Project co-financed by the European Regional Development Fund

MED Greenhouses
"Green Growth through the capitalization of innovative Greenhouses"

Project Evaluation Report

[SEMIDE]

Project Details:

Programme: **Interreg MED 2014-2020**

Priority Axis: **1. Promoting Mediterranean innovation capacities to develop smart and sustainable growth**

Objective: **1.1. To increase transnational activity of innovative clusters and networks of key sectors of the MED area**

Project Title: **Green Growth through the capitalization of innovative Greenhouses**

Project Acronym: **MED Greenhouses**

Reference No: **3082**

Lead Partner: **TEI of Thessaly**

Total Budget: **1,171,400 €**

Time Frame: **01/02/2018 - 31.07.2019**

Deliverable Details

WP: 1 – Project Management

Activity: 1.2 – Project Evaluation

Deliverable Title: Project evaluation report

Responsible Partner: TEI of Thessaly

Involved Partners: All

Date & Place of delivery:

Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

An intermediate and a final evaluation report are foreseen during project implementation, in order to validate the fulfilment of the expected results and define possible modifications.

This deliverable will be a tool that each partner must use in order to monitor the progress of its activities, identify any gaps compared to the Project's Application Form, and proceed to immediate interventions/actions. The evaluation report will be based on the following methodology (Section 1), produced by the Lead Partner for project purposes.

Afterwards, the Lead Partner(LP), through its external evaluator,will collect the overall project results and outputs (based on the individual reports of the partners)assessing whether these arein line with the project's Application Form and with the MED requirements.

Two Joints Reports will be produced in total; one intermediate and one Final report.

1. Rationale

The Evaluation report will facilitate the evaluation ofthe project's activities by the partners and allow them to proceed to the design and implementation of necessary interventions and corrective measures when this is necessary. In this context, tailored qualitative and quantitative indicators are designed in line with the content and the required deliverables of the activities, as well as the targets and the goals that have been set and defined during the project implementation process. In particular,

- ❑ input, output and result (performance) indicators will be used for the unbiased evaluation of project's activities.
- ❑ The indicators/tools will also assess the level of achievement of the project objectives.

The indicators are divided in the following three (3) main categories:

- **Input indicators**
- **Output indicators**
- **Result (and performance)[1] indicators**

This methodology provides a matrix (Section 2) with all the types of indicators that have been identified and are in line with the project's activities/deliverables and the values/goals/targets that have been set. Nevertheless, it is highlighted that in some cases, in order to assess the results extracted from the indicators table, the completion of the project is required; for this reason, the target value of some indicators is expected to be filled in/ and/or re-assessed accordingly by each partner at the end of the project.

Once the matrix of the indicators is completed, the partners will be able to extract conclusions by evaluating the indicators (section 3). The results of these evaluations will allow the partners to identify whether any interventions and/or corrective actions are required in order to improve their performance (section 4).

Section 4 presents a pool of interventions/corrective actions that the partners should take into consideration if they score poorly on the indicators.

[1]It is highlighted that for the purpose of this methodology (and report) the result indicators also include the performance indicators; thus, both financial and non-financial values are reported and the results of both individual and overall activities are foreseen to be recorded in order to provide insights on what actions should be taken to make improvements.

2. Type of Indicators

The section identifies and presents the qualitative and quantitative indicators designed separately for the needs of each activity. The indicators aim to provide the necessary data/information to the partners in order to give them the input to assess whether they are in line with the qualitative standards and they have reached the goals/objectives of the project.

In particular, the indicators aim to provide valuable data that will help the project partners to:

- ❑ Assess the level of achievement of the projects' objectives/activities and the impact of the project's results to thetarget groups.
- ❑ Valorise efficiently the available financial and human resources for project's purposes.
- ❑ Ensure that the foreseen project deliverables and main outputs are produced properly meeting the required quality standards.
- ❑ Improve the existing knowledge and the decision-making capacity regarding the project's activities.
- ❑ Stimulate and engage key players of the agriculture/greenhouse sector with project's activities, reaching the expected target values.
- ❑ Influence government policy.
- ❑ Identify poor performances/gaps and adopt immediate corrective measures/interventions.

