

Evaluation Plan

The monitoring and impact assessment
framework for JA-CHRODIS

Annex: Indicators description



Co-funded by
the Health Programme
of the European Union

THIS PUBLICATION ARISES FROM THE JOINT ACTION CHRODIS, WHICH HAS RECEIVED FUNDING FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION, IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE HEALTH PROGRAMME (2008-2013). SOLE RESPONSIBILITY LIES WITH THE AUTHOR AND THE CONSUMERS, HEALTH, AGRICULTURE AND FOOD EXECUTIVE AGENCY IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY USE THAT MAY BE MADE OF THE INFORMATION CONTAINED THEREIN.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
GENERAL PROCESS INDICATORS.....	4
WP1: Coordination.....	8
Task 1: General coordination.....	8
Kick off meeting	23
Activity: Stakeholders meetings	28
Activity: Executive Board meetings	34
Activity: Advisory Board meetings.....	39
Activity: General Assembly meetings	47
Task 2: Establishment of the Governing Board	53
WP2: Dissemination of the Joint Action.	64
Task 1: Dissemination	66
Task 1: Stakeholder Mapping.....	82
Task 2: Online Tools	88
Activity: JA-CHRODIS website	88
Activity: Social Media.....	103
WP3: Evaluation.....	109
Task 1: Development of evaluation plan	109
Task 2: Implementation of mid term report.....	112
Task 3: Implementation of final report.....	116
WP4: Platform for knowledge exchange.	120
Task 1: Development of assessment criteria	120

Task 2: Design of a set of online tools aimed at providing users with guidance on development, implementation and evaluation of chronic care practices	123
Task 3: Setting an online help desk with expert consultants available to help users in the actual development, implementation and evaluation of chronic care practices	125
Task 4: Creation of a repository of excellent chronic care practices and policies across Europe	127
Task 5: Development of a digital library	131
Task 6: Technological platform and services to support post JA activities	135
WP5: Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic prevention across the life cycle.	142
Task 1: Review of existing work, situation and needs	142
Task 2: Defining an approach.....	151
Task 4: Conference seminars	158
Task 5: Peer reviews/ Study visits.....	162
WP6: Development of common guidance and methodologies for care pathways for multi-morbid patients.....	166
Task 1: Identify targets of potential interventions for management of multi-morbid patients	166
Task 2: Review existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients.....	173
Task 3: Assess and select good practices on management of multi-morbid patients	183
Task 4: Define multi-morbidity case management training modules	194
WP7: Diabetes: a case study on strengthening health care for people with chronic diseases.	202

GENERAL PROCESS INDICATORS

(common indicators for all the WP, some WPs have their own general process indicators))

(code)_Indicator	WPx.G.1_Number of meetings/teleconferences organized by WPx
Definition	Number of meeting/teleconferences organized by WPx
Justification	Monitoring WP coordination
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WPx meeting minutes
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WPx
Periodicity of data collection	Annual M12, M24, M36
Completion criteria	2 per year
Acceptance criteria	2 per year
Observations	Either F2F or teleconference

(code)_Indicator	WPx.G.2_Percentage of partners attending to the WPx meetings/teleconferences
Definition	(Number of WPx partners attending each meeting/number of total WPx partners)*100
Justification	Monitoring partners involvement in their own WP
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WPx meetings/teleconferences' minutes
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WPx
Periodicity of data collection	Annual M12, M24, M36
Completion criteria	100% of partners involved in WPx attending all the meetings
Acceptance criteria	80% of partners involved
Observations	Either F2F or teleconference

(code)_Indicator	WPx.G.3_Percentage of accomplishment of Deliverables
Definition	(number of Deliverables completed on time/ total number of deadlines)*100
Justification	Monitoring WP activity
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Interim (annual) and final reports
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WPx
Periodicity of data collection	Annual M14, M26, M39
Completion criteria	100% of the Deliverables completed on time
Acceptance criteria	M14 30% / M26 60% / M39 100%
Observations	Deliverables as foreseen in GA amended

(code)_Indicator	WPx.G.4_Satisfaction of WP members with WPx
Definition	Satisfaction of WP members with organization, information received and feedback of their work
Justification	Monitoring partners satisfaction
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Associated and Collaborating partners of WPx
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction survey
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	M27, M38
Completion criteria	100% satisfied
Acceptance criteria	80% satisfied
Observations	

WP1: Coordination

Task 1: General coordination

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.1_Development of SOP
Definition	Development of Standard Operating Procedures for JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Provides the description of the principles, procedures and tools in order to facilitate the relations between the JA-CHRODIS partners and the governance structures
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website or intranet
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	SOP document developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.2_3-year Work Plan
Definition	Development of 3-year JA-CHRODIS work plan documents
Justification	Work Plans provides the guide for the coordination and timing of the JA-CHRODIS activities to manage the action
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website or intranet
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M4)
Completion criteria	3-year work plan developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.3_Deliverables WP1
Definition	% accomplishment of deliverables WP1 deadlines
Justification	Timing of WP1 deliverables ensures compliance with GA and facilitate update information to all partners and stakeholders of JA-CHRODIS
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Annual and final reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Annually (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	All deliverables achieved on schedule
Acceptance criteria	Deliverables achieved are completed with no more than 3 months delay in relation to schedule
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.4_ Internactions EIP-AHA
Definition	Interactions (TC's, meetings) with the EIP-AHA partnership it is relevant considering the synergies and close collaboration with this other EU initiative that are similar to JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Synergies with EIP-AHA have been identified. It is relevant for WP1 to manage the progress of JA-CHRODIS in communication with EIP-AHA partnership
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting minutes/ annual reports/ email contact
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Annually (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Evidence of regular exchanges (meetings and/or emails) with EIP-AHA partnership
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.5_Annual reports
Definition	Annual reports developed for JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Annual reports (interims and final) provides the basic information on the progress of the JA-CHRODIS according to GA, indicating possible deviations, problems encountered and next actions
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Final report
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Annually for interim reports (M12, M24, M39) and final report (M39)
Completion criteria	All reports completed on schedule
Acceptance criteria	All report completed with no more than 2 months delay in relation to schedule
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.6_Delivables_reports_on_web
Definition	Deliverables and reports from JA-CHRODIS available on public project's website
Justification	It is necessary that all partners and public audience have accessed to the results from JA-CHRODIS
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M12, M24 and M39)
Completion criteria	Public deliverables and reports available on public website
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	Indicator to be achieved with the collaboration of WP2

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.7_Person days GA vs actual person days
Definition	Person days per WP in GA versus person days per WP present day
Justification	Accuracy in the estimation of the resources necessary to carry out the project is key to enable transfer of resources between WPs.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Emails
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M9, M14, M21, M26, M33, M36
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.8_ Person days executed vs person days available
Definition	Person days executed per WP versus person days available for the whole JA
Justification	WP leaders need to be informed on an ongoing basis of the person days executed within their WP to enable them to have an efficient allocation of the remaining resources available to complete the tasks assigned to their WP.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Financial Reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Biannually (M6, M12, M18, M24, M30, M39)
Completion criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Acceptance criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.9_ Budget executed WP versus budget JA
Definition	Budget executed per WP versus budget available for the whole JA
Justification	Being aware of their level of budget execution within their WPs allows WP leaders to make decisions to maximize their resources.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Financial Reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Biannually (M6, M12, M18, M24, M30, M39)
Completion criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Acceptance criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.10_ Collaboration EIP-AHA
Definition	Collaboration and synergies established with initiative EIP-AHA
Justification	It is important that a collaboration is established with EIP-AHA with who JA-CHRODIS share similar objectives and possible stakeholder's interests
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Monthly reports/ interim reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Evidence of regular exchange and interaction with EIP-AHA representatives
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.11 _ Satisfaction WP leaders
Definition	Satisfaction of WP leaders with organisation, information received and feedback of WP1 work
Justification	As the coordinating WP, it is essential for the smooth and successful running of the project that all WP leader are satisfied with the organisation and information provided by WP1
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Evaluation reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (M24 and M39)
Completion criteria	80% of WP leaders satisfied with organisation and information provided by WP1
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.12_ % accomplishment deliverables
Definition	Percentage of accomplishment deliverables deadlines in all WPs
Justification	The deliverables as agreed in the Grant are the results of the project and a relevant indicator that demonstrate its achievements and timely progress. It is important to comply with the GA and continue with the planned project to execute and deliver these reports in a timely manner.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Interim and final reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24 and M39
Completion criteria	All deliverables achieved on schedule
Acceptance criteria	Deliverables achieved are completed with no more than 3 months delay in relation to schedule
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.13_ Indicators for JA-CHRODIS impact assessment
Definition	Defining indicator to evaluate together with WP3 JA-CHRODIS impact assessment
Justification	The impact JA-CHRODIS needs to be evaluated to monitor performance according to a defined indicators
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List and description of indicators
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Set of impact indicators agreed between WP1 and WP3
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.14_ % person days executed
Definition	% of person days executed in relation to the total number of person days allocated to the JA
Justification	To monitor that the progress of the JA is in line with the man effort predicted.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Financial Reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Annually (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Acceptance criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.1.15_ % Budget executed
Definition	% of budget consumed in relation to the total budget allocated to the JA
Justification	To monitor that the progress of the JA is in line with the predicted budget.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Financial reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Annually (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Acceptance criteria	100% Financial Reports received
Observations	

Kick off meeting

(code)_Indicator	WP1.KO.1_ Kick off meeting
Definition	Kick-off meeting organisation
Justification	The kick off meeting is the first face-to-face interaction of the group where a common language is developed, goals are set and important discussions on expectations and upcoming activities in term of content and timing occur, avoiding ambiguity and miscommunication. Its smooth organisation facilitates the participation of all invitees.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Minutes from meeting
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Kick off meeting completed
Acceptance criteria	Kick off meeting completed
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.KO.2_MS participating in kick off meeting
Definition	Number of MS who participated in kick off meeting
Justification	Being JA-CHRODIS a European initiative, it is important that MS participating in it are represented at the kick off meeting
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List of participants
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	80% of MS participating in JA-CHRODIS, represented in meeting
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.KO.3_Partners participating in kick off meeting
Definition	Number of partners (%) who participated in kick off meeting
Justification	Being JA-CHRODIS a large European initiative, it is important that partners participating in it are present at the kick off meeting
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List of participants
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	80% of partners participating in JA-CHRODIS, represented in meeting
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.KO.4_Minutes kick off meeting
Definition	Minutes posted on the project's website
Justification	For a transparent interaction and decision making, minutes from the kick-off meeting needs to be available for all public
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS web
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Kick off minutes meeting posted on website
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.KO.5_Final outcome of the meeting
Definition	Final outcome of the meeting based on minutes and objectives
Justification	For a transparent interaction and decision making, minutes from the kick-off meeting needs to be available for all public
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS web
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Conclusions of meeting included in meeting minutes
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

