



FINAL REPORT

NEXT2 EXTERNAL EVALUATION

AUGUST 2007



DB INGENIERIE-

21 Avenue des Charmettes - 31500 TOULOUSE

☎ 06 70 64 58 90 dominique.barbes@wanadoo.fr

Centre de facturation : Coopérative d'activités et d'emploi REGATE
205 avenue Charles de Gaulle- 81100 CASTRES

Tel : 05 63 62 82 84 – SIRET : 42376651800033- RCS Castres B 423766518

PLAN:

I. EXTERNAL EVALUATION WORKPLAN & METHODS

- A.** ACT mission for the evaluation
- B.** Work plan as completed)
- C.** External evaluation agenda
- D.** NEXT2 evaluation tools
- E.** Work plan completed in 2006 & 2007

II. EXTERNAL EVALUATION GENERAL REPORTING

- A.** Good practices
- B.** Proposals of progress

III. NEXT2 LOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR TRANSNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AND PARTNERS PRIORITIES

- A.** TP logical framework
- B.** Transnational partner's priorities

IV. NEXT2 STRENGTHS AND REFEXIONS FOR FUTURE PARTNERSHIPS

ANNEXES

1. NEXT2 external evaluation 2006 report & annexes (2006 Turin TCM ; Lenti's Conference)
2. Huesca General Meeting evaluation report (january 2007)
3. Brest 2007 evaluation report
4. Turin Final conference (June 2007) evaluator's synthesis.

V. EXTERNAL EVALUATION WORKPLAN & METHODS

A. TCA mission for the evaluation (Extract from the call for tender)

- The external evaluator will attend all transnational coordinators meetings (CM) as well as general meetings (GM) and conferences in order to collect evaluation material from January 2006 up to September 2007.
- The following items will be both monitored and evaluated :
 - ❑ transnational coordinators meetings
 - ❑ general meetings
 - ❑ activities
 - ❑ communication
 - ❑ budget
 - ❑ products
 - ❑ relationships with national projects
 - ❑ impact of transnational activities on local partners
 - ❑ impact of transnational activities on target groups
 - ❑ intercultural networking
- During all meetings (coordinators meetings, general meetings, conferences) the external evaluator should monitor and evaluate the above mentioned items and define performance indicators related to the following :
 - Inputs : “what the different partners bring in the partnership”
 - Process : participation of all partners, use of inputs
 - Outputs : results, products, knowledge...the outputs should taking into account different levels : transnational level, DPs level, national levels
 - Gender mainstreaming
 - Empowerment
 - Innovative objectivesThe three last indicators are horizontal and should be taken into account in transnational activities both at local partners and target groups levels.
- He/she is expected to be “a critical friend” and to give recommendations the partnership will have the responsibility to follow and implement:
- He/she will present reports in English at six – and twelve – monthly intervals, in relation to the transnational work plan planning.

B. Proposal and Work plan as completed

1. About methods (Extracts from the evaluation proposal)

Regarding the evaluator's posture, based on EQUAL experience, evaluation is meant to :

- bring more meaning and coherence into action,
- take into account each partner input, learn from differences, esp. in multicultural work;
- help the group to focus on its shared initial goals and main issues, through targeted questioning,

- give useful recommendations for adjustment and best efficiency/effectiveness,
- guarantee a products and process memory (what has been done and how it was done)

Best evaluation is achieved through :

- a combination of internal and external evaluation;
- a learning process based on co-construction, from building tools to drawing analysis.

In this given context, evaluation aims at facilitating group progress towards common goals:

- evaluation will first revisit individual and collective objectives to reach a shared strategic **“frame of reference”**. This one must be pragmatic and realistic, from general issues to work plan and productions, methodology and tools; setting clear priorities. Most TP's suffer from oversized objectives and lack of global coherence.
- **group potential** is often under estimated. Evaluation will help assessing initial knowledge, experience and expectations partners bring into the TP, facilitating comprehension and follow-up of specific inputs & outputs.
- **Efficient co-monitoring** is essential for a quality evaluation. A close look at NEXT2 information system will look for best complementarities between internal and external monitoring. Making sure of collecting necessary data's only. Such transnational evaluation should be based on a co-designed process, managed and synthesised by external evaluator, and where partners provide core material.