In this context, 3 types of indicators are designed and examined in table 1. These are:

- **Input indicators**[2]: usually provide a quantitative estimation and count the resources consumed/exploited by partners during a finite time. These could be human resources, financial resources or even equipment or infrastructures used for the implementation of the project's activities.
- **Output indicators:** usually provide a quantitative estimation and count the outputs produced from the implementation of the project's activities at a finite time. In particular, outputs could be deliverables such as reports, organized events, plans, studies etc.
- **Result (Performance) indicators:** The result (and performance) indicators of the project will be based on quantitative and qualitative indicators addressing categories such as:
    - Formalization of economic, technological & scientific objectives;

[2] It is strongly recommended that the Input indicators be filled in line with the Financial Reporting in SYNERGIE CTE.

- Number of Cluster members reached;
- Number of the stakeholders involved in project's activities;
- Number of main outputs achieved;
- International visibility &synergies achieved with other projects

The evaluation of the performance indicators will result in useful conclusions regarding the performance of the Project's activities and will define whether the Project Manager of each partner and the Project Coordinator need to take corrective measures and/or project modifications. Generally, the evaluation report of the Project should provide answers to the following questions:

- What progress has been made compared to the anticipated activities?
- Has the Project achieved its goals in terms of the expected results within the deadlines?
- Does the Project coordinator have enough information and data to measure and evaluate the project's performance?
- Have the foreseen main outputs of the project been achieved?
- How effective was the co-operation among the partners?
- How successfulwere the project's events? Did they engage key players of the sector? Were they satisfied?
- Did the project tools (e.g. policy recommendations) influence policy makers? Did they make any commitments?

The target valuesthat have been included in the following matricesare based on the Application Form of the project (Project's goals). However, some of the indicators do not have a specific target value as these might differ for each partner. In this case, the partners are strongly recommended to set their own initial targets in order to be able to assess their performance in the project.Furthermore, there indicators are not applicable for some partners; these partners should thus ignore them (i.e. leave it empty).

Section 3 presents the monitoring matrices that have been designed per WP / Activity. Each partner must fill in the tables 1-5 based on the project's and partner's goals.

3. Monitoring matrices (to be filled in)

Table 1 – Indicators of WP1/Activity 1.1

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
1.1 – Project Management & Coordination	*1. Number or working hours spent*	*87.75*	*184*	*1. Number of Progress Reports elaborated*	*1*	***31***	*1. Number of Certificates issued*	*1*	***3***
	2. Cost[3]	*2789*	*8000*	*2. Number of Steering Committee Meetings attended (including Kick Off)*	*2*	***2***	*2. Number of payments received by the Program*	*1*	***3***
	3. Number of personnel occupied in the activity	*3*	*3*	*3. Number of Minutes produced*	*2*	***2***			
	4. Number of[4] *Tenders launched*	*Not concerned*	*Not concerned*	*4. Number of requests for the validation of the expenses*	*1*	***1***	*3. Eligibility of Expenses achieved (percentage)*		***100%***

[3]The target value for the cost should be in line with the foreseen budget in the Application Form. Apply this in all the matrices.

[4]If applicable. Apply this in all the matrices.

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
				5. Number of External Experts contracted[5]					

Table 2 – Indicators of WP2 / Activities 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4

Activities	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4	*1. Number or working hours spent* *2. Cost* *3. Number of personnel occupied in the activity* *4. Number of Tenders*	*160* *5 072* *2* *1*	*413* *18 000* *2* *No*	*1. Number of Communication Plans elaborated* *2. Number of Promotional material produced* *3. Number Social pages created* *4. Number of posts sent to Social Media pages*	*1* *2 and the rest in progress* *Not concerned* *10*	***1*** ***1172*** ***2*** ***20***	*1. Synergies with other projects achieved* *2. Number of stakeholders (from the foreseen target groups) involved/engaged in the project*	*2* *40*	***2*** ***37***