Activity: Stakeholders meetings

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.1_ Number stakeholders meetings
Definition	Number of stakeholder meetings
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS web
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M39)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Stakeholder meetings organised according to GA (once per year)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.2_ Number of participants invited to SH meetings
Definition	Number of participants (organisations per Member State) invited to stakeholders meetings
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Participants list SH meetings
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	3 times (following the annual SH Forum meeting) (M12, M17, M29)
Completion criteria	SH forum list
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.3_ Number of participants to SH meetings
Definition	Number of participants (organisations per Member State) attending stakeholders meetings (%)
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Participants list SH meetings
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	3 times (following the annual SH Forum meeting) (M12, M17, M29)
Completion criteria	SH forum list
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.4_ Minutes website
Definition	Minutes posted on the project's website
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	3 times (following the annual SH Forum meeting) (M12, M17, M29)
Completion criteria	Minutes from SH meeting available on JA-CHRODIS
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.5_ Satisfaction SH meeting
Definition	Satisfaction from participants about SH meetings
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS. Their satisfaction to the meeting is important as a proxy to the achievement of objectives of the meeting.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	Satisfaction survey
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	3 times (following the annual SH Forum meeting) (M12, M17, M29)
Completion criteria	SH satisfaction survey
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.SH.6_ Continuous involvement
Definition	Number of stakeholders who attend more than one stakeholders meeting
Justification	The involvement of stakeholders is essential as having an impact on the success of JA-CHRODIS. Organisation and involvement of SH in meetings ensures that stakeholders receive information that is relevant to their needs and builds positive attitudes towards JA-CHRODIS. Attendance to more than one meeting can represent interest and continuous involvement of SH in JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	Participants list
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	2 times (following the 2 nd and 3 rd annual SH Forum meeting) (M17, M29)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	30% of SH attending 2 nd or 3 rd annual meeting has attended at least 1 previous
Observations	

Activity: Executive Board meetings

(code)_Indicator	WP1.EB.1_ Number of EB meetings
Definition	Number of EB meetings/ teleconferences organised by WP1
Justification	The Executive Board has among other responsibilities, the guidance and steering the project and informing on progress, outputs and outcomes. It is essential that meeting and communication occurs within this board for the successful development and implementation of the JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting minutes
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	2 face-to-face meetings a year
Acceptance criteria	At least two EB meetings a year
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.EB.2_ Attendance to EB meeting
Definition	% attendance to EB meeting/ conferences
Justification	The Executive Board has among other responsibilities, the guidance and steering the project and informing on progress, outputs and outcomes. It is essential that meeting and communication occurs within this board for the successful development and implementation of the JA-CHRODIS and WP leaders & co-leaders participate in these meetings.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting list of participants
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	Recording of WP leader and co-leaders participation (institutions)
Acceptance criteria	WP leaders and co-leaders to have participated in 90% of all meetings organised
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.EB.3_ Minutes on website
Definition	EB minutes posted on JA-CHRODIS website and intranet
Justification	The Executive Board has among other responsibilities, the guidance and steering the project and informing on progress, outputs and outcomes. It is essential that meeting and communication occurs within this board for the successful development and implementation of the JA-CHRODIS and WP leaders & co-leaders participate in these meetings and information is available to all partners (intranet or internet).
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting minutes on intranet or internet
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	EB meeting minutes on internet
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.EB.4_ Satisfaction EB meetings
Definition	Satisfaction from participants about EB meetings
Justification	The Executive Board has among other responsibilities, the guidance and steering the project and informing on progress, outputs and outcomes. It is essential that meeting and communication occurs within this board for the successful development and implementation of the JA-CHRODIS, WP leaders & co-leaders participate in these meetings. Satisfaction from participants can be a reflection of the organisation and success of the meeting.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative and qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	EB face-to-face meeting survey
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	Overall satisfaction of participants in EB meeting
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.EB.5_ Follow up actions
Definition	Follow up on EB meetings agreements –actions taken after each EB meeting
Justification	The Executive Board has among other responsibilities, the guidance and steering the project and informing on progress, outputs and outcomes. It is essential that a follow up is established on those agreements and actions discussed during EB meetings
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting minutes
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	Actions reviewed and/ or achievement indicated in meeting minutes
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

Activity: Advisory Board meetings

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.1_ Advisory Board selection
Definition	Advisory Board members selection criteria
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. It advises the Executive Board (EB) on content and methodology. Criteria for the best selection of members need to be agreed and identified by EB.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Recording of criteria discussed and agreed by EB
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M5)
Completion criteria	Criteria to become AB member discussed and agreed by EB
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.2_ Number candidates
Definition	Number of AB candidates proposed
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. It advises the Executive Board (EB) on content and methodology. Sufficient number of candidates guarantees quality in the selection of AB members.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Voting results for AB members
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M5)
Completion criteria	AB members selected
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.3_ % candidates acceptance
Definition	Number of AB candidates proposed
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. It advises the Executive Board (EB) on content and methodology. Acceptance to become AB proves success of selection criteria.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	AB members response
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M5)
Completion criteria	AB members selected replied to invitation of role
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.4_ Number of AB meetings
Definition	Number of AB meetings
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. It advises the Executive Board (EB) on content and methodology. It is important that AB meetings take place according to the Grant Agreement.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Annual reports
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	AB meetings on yearly basis
Acceptance criteria	3 AB meetings as per GA
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.5_ Minutes on website
Definition	Minutes posted on the project's website
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. It advises the Executive Board (EB) on content and methodology. It is important that AB meetings take place according to the Grant Agreement and minute accessible to all participants.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	AB meeting minutes on website
Acceptance criteria	All AB meeting minutes on website
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.6_ Setting up Advisory Board
Definition	Advisory Board is established
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. As a new group, it needs to be established during the 1 st year of JA-CHRODIS
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	AB Terms of reference and 1 st meeting
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M6)
Completion criteria	AB Terms of references and minutes from 1 st AB meeting
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.7_ Satisfaction from AB members
Definition	Satisfaction from AB members
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. Their satisfaction with the organisation and role in this group will increase the input and involvement in the board.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	AB meeting survey
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	Survey report from AB meetings
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.AB.8_ Feedback AB member
Definition	Feedback given by AB members included in minutes
Justification	The Advisory Board (AB) advises and supports JA-CHRODIS to ensure an optimal overall scientific quality of all components. Their verbal input in meetings needs to be recorded accordingly in the meeting minutes
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	AB minutes approval
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	AB minutes circulated and approved by AB members
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

Activity: General Assembly meetings

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.1_ Number of GA meetings
Definition	Number of GA meetings
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. It is important to ensure open discussion and updates to all partners through yearly meetings as included in the Grant Agreement.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	GA meetings on yearly basis
Acceptance criteria	3 GA meetings as per Grant Agreement
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.2_ % of GA attendance
Definition	% of GA attendance (Associated and Collaborating partners)
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. It is important to ensure open discussion and updates to all partners through yearly meetings as included in the Grant Agreement and that these meetings are well attended by partners involved.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Participants' list
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	GA meetings attended by partners (institutions)
Acceptance criteria	GA meetings attended by 80% partners (institutions)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.3_ General Assembly minutes on website
Definition	GA minutes posted on JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. It is important to ensure open discussion and updates to all partners through yearly meetings as included in the Grant Agreement and minutes from these meetings are public.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Three times (M12, M24, M39)
Completion criteria	Minutes available on website
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.4_ Setting up General Assembly
Definition	General Assembly established
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. It needs to be established to constitute it as a group
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	General Assembly 1 st meeting. Annual report
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M12)
Completion criteria	GA 1 st meeting
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.5_ Satisfaction General Assembly
Definition	General Assembly satisfaction
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. Their satisfaction with the organisation would increase their commitment into the project
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	GA meeting survey
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24 and M36
Completion criteria	Report on GA satisfaction survey
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GA.6_ Continuous interest
Definition	General Assembly continuous interest: number of partners (institution) who attend more than one GA meeting
Justification	The General Assembly (GA) involves all partners. Attendance to more than one meeting can represent interest and continuous involvement in JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Participants' list/ Surveys
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	2 times (following the 2nd and 3rd annual GA meeting) (M15, M27)
Completion criteria	Report on GA satisfaction survey
Acceptance criteria	70% of GA institutions participating in 2 nd and/or 3 rd annual meeting has attended at least 1 previous meeting
Observations	

Task 2: Establishment of the Governing Board

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.1_ Nomination for members to Governing Board
Definition	% of Member States (EU/EAA) nominating members for the GB
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. The support from Member States through participation in this Board is indicator of the relevance and interest in this Action
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List of Member States nominations to the GB
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M12)
Completion criteria	Member states nominated GB members
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.G2.2_ Number of Governing Board meeting
Definition	Number of Governing Board meetings
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. The meetings of this board are key to JA-CHRODIS.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Minutes from GB meetings
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	Two GB meetings per year as Grant Agreement indicates
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.G3.3_ % of GB attendance
Definition	% GB attendance to meetings
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. Participation from GB members is important for the outcome of these meetings.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List of participants
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	70% attendance to GB meeting by GB members
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.4_ GB minutes on intranet
Definition	Minutes posted on the project's website
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. Minute GB meetings need to be available on project's web
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Intranet
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M39
Completion criteria	GB minutes from all GB meeting available on intranet
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.5_ % MoH involved
Definition	% of Ministries of Health involved
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS and it should be formed by Ministries of Health. It is important to determine the percentage of MoH involved in JA-CHRODIS Governing Board
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	GB member list & affiliation
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12
Completion criteria	GB member belong to MoH or related departments
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.6_ Working Plan
Definition	Set up a Working Plan
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It needs a working plan to guide their involvement.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	GB Working Plan
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	GB Working Plan available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.7_ Publication reports
Definition	Publication of reports on website
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. Their reports can be available on the project's website for information to rest of partners.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M20, M30, M37
Completion criteria	GB reports on web
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.8_ Set up GB
Definition	Setting up Governing Board
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. The establishment of the Board is crucial and a relevant outcome on the development of the Action.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	List of GB members
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M12)
Completion criteria	Full list of GB members
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.9_ Satisfaction of Governing Board meetings
Definition	Satisfaction of GB meeting
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. GB members should be satisfied with meeting organised.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative & Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Survey
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M37
Completion criteria	Survey meeting report
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.10_ Feedback by GB
Definition	Feedback given by GB members in each meeting
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. Feedback given by GB members should be recorded on minutes.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Meeting minutes
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M12, M24, M37
Completion criteria	Minutes from meetings record feedback given by GB
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP1.GB.11_ Feedback by GB
Definition	Feedback given by GB members in each meeting
Justification	The Governing Board provides strategic guidance for the development of JA-CHRODIS. It also assesses possible options for the sustainability of a joint initiative on chronic diseases and of CHRODIS. The GB will produce a final report crucial in the Joint Action.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP1 leadership
Data collection instrument	Report
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	M37
Completion criteria	Report on conclusions of the discussions of the MoH completed
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

WP2: Dissemination of the Joint Action.