Such evaluation will be:

- practical and output-oriented, in order to help reaching ACT objectives
- “on going”, as a sustaining process for members and - on request - for the coordination;
- participatory, in close cooperation with the TP partners; through peer reviews, reflective journals, individual interviews, systematic follow up questionnaires on TP's events;
- focused on management methods, in order to better plan and monitor various activities and to consolidate the partnership, its roles and functioning; through simple strategy “compass” (opportunities, threats, strength, weaknesses/limits), etc.
- aware of the transcultural and linguistic barriers of transnational cooperation, facilitator for these exchanges if needed; through glossaries for ex.
- coordinated with each national DP's evaluation process in order to optimize integration between national and transnational projects and get the added value expected by each DP;
- Transversal items are to be followed as gender mainstreaming; empowerment; innovation.

2. About work plan (Extracts from the evaluation proposal)

a) Monitoring

The evaluator will help and facilitate the monitoring process which will be proceeded by the TCA Steering Committee and by each Theme Management Team.

⇒ preparation of monitoring frameworks ("tableaux de bord" or templates and time tables) for TCA management and activity, possibly with a few co constructed and simple indicators.

b) Evaluation of outcome and results

This function may concern the following points :

- main aims and general objectives of the project
- different foreseen outputs (as mentioned in ACT)
- specific expected results and added value for each DP (to check in first seminar)
- transnational partnership, in terms of participation and empowerment of each member, linked with each participating DP, as well as transversal criteria.

c) Evaluation of process

Especially in order to capitalize from the NEXT2 experiment in transnational networking.

- An evaluation framework, including evaluation objectives step by step, evaluative TP's questioning, proposed methods and a few indicators of outcome and of first results and impacts, calendar, will be co-designed with the Steering Committee, 03/2006.
- Evaluative information collect & oral participative restitution upon each meeting
- The evaluator will produce a mid term evaluation report and the final report.
- Reports will be transmitted a month ahead, so as to be discussed on General meetings.
- Evaluation calendar should fit into the final ACT calendar (project life cycle).

C. External evaluation agenda

SPANISH PRESIDENCY FRENCH PRESIDENCY Hungarian presidency Italian presidency

EXTERNAL EVALUATION	09-2005	10	11	12	01-2006	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09-2006	10	11	12	01-2007	02	03	04	05	06	07-2007	
NEXT2 Logical frame & priorities																								
Building NEXT2 external evaluation tools																								
NEXT2 meetings external evaluation			Huesca			Rennes				Turin			Lenti				Huesca			Rennes			Turin	
NEXT2 process follow-up																								
NEXT2 external indicator's follow-up																								
Reports								Int. report			Int. report				2006 Report 1					Int. report		Int. report		final report 2

All filled-in spaces = external evaluation work in progress

D. NEXT2 external evaluation tools and methods

A specific gathering of information is necessary during each meeting in order to evaluate; simple observation is not a sufficient tool apart from the fact it is not participative. Collect of information had to adapt to various forms of meetings in NEXT2.

Various tools have been proposed and experienced from the beginning :

- Frame of reference
- Indicators
- Partners priorities
- Questionnaires: expectations, results and impact.

As far as methods, some have been quantitative (questionnaires, radars), but most of them have been qualitative (collective interviews with delegations and with the coordinators in particular)

These collective interviews have been the most efficient when sufficient time was given (as in Brest for example).

Remarks:

- the expected co-monitoring has not always been possible; some of the internal evaluations haven't been presented (Lenti, Turin) and little exchange was led collectively about the external evaluation (only with the coordinator).
- Last seminars in particular would have been enriched with the participants contribution. Further, a feedback given to these participants from the in/out evaluation might have increased the quality of participation and impacts from the Transnational meetings. Though this participation level was quite good.

