

Erasmus+

## DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATION PROJECT

2016-1-TR01-KA202-33958

# **CLEAN-kWAT**

## Integrating Environmental Considerations into Energy Systems Development

CLEAN-kWAT 2<sup>nd</sup> BUDAPEST MEETING EVALUATION REPORT

**P**REPARED BY:

Şahika KARDAM Environmental Engineer

Kali Energy Engineering Consulting Co. Ltd.



1



### CONTENTS

| 1. INTRODUCTION                                   | 3      |
|---|--------|
| 2. THE MEETING                                    | 4      |
| 3. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION                      | 6      |
| 4. MEETING RESULTS                                | 8      |
| 5. CONCLUSION                                     | 11     |
| 6. ANNEXES  | 12     |
| ANNEX 1 – 2nd Budapest Meeting Evaluation Questio | nnaire |

ANNEX 2 – Detailed Demonstration of Partner Results





#### CLEAN-KWAT 2<sup>nd</sup> BUDAPEST MEETING EVALUATION REPORT

#### Dates: 07-08 September 2017

#### Meeting place: ENERGIAKLUB's head office, Budapest, Hungary

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the evaluation report for the 2<sup>nd</sup> transnational meeting of the Erasmus+ Development of Innovation "CLEAN-kWAT" Project that took place on September 07 - 08<sup>th</sup> 2017, in Budapest, Hungary, in order to foresee solutions for any kind of problems, and so that modifications for the future meetings can be handled. The aim is to have a successful progress and products in the project by internal monitoring and evaluation of the project.

It is focused on the initial stages of the project, the set up of tasks/outcomes, and the general operational approach, including:

- a review of project meeting, particularly focused on meeting outcomes, work package review, and status of partnership communication;
- participant observation, face-to-face (individual and group) discussions and consultation with project partners at the second transnational meeting in Budapest, Hungary, which includes a questionnaire for evaluating the second meeting.

The evaluation approach is designed to judge the degree of success of the project in a conventional output/outcome format, as well as to directly support the achievement of project objectives through a process of regular progress review and feedback. It also includes the review of the agreed work package tasks, and assessing partnership strengths and weaknesses. This involves capturing successes and avoiding difficulties as they might arise through recommended actions that are designed to minimize the incidence of barriers to the successful completion of the project.





#### 2. THE MEETING

All partners could participate in Budapest 2nd international meeting.

#### Participants:

The participants of the meeting are given below;

Participants

BASAK TASELI, DUYGU ALTIOK, GIRESUN UNIVERSITY, GIRESUN, TURKEY

GAMZE YUCEL ISILDAR, FERIHA YILDIRIM, GAZI UNIVERSITY, ANKARA TURKEY

ALTAN DIZDAR, ERTUGRUL DIZDAR, ORKON INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING TRAINING CONSULTING INC, ANKARA TURKEY

UTA ZAHRINGER, RENAC, BERLIN, GERMANY

JOSE M.DAZA, SONIA GARCIA CARRASCO, AELV, SPAIN

ŞAHİKA KARDAM, DENİZ CİLASUN, KALI, ANKARA, TURKEY

LASZLO MAGYAR, ENERGIAKLUB, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

ALEKSANDRA SRETENOVIC, UROS MILOVANCEVIC, UB BEOGRAD, BELGRAD,

ENERGYSOLUTIONS



#### SERBIA

In the meeting mainly the progress in the tasks of partners and workplan till the next meeting were discussed. Each partner presented its own progress and each work was integrated to the project progress, specifically the intellectual outputs and discussions done on how to proceed on the production of outputs, the responsibilities and the deadlines. Detailed descriptions of multiple events, dissemination, exploitation & sustainability of the project, the tasks and responsible partners were also discussed.

The meeting was very fruitful and every partners' opinion was valued in the discussions. A very strong agreement at the end of the meeting was achieved.