(code)_Indicator	WP2.1.1_Evidence of e-mail exchanges, meetings/teleconferences organised by WP2
Definition	Evidence of collaboration amongst WP2 leaders and partners
Justification	Exchanges and meetings between work package leadership and partners , to reach agreement on approaches, outputs and task distributions, and further the objectives of the WP.
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Informal meeting minute/email contact
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Evidence of regular exchanges (meetings and/or e-mails) with WP 2 associated partners
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.1.2_% accomplishment of deadlines of milestones/deliverables
Definition	Percentage of accomplishment of milestones and deliverables within planned schedule
Justification	Timely delivery of planned milestones and deliverables contributes critically to the success of the Joint Action
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Monthly Reports/Interim Report
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	All milestones and deliverables are completed on schedule
Acceptance criteria	All milestones and deliverables are completed with no more than 2 months delay in relation to schedule
Observations	

Task 1: Dissemination

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.1_Development of Dissemination Strategy
Definition	Preparation of the Communication and Dissemination Strategy
Justification	Development of a Communication and Dissemination Strategy to inform and support the dissemination activities of JA-CHRODIS partners
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Dissemination Strategy developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.2_% of partners who consulted the Dissemination Strategy
Definition	Percentage of JA-CHRODIS partners that are aware of and have consulted the Communication and Dissemination Strategy
Justification	In such a large project, with widespread partners, the consistency and effectiveness of dissemination requires that everyone is following the same Strategy as a pre-requisite. Everyone must be familiar with it to assure its use.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported surveys
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS Partners survey
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of partners have consulted the Dissemination strategy
Acceptance criteria	80% of associated partners have consulted the Dissemination strategy; 50% of collaborating partners have consulted the Dissemination strategy
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.3_Design of JA-CHRODIS logotype
Definition	Creation of a JA-CHRODIS specific logotype
Justification	A specific logotype permits partners and other stakeholders to visually identify the Joint Action initiatives and materials
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	JA-CHRODIS logotype developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.4_Development of Guidance document
Definition	Preparation of the Guidance document
Justification	Development of a Guidance document to provide the rationale as well as guidance in relation to the stakeholder mapping exercise
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Guidance document developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.5_% of partners who consulted the Guidance document
Definition	Percentage of JA-CHRODIS partners that are aware of and have consulted the Guidance document
Justification	In such a large project, with widespread partners, the consistency and effectiveness of dissemination is affected by the lack of a strategy, but on the other hand such a document must be familiar to assure its use.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported surveys
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS Partners survey
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of partners have consulted the Guidance document
Acceptance criteria	80% of associated partners have consulted the Guidance document
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.6_Reporting-back template
Definition	Preparation of a Reporting-back template
Justification	Development of a Reporting-back template to harmonize the yearly data collection of all partners by WP2
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Reporting-back template developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.7_% of partners reporting back on dissemination activities
Definition	Percentage of JA-CHRODIS partners that have conducted and reported dissemination activities
Justification	The effective impact of JA-CHRODIS depends greatly on dissemination network activities to inform stakeholders on JA development, conclusions, and materials, and to further the overall objectives of the Joint Action
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Reporting-back documents, email
Responsible	WP2
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M12, M24, M36)
Completion criteria	100% of associated partners that have reported at least one dissemination activity
Acceptance criteria	60% of associated partners have reported at least one dissemination activity
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.8_% of JA-CHRODIS partners with links to website
Definition	Percentage of partners that have links to the JA-CHRODIS website at their institutional website
Justification	A link to the JA-CHRODIS website should be clearly observable at all partners institutional websites, to promote traffic to the nexus of information about the Joint Action
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Direct contact with partners. Partners should provide an address to the location where the link to the JA-CHRODIS website is located
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of partners have an institutional link available to the JA-CHRODIS website
Acceptance criteria	80% of associated partners have an institutional link available to the JA-CHRODIS website
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.9_Development of dissemination materials
Definition	Development of dissemination materials to be provided to WP leaders and partners
Justification	Development of dissemination materials (brochures, pens, folders, pads, videos) for meetings and events
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	Dissemination materials developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.10_Number of languages in which the brochure is available
Definition	Number of translations of the JA-CHRODIS brochure originally developed in English
Justification	For national dissemination, brochure translations are able to better communicate with stakeholders
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	JA-CHRODIS is available in 100% of main languages of the countries where partners have requested the translation
Acceptance criteria	JA-CHRODIS is available in 80% of main languages of the countries where partners have requested the translation
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.11_ Number of press releases of key JA-CHRODIS events
Definition	Number of press releases produced in English of identified key events
Justification	To maximise dissemination of JA-CHRODIS key events, press releases should be disseminated before (to partners) or on the day of the event
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	Press releases are disseminated prior to all key JA-CHRODIS events, as identified in the yearly WP 2 work-plan
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.12_Number of JA-CHRODIS national press releases produced by project partners
Definition	Number of press releases produced by project partners
Justification	To maximize dissemination of JA-CHRODIS activities at the national and regional level, press releases can be translated and/or adapted by partners in each country
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Reporting-back template
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M12, M24, M36)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	This is a voluntary task, to be assessed to provide information about effective national and regional dissemination

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.13_Number of brochures delivered
Definition	Number of brochures provided by WP2 to project partners, at their request
Justification	To promote awareness about JA-CHRODIS at international and local levels, the project brochure is an essential tool
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	WP2 Activity Reports
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	This indicator is dependent upon the requests of the project partners
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.14_Number of events where the brochures are distributed
Definition	Number events where the brochures are distributed
Justification	To promote awareness about JA-CHRODIS at international and local levels, the project brochure is an essential tool
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Reporting-back template
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M12, M24, M36)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	If possible, the number of event participants should be recorded and/or an estimated based on the event being local/regional/national/international

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.15_Number of events in which JA-CHRODIS is disseminated
Definition	Number of events where JA-CHRODIS is disseminated, either through general information or by the presentation of scientific work
Justification	The promotion of stakeholders awareness about JA-CHRODIS, at international and local levels, can be achieved by participating in events with presenting either general information about the project or scientific work derived from WP activities
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Reporting-back template
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M12, M24, M36)
Completion criteria	Coverage of at least one event in every country represented in JA-CHRODIS
Acceptance criteria	Yearly coverage of at least one-third of countries represented in JA-CHRODIS by associated partners. For the last evaluation, acceptance will correspond to: at least one event in every country represented in JA-CHRODIS by associated partners.
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.2.16_Number of requests for information about JA-CHRODIS
Definition	Number of instances where external stakeholders contact either WP1 or WP2, asking for further information about the Joint Action and/or how to become involved.
Justification	To assess the interest of external stakeholders to know more about the Joint Action and/or to become more involved
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP 1 and 2 leadership
Data collection instrument	WP 1 and 2 Records
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	These contacts usually lead to the inclusion on the JA-CHRODIS mailing list.

Task 1: Stakeholder Mapping

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.1_Stakeholder mapping template
Definition	Development of template to collect information on stakeholder mapping from the JA-CHRODIS partners
Justification	Mapping of relevant stakeholders is critical for dissemination and external stakeholder communication
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire/WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M3)
Completion criteria	Template for Stakeholder Mapping developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.2_Report of Stakeholder mapping exercise
Definition	Report with integrated responses from the Stakeholder mapping exercise
Justification	Mapping of relevant stakeholders is critical for dissemination and external stakeholder communication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire/WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M10)
Completion criteria	Report of Stakeholder Mapping exercise developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.3_Contact database
Definition	Database comprising contacts of all stakeholders identified by partners and requesting to be added to JA-CHRODIS distribution list
Justification	An extensive contact database is essential for disseminating information about JA-CHRODIS to a broad audience.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	WP 2 records
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M7)
Completion criteria	Contact database developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	This internal database must be checked, and if need be updated, at least once a year (see further indicator WP2.3.6)

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.4_% of EU and Associated Countries covered
Definition	Percentage of EU and Associated Countries covered by mapping of stakeholders
Justification	JA-CHRODIS aims to provide an overview of practices and successful strategies throughout Europe, for which identification and engagement of national stakeholders with a true European coverage is essential
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative/Qualitative
Data source(s)	Stakeholders database
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of EU and associated countries are represented in the stakeholders mapping
Acceptance criteria	21 EU countries represented in JA-CHRODIS plus at least 3 associated countries are represented in the stakeholders mapping
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.5_Coverage of all categories of stakeholders considered
Definition	Percentage of categories of stakeholders, as identified and agreed upon between WP2 and WP1, covered by the mapping of stakeholders
Justification	JA-CHRODIS aims to provide an overview of practices and successful strategies throughout Europe, for which identification and engagement of national stakeholders with a true European coverage and a systematic representation of stakeholder categories is essential
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Stakeholders database
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of the identified categories of stakeholders are represented in the stakeholders mapping
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	As part of the yearly database revision

(code)_Indicator	WP2.3.6_Yearly database revisions
Definition	Framework document for mapping stakeholders, in alignment with the Guidance document and mailing lists from other EU initiatives
Justification	Mapping of relevant stakeholders is critical for dissemination and external stakeholder communication. JA-CHRODIS partners and their national collaboration networks are prime sources of information to map this
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS contact list in database
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	Revision and update of Internal contact and Stakeholders databases done once a year
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	Increased number of entries into the database will be considered as proof of revision

Task 2: Online Tools

Activity: JA-CHRODIS website

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.1_Development of JA-CHRODIS website
Definition	Development of a JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	A properly identified JA-CHRODIS website would be the prime source of information regarding the activities and materials of the Joint Action
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M6)
Completion criteria	JA-CHRODIS website developed and available
Acceptance criteria	