E. Work plan completed in 2006 & 2007

▪ April 2006/ Rennes General Meeting:

- Presence during Rennes Meeting, NEXT2 steering committee included
- Interviews with each national delegation
- First Intermediary report.

▪ June 2006/ Turin TCM (see annex 1):

- Distance work on intermediary report with French Transnational Coordinator
- Presence during Turin Meeting
- Turin: presentation of the logical framework and other evaluation tools; TCM evaluation; partner's priorities.
- Second Intermediary report.
- Dissemination of evaluation report to partners (Mayetic)

▪ September 2006/ Lenti 's Conference (see annex 2) :

- Distance coordination with the French Transnational Coordinator
- Presence during Lenti's Meeting
- LENTI: Validation of evaluation work plan for next period
- LENTI: Evaluation of thematic workshops (see annex 3)

- Annual 2006 report.

▪ **January 2007 / Huesca's General Meeting:**

- Presence during Huesca's Meeting
- Distance work on organizing evaluation with the Spanish Transnational Coordinator,
- Mid term evaluation on innovation, empowerment, TIC, Equality, impacts, efficiency, effectiveness (questionnaire)

▪ **April 2007: Brest**

- Evaluation of expectations from partners (collective interview)
- Evaluation of process (observation of study visits).

▪ **June 2007 :Turin**

- Partial presence during Turin's meeting (material reasons)
- Turin report : feedback on the process; evaluation of frame of reference and global strategy.
- Final evaluation report

VI. EXTERNAL EVALUATION GENERAL REPORTING

On the base of the EQUAL Guide on Transnational Co-operation 2004 – 2008 (see annexes), NEXT2 content and added value may range into the Model 1: Exchange of information and experiences.

A. Some transversal good practices

Beyond difficulties from language barriers, legal environments, and many other differences, NEXT2 gave the opportunity to experiment **with some key elements to facilitate Transnational exchange of practices and knowledge.**

This part of the report will focus on some observed “good practices” during meetings evaluation:

- **Field visits, especially when planned first in the partnership** facilitate mutual understanding, reassure the actors with familiar professional environments, (ex: visit of building site and school in Brest, visit of workshops in Lenti; of the kitchen in Turin, etc)
- **Visits alternating with specific technical presentations**, altogether cause more appropriate questioning and more efficient exchange (ex: social clause in Brest)
- **Moving from one place to another**, has been balanced enough to make dynamic meetings (**without causing dispersion**)
- **Use of diagrams and drawings** (as the representation of networking in Brest) is worth many long presentations;
- **Thematic workshops**, allow to explore more specific fields. A suggestion would be to alternate technician closed workshops (to go deeper into the subject) and open meetings where to share about their results.

- **Obligation of a final product:** not speaking of the content (not evaluated), but rather of the process. A real co-operation has come out between coordinators during the last 3 meetings (exchange of contents, photos, ideas; search for solutions). More efficient TCM: expression of needs, proposals, negotiations.
- **Long term involvement of mixed delegations (technicians and decision makers):** strong participation during the whole length of NEXT2 has enriched the process
- **Material and contents to bring back to local participants :** this would have encouraged the working preparation in the local DP, as done in AIXENA.
- **Rotating coordination :** an excellent way to involve each partner and progress into management of Transnational projects (as wished by most partners) but under some conditions.

B. Proposals of progress

- ☐ Specify and follow the Coordinator's function: Some ideas:

Conducting thread of the project, has to guaranty the respect of the production planning and the decided process as well.

Not to be confused with meeting coordination.

Make sure of good communication between partners.

Make sure all opinions are taken into consideration.

Make sure ongoing evaluation (in/out) results are understood, debated and taken into account (adjustments).