#### 3. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

The evaluation material is based on the evaluation questionnaires administered by the project evaluator, KALIENERGY. The questionnaire was designed to evaluate the following four subjects;

- 1. Meeting Organisation
- 2. Meeting Efficiency
- 3. Outcome Adequecy
- 4. Activities of the Project

Evaluation subjects of the initial transnational meetings include whether:

- Partners received advanced notification of agenda and role,
- Communication between promoter and partners were adequate,







- Communication regarding: working programme; project aims, methodology, technical & financial issues; exchanging contact data was adequate,
- Partners actively participated in the meetings and were well prepared,
- Scheduling/timetables: meetings, work load and milestones,
- General organization of the meetings: premises, facilities, agendas, technical equipment,
- Materials, presentations and discussions at the meeting were: useful, relevant, complete, and sufficient,
- Discussions regarding difficulties, work methods and dissemination,
- Distribution of the tasks within the project: clear (in writing, indicating the responsible partner, activity and time period), related to the specialization and expertise of each partner,
- Partners level of satisfaction with: social programme and accommodation, working atmosphere, work packages and phases, promoter assistance during meetings and meeting outcomes.

The partners evaluated the meetings and project activities/outcomes by rating the level of effectiveness. The evaluation scale provided is from one to ten, where 1 = not at all and 10 = excellent and 2-9 as varying degrees in between. The questionnaire is given as Annex I.

Participants were given 4 open questions to be able to elaborate their impressions more on suggestions for improvements for the meeting and for the questionnaire itself.

The main objective of the initial transnational meeting evaluation report is to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the meeting and the state of the CLEAN-kWAT project.



6



#### 4. MEETING RESULTS

The overall rating for the CLEAN-kWAT project is 9.42.

The highest rating of 9.9 is for the question "All partners received the agenda in advance". And the lowest rating of 7.8 is for the question "I am satisfied with the "social" and cultural programs?"

The questionnaire has inner components as structure so that we can evaluate them separately. From the answered we can give the ratings as;

- Overall rating for meeting organization is 9.05.
- Overall rating for meeting efficiency is 9.39.
- Overall rating for outcome adequacy is 9.60.
- Overall rating for activities of the project is 9.43.

Some partners made commends to the questions as given below;

- Q) I am satisfied with the premises, where the meeting took place. Only Lazslo Magyar was shown a very good hospitality. Thanks to him.
- Q) I am satisfied with the handouts and information material provided at the meeting. Any material wasn't provided (paper, pen, meeting agenda printout,...)
- Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 3 (Development of Documentaries) and the coordinator AELV/BELGRADE.
  We are still waiting scripts for beginning the documentaries

It can be said from commends that the least satisfaction was in the social events and meeting organization. However; since few commends were given and one was on the progress of Activity 3-Development of Documentaries, a special interest should be given in the related supporting activities of the production of documentaries.



7



Based on the open ended questions;

#### - What do you think could have been done in a better way during the meeting?

- We should keep the timetable.
- Coordinator should be stricter with timeline schedule during meeting.
- The partnership and communication among group is really very good. Every partner is aware of their duties.
- Everything was well organized and organization of the meeting & the meals were perfect,
- In order to recognize the country, it would better to have cultural visits to historical places together with the hosting company,
- Partners did their work and we had presentations from all partners, this led us to learn more and better knowledge about the project.

- What should we keep in mind for future consortium meetings (suggestions for improvements)?

- Improve the efficiency of each conversation.
- Pay attention to each other, when somebody is speaking.
- It would be very useful if the meeting organizer could arrange some hotel where all the partners can stay, or suggest two hotels nearby.
- We suggest that the person who is organizing the meeting also be responsible for "leading" the discussion, taking care that the time schedule is adequately followed.
- I must say that we are far behind the schedule and if we go on like this, it will be impossible to finish the project on time, this will lead to a time extension in the project and this may cause a deep evaluation from NA to us so we have to be quick in our tasks & works. We mustn't postpone anything from now on and everybody must obey to "Terms of References" of the 2nd meeting.





The detailed demonstration of partners' result is given in Annex II.

#### 5) CONCLUSION

The overall rating for the CLEAN-kWAT project is 9.42 which is a very high score.

Based on combined results of the evaluation questionnaires of the second transnational meeting in Budapest, Hungary, it can be deduced that the project CLEAN-kWAT will be well able to meet the aims and goals as established at the onset of this project. However, everybody must obey the "Terms of Reference" and deadlines given.

As this CLEAN-kWAT project evaluation report reveals that the project partners work well together and it is anticipated, based on these results, that project's end products will undoubtedly not only meet but exceed expectations regarding quality, usefulness and contribute to the promotion of ethical aspects of environmental training programs to promote greening business and expand employability.





# ANNEXES