Observations	
--------------	--

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.2_Information provided to EIP-AHA website
Definition	Availability of institutional information about JA-CHRODIS to be included in the EIP-AHA website
Justification	The JA-CHRODIS and the EIP-AHA are two EU-funded initiatives with similar aims and objectives and partners in common, and the two initiatives will collaborate to build upon and strengthen one another
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	WP2 records
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M12)
Completion criteria	Information about JA-CHRODIS made available to the EIP-AHA website contact
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.3_Promotional materials available on the website
Definition	Availability of promotional materials through the JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	As the prime source for information about JA-CHRODIS, the website is ideal as a clearinghouse for promotional materials, especially the JA-CHRODIS brochures
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Promotional materials available at the JA-CHRODIS website, at least in English
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.4_Average number of visits to JA-CHRODIS website
Definition	Average number of monthly visits to the JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	To assess the effective use of the JA-CHRODIS website by visitors
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Visits to JA-CHRODIS website
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	Average visits should increase with project development
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.5_Time spent visiting JA-CHRODIS website
Definition	Average time of visits to the JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	To assess the effective use of the JA-CHRODIS website by visitors
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Visits to JA-CHRODIS website
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.6_Updates to the JA-CHRODIS website
Definition	Number of updates, either news or other content to the JA-CHRODIS website done directly by WP2
Justification	To assess the updated status and the content production dynamics of the JA-CHRODIS website
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Website back-office
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	At least one bimonthly content update provided by WP2 to the JA-CHRODIS website.
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.7 _Satisfaction of partners with website
Definition	Satisfaction of stakeholders with JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	To evaluate the self-reported degree of satisfaction of partners regarding the JA-CHRODIS website
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported stakeholders
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction surveys
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the website
Acceptance criteria	75% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the website
Observations	

code)_Indicator	WP2.4.8_ % of returning visitors
Definition	Number of returning single identified visitors/Number of total identified visitors
Justification	To assess the effective involvement of visitors with the JA-CHRODIS website, and to assess the ability of the updated website to drive returning visitors
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Visits to JA-CHRODIS website
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	At least 40% of unique identified visitors are not first time visitors
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.9_ Number of JA-CHRODIS newsletters
Definition	Number of JA-CHRODIS newsletters
Justification	The JA-CHRODIS newsletters produced by WP2 are a major avenue of information dissemination, to Joint Action partners and to external stakeholders included in the mailing list
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	Bi-annual newsletters, sent to the mailing list and made available at the JA-CHRODIS website
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.10 _Number of newsletter page visits
Definition	Number of average newsletter page views in the JA-CHRODIS website
Justification	The JA-CHRODIS newsletters produced by WP2 are a major avenue of information dissemination, to Joint Action partners and to external stakeholders included in the mailing-list
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.11_Satisfaction of partners with Newsletters
Definition	Satisfaction of stakeholders with distributed newsletters
Justification	To evaluate the self-reported degree of satisfaction of partners regarding the JA-CHRODIS newsletters
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported stakeholders
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction surveys
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the website
Acceptance criteria	75% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the website
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.12_Development of Webinars Strategy
Definition	Development of a document detailing the Webinars Strategy
Justification	To support the implementation of webinars to promote JA-CHRODIS work, WP2 will coordinate the development of a Webinars Strategy
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Webinars Strategy developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.13_ Number of webinar participants
Definition	Number of webinar participants in relation to the number of registrants
Justification	Webinar participation is a measure of effective involvement and interest of JA-CHRODIS partners and external stakeholders on the project objectives and aims
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Registration/ documented attendance
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once for each webinar (M36)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	At least 60% of registered participants attend
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.14_Satisfaction of webinar participants
Definition	Satisfaction of participants with JA-CHRODIS webinars
Justification	To evaluate the self-reported degree of satisfaction of webinar participants
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported webinar participants
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction survey
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once for each webinar (M36)
Completion criteria	100% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the webinar
Acceptance criteria	75% of respondent stakeholders report a medium/high degree of satisfaction with the webinar
Observations	

Activity: Social Media

(code)_ Indicator	WP2.4.15_Opening a Twitter account
Definition	Register and activate a Twitter account regarding JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Twitter is an important tool in terms of Social Media, to disseminate information and drive interest to other JA-CHRODIS outlets and materials
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M5)
Completion criteria	A JA-CHRODIS Twitter account is made available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.16_Opening a Facebook page
Definition	Register and activate a Facebook page regarding JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Facebook is an important tool in terms of Social Media, to disseminate information and drive interest to other JA-CHRODIS outlets and materials
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M5)
Completion criteria	A JA-CHRODIS Facebook page is made available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.17_ Number of followers on Twitter
Definition	Number of followers on the Twitter account for JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Number of Twitter followers is a measure of impact and dissemination of messages through that social media
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	JA-CHRODIS Twitter account /WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Twitter account statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.18_ Number of followers on Facebook
Definition	Number of followers on the Facebook account for JA-CHRODIS
Justification	Number of Facebook followers is a measure of impact and dissemination of messages through that social media
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	JA-CHRODIS Facebook account/WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Facebook account statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.19_Number of retweets
Definition	Number of retweets linked to the JA-CHRODIS Twitter account
Justification	Twitter is an important tool in terms of Social Media, to disseminate information and drive interest to other JA-CHRODIS outlets and materials. An important aspect of the dissemination power of Twitter is the number of retweets.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Twitter account statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	30% of JA-CHRODIS own Twitter messages are retweeted at least once
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP2.4.20_Number of Facebook WP2-generated posts
Definition	Number of messages posted in the JA-CHRODIS Facebook account by WP2
Justification	Facebook is an important tool in terms of Social Media, to disseminate information and drive interest to other JA-CHRODIS outlets and materials. An important aspect of the dissemination power of Facebook is the number of posts
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP2 leadership
Data collection instrument	Facebook account statistics
Responsible	WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once a year (M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

WP3: Evaluation.

Task 1: Development of evaluation plan

(code)_Indicator	WP3.1_1 Number of meetings/TC with WP leaders
Definition	Number of communications established (TC/face-to-face meetings) with WP-leaders in relation to the development of the evaluation plan
Justification	Keeping in mind that the assessment is an horizontal task communication between leaders of the evaluation WP and the rest of WP-leaders is crucial in the process of assessment
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Agendas and minutes
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Establish communication (TC/ face-to-face) with all the WP-leaders for discussing topics related to the development of the mid-tem report
Acceptance criteria	Minimum 1 TC/ face-to-face meeting with each WP-leader and co-leader for discussing topics related to the development of the mid term report
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.1_2 Terms of reference document
Definition	Acceptance of the terms of reference conditions
Justification	Formalization of WP3 members involvement with the JA-CHRODIS and WP3 tasks and responsibilities
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Terms of reference document
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M21)
Completion criteria	WP3 leader and co-leader accepting the TOR proposed by WP1
Acceptance criteria	Acceptance of the document
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.1_3 Evaluation plan
Definition	Release of the evaluation plan for the JA-CHRODIS. The document must include the monitoring plan and the impact assessment of the JA.
Justification	Provide tools for the monitorization of the JA and its future impact
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Evaluation plan document
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M21)
Completion criteria	Release of the Evaluation Plan document
Acceptance criteria	Evaluation Plan completed
Observations	The development of the Evaluation Plan must be agreed with WP-leaders and WP1

Task 2: Implementation of mid term report

(code)_Indicator	WP3.2_1 Number of meetings/TC with WP leaders
Definition	Number of communications established (TC/face-to-face meetings) with WP-leaders in relation to the monitorization process for the mid-term report
Justification	Keeping in mind that the assessment is an horizontal task communication between leaders of the evaluation WP and the rest of WP-leaders is crucial in the process of assessment
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Agendas and minutes
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Establish communication (TC/ face-to-face) with all the WP-leaders for discussing topics related to the development of the mid-tem report
Acceptance criteria	Minimum 1 TC/ face-to-face meeting with each WP-leader and co-leader for discussing topics related to the development of the mid term report
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.2_2 Mid term evaluation report
Definition	Release of the final version of the mid term evaluation report on-time
Justification	The Mid term evaluation report is a milestone of WP3 (M24)
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 and WP3 records
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Release of the final version of the mid term evaluation report in M24 (December 2015)
Acceptance criteria	Release of the final version of the mid term evaluation report in M25 (January 2016)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.2_3 Percentage of indicators with response at mid term according to the total of indicators proposed
Definition	Percentage of indicators obtained according to the total of indicators agreed for the assessment
Justification	Check the correspondence between the original proposal and the final version of the report
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Mid term evaluation report
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	100% of indicators obtained in each WP
Acceptance criteria	80% of indicators obtained in each WP
Observations	Low percentages of indicators obtained could compromise the quality of the JA assessment

(code)_Indicator	WP3.2_4 Satisfaction survey about the quality of the project evaluation at mid term (perception of utility, support and understanding of the assessment)
Definition	Rank of satisfaction with the evaluating process focusing on utility of the process, support provided and understanding of the assessment
Justification	Keeping in mind that the assessment is an horizontal task is useful to know about WP-leaders satisfaction with the assessment process
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative/Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP-leaders
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction surveys
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M26)
Completion criteria	100% of partners satisfied with the results
Acceptance criteria	80% of partners satisfied with the results
Observations	

Task 3: Implementation of final report

(code)_Indicator	WP3.3_1 Number of meetings/TC with WP leaders
Definition	Number of communications established (TC/face-to-face meetings) with WP-leaders in relation to the monitorization process for the final report
Justification	Keeping in mind that the assessment is an horizontal task communication between leaders of the evaluation WP and the rest of WP-leaders is crucial in the process of assessment
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Agendas and minutes
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M39)
Completion criteria	Establish communication (TC/ face-to-face) with all the WP-leaders for discussing topics related to the development of the final report
Acceptance criteria	Minimum 1 TC/ face-to-face meeting with each WP-leader and co-leader for discussing topics related to the development of the final report
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.3_2 Final evaluation report
Definition	Release of the final version of the final evaluation report on-time
Justification	The Final term evaluation report is a milestone of WP3 (M39)
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP1 and WP3 records
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M39)
Completion criteria	Release of the final version of the final term evaluation report in M39 (March 2017)
Acceptance criteria	Release of the final version of the final term evaluation report in M40 (April 2017)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP3.3_3 Percentage of indicators with response according to the total of indicators proposed
Definition	Percentage of indicators obtained according to the total of indicators agreed for the assessment
Justification	Check the correspondence between the original proposal and the final version of the report
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Final evaluation report
Data collection instrument	
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M39)
Completion criteria	100% of indicators obtained in each WP
Acceptance criteria	80% of indicators obtained in each WP
Observations	Low percentages of indicators obtained could compromise the quality of the JA assessment

(code)_Indicator	WP3.3_4 Satisfaction survey about the quality of the project evaluation at final term (perception of utility, support and understanding of the assessment)
Definition	Rank of satisfaction with the evaluating process focusing on utility of the process, support provided and understanding of the assessment
Justification	Keeping in mind that the assessment is an horizontal task is useful to know about WP-leaders satisfaction with the assessment process
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative/Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP-leaders
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction surveys
Responsible	WP1
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M39)
Completion criteria	100% of partners satisfied with the results
Acceptance criteria	80% of partners satisfied with the results
Observations	

WP4: Platform for knowledge exchange.