[5]If applicable. Apply this in all the matrices

Activities	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
	launched		*target value*	*5. Number of videos produced* *6. Number of external events attended* *7. Number of minutes from the external events elaborated* *8. Number of reports with knowledge from horizontal project produced* *9. Number of articles/documents/posts uploaded to the project's Website* *10. Number of External Experts contracted*	*Not concerned* *In progress* *In progress* *1* *4* *1*	***1*** ***2*** ***2*** ***1*** ***18*** ***1***			

Table 3 – Indicators of WP3 / Activity 3.1State of play in Policies, Financing, Technologies &Stakeholders

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
3.1 State of play in Policies, Financing, Technologies &Stakeholders	*1. Number or working hours spent* *2. Cost* *3. Number of personnel occupied in the activity* *4. Number of Tenders launched*	*581* *25 324* *2* *In progress*	*No target value* *No target value* *2* *No target value*	*1. Number of reports on technologies of innovative greenhouses elaborated* *2. Number of databases with stakeholders & Beneficiaries of the sector developed* *3. Number ofreports with available financial channels for eco-innovative technologies elaborated* *4. Number of reports on*	*1* *1* *1* *1*	***1*** ***1*** ***1***	*1. Number of Innovative Technologies identified and presented* *2. Number of financial channels for eco-innovation identified and presented* *3. Number of policies / frameworks promoting eco-innovation identified and presented*	*6* *4* *5*	*6* *4* ***5***

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
				existing policies / frameworks related to the greenhouse sector elaborated		***1***	*4. Number of gaps and missing links identified and presented*	*In progress*	***8***
				5. Number of reports with gaps and policy recommendations elaborated	*In progress*	***1***	*5. Number of policy recommendations designed and presented*	*In progress*	***3***
				6. Number of External Experts contracted	*0*	***No target value***			

Table 4 – Indicators of WP3 / Activity 3.2 Transferring knowledge

Activity	Input indicators	Output indicators	Result Indicators

	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
3.2. Transferring Knowledge	*1. Number of working hours spent* *2. Cost* *3. Number of personnel occupied in the activity* *4. Number of Tenders launched*	*117* *5 100* *2*	*no target value* *no target value* *2*	*1. Number of Training course material produced on geothermal installations* *2. Number of E-learning platforms developed* *3. Number of Workshops held with the participation of actors/ stakeholders of the greenhouse sector* *4. Number of Webinars heldwith the participation of actors/ stakeholders of the greenhouse sector*	*Not concerned* *Not concerned* *In progress* *In progress*	***1*** ***1*** ***3*** ***3*** ***1***	*1. Number of key players/stakeholders trained through webinars/seminars* *2. Number Actions designed for transferring existing knowledge* *3. Number of stakeholders who participated in the consultations* *4. Numbers of mechanisms favouring cooperation between actors of the 4-helix identified and presented*	*In progress* *In progress* *49* *In progress*	***40*** ***3*** ***60*** ***4***

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
				5. Number of Action Plans elaborated	*Not concerned*	***3***			
				6. Number of Consultations organized with the participation of stakeholders/ actors of the sector	*2*	***1***			
				7. Number of reports elaborated with recommendations for the establishment of mechanisms favouring cooperation between actors of the 4-helix.	*In progress*	***1***			
				8. Number of External Experts contracted	*In progress*	***1***			

Table 5 – Indicators of WP3 / Activity 3.3 Synergies & Establishment of Transnational Innovative Cluster

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value
3.3. Synergies & Establishment of Transnational Innovative Cluster	*1. Number or working hours spent* *2. Cost* *3. Number of personnel occupied in the activity* *4. Number of Tenders launched*	*0* *0* *In progress*	*No target value*	*1.Number of Memorandums developed and signed* *2. Number of Conferences organized* *3. Number of Forums for Innovative agriculture developed* *4. Number of External Experts contracted*	*In progress* *In progress* *In progress* *In progress*	***1*** ***1*** ***1*** ***2***	*1. Numberof Clusters developed* *2. Numberof Cluster'smembers reached* *3.Number of Visitors engaged in the Forum* *4. Number of guests who attended the Conference*	*In progress* *In progress* *In progress* *In progress*	***1*** ***20*** ***20*** ***25***

Activity	Input indicators			Output indicators			Result Indicators		
	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value	Indicator	Value reached	Target value

4. Evaluation of the Indicators

Once the partners have filled in the above matrices (tables 1-5) with the corresponding values for each indicator (input, output and result), they will be able to proceed to the evaluation process in order to identify whether any interventions/ corrective actions are required.
Due to the fact that the selected indicators measure different parameters, it is not possible to use the same scoring scale for their evaluation. In this context, the evaluation takes place in 5 individual matrices, based on the above activities. Although the evaluation is separated in 5 different groups, the partners can extract an overall view of their performances regarding the goals, objectives, outputs and results of project.