- ☐ Guarantee exchange and feedback towards local DPs during the program (inputs and outputs) (mainstreaming)

- ☐ Better use of peer meetings (groupes de pairs) to facilitate exchange and to improve the quality of outputs (individual and collective):

Efficient with groups of beneficiaries, technicians, decision makers, experts...

To be followed with large groups restitutions and debate.

- ☐ Internal and external evaluations are meant to enrich and support the products and the processes:

A minimum time to dedicate would be 1h30 to 2 hours each meeting, preferably in the beginning of the seminar.


A longer specific time could be dedicated to reflection and adjustments at mid-term

A shadow group (*groupe témoin*) with participants in charge of giving a feedback in the end of the seminar (*rapport d'étonnement*). This will bring more objectivity, help the coordinator to suggest adjustments and to capitalize on added value and good practices along the way.

VII. NEXT2 LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND PRIORITIES

A. NEXT2 initial logical framework

This framework is the frame of reference for NEXT2; completed in Turin (June 2006) it was shared by all partners and used to present the partnership. It helps keeping in mind common goals and expected productions. As far as productions, the final "good practice report" remained to be specified.



B. Transnational partner's priorities *(collected on Turin TCM)*

In order to meet expectations, whether they are national or common to all partners, the EQUAL partnership begins with collecting those expectations. This took place during Rennes meeting (national DP interviews) and Turin (collective interview). They are summarized below.

We have questioned partners in Brest (April 2007) to measure if these initial expectations were met or not, and why.

PARTNERS	LOCAL DP	TRANSNATIONAL
AIXENA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experiment a lasting territorial insertion system ▪ Strengthen public & private concerned partners on a territory (after the 1st Equal) ▪ A total coverage of Huesca territory ▪ Reach also the non identified publics ▪ Obtain significant quantitative results (especially in enterprise start up) ▪ Make the legal frame change ▪ Develop employers mobilisation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand partners difficulties ▪ Know, compare & share methods & tools (recruitment, counselling, training, work placement, enterprise start up) ▪ Identify common interests ▪ Work on thematic activities
NEW ROUTES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Launch new comprehensive programs for unemployed people (beyond placement) ▪ Motivate & maintain employed people ▪ Involve employers & inform them about beneficiaries difficulties ▪ Develop local networking for employment of all beneficiaries ▪ Involve all concerned actors on the territory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand partners difficulties, working methods & systems ▪ Visit field experiments ▪ Locate specific experiments for later exchanges ▪ Build an operative guide in order to point out good practices & implement them ▪ Initiate & strengthen transnational networking & operational cooperation ▪ See concrete individual pathways; successful results ▪ Long term watching
PRIMEALI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Experiment a lasting territorial insertion network ▪ Recruitment of young people ▪ Involve local partners in transnational activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compare & share methods & tools (recruitment, counselling, training, work placement, enterprise start up) ▪ Strengthen & develop lasting european networking (XARXA & others) ▪ Build a transnational working method & skill ▪ Exchange about territorial networking
QUALICOO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Improve beneficiaries empowerment process ▪ Optimize the national Professional Training reform ▪ Strengthen territorial networking ▪ Develop employers awareness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Know methods for certification & share methods and tools ▪ Question own practices through transnational confrontation ▪ Transfer & test new practices ▪ Work in an "european dimension" & long lasting cooperation ▪ Territorial networks mobilisation (EQUAL and others)

VIII. NEXT2 STRENGTHS AND REFLEXIONS FOR FUTURE PARTNERSHIPS

The Transnational Partnership NEXT2 has put together from September 2007 (RENNES) to June 2007 (TORINO), 4 rich EQUAL DP with experience and professionalism, all involved into local networking for insertion of target groups encountering difficulty.

Quality and diversity (form and content), organization of NEXT2 meetings have demonstrated these assets.

The Transnational Co-operation Act signed in LENTI in April 2005, from head lists opinion's, was quite ambitious.

