/conference or Journal: Geographical dimension (national or international) and relevance

2. Impact measurements: e.g., IF or number of attendants
3. Peer-reviewing process: if possible, scientific outcomes should be peer-reviewed
4. Results or data disclosed and IPR
5. Results and ethical issues concerning science and publication of research outcomes (e.g., malpractices or any issue related to criteria specified for measuring the quality of the research, as explained below)
6. Open Access publication of public research results
7. Completeness of the Dissemination report

## 2.2 Project Management

### 2.2.1 Description of the action and its activities

Managerial processes are comprised of administrative, financial, quality and risk management. Project Management workstream lasts from the beginning until the end of the project. A summary of each of the processes undertaking within this workstream during the execution phase is being identified:

- Time and costs
- Quality control
- Risks management and adaptation to change
- Communication management (internal and external)

This set of evaluation indicators is based on the Project Management procedure and Quality Plan that could be derived from its principles. This document describes the processes for managing the internal and external (with the European Commission, but also stakeholders) of EUROCOORD.

The purpose of adopting controls is to ensure that the project is producing the required products which meet the defined Acceptance Criteria and is being carried out to schedule and in accordance with the resource and budget plans

### 2.2.2 External evaluation criteria

The following table summarizes the potential tools and techniques for measuring the project management processes and its success within EUROCOORD

PM item	Tools	Results
<b>Risks and changes</b>	Risks monitoring Mitigation procedures Deviations of chronograms	Risks Management Plan
<b>Stakeholders communication</b>	Control charts Report of Dissemination and Communication activities Lists of contacts Flowcharting Statistical sampling	Impact Assessment and External Communication Evaluation



### 2.2.3 Processes

- Risk Management

Risks will be monitored quarterly. A collaborative spreadsheet specifying Date, Risk Identified and Means for mitigation will be shared among partners. The external evaluation committee will follow-up the self-assessment every 3 months and will also suggest new risks to be considered by the project coordinator or project Manager

- Change Control

In case a risk cannot be mitigated, changes will be suggested by the project coordinator; the external evaluation will establish a control mechanism for assessing how changes to the agreed requirements are being implemented and how these ensure the Quality standards expected by the European Commission.

- Standards and protocols

The Project Handbook will be updated on demand. It must include the main guidelines, standards, rules, agreements between partners and with the European Commission and governance structure. External evaluators will guarantee that the Handbook is being updated when it is required by the project lifecycle.

- Project repository

All partners must share some document in a joint repository assuring transparency and coordination within the consortium. The external evaluation will check that the repository is adequately used and these needs are been accomplished.

## 2.3 Research framework and results

### 2.3.1 Description of the action and its activities

EUROCOORD includes fieldwork research, primary focused on accused persons and law enforcement authorities. Research into Law requires a wide range of quality indicators and a more flexible way for measuring the scientific impact due to the research practice, publication languages and media, outputs and results and, also, target groups.

The external evaluation of these activities will be comprised of an analysis of the sample, research procedures, methodologies for quantitative and qualitative collection of data and adequacy of this data gathering process, including how it addresses the main Ethical directives and regulations as regards informed consent or anonymization of these information.

The design of the research, implementation and evaluation procedures and methodologies as planned by the consortium will be also evaluated by the external reviewers.

### 2.3.2 Ethics:

EUROCOORD cannot harm other persons (*primum non-nocere*), paying special attention to vulnerable groups observed during the project, such as inmates and persons in detention centres. Its objective, from an ethical point of view, is to raise the positive consequences of the implementation of the EOI at long-term (beneficence).

- Intrinsic and social value of the publicly-funded research: EUROCOORD must demonstrate its intrinsic value for the whole society and the public administration at European-level, far beyond the mere instrumental value and usefulness. However, instrumental value should be demonstrated as well.
- Utility of the research for improving the current situation and the implementation of the EIO.

Justice and Autonomy of researchers must be also encouraged by the EUROCOORD consortium through exchange of knowledge and debate, as the EIO could be considered a controverted topic in the field of cross-borders regulation and involves a wide range of ethical challenges and concerns. In addition, EUROCOORD must guarantee that research, data collection and disclosure are being done considering the following critical points:

- Informed written consent. All data gathered or used during the research cycle were collected by voluntary persons; any other experimental requirements involving humans requires formal and written consent, including complete and reliable information.
- Data protection: Protection of personal data follows the National Spanish Law and the European Directives; specifically, all data will be anonymized and databases will be encrypted, among other measures detailed below.
- Open Access: Papers and research articles written about the EUROCOORD outcomes and results must be made public under Open Access terms.

## 2.4 Quality of the training activities

### 2.4.1 Description of the action and its activities

During EUROCOORD, several training and capacity building initiatives are taking place. Then, materials, resources used and the seminars themselves should be externally evaluated.