Based on the indicator, 2 types of criteria are used for its evaluation:

1st type:[6] Yes or **No (On-off criterion).**
There are some indicators that have been either achieved, or they haven't (e.g. assessing whether the partners had involved/engaged37 stakeholders in the project). In case that the answer is "no", then the performance is considered "poor" and further effort/action is required by the partners in order to reach the target value; otherwise, the performance is considered "Good" and no further action is required.

Response:	**Yes**	**No**
Evaluation:	**Good**	**Poor**

NB: In quantitative terms it is understood that having36stakeholders instead of 37 is not practically "poor" performance; however, considering that this is also a project goal (it is foreseen in the AF) and that this value will be evaluated during the project closure, failing to achieve these results may partly render the project unsuccessful. For this reason, great importance is given to this type of indicators. Thus, every indicator that assesses a project goal is evaluated with an on-off criterion.

[6]The 1st type is used for project's goals (target values that had been set in the Application Form).

2nd type: Extent [7]of achievement of the target value (transforming quantitative values in easy to use qualitative terms).

The 2nd type of evaluation assesses the extent of achievement of the target value. This type is used for the goals set by each partner and not foreseen in the AF. The scoring scale is presented in the following table, according to the achieved results.

% of target value achievement	< 50%	51-80%	> 81 -100%
Status	Poor	Moderate	Good

- ✓ When one of the indicators has a "Poor" performance, then further actions are required by the partners in order to improve the project performance and achieve the targeted results.
- ✓ When more than 3 indicators (per matrix)have a "Moderate" performance then further actions and effort is required by the partners in order to improve the project performance and achieve the targeted results.

The following matrices illustrate which type of evaluation method corresponds to each indicator:

Table 6. Evaluation Matrix of the WP1/Activity 1.1

Activity	Input Indicator		Output Indicator		Result Indicator	
1.1.Project Management & Coordination	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*
	1	2nd	1	1st	1	2nd
	2	2nd	2	2nd	2	2nd
	3	2nd	3	1st	3	2nd
	4	2nd	4	2nd		
			5	2nd		
Need for Action	*If any of the indicators is scored as "poor" or more than 3 indicators are scored as "moderate"*					

[7]The 2nd type is used for partner's goals (target values that had been set by partner's – not included in the Application Form of the project).

Table 7. Evaluation Matrix of the WP2 / Activities 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4

Activities	**Input Indicator**		**Output Indicator**		**Result Indicator**	
2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*
	1	2nd	1	1st	1	2nd
	2	2nd	2	1st	2	1st
	3	2nd	3	1st		
	4	2nd	4	2nd		
			5	1st		
			6	*1st*		
			7	*1st*		
			8	*1st*		
			9	*2nd*		
			10	*2nd*		
Need for Action	*If any of the indicators is scored as "poor" or more than 3 indicators are scored as "moderate"*					

Table 8. Evaluation Matrix of the WP3 / Activity 3.1

Activity	**Input Indicator**		**Output Indicator**		**Result Indicator**	
3.1. State of play in Policies, Financing, Technologies & Stakeholders	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*
	1	2nd	1	1st	1	2nd
	2	2nd	2	1st	2	2nd
	3	2nd	3	1st	3	2nd
	4	2nd	4	1st	4	2nd
			5	1st	5	2nd
			6	2nd		
Need for Action	*If any of the indicators is scored as "poor" or more than 3 indicators are scored as "moderate"*					