During the first part of this evaluation – a process of re-building the framework based on the TCA and interviews with partners – more precise expectations have been expressed by each DP.

The aims of this exchange have been expressed this way in the evaluation request:

- to exchange practices and tools, knowledge on respective systems,
- to work together in an European dimension,
- to take part to European thematic workgroups,
- to find a research object more focused and to have possibility to find others European projects,
- to build shared evaluation tools.

And expectations for evaluation synthesized as to : "help us to formalize, to manage work axis, to produce together ; to propose a participative form of intercultural exchange ; to lead a learning evaluation and not a normative evaluation".

As NEXT2 is ending, quite a lot of results and impacts are appearing already:

- a large (except for Italy, with a more limited budget), and sustained participation from all delegations,
- a growing quality within the link between participants, as the program went on
- a cooperative process through the making of the final product – production to be finalized shortly.
- technical exchanges thanks to study visits and thematic activities,
- participants were able to locate relevant good practices (further visits of projects are planned by NEW ROUTES, Hungary)
- draft co-operation planned for the future between TCA partners.

Conscious of the excellent level of performance NEXT2 partners achieved, we may as evaluator, suggest a few axes of progress towards excellence for further programs :

- **Strengthen rotating co-ordination function** : this initiative from NEXT2 partners has certainly strengthened each DP's identity and involvement into NEXT2 outputs. It also allowed deeper cross cultural exchanges within the program. In order to improve the learning effect of such innovative project management, we suggest to dedicate more time and attention to giving a precise definition of the function, and passing it out from one partner to another each time. Since this function is responsible of the program progress as a whole (meetings, productions, intermediary exchanges).
- **Maintain both self evaluation and external ongoing evaluation:** launched by the partners themselves since the first seminar from HUESCA in 2005 December, its restitution has been systematic, except for the last 2 meetings. External evaluation does not substitute to self evaluation and both insights are complementary.
- **Use external evaluation as an added guidance tool:** As the Evaluation Guide points out (Evaluating socio economic development, "The Guide"; part two, page 49-50; december 2003):*"The fact that the evaluations in the structural funds are often compulsory is a mixed blessing. Evaluation may become only an obligation to satisfy institutions, with no clear added value for programme managers....Evaluation can also be seen as an attempt to second-guess programme manager's choices. More often than not they are under the impression that they already know most of the things evaluators are bound to tell them. This is why it is important to involve political authority or at least the top management together with the most important external partners of the programme, in the planning of the evaluation."*

This suggestion (a rule in regular evaluations) may be useful to enrich future Transnational evaluations: separate operational management (NEXT2 coordinators) from a strategic management of the evaluation.

A mid term evaluator's reporting to both would provide a specific time for partners to analyse and adjust the work in progress.

The evaluator thanks all NEXT2 stakeholders for their inputs in this ongoing evaluation work throughout the programme.

**ANNEX 1: NEXT2 external evaluation 2006 report
& annexes (Turin TCM ; Lenti's Conference)**

Joined to this report.

ANNEX 2: Huesca General Meeting evaluation report (01/2007)

Joined to this report.

ANNEX 3: BREST- Final self evaluation of main results & impacts

Based on the the NEXT2 partners priorities collected in the beginning of NEXT2 evaluation. Collected from partners collectively in Brest seminar on Saturday, April 28th, 2007.

What are the differences between expectations and NEXT 2 outputs

QUALICOO (France)	
PRODUCTS: efficacy	<p>presentation & sharing of methods of certification</p> <p>Good picture of certification in the 4 countries</p>
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS	<p>Work in a European dimension: Most of the French local partners never worked on a European dimension before: <u>strong involvement from them</u></p> <p>NEXT 2 has helped local involvement</p> <p>Large national delegations present in Transnational meetings</p>
New PROJECTS	<p>Some local partners want to belong to NEXT2 partnership</p> <p>LEONARDO projet + Spain : transfer of innovation</p> <p>FLEX-SECURITY => flexibility & security for target groups (vocational security pathways for adults) + ECCE (universities teachers European network)</p>