Task 1: Development of assessment criteria

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T1.1_Process of development of assessment criteria
Definition	Each Delphi has followed the steps foreseen in the protocol
Justification	Monitoring DELPHI process
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Documentation used in the process: Conceptual map, Q1 draft, Q1 in platform, Interim report Q1, Q2 draft, Q2 in Platform, Interim report Q2, background docs for F2F, final report.
Data collection instrument	Final report (excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	D1: May 2015 (M17); D2: November 2015 (M23); D3: December 2015 (M24); D4: July 2016 (M31)
Completion criteria	All steps have been carried out and documented
Acceptance criteria	All steps have been carried out and documented
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T1.2_Response rate in each Delphi round (for each Delphi)
Definition	Number of questionnaires completed in each round/Number of people accepting to participate in each round of the Delphi
Justification	Monitoring Delphi process
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Online Delphi platform
Data collection instrument	Platform metrics and final report (excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once per round Delphi 1. R1 / R2 / R3 Delphi 2. R1 / R2 / R3 Delphi 3. R1 / R2 / R3 Delphi 4. R1 / R2 / R3 Delphi 5. R1 / R2 / R3
Completion criteria	100% of the invited people who accepted participating in the process
Acceptance criteria	R1: 90% R2: 90% with regard to R1 respondents R3: 75% with regard to R2 respondents
Observations	Each round will be considered individually

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T1.3_Criteria, categories and weights agreed
Definition	Actual list of criteria obtained from each consensus process
Justification	This is the actual deliverable of the process
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Final report
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	D1: May 2015 (M17); D2: November 2015 (M23); D3: December 2015 (M24); D4: July 2016 (M31)
Completion criteria	All Delphi ended up with a list
Acceptance criteria	All Delphi ended up with a list
Observations	

Task 2: Design of a set of online tools aimed at providing users with guidance on development, implementation and evaluation of chronic care practices

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T2.1_Assessment tool: piloting phase (no storage)
Definition	Number of incidences reported
Justification	Monitoring the functionalities associated to the assessment of practices
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Platform metrics
Data collection instrument	User metrics (excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	December 2015 (M24)
Completion criteria	Incidences reported
Acceptance criteria	Beta users' feedback (any number is acceptable)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T2.2_Other online tools available
Definition	Usability and satisfaction
Justification	Monitoring online tools quality
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Online tools platform
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction survey
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	December 2016 (M36)
Completion criteria	Incidences reported
Acceptance criteria	Beta users' feedback (any number is acceptable)
Observations	

Task 3: Setting an online help desk with expert consultants available to help users in the actual development, implementation and evaluation of chronic care practices

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T3.1_Help Desk Services ready for piloting
Definition	Usability and satisfaction
Justification	Final Monitoring online tools quality
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Online front-desk platform
Data source(s)	Platform metrics plus survey to beta-piloting users
Data collection instrument	User metrics (excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4 – partner YPE
Periodicity of data collection	December 2016 (M36)
Completion criteria	Incidences reported / 100% beta-users satisfaction
Acceptance criteria	Any incidences reported / 80% satisfaction
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T3.2_User satisfaction
Definition	Satisfaction of users with the online help-desk
Justification	Monitoring quality of the product - responsiveness of the help desk
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Survey
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction survey (Questionnaires completed by users of the platform while using it)
Responsible	WP#3 & WP#4 – help desk manager
Periodicity of data collection	From January 2017 onwards (M39)
Completion criteria	100% Satisfied
Acceptance criteria	At least 80% Satisfied
Observations	

Task 4: Creation of a repository of excellent chronic care practices and policies across Europe

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T4.1_Repository of practices: storage in the piloting (phase II)
Definition	Number of incidences reported
Justification	Monitoring the functionalities associated to the storage of practices
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Platform metrics
Data collection instrument	User metrics (excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Q1 2016 (M27)
Completion criteria	Incidences reported
Acceptance criteria	Beta users' feedback (any number)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T4.2_Repository of practices: operational phase
Definition	Satisfaction
Justification	Monitoring online tools quality
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Online repository platform
Data collection instrument	Satisfaction survey
Responsible	WP#3 & WP#4 - YPE
Periodicity of data collection	From January 2017 onwards (M39)
Completion criteria	100% satisfied
Acceptance criteria	At least 80% satisfied
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T4.3_User metrics on assessment of practices
Definition	practices assessed (reviewers, referees) vs. number of practices submitted (submitters),
Justification	Monitoring users activity
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Online repository platform Platform records
Data collection instrument	Excel Sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	January 2017 till the end of CHRODIS JA (M39)
Completion criteria	100% practices submitted are assessed –
Acceptance criteria	100% practices submitted are assessed
Observations	number of practices submitted to be decided among practices available in the other WP

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T4.4_Practices suitable for public display
Definition	Number of practices above the Percentile 10-threshold vs. total practices submitted
Justification	Monitoring the underlying quality of the practices submitted
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Online repository platform
Data collection instrument	Platform records (Excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once- March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	All practices submitted
Acceptance criteria	All practices submitted
Observations	This indicator is not monitoring the repository but the underlying quality of existing practices – allows a reflection on the assessment criteria and the tightness of the threshold.

Task 5: Development of a digital library

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T5.1_Digital library: piloting phase
Definition	Monitoring users activity
Justification	Monitoring the functionalities associated to the digital library
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Digital library platform
Data collection instrument	Platform metrics (Excel sheet)
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	April 2016 until June 2016 (M30)
Completion criteria	Incidences reported
Acceptance criteria	Beta users' feedback (any number)
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T5.2_ Quality of Digital library at operational status
Definition	Quality of the experience
Justification	Monitoring the Quality of the digital library
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Digital library platform
Data collection instrument	Survey
Responsible	WP#3 & WP#4 - YPE
Periodicity of data collection	Once- March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	100% appreciation of quality
Acceptance criteria	80% appreciation of quality
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T5.3_ Use of the Digital library at operational status
Definition	Number of uses: submissions and queries
Justification	Monitoring the actual use of the digital library
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Digital library platform
Data collection instrument	PKE metrics
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once- March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	Number of uses stratified submissions and queries
Acceptance criteria	NA – Any number
Observations	None denominator is sensible enough to build an output indicator

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T6.1_Clearinghouse with practices of excellence in chronic care across Europe, based on a valid and sound set of criteria (D4.1)
Definition	<i>Developed or not</i>
Justification	Monitoring technological platform and support services
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Final report
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once – March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	All foreseen functionalities developed
Acceptance criteria	All list deployed
Observations	

Task 6: Technological platform and services to support post JA activities

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T6.2_ Efficiency of the Clearinghouse in the operational phase
Definition	Time of response
Justification	Monitoring speed in all the clearinghouse flows
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Online platform
Data collection instrument	Platform records
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once – March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	XX
Acceptance criteria	XX
Observations	To be sensible, time of response should be defined after piloting

(code)_Indicator	WP4.T6.3_On-line help-desk with expert consultants, providing on-line tools and meaningful information (D4.2)
Definition	<i>Developed or not</i>
Justification	Monitoring technological platform and support services
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Final report
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Once – March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	All foreseen functionalities developed
Acceptance criteria	All deployed
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.TO.1_ Number of meetings with EIP-AHA members
Definition	Number of meetings organized between partners of WP4 and members of EIP-AHA
Justification	Alignment between the main European projects devoted on chronic care
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP4 agenda
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	Twice – December 2015 (M24), March 2017 (M39)
Completion criteria	Minimum 3
Acceptance criteria	At least 3
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.TO.2_Report of convergence
Definition	Analysis of the functionalities included in the PKE that allows convergence with EIP AHA repository
Justification	Alignment between the main European projects devoted on chronic care
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Report on convergence
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	December 2015 (M24)
Completion criteria	All foreseen functionalities developed
Acceptance criteria	All deployed
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.TO.3_Development of the business plan
Definition	Listing PKE Tasks beyond Chrodis JA
Justification	Sustainability of Chrodis JA after March 2017
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Report
Data collection instrument	Excel sheet
Responsible	WP#4
Periodicity of data collection	December 2015 (draft – M24), March 2017 (final- M39)
Completion criteria	Report provided to the coordination
Acceptance criteria	Report provided to the coordination
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.TO.4_Effective use of the insight from WP 5,6, 7
Definition	Assessment of the collaboration between WPs
Justification	Alignment among the Work Packages
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Satisfaction Survey
Data collection instrument	Excel Sheet
Responsible	Coordination
Periodicity of data collection	July 2016 (M31)
Completion criteria	100% Satisfied
Acceptance criteria	80% Satisfied
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP4.TO.5_Effective linkage to website (WP2)
Definition	Linkage of the PKE in JA_CHRODIS website
Justification	Assessment of the collaboration between WPs
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	JA_CHRODIS website
Data collection instrument	Excel Sheet
Responsible	Coordination – WP2
Periodicity of data collection	Once - December 2016 (M36)
Completion criteria	Linkage completed and operational
Acceptance criteria	Linkage completed and operational
Observations	

WP5: Good practices in the field of health promotion and chronic prevention across the life cycle.

Task 1: Review of existing work, situation and needs

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.1_ Questionnaire development guideline
Definition	Development of a questionnaire on “GoodPractice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Justification	There will be a structured questionnaire for partners to provide information to assess the prevention landscape, identify strengths, needs and gaps in partner countries in Promotion and Disease Prevention
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS Website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Questionnaire on “GoodPractice in theField of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention” document developed and available Six best practices in promotion and prevention
Acceptance criteria	Questionnaire is developed
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.1.2_ Questionnaire development
Definition	Development of a questionnaire on a “Needs Assessment Guidance”
Justification	There will be a structured questionnaire for partners to provide information for the detection and identification of strengths, needs and gaps in partner countries
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Questionnaire on “Needs Assessment Guidance” document developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.2 Percentage of partners agreement on the final version of the questionnaire
Definition	Total of partners involved in developing the questionnaire / Total partners that questionnaire has been sent to.
Justification	Involvement of the partners in the process of agreement of the final version of the questionnaire on “Good Practice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention” For better quality in questionnaires, the participation of partners is requested seeking greater consensus.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP5 Meeting protocol, Mail correspondence
Data collection instrument	Information to be completed by WP5 leader
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	100% of the members participated in the process of agreement on the final version of the questionnaire
Acceptance criteria	50 % of the members participated in the agreement on the final version of the questionnaire
Observations	The intention is to obtain the consensus of the partners.

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.3 Percentage of questionnaires received
Definition	Total questionnaires received / Total questionnaires sent.
Justification	Final involvement in the process in of answering the questionnaire on “Good Practice in theField of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP5 leader
Data collection instrument	Questionnaire on “GoodPractice in theField of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	100% response rate to the questionnaires sent
Acceptance criteria	80% response rate to the questionnaires sent (Does not exist)
Observations	To identify possible causes of such response rates (qualitative assessment of response rate)

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.4 Percentage of questionnaires fulfilling
Definition	Percentage of questionnaires that reach the minimum of answered questions considered acceptable.
Justification	Final involvement in the process of answering the questionnaire on "Good Practice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention" It must be established by people responsible for questionnaire.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Country responses to questionnaire
Data collection instrument	Questionnaire on "GoodPractice in theField of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention"
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	100% of the questionnaires received were fulfilled/ It will be incomplete when the minimum percentage is not answered. Most be established by the responsible of the surveys (WP5)
Acceptance criteria	80% of the questionnaires received were fulfilled At least 50% for the compliance of fulfillment.
Observations	Fulfilling that corresponds to an "X"% of answered questions. At least 50% for the compliance of quality criteria.

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.5_Countries participating
Definition	The name of the countries that answered the questionnaire
Justification	Final involvement of the countries in the process of answering the questionnaire on “Good Practice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP 5 Task leaders
Data collection instrument	Questionnaire on “Good Practice in the field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Name of countries that participated in the process of answering the questionnaire on “Good Practice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Acceptance criteria	14 countries participated in the process of answering the questionnaire on “Good Practice in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention”
Observations	WP5 should identify whether the information obtained from the countries corresponds to the literature found, to see if we're getting new information not previously known.