Table 9. Evaluation Matrix of the WP3 / Activity 3.2

Activity	Input Indicator		Output Indicator		Result Indicator	
3.2. Transferring knowledge	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*
	1	2nd	1	1st	1	2nd
	2	2nd	2	1st	2	2nd
	3	2nd	3	1st	3	2nd
	4	2nd	4	1st	4	2nd
			5	1st		
			6	1st		
			7	1st		
			8	2nd		
Need for Action	*If any of the indicators is scored as "poor" or more than 3 indicators are scored as "moderate"*					

Table 10. Evaluation Matrix of the WP3 / Activity 3.3

Activity	Input Indicator		Output Indicator		Result Indicator	
3.3. Synergies & Establishment of Transnational Innovative Cluster	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*	*No*	*Type of Evaluation*
	1	2nd	1	1st	1	1st
	2	2nd	2	1st	2	2nd
	3	2nd	3	1st	3	2nd
	4	2nd	4	2nd	4	2nd
Need for Action	*If any of the indicators is scored as "poor" or more than 3 indicators are scored as "moderate"*					

Examplesof how to fill in the Evaluation matrices:

1. Assessing an indicator following the 1st type of evaluation (on-off criterion):

Output indicator No.3 of the Activity3.2:

Output indicator	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
Number of Workshops conducted with the participation of actors/stakeholders of the greenhouse sector	2	3 **(Project goal)**	**Poor**
Need for Action	The organization of one more workshop is required		

2. Assessing an indicator following the 2nd type of evaluation (the extent of achievement of the target value):

Result indicator No.1 of the activity 3.2:

Result indicator	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**% of target value achievement**	**Status**
Number of key players/stakeholders trained through webinars/seminars	21	25[8] (Partner's goal)	84%	GOOD

[8]This is an indicative value. Each partner will set its own goals.

5. Corrective Measures / Interventions

After completing the evaluation process, the partners must undertake corrective actions/ interventions wherever this is needed. These modifications can be separated in 3 main categories:

1st - Need for more resources (Improve the Input Indicators).

The poor performance of an activity could be due to the lack of financial or human resources or lack of the necessary equipment/infrastructures. In this case, the partners should focus their efforts to address these issues; otherwise, they will not be able to reverse their poor output/results.

2nd - Need for further dissemination / Improve communication channels

The poor scoring might also be due to the fact that the dissemination activities, such as newsletters, promotional material, publicity actions, events etc., do not meet the standards for achieving the project goals. For example, a poor score linked to the evaluation of the indicators related to the members, stakeholders, key players of the sector, funders, policy makers, investors etc., could mean that either they did not receive the correct message/ motivations in order to be involved, or they did not receive the message at all. In this case, the partners should make additional efforts and design follow-up activities included in the communication strategy of the project, or, if necessary, redesign the strategy to improve the impact of project results.

3rd – Need for systemic changes of the designed activities

Changes in one or several parts of the activities might be necessary in order to improve the performance of the output/result indicators. The poor performance of these indicators might be due to the fact that the approach for the implementation of the activities / organization of the project events was poorly designed and might not be as valuable and useful as was initially considered. In this case, the partners should review and revise the nature/content of these activities focusing on those that will trigger the interest of the stakeholders and maximize the impact of project's results.

Table 11 presents a list of indicative interventions / corrective actions that could modified and tailored to the project needs by the partners depending on the issues that have been identified from the evaluation of the indicators.

Table 11 - Pool of indicative interventions / corrective actions

Category	Indicative Interventions / corrective actions
1	▪ Hire qualified personnel for the implementation of the project's activities. ▪ Provide additional / allocate financial resources in order to cover the requirements of the activities. ▪ Acquire the necessary equipment. ▪ Grant access to International / National databases. ▪ Consult external experts valorising their experiences/knowledge.
2	▪ Review the communication strategy and modify/improve, it if necessary. ▪ Review the message of the promotional material and proceed to the necessary changes, if necessary. ▪ Implement a better dissemination strategy to the target groups and potential members. ▪ Participate in more external events of Green Growth Community ▪ Improve the content of the events. ▪ Review & revise the communication channels among the partners & the target groups / members. ▪ Identify and provide further incentives to the target groups / members.
3	Review & revise: ▪ the offered services of the Cluster; ▪ the coordination / management of the project; ▪ the communication approach between the members; ▪ the business model & the structure of the Cluster. ▪ The approach for conducting the workshops/webinars/consultations ▪ The content of the training material