LIMITS

PRODUCTS	<p>Tools are not shared</p> <p>2 reasons: there is a link between law and tools; lack of time</p>
New PROJECTS	<p>Brittany has no possibility for Transnational partnership in 2007-2013</p>

PRIMEALI (Italy)	
PRODUCTS: efficacy	<p>Compare & share methods</p> <p>Exchange about territorial networking</p>
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERS	<p>Progress in Transnational skills</p>
Transnational cooperation	<p><u>Strengthened and developed Transnational cooperation</u></p> <p>⇒ Rennes township will participate into XARXA network (IBEP being named as coordinator)</p> <p>⇒ LEONARDO + IBEP</p>
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS	<p>Local partnerships strengthened with final conference in June 2007.</p>

LIMITS

PRODUCTS	<p>No tools have been shared</p>
New PROJECTS	<p>Difficulty with next programs => appear less concrete and further from target groups</p>

AIXENA (SPAIN)	
PRODUCTS: efficacy	Work on thematic activities has been achieved beyond expectations Interest and impacts of visiting experiments
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERS	Find new ideas to experiment ⇒ Idea from Italy = short training in enterprises ⇒ More impacts in the future
Transnational cooperation	Understand partners difficulties, thanks to travelling in each partners's country
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS	Distance between our local DP and transnational partnership has decreased

LIMITS

PRODUCTS	Sharing tools is too ambitious ⇒ For each specific target group each country has its own regulation ⇒ Sharing tools is difficult in general, for 2 reasons: Specificity of context Compulsory tools (ex: certification)
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERSHIPS	Valorisation of Transnational work may be developed on the local level, under some conditions: ⇒ Less participants ⇒ A pre-existing network ⇒ A will to share experiences

NEW ROUTES (HUNGARY)

PRODUCTS: efficacy	Tools identified both in France and Spain
IMPACT on LOCAL PARTNERS	We know more about the local partners to involve in a Transnational partnership
Transnational cooperation	Will to go back and deeper into some experiments visited in NEXT2 meetings
New PROJECTS	Future cooperation to be thought about

LIMITS

PRODUCTS	We understand limits about tools, but it remains our main expectation
-----------------	---

ANNEX 4: Final conference in TURIN (06/2007) Evaluator's synthesis

Please take into account this is only one point of view, it may be wrong or incomplete.

It is expressed only as a tool to go deeper into final evaluation, statement of what helped or what limited progress into the partnership and make proposals for further improvement, as demanded by the NEXT2 partners.

Evaluator's synthesis : What should we keep? What should we change?			
NEXT2 project	To change: lack of coherence	To be questioned	To keep & Give more priority
Final aims	<u>Empower excluded people</u> Beneficiaries empowerment is the last point NEXT2 has worked on. Use instead "collective or professional empowerment", which is a condition for the individual empowerment.		<u>Shared knowledge and experience</u> : YES <u>BUT changing the order</u> : Change experiences and knowledge Brings a difference in the Transnational expectations from the exchanges and in the methods. ACTION is MEDIATION
Strategy	Equal strategy adopted for NEXT2 seems too wide to the evaluator. The TCA does not usually provide a complete strategy, only a working plan. Normal since it is a complex partnership, to be built during the project .	Danger of "soft consensus" in partnerships may be avoided with evaluation.	This strategy became more focused <u>during the project</u> , through shared action towards a common final product
Operative goals <i>Work hypothesis</i>		Results remain to be self evaluated as far as : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First family: tools exchange • second family: point out & implement good practices • common product ? • consolidated networking (many projects) 	STRONG POINT of NEXT2 initial frame of reference Well thought from the beginning, could have been more efficient with adjustment during the project.
Means & Method		See detail below	
			Collective effort of partners allowed to reach the result expected. Presentation of the 4 thematic groups was achieved in Torino; 3 of them have been put on Mayetic beforehand. The 4th product being a DVD, was presented for a last review in Torino.
Productions			<u>Good practice report</u> : it appears to the evaluator, the good practices end up being part of the final product. They were presented during each meeting and appear in the final DVD.