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.8_Publication of Country Reviews.
Definition	Publicacions found by country on the analysis of needs and gaps in the Field of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention .
Justification	Country Reviews to understand what countries are doing to prevent chronic diseases and to promote health. It aims to identify contextual differences between countries as well as gaps and needs.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Country reports
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	100% of the partner countries are represented through a Country Review. This review is available in JA-CHRODIS web site
Acceptance criteria	90% of the partner countries are represented by a Country Review. This review is available in JA-CHRODIS web site
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.9 _Number of visits / downloads of country reviews
Definition	Number of downloads
Justification	To monitor the interest generated by Country on sistematic reviews related to prevention of chronic diseases and to health promotion available in JA-CHRODIS web site
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	CHRODIS website stats (WP1/WP2)
Data collection instrument	JA-CHRODIS web site
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	2x per year (M20, M24, M30, M36, M39)
Completion criteria	500 number of visits/downloads of the country reviews made in JA-CHRODIS web site
Acceptance criteria	At least 300 number of visits/downloads of the country reviews made in JA-CHRODIS web site
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.1.10_Overall summary of country reviews
Definition	summary of the findings in the country reports
Justification	Overall summary report of country reviews to understand what countries are doing to prevent chronic diseases and to promote health. It aims to identify contextual differences between countries as well as gaps and needs.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Summary report
Data collection instrument	CHRODSI website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Overall summary report of country reviews developed and available in JA-CHRODIS web site
Acceptance criteria	none
Observations	It is necessary to clarify how the information was obtained for the situation analysis of countries in theField of Health Promotion and Disease Prevention.

Task 2: Defining an approach

(code)_Indicator	WP5.2.1_Composition of an Expert Board for Delphi panel – Expert list
Definition	Description of the professionals who integrated the Expert Board
Justification	Identification and the proposal of the experts representatives for WP5 to be part of an Expert Board for the Delphi panel
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	List of expert representatives for WP5 in the Delphi panel
Data collection instrument	Expert list
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	30 experts identified for the Delphi panel
Acceptance criteria	At least 25 experts identified
Observations	To define the criteria that the experts were selected

(code)_Indicator	WP5.2.2_Criteria template used for Delphi panel process
Definition	Description of the criteria for the Delphi panel process
Justification	Development of the criteria template to be used for Delphi panel process in order to ensure the rigor of the methodology to be followed during the same
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Delphi criteria template
Data collection instrument	Template
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Criteria template to be used for Delphi panel process developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	Explanation or justification for the selection of criteria for the development of templates (Why do they were elected)

(code)_Indicator	WP5.2.3_ Description of criteria for the identification of good practices in the prevention of chronic diseases
Definition	Criteria described to identify good practices in the field of prevention of chronic diseases
Justification	Detailed description of the criteria for the identification of good practices in the prevention of chronic diseases from the papers previously identified or by experts consensus of WP5
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Delphi Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	Questionnaire
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Description of the criteria for the identification of good practices in the prevention of chronic diseases developed and available
Acceptance criteria	The criteria must be backed by national good practice processes and/or literature
Observations	Way that is explicit the criteria selection methodology

(code)_Indicator	WP5.3.1_ Identification of 3 good practices from associated countries that match the selection criteria
Definition	Number of associated countries that identify 3 good practices/Total of associated countries
Justification	Identification and selection of good practices on CVDs, stroke and diabetes from all associated countries that match the selection criteria described in task 2
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Good practices report
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS Website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	100% of the associated countries identify 3 good practices
Acceptance criteria	80% of the associated countries identify 3 good practices / 100% of the associated countries identify 2 good practices
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.3.2_Number of good practices collected per country and sent to WP4
Definition	Total of good practices sent to WP4 for each country / Total of best practices by country
Justification	Identification of good practices on CVDs, stroke and diabetes from all associated countries that match the selection criteria described in task 2 and sent to WP4
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Good practices report Information to be completed by WP5 leader
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS website, WP4 and WP5 leaders
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	Full report on GP criteria is sent to WP4 leader
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.3.3_Development of an English summary of good practices
Definition	English summary of good practices
Justification	Development of English summary for each good practice identified in order to make it available for exchange and transfer process between European countries and regions through a platform for knowledge exchange
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Good practices report
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS Website/ Intranet
Responsible	WP5 and WP1 Coordinator
Periodicity of data collection	Once (August 2015-M20)
Completion criteria	English summary for 100% of the selected good practices developed and available
Acceptance criteria	English summary for 80% of the selected good practices developed and available
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.3.4_ Number of visits/downloads of good practices report
Definition	Number of downloads of good practice report
Justification	To monitor the interest in the reports of the identified good practices publically available in JA-CHRODIS website and shared between associated partners and countries in order to provide a helpful working tool.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative/Qualitative
Data source(s)	Good practice report JA-CHRODIS website
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS Website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	M24, M36
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

Task 4: Conference seminars

(code)_Indicator	WP5.4.1_Organization of the general conference
Definition	Description of evaluation criteria of the results of the conference
Justification	Organization of the general conference dedicated to exchange and discuss good practices between associated partners , policy and decision makers at the European and national levels and health promotion and diseases prevention stakeholders
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Conference agenda and minutes List of general conference signatures Conference documentation
Data collection instrument	Agenda and minutes
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (March 2016-M27)
Completion criteria	One general conference to exchange and discuss good practices was organized
Acceptance criteria	That satisfaction questionnaires and the definition of the quality criteria have been answered by the audience.
Observations	It is important to know who participated in the conference and whether there were evaluation criteria (such as participation, satisfaction and utility)

(code)_Indicator	WP5.4.2_Number of participants in the Conference “Joining forces in health promotion to tackle the burden of chronic diseases in Europe”
Definition	Number of participants in the good practices general conference/ Total expected
Justification	Involvement of associated partners, policy and decision makers at the European and national levels and health promotion and diseases prevention stakeholders in participating in the general conference dedicated to exchange and discuss good practices
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	List of Member States representatives who confirmed their attendance List of policy/decision maker and/or stakeholder who confirmed their attendance List of general conference signatures
Data collection instrument	List of signatures Conference documentation
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (March 2016-M27)
Completion criteria	100% of associated partners have at least 1 representative at the conference 1 policy/decision maker and/or stakeholder to attend the conference / per every associated partner
Acceptance criteria	80% of partners have at least one decision maker/policy officer/stakeholder at the conference
Observations	Assessment of the number and composition (positions/backgrounds) of the conference attendees

(code)_Indicator	WP5.4.3 _Satisfaction with the general conference
Definition	Description of evaluation criteria of the results of the general conference
Justification	Level of satisfaction expressed by the participants on the general conference dedicated to exchange and discuss good practices
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database with answers of the participants regarding their satisfaction with the general conference
Data collection instrument	General conference satisfaction questionnaire
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (March 2016-M27)
Completion criteria	Average level of satisfaction with the general conference $\geq 80\%$
Acceptance criteria	Average level of satisfaction with the general conference $\geq 60\%$
Observations	To identify strengths and gaps in the conference concept and agenda

(code)_Indicator	WP5.4.4_Recommendations on policy and practical measures for local, national and EU level to strengthen health promotion and primary prevention and reduce the burden of chronic diseases
Definition	Development of recommendations to local, national and EU
Justification	Formulate initial recommendations on policy recommendations and practical measures for local, national and EU level to strengthen health promotion and primary prevention and reduce the burden of chronic diseases through the panel discussion, round table discussion and plenary discussion carried out in the general conference dedicated to exchange and discuss good practices
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative/Qualitative
Data source(s)	Conference agenda and minutes List of initial recommendations formulated Documentation
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS Website
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (December 2016-M36)
Completion criteria	1 panel discussion carried out / 1 round table discussion carried out / 1 plenary discussion carried out during the general conference List of initial recommendations formulated and available
Acceptance criteria	Existence or not
Observations	The establishment of arrangements for the methodology and process in developing recommendations for health promotion and primary prevention

Task 5: Peer reviews/ Study visits

(code)_Indicator	WP5.5.1_Guideline to select good practices for study visits
Definition	Development of criteria for the identification of quality interventions in health promotion and prevention
Justification	Development of the guideline document defining the steps for selection of good practices for study visits
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Guideline document available
Data collection instrument	Data source
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (June 2016 – M30)
Completion criteria	Guideline document developed and available
Acceptance criteria	There is an explicit methodology for the development of the criteria either by papers or expert consensus
Observations	How the assessment methodology is explicit

(code)_Indicator	WP5.5.2_Number of study visits carried out for the selected good practices
Definition	Number of partners involved in a visit / total partners
Justification	Study visits carried out for the selected good practices in order to exchange of experiences and knowledge transfer
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Agenda and minutes on study visits
Data collection instrument	List of signatures of the participants on study visit Evaluation forms for the study visits
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (June 2016 – M30)
Completion criteria	Between 2 to 3 study visits are carried out and that all partners involved participate at least in two visits
Acceptance criteria	At least all the partners are involved in one visit
Observations	There should be quality evaluation criteria for participation, satisfaction and usefulness

(code)_Indicator	WP5.5.3_Overall report on success factors and barriers for transferring of good practices to other countries and settings
Definition	Existence of country reports
Justification	Development of the overall report on success factors and barriers for transferring or scaling up promising practices into different contexts / to other countries and settings
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Comparable descriptions for all visited studysites (template) Reports prepared by partners
Data collection instrument	Report document
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	Once (June 2016 – M30)
Completion criteria	Overall report on success factors and barriers for transferring of good practices is developed and available 100% of associated partners that participated in the study visits prepare reports on identified elements during the study visits and/or promising practices and the irsuccess factors and barriers for transferring in their country contexts
Acceptance criteria	80% of associated partners that participated in thestudy visits prepare reports on identified elements during the study visits and/or promising practices and their success factors and barriers for transferring in their country contexts
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP5.5.4_Number of visits/downloads of the overall report
Definition	Download requests of overall report
Justification	To monitor the interest in the overall report on success factors and barriers for transferring or scaling up promising practices into different contexts / to other countries and settings publicly available in JA-CHRODIS web site and shared between associated partners and countries in order to provide a helpful working tool.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	JA-CHRODIS website backend (WP2)
Data collection instrument	Website stats
Responsible	WP5
Periodicity of data collection	M36
Completion criteria	500 number of visits/downloads of the overall report made in JA-CHRODIS web site
Acceptance criteria	At least 300 number of visits/downloads of good practices report made in JA-CHRODIS web site
Observations	

WP6: Development of common guidance and methodologies for care pathways for multi-morbid patients.

Task 1: Identify targets of potential interventions for management of multi-morbid patients

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.1_ Number of databases analyzed
Definition	The number of databases analyzed sending by associated partners/Total of partners associated.
Justification	Analyses of national databases, an expert survey and literature review in order to identify populations with high care demand and the targets of potential interventions for management of multi-morbid patients.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	National databases: partners surveys
Data collection instrument	Questionnaire distributed among partners
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Databases analysis performed by associated partners.
Acceptance criteria	At least five databases analysed associated partners. Production of a final official report
Observations	Database analysis has to follow a standardized methodology shared by partners. (Each partner maintained its database, and each one performed its analysis on site).