6. Evaluation Matrices (to be filled in)

Table 12 – Evaluation Matrix for WP1/Activity 1.1

Activity		Input Indicator			Output Indicator			Result Indicator		
1.1 Project Management & Coordination	**No**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
	1	87.75	184	Poor	1	1	Good	1	3	Moderate
	2	2789	8000	Poor	2	2	Good	1	3	Moderate
	3	3	3	Good	2	2	Good	In progress	100%	-
	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	Good			
Need for Action	**Yes /No***(select accordingly)* **No**									
Proposed Intervention / Corrective Action	*(if it is required)* - Minutes will be produced after the meeting in France - *2 progress reports will be prepared after the end of second and thirs semesters*									

Table 13 – Evaluation Matrix for WP2/Activities 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 & 2.4

Activities		Input Indicator			Output Indicator			Result Indicator		
	No	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
2.1, 2.2., 2.3 & 2.4	**1**	160	413	Poor	1	1	good	2	2	good
	2	5072	18000	Poor	2	1172	Poor	40	37	good
	3	2	2	Good	Not concerned	2	N/A			
	4	1	N/A	N/A	10	20	Moderate			
	5				N/A	N/A				
	6				*0*	*2*	*poor*			
	7				*0*	*2*	*poor*			
	8				*1*	*1*	*Good*			
	9				*4*	*18*	*Poor*			
	10				*1*	*1*	*Good*			
Need for Action	**Yes /No***(select accordingly)* **yes**									
Proposed Intervention / Corrective	*(if it is required)* - *Output indicator 2 : Dissemination materials will be printed soon*									

Activities	Input Indicator	Output Indicator	Result Indicator
Action	- *Output indicator 9: More articles will be sent to the communication leader* - *In march SEMIDE will participate at 2 external events*		

Table 14 – Evaluation Matrix for WP3/Activities 3.1

Activity		Input Indicator			Output Indicator			Result Indicator		
3.1. State of play in Policies, Financing, Technologies & Stakeholders	No	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
	1	581	N/A	N/A	1	1	Good	6	6	Good
	2	25324	N/A	N/A	1	1	Good	4	4	Good
	3	2	2	Good	1	1	Good	5	5	Good
	4	In progress	In progress	In progress	1	1	Good	In progress	In progress	
	5				*0*	*N/A*				
	6									
Need for Action	**Yes /No***(select accordingly)* *No*									
Proposed Intervention / Corrective Action	*(if it is required)*									

Table 15 – Evaluation Matrix for WP3/Activities 3.2

Activity		Input Indicator			Output Indicator			Result Indicator		
3.2. Transferring knowledge	No	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
	1	117	N/A	N/A	Not concerned	N/A	N/A	In progress	40	
	2	5100	N/A	N/A	Not concerned	N/A	N/A	In progress	3	
	3	2	2	Good	In progress	3		49	60	Moderate
	4				In progress	1		In progress	4	
	5				*In progress*					
	6				*2*	*3*	*Moderate*			
	7				*In progress*	*1*				
	8				*In progress*					
Need for Action	**Yes /No***(select accordingly)* **Yes - Moderate**									
Proposed Intervention / Corrective Action	*(if it is required)* - *By organizing the 3rd consultation SEMIDE will reach the target value (60stackholders)*									

Table 16 – Evaluation Matrix for WP3/Activities 3.3

Activity		Input Indicator			Output Indicator			Result Indicator		
3.3. Synergies & Establishment of Transnational Innovative Cluster	No	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**	**Value Reached**	**Target value**	**Status**
	1	0	N/A		In progress	1		In progress	1	
	2	0	N/A		In progress	1		In progress	20	
	3	In progress	2		In progress	1		In progress	20	
	4	In progress			In progress	2		In progress	25	
	5									
	6									
	7									
Need for Action	**Yes /No***(select accordingly)*									
Proposed Intervention / Corrective Action	*(if it is required)*									