### 2.4.2 External evaluation criteria

External evaluators or the PC will send to all people involved in the seminars and capacity building activities organised within EUROCOORD a simple, brief and online questionnaire mainly focused on open questions for allowing a qualitative and descriptive evaluation focused on:

- **Capacity building programme and the EUROCOORD project**
  - Objectives are clear and achieved after the capacity building ends
  - Programme objectives are in-line with the EUROCOORD project goals
  - Facilities and infrastructures contribute to accomplish the project objectives
  - Self-reported student perceptions
- **Evaluation of the staff**
  - Appropriate training and expertise to oversee and evaluate the course
  - Self-reported active involvement in the programme or course
  - Trainees' perceptions about trainers
- **Evaluation of course materials**
  - Perception of usefulness

- Post-training use
- **Knowledge and skills acquired**
  - Greatest decision-making competencies reported
  - Trainees’ self-assessment on knowledge and skills acquired during the course
  - Tests and objective performance assessment focused on knowledge
  - Self-reported changes in awareness, concerns and attitudes
- **Strengths, weakness and improvement suggestions**

## 2.5 External Communication

### 2.5.1 EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

The external evaluation of Dissemination and Communication activities will be performed quantitatively following the KPIs and Indicators specified in the proposal and the Annex III of EUROCOORD.

In addition, the RE-AIM framework (reach, efficacy, adoption, implementation, and maintenance) will be adapted to evaluate the overall external Dissemination and Implementation (D&I) of EUROCOORD after the end of the project. The following selection of KPIs is in-line with the RE-AIM framework (Glasgow, Vogt, & Boles, 1999), a well established methodology for assessing dissemination among potentially reluctant populations.

- Reach: proportion of the target population participating in the project (e.g., trainings, European Observatory on the EIO)
- Efficacy: success rate if implemented as in the original proposal.
- Adoption: proportion of organisations adopting practices, recommendations or plans derived from the EUROCOORD project
- Implementation: extent to which project outputs are being implemented (as intended) in the real world.
- Maintenance: in this case, it should be understood as “sustainability” or potential for being maintained by partners or third-parties over-time for continuing the research and implementation efforts after the EUROCOORD project ends.

#### *Target groups and expected impact*

<b>ACADEMIA</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>JUDGES</b>	100
<b>PROSECUTORS</b>	200
<b>NATIONAL AUTHORITIES</b>	28
<b>LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES</b>	800
<b>LAWYERS</b>	400
<b>ANTI-DISCRIMINATION EXPERTS/PROFESSIONALS</b>	200
<b>NGOS/CSOS</b>	20 (Organizations)
<b>PRISONERS</b>	200

*Dissemination*

<b>CONFERENCE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CAMPAIGN</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>PUBLIC DEBATE/ROUNDTABLE</b>	<b>1</b>

*Scientific Dissemination*

<b>PEER-REVIEWED ARTICLE</b>	<b>4</b>
1 Final conference in Madrid (Ws8, T8). 1 Roundtable via Delphi methodology (WS3, T2). Expected attendants	
<b>ACADEMIA</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>NGOS/CSOS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>JUDGES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>PROSECUTORS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITIES</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>LAWYERS</b>	<b>10</b>

*Dissemination aimed at enhancing the sustainability of the project results*

<b>NETWORK</b>	<b>1 (European Observatory)</b>
<b>FORMAL ADVISORY GROUP</b>	<b>1</b>

*Communication*

<b>BOOKLET/LEAFLET</b>	<b>500/NGOs &amp; policy makers</b>
<b>BOOKLET/LEAFLET</b>	500/juridical staff, jugdes, prosecutors
<b>BOOKLET/LEAFLET</b>	300/law enforcement officers
<b>NEWSLETTER</b>	4 newsletters
<b>NEWSPAPER/MAGAZINE ARTICLES</b>	4 articles
<b>SOCIAL NETWORK PROFILE</b>	2 (Facebook, Twitter)/5000 each one
<b>WEBSITE/BLOG</b>	1 (English) + 3(translated)/7 admin users/500(single visitors per day)
<b>ONLINE COURSES AND THEIR RESOURCES</b>	<b>3/ 4 languages/ 1120 people</b>

## 2.6 Impact of the project

### 2.6.1 Description of the action and its activities

EUROCOORD will contribute to realize the potential of individuals and staff of organisations involved in the consortium: researchers, but also additional technical or managerial staff. The main impacts are described below.



## EUROCOORD

The participant partners are already collaborating in a voluntary basis to contribute to a better situation of the research into the EIO. With EUROCOORD implementation, partners aim to consolidate their collaboration but, most important to establish the basis for a systematised working dynamics that leverage their joint research. Thus, EUROCOORD will be the starting point of a long-term network for encourage research and good practices in Europe, which will become the reference body for any entity interested in contributing to the state of the art

As a result of EUROCOORD, the partnership will be positioned as relevant international advisory body targeted at public administration, private players, decision-makers and experts in research into transnational evidence gathering.

The external evaluation will perform a qualitative assessment on the impact, considering reports, surveys, conversations with stakeholders, and new initiatives in this field carried out by partners involved in EUROCOORD.