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.2_Overall number of patients in the dataset analysis with multimorbidity
Definition	To know the total number of patients studied in the Database
Justification	Life expectancy in the EU is higher than ever before, due in part to good and improving healthcare. However, the co-occurrence of multiple chronic conditions in one person, i.e. multimorbidity, has become increasingly common as well. 65% of people over 65 are affected by multimorbidity. This number rises to 85% for the 85-year-old group. In order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems, an analysis of national databases and literature review to identify populations with high care demand is needed.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Partners national databases
Data collection instrument	1 partners survey, 1 questionnaire, 1 interim report , 1 final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Final number of patients in the dataset analysis
Acceptance criteria	At least 1000000 patients globally evaluated.
Observations	In this case not applicable

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.3_ Number of articles identified in literature search
Definition	Number of documents identified according the research question
Justification	Literature review in order to identify tools that can be used to identify targets of potential interventions with specific focus on multi-morbid patients.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Electronic databases search
Data collection instrument	Interim report and final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Availability of the total number of identified articles
Acceptance criteria	The search methodology applied has to be clear explained
Observations	The selection of documents must justified according of its rigor and methodological quality

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.4_ Number of articles selected
Definition	Number of articles selected / number of articles identified in literature search
Justification	After the literature review, selected tools can be used to identify targets of potential interventions and provide clinically relevant risk stratification and help to allocate resources.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Electronic databases search
Data collection instrument	Interim and final report.
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Availability of a final list with the Number of articles selected
Acceptance criteria	Articles identified in literature search defined with multi-morbidity criteria search
Observations	The selected articles must comply with the criteria established in the (6.1.7)

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.5_ Definition of target population
Definition	To define the specific criteria of the target population
Justification	In order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems, an analysis of national databases and literature review to identify populations with high care demand is needed. To perform this systematic identification, a definition of the target population is required.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Literature search and national database analysis
Data collection instrument	Interim and final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once every four months, and according scheduled deliverables
Completion criteria	The target population is clearly defined, described and available for further project proposes.
Acceptance criteria	Production of a manuscript defining target population
Observations	No

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.6_Description of the criteria for the definition of multi-morbid patient
Definition	Clear description of the methodology used in the selection of the criteria for multimorbidity patient
Justification	In order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems, an analysis of national databases and literature review to identify populations with high care demand is needed. To perform this systematic identification, a description of the criteria for the definition of multi-morbid patient is required.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Literature review, field survey
Data collection instrument	Interim and final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	updates (ex by email, phone contacts) about once every four months, and according scheduled deliverables
Completion criteria	The criteria for the definition of multi-morbid patient are clearly defined, described and available for further project proposes.
Acceptance criteria	There is a consensus of experts to define the methodology used for define the criteria of multimorbidity patients
Observations	No

(code)_Indicator	WP6.1.7_Description of methodology for the identification of papers (articles)
Definition	Clear description of the methodology used in the selection of the criteria for multimorbidity papers
Justification	In order to perform the literature review focused on identifying the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems and the targets of potential interventions for management of multi-morbid patients systematically, a clear description of methodology for the identification of papers (articles) is required
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Literature review
Data collection instrument	interim informal reports and final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice: T0 and after 3 months
Completion criteria	The methodology for the identification of papers (articles) is defined, and available for the literature search.
Acceptance criteria	There is a consensus of experts to define the methodology used for define the criteria for the identification of papers of multimorbidity patients
Observations	No

Task 2: Review existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.1_Number of relevant papers identified by electronic database search
Definition	The number of relevant papers identified by electronic database search about the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication
Justification	Analyses of national databases, an expert survey and literature review to identify existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems and also to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	National databases: surveys Official reports derived by other UE projects Literature search
Data collection instrument	Once
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Number of relevant papers identified by electronic database search and field survey, and already performed EU projects.
Acceptance criteria	Relevant papers identified by electronic database search, field survey, and already performed EU projects about the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication
Observations	No

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.2_ Number of articles selected
Definition	Number of articles related to the existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients selected / total number of articles related the existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients identified in literature search
Justification	Analyses of national databases, an expert survey and literature review to identify existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems and also to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	National databases: surveys Results of already performed EU projects
Data collection instrument	Database analysis, field survey
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Periodical informal updates and two official report: 1 interim report (WP6 meeting) and the final report (M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Availability of a final list reporting the number of identified articles and studies related to the existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients that were identified by associated partners.
Acceptance criteria	The search of articles and the identification of practices for multi-morbid patients must comply with the criteria selected of the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication
Observations	It is necessary to justify the criteria related to the existing care (pathways) approaches for multi-morbid patients selected taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.3_Countries where these studies take place
Definition	Identify the name of the countries in which the papers describe conducting studies the best possible care models for multimorbid patients
Justification	Identifying, through the literature search, of the countries where the studies related to the care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients were developed /took place in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	ICARE4EU network, documents provided by partners
Data collection instrument	Periodical informal updates and two official report: 1 interim reports (WP6 meeting) and the final reports
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	List of the countries where the studies took place developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	Production of a final report
Observations	No one

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.4_ Number of type of outcomes analyzed in those studies
Definition	Description of the number of outcome variables analyzed in these studies selected
Justification	Identification of the type of outcomes related to the care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients analyzed in the studies identified through the literature search in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	ICARE4EU network, documents provided by partners, publications selected by scientific literature review.
Data collection instrument	Periodical informal updates and two official report: 1 interim reports (WP6 meeting) and the final reports
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Availability of a final list reporting the number of type of outcomes analyzed in those studies
Acceptance criteria	At least 2 type of variables by outcomes in those studies
Observations	It is necessary to justify the criteria applicable to the selection of variables

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.5_ Number of works done or interventions found
Definition	To describe the number of works done or interventions found related to the care programs of approaches for multi-morbid patients
Justification	Identification, through the literature search, of the works done/ interventions related to the care programs of approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	ICARE4EU network, documents provided by partners, publications selected by scientific literature review.
Data collection instrument	Periodical informal updates and two official report: 1 interim reports (WP6 meeting) and the final reports
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Availability of a final list reporting the number of works done or interventions found through the literature search
Acceptance criteria	Number of works done or interventions found through the literature search related to the care programs of approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Observations	It is necessary to justify the criteria applicable to the selection of works done or interventions found taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.7_ Total number of identified existing pathways
Definition	Total number of pathways identified in the literature reviews
Justification	Identification, through the literature search, of the existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	ICARE4EU network, documents provided by partners, publications selected by scientific literature review
Data collection instrument	Periodical informal reports and two official report (the interim report and the final one)
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Total number of identified existing pathways on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients
Acceptance criteria	That the definition of the criteria of identified existing pathways, for multi-morbid patients in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication take into consideration of the consensus of experts
Observations	The selection of the pathways on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients must be made following the methodological criteria described previously

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.8_ Summary of existing care pathways
Definition	The existence of a summary describing the care pathways of patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients
Justification	Development of the summary of existing care pathways (patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients) identified previously through the literature search in order to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, and select good practices on management of multi-morbid taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database with care pathways identified through the literature search
Data collection instrument	Interim and final official report with care pathways identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (Interim and final report - M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Summary of existing care pathways is developed and available for further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	Production of a final document
Observations	It is necessary to justify the methodology applicable for elaborate the summary describing the care pathways of patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients made following the criteria described previously

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.9_ Article published in a peer-review indexed journal
Definition	Articles that the WP6 group of experts published in a peer-review index journal
Justification	Analyses of national databases, an expert survey and literature review to identify existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients in order to identify the needs of the participating countries' healthcare systems and also to be able to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Scientific literature search
Data collection instrument	Published or submitted paper
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M36)
Completion criteria	Article published in a peer-review indexed journal
Acceptance criteria	At least one article of the subject published in a peer-review indexed journal and taking account the review of the experts consensus
Observations	It must be an index journal impact on the environment of care for patients with multimorbidity

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.10_ Quality of Systematic Review measured with AMSTAR checklist
Definition	Ensure the quality of Systematic Review of existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients measured with the compliance of AMSTAR checklist
Justification	<p>To ensure the quality of systematic review of existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs / approaches for multi-morbid patients, it is necessary to measure it. This measurement will be done through an AMSTAR checklist (*) as a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews.</p> <p>AMSTAR checklist (*)</p> <p>Consists of 11 items each with a Yes, No, Can't Answer or Not Applicable options. Among others it checks for an a priori design; duplicate study selection and data extraction; the use of status of publication as an inclusion criteria.</p>
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Published papers
Data collection instrument	AMSTAR checklist
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Quality result of Systematic Review measured with AMSTAR checklist.
Acceptance criteria	AMSTAR fulfilling checklist in the assessment of systematic review of existing patient-centred European comprehensive care programs and approaches for multi-morbid patients
Observations	No one

(code)_Indicator	WP6.2.11_Description search criteria for papers describing applied interventions
Definition	Description search criteria for papers describing applied interventions of the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication
Justification	In order to advise on the best possible care models for multi-morbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication, an analysis of national databases and literature review is needed. To perform this systematic identification, while ensuring its quality, a clear description of the search criteria for papers describing applied interventions must be done.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Submitted or published article
Data collection instrument	Interim and final reports
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice and according deliverable times.
Completion criteria	The search criteria for papers describing applied interventions are clearly defined, described and available for further project proposes.
Acceptance criteria	The search criteria for papers describing applied interventions must be accepted by the consensus of experts
Observations	It is necessary to justify the criteria applicable for the search of papers describing applied interventions selection of works done or interventions found taking into account outcomes.

