

Erasmus+

DEVELOPMENT OF INNOVATION PROJECT

2016-1-TR01-KA202-33958

CLEAN-kWAT

Integrating Environmental Considerations into Energy Systems Development

3rd Jerez Meeting Evaluation Report

PREPARED BY:

Şahika KARDAM Environmental Engineer

Kali Energy Engineering Consulting Co. Ltd.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
THE MEETING	4
METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION	5
MEETING RESULTS	6
CONCLUSION	9
ANNEXES1	.0
ANNEX 1 – 3 rd Jerez Meeting Evaluation Questionnaire	
ANNEX 2 – Detailed Demonstration of Partner Results	





CLEAN-kWAT 3rd JEREZ MEETING EVALUATION REPORT

Dates: 15-16 March 2018

Meeting place: AELV's Head Office, Jerez, Spain

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the evaluation report for the 3rd transnational meeting of the Erasmus+ Development of Innovation "CLEAN-kWAT" Project that took place on March 15 - 16 2018, in Jerez, Spain, 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 third transnational meeting in Jerez, Spain, which includes a questionnaire for evaluating the third 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 Jerez 3rd international meeting. The participants of the meeting are given below;

Participants

BASAK TASELI, EVREN 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 ZÄHRINGER, EMILIENNE TINGWEY, RENAC, BERLIN, GERMANY

JOSE M.DAZA, AELV, SPAIN

LASZLO MAGYAR, ENERGIAKLUB, BUDAPEST, HUNGARY

ALEKSANDRA SRETENOVIC, BRANISLAV ZIVKOVIC, UB BEOGRAD, BELGRAD, SERBIA

SAHIKA KARDAM, DENİZ CİLASUN, KALI, ANKARA, TURKEY

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 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.

4. MEETING RESULTS

The overall rating for the CLEAN-kWAT project is 9.44.

The highest rating of 10.00 is for the question "I am satisfied with the premises, where the meeting took place". And the lowest rating of 8.75 is for the question "I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 4 (Description of Qualifications, Learning Objectives and European components) and the coordinator RENAC/GAZI. Considering 8.75 is a very high score, it can be said that the meeting was very satisfactory in every aspect starting from the organizational issues to the achievements of the project outcomes.

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 9.75.
- Overall rating for meeting efficiency is 9.45.
- Overall rating for outcome adequacy is 9.37.
- Overall rating for activities of the project is 9.28.

Some partners made commends to the questions as given below;





- Q) I am satisfied with the premises, where the meeting took place.
- It was clean, well-equipped.
- We think so, place was adapted to our need and 5 minutes walking from different accommodation.
- Q) I am satisfied with the handouts and information material provided at the meeting.
- Each partner has received a folder and notebook from Cleankwat, as part of dissemination material.
- Q) The general organisation of the meeting has been adequate (facilities, running, agenda, etc.).
- We have been flexible and there was time for working and some free time for leisure. Q) All partners received the agenda in advance.
- Was sent by mail and upload to Dropbox before arrival.
- Q) I am satisfied with the "social" and cultural programs?
- I hope whole partners enjoyed during free time even with bad weather we had during meeting days.
- Q) Partners have actively participated in the meeting.
- I thinks so we have solves some financial aspects that wasn't clear enough and we have open a new discussion about homologation of credits.
- Q) Aims, methodology, technical and financial issues were explained in a detailed way.
- Giresun University has to tell us what they need for receiving second payment.
- Q) The estimated schedule is adequate to the working load.
- We have to adapt the agenda according to delays.

Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 1 (Project Organisation& Management) and the coordinator GIRESUN/ORKON.

• We are waiting from Giresun University the template they need for declaration of expenses of the first period in order to receive the second payment as was written in ERASMUS+ agreement.

Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 2 (Development of the Training Book) and the coordinator GIRESUN/GAZI-ENERGIAKLUB-BELGRADE.

• After seen Outcome 4 I think that book chapters should be done after Professional training pathways design in order to avoid the actual situation, with a book that doesn't cover 100% of the Professional training pathways for 30 credits course.

Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 3 (Development of Documentaries) and the coordinator AELV/BELGRADE.

• We have big delays due adaptation of the scripts, and lack of feedback from partners.





Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 4 (Description of Qualifications, Learning Objectives and European components) and the coordinator RENAC/GAZI?

 Now we have to see how adapt the learning pathways to training material produced in order to justify 30 credits.

Q) I am satisfied with the working methods/progress of Activity 8 (Dissemination, Exploitation & Sustainability of the Project) and the coordinator BELGRADE/GIRESUN-GAZI-ENERGIAKLUB-AELV-ORKON- KALIENERGY.

 Whole partners must do an effort with dissemination activities in social network and mailing activities.

It can be said from commends that the international meetings have a very important role at which partners come together and solve managerial issues and monitor the activities, ask questions to each other and share experiences to achieve the ultimate goal of the project. However; a special emphasis should be given to the development of documentaries - Activity 3 to avoid the delays in the next period.

Based on the open ended questions;

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

- It was the best meeting I had ever participated in several respects; hospitality, time management, meeting venue...
- Pay attention, while somebody is speaking.
- Everything and the arrangements for the meeting were quite perfect, thanks to the hosting organization,
- Cultural events were perfect and it was good to know a lot about the south of Spain cities & towns also,
- There was a good cultural integration between the partners which is desired to happen in all projects.
- Hosting Spanish team prepared the meeting very perfectly and we enjoyed our time in Spain a lot and we had a very successful meeting also.
- What should we keep in mind for future consortium meetings (suggestions for improvements)?
 - Better estimation for the time needed for each presentation.
- Do you have any recommendations to improve this questionnaire?



• No,

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

5) CONCLUSION

The overall rating for the CLEAN-kWAT project is 9.44 which is a very high score.

Based on combined results of the evaluation questionnaires of the third transnational meeting in Jerez, Spain, 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 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