Evaluator's synthesis : **What should we keep? What should we change?**

Means & Methods	-- To abandon	- To improve & adjust	+ To improve & adjust	++ To keep & develop
Organisation of Transnational meetings				a real skill in each country, technical and human quality (high level of satisfaction). A lot to learn.
Partnership composition				<u>Partnership</u> rich & diversified
Types & content of meetings	Little time to exchange on the process; regulate and adjust.	<u>Thematic Workshops</u> : public is heterogeneous, no continuity between TL meetings, little progress of collective production (exposés)	<u>Different types of meetings</u> : good idea but has been confusing because lack of flexibility (no adjustment of initial program) and may be too ambitious	More focus of <u>field visits</u> may bring more mutual questioning and mutual understanding. <u>Deeper exchange on tools</u> between technicians interested only.
Field visits		Little feedback for local stakeholders when they have participated into the production	<u>Field visits</u> : One of the best ways in a short period (as a seminar) to get in touch with reality and make partners react. Specific methods should be used to evaluate & capitalize their inputs (Italy proposal of partner's feedback) See <i>BREST evaluation</i> .	
Coordination			<u>Coordination</u> : Learning and efficiency limited by the lack of definition of the function, of transmission, of co-construction with the evaluation	<u>Coordination</u> : Rotating principle helps developing collective Transnational skills: it is a strong learning tool.
Working Languages			<u>English/French ??</u>	<u>Languages</u> : Great adaptation skills from partners and stakeholders
TCA			<u>Lack of adjustment & flexibility</u> when the TCA proved to be too ambitious, or some parts of the methods needed to be developed. (may happen when some initial members of the partnership aren't present during the whole length)	<u>Very good tool</u> : Precise working plan from the start; innovative; Wide and ambitious. Offered lots of possibilities to partners. Partially experimental.

<p>Evaluation</p>	<p><u>The continuous and participative</u> specificity chosen for NEXT2 evaluation might have been more developed during this partnership.</p> <p>This means evaluation statements (intermediary reports mainly) may be seen more as an opportunity to look back on the project and make necessary adjustments while it is happening.</p> <p>This way it is an additional resource in the project management, while a final evaluation is more focused on results and added value from the project.</p>	<p>Many evaluation tools have been experimented in order to adapt to the partnership needs.</p> <p>Few <u>reactions or feedbacks</u> were expressed by the partners as a response to these intermediary reports for instance.</p> <p>Dedicating sufficient time, at relevant stages of the project (launching, <u>mid-term</u> and final) seems to be a major key for an efficient exchange around evaluation.</p> <p>About involving partners "<u>political authorities¹ and/or top management</u> together with the most important external partners of the program" in the planning and reporting of the evaluation: This is currently needed in regular programs evaluation. To be tried in further programs.</p>	<p>While a <u>collective contribution allowed to finalize the last report</u>, for which cooperation has fully worked.</p> <p>Evaluation sessions were also fully <u>used for debate and adjustments</u> in some meetings, like Brest and Huesca (2nd) for instance.</p> <p><u>Cooperation between coordination and evaluation could have been more extended.</u></p> <p>For instance, the working plan proposed in the TCA could have been enriched (about the role of rotating coordination for instance) with the help of continuous evaluation.</p> <p>This may come from a vision of evaluation as an outside and final look on a project, while continuous evaluation allows more input and adjustment during the project.</p>	<p><u>Both self evaluation and external evaluation</u> were led in NEXT2.</p> <p>This partnership has been a rich learning experience about adapting evaluation to the context of a Transnational partnership.</p>
--------------------------	---	--	---	--

¹ As suggested in the Evaluation Guide.