Task 3: Assess and select good practices on management of multi-morbid patients

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.1_ Variables evaluated as good practices
Definition	Description of the variables of study for evaluate good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models
Justification	Definition of the variables for the evaluation and selection of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices identified
Data collection instrument	Database of good practices identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	List of variables evaluated as good practices is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	Description of the variables of study for evaluate good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	It is important to have quality criteria for the development of this variables for the evaluation and selection of good practices

(code)_ Indicator	WP6.3.2_ Assessment methods of good practices
Definition	Establish the evaluation methodology of good practices for the evaluation and selection process of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients
Justification	Description of the assessment methods for the evaluation and selection process of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP6 leader
Data collection instrument	WP6 records
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Description of the assessment methods of good practices is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	The evaluation methodology of good practices for the evaluation and selection process of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	Make a reference to models used for assessing good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.3_Number of works done of selected good practices according established criteria
Definition	Know the number of interventions of selected good practices according established criteria
Justification	In order to be able to develop the final guidance report on the evidence-based patient-centred care model for multimorbidity, it is necessary to identify the works done of good practices on the basis of established criteria (related to outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication, etc).
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP6 leader
Data collection instrument	WP6 records
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Total number of works done of selected good practices according established criteria
Acceptance criteria	At least x works done of selected good practices according established criteria per associated partners that must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	Make a reference to the methodology used for selected good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to be able to develop the final guidance report on the evidence-based patient-centred care model for multimorbidity

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.4_Number of good practices identified at local level by questionnaires
Definition	Number of good practices identified at local level by questionnaires Total by associated countries
Justification	In order to be able to develop the final guidance report on the evidence-based patient-centred care model for multimorbidity, it is necessary to identify all possible good practices on management of multi-morbid patients from associated countries.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP6 leader
Data collection instrument	WP6 records
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	X Number of good practices identified at local level by associated countries
Acceptance criteria	At least x of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients identified at local level by associated countries that must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	Make a reference to the methodology used for good practices identified at local level by questionnaires on management of multi-morbid patients in order to be able to develop the final guidance report on the evidence-based patient-centred care model for multimorbidity

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.5_ Number of good practices selected and given to WP4
Definition	Know the number of good practices selected and given to WP4 according established criteria per associated countries
Justification	Identification of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients from all associated countries, evaluation and selection of those good practices that match the selection criteria and their sending to WP4
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices identified
Data collection instrument	WP6 records
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	X Number of good practices selected and given to WP4 per associated countries
Acceptance criteria	At least x of good practices selected and given to WP4 according established criteria per associated countries that must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	Acceptance criteria of good practice must be homogeneous and defined by the WP4

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.6_ Description of criteria used for evaluation of interventions
Definition	To know the criteria for the evaluation of interventions on management of multi-morbid patients identified
Justification	Detailed description of the criteria used for evaluation process of the interventions on management of multi-morbid patients identified
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Data collection instrument	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Description of evaluation criteria for the interventions on management of multi-morbid patients developed and available
Acceptance criteria	The criteria used for evaluation of interventions on management of multi-morbid patients identified must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	The criteria used for evaluation of interventions on management of multi-morbid patients identified must be homogeneous and defined by experts of WP4 and WP6

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.7 _Number of interventions selected
Definition	Know the number of interventions selected according established criteria per associated countries
Justification	After the evaluation process, the selection of good practices will be held with the aim of including them in the repository of good practice and clinical data
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Data collection instrument	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Total number of the interventions on management of multi-morbid patients selected from the identified ones
Acceptance criteria	At least x number of the interventions on management of multi-morbid patients selected per associated country that must be validated by expert consensus
Observations	Make a reference to the methodology used for interventions selected per associated countries on management of multi-morbid patients in order to including them in the repository of good practice and clinical data

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.8_ Description of good practices selected
Definition	Clear description of the methodology used in the selection of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients identified
Justification	Detailed description of the interventions of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients selected with the aim of including them in the repository of good practice and clinical data
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Data collection instrument	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	The methodology in the selection of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients is defined, and available for the literature search.
Acceptance criteria	A clear description to define the methodology used for define the criteria for the selection of good practices on management of multi-morbid patients identified and defined by the consensus of experts
Observations	Make a reference to the methodology used for selected good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to including them in the repository of good practice and clinical data.The methodology must be homogeneous.

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.9_Final document report produced
Definition	The existence of a Final document report for management of multimorbid patients
Justification	As a result of the previous work, and taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication, a development of the final document report on beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients will be done to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Data collection instrument	Database of good practices / interventions identified
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Final document report on beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients developed and available
Acceptance criteria	A Final document report for management of multi-morbid patients taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication and defined by the consensus of experts
Observations	Make a reference to the methodology used for the development of the final document report on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.10_Quality of the document following: ©Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Research Checklist
Definition	Ensure the quality of the document of beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients measured with the compliance of AMSTAR checklist
Justification	To ensure the quality of the final document report on beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients, it is necessary to measure it. This measurement will be done through an ©Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Research Checklist
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Final document report on beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients
Data collection instrument	©Critical Appraisal Skills Programme (CASP) Qualitative Research Checklist
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Quality result of document measured with AMSTAR checklist.
Acceptance criteria	AMSTAR fulfilling checklist in the assessment of the document report on beneficial interventions for management of multi-morbid patients
Observations	It should be defined and explain the AMSTAR checklist criteria Additional

(code)_Indicator	WP6.3.11_Description of experts consensus for assessment cost-effectiveness and applicability of good practices in multi-morbidity management
Definition	Existence of a consensus of experts for the evaluation of cost-effectiveness, applicability of good practices in multi-morbidity management
Justification	In order to advise on the best possible care models for multimorbid patients, taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication, the experts meeting will be held to agree on the assessment of methodology and applicability of good practices in multi-morbidity management.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	The expert meeting agenda and minutes
Data collection instrument	The expert meeting agenda and minutes
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	M18
Completion criteria	Description of consensus for assessment cost-effectiveness and applicability of good practices in multi-morbidity management developed and available
Acceptance criteria	Description of the variables of study for evaluate good practices on management of multi-morbid patients in order to advise on the best possible care models taking into account outcomes, cost-effectiveness, applicability and replication with the available information by all the associated partners, reported, selected and validated by expert consensus
Observations	It is important to have quality criteria for the expert consensus for the evaluation criteria of cost-effectiveness and applicability of good practices in multi-morbidity management

Task 4: Define multi-morbidity case management training modules

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.1_ Number of case management training programmes identified
Definition	Description of numbers of training programs for professionals trained for conducting best practices in patients with multimorbidity
Justification	Identification of the essential professional competencies and the training programme for healthcare providers in order to develop and facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Literature search and analysis of available databases of already EU projects, national reports
Data collection instrument	Field survey, interim report, final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice: interim and final reports (M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Total number of case management training programmes identified
Acceptance criteria	Expert consensus for the selection of criteria for the identification of training programs
Observations	To describe the criteria used for the training of professionals in good practices

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.2_ Description of the identified training modules
Definition	know the contents of the selected programs for trainings modules of good practices
Justification	Description of the essential professional competencies and the training modules / programme for healthcare providers in order to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	List reporting the identified training models
Data collection instrument	Interim report and final report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Twice (M18, M36)
Completion criteria	Description of the identified training modules is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	Additional information to be completed if necessary No

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.3_ Definition of consensus meeting protocol
Definition	Existence of a protocol that explains the consensus criteria for the development definition of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes
Justification	In order to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe, the experts meeting will be held to agree on definition of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules. To reach agreement among experts, the protocol definition is necessary.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Consensus meeting agenda and minutes List of participants / signature sheet
Data collection instrument	Consensus meeting agenda and minutes List of participants / signature sheet
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Definition of consensus meeting protocol is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	There is a methodology for the development of consensus meeting protocol
Observations	There is a justification of the methodology used for the development of the consensus meeting protocol

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.4_ Number of participants in the consensus meeting
Definition	Description of the number of members involved in the consensus meeting
Justification	In order to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe, the experts meeting will be held to agree on definition of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	List of participants / signature sheet
Data collection instrument	List of participants / signature sheet
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Meeting performed
Acceptance criteria	At least 1 participants in the consensus meeting per each associated partners
Observations	To know the professional profile of the participants

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.5_ Minutes of the consensus meeting
Definition	Existence of a minutes of the consensus meeting
Justification	In order to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe, the experts meeting will be held to agree on definition of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Consensus meeting agenda and minutes
Data collection instrument	NA
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Minutes of the consensus meeting is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	Existence or not of the minutes of the consensus meeting
Observations	Existence of a template where the minutes are developed

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.6_Definition of a standardized curriculum applicable in different countries and settings
Definition	The existence of criteria for the standardization of curricula in different countries and settings
Justification	The development of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules requires a definition of a standardized curriculum applicable in different countries and settings to ensure and to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices across Europe.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Results of the expert meeting
Data collection instrument	Interim report, final report and submission of a scientific paper.
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Definition of a standardized curriculum applicable in different countries and settings is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	Each country must define its minimum standards adaptation of curricula to ensure and to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices
Observations	Must be a justification for the criteria by country adaptation or not of the curricula to ensure and to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.7_Description of skills for search multi-morbidity professionals training programs
Definition	To describe the skills for search multi-morbidity professionals training programs
Justification	The development of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules requires a description of skills for search multi-morbidity professionals training programs in order to ensure the quality of results of the search.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Results of the expert meeting and scientific publications
Data collection instrument	Official report
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M36)
Completion criteria	Description of skills for search multi-morbidity professionals training programs is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	The existence of a consistent methodology for describing the skills for search of multi-morbidity professionals training programs
Observations	There is a justification of the methodology used for describing the skills for search of multi-morbidity professionals training programs

(code)_Indicator	WP6.4.8_Provide Guidelines for development of multi-morbidity training programmes
Definition	To elaborate guidelines for developing of multi-morbidity training program
Justification	To ensure and to facilitate the process of knowledge exchange and transfer of good practices in different countries and settings across Europe, the elaboration of guidelines for the development of the multi-morbidity case management training programmes /modules is necessary.
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Official report
Data collection instrument	Official report according scheduled deliverable
Responsible	WP6
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M36)
Completion criteria	The elaboration of guidelines for multi-morbidity training programmes is developed and available for the further project proposes
Acceptance criteria	The existence of guidelines for development of multi-morbidity training programmes adapted to the necessities per country
Observations	There is a justification of the methodology used for the elaboration of guidelines for multi-morbidity training programmes

WP7: Diabetes: a case study on strengthening health care for people with chronic diseases.

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.2_% attendants to the WP7 meetings
Definition	Percentage of WP7 associated and collaborating partners participation in in person meetings
Justification	Representation and active involvement of WP7 partners at WP meetings
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP7 partners confirmation of participation
Data collection instrument	Presence sheets
Responsible	WP7
Periodicity of data collection	Yearly (October M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of WP7 partners participated in every meeting
Acceptance criteria	100% of WP7 associated partners participated in any of the meetings; 50% of WP7 collaborating partners participated in any of the meetings
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.3_% accomplishment of deadlines of milestones/deliverables
Definition	Percentage of accomplishment of milestones and deliverables within planned schedule
Justification	Timely delivery of planned milestones and deliverables contributes critically to the success of the Joint Action
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP7 leadership
Data collection instrument	Activities Report
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Twice a year (October/May - M18, M20, M22, M30, M32)
Completion criteria	All milestones and deliverables are completed on schedule
Acceptance criteria	All milestones and deliverables are completed with no more than 2 months delay in relation to schedule
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.4_WP7 web-based community of practice indicators: number of log ins
Definition	Number of log ins performed by partners to access the WP7 platform provided by the leadership
Justification	To assess the effective participation of WP7 members through the intranet WP7 platform provided by WP7 leadership to promote interaction between WP members
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Access of WP7 members to the platform
Data collection instrument	Platform statistics
Responsible	WP7
Periodicity of data collection	Twice a year (October/May - M18, M20, M22, M30, M32)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	50 log ins of registered WP members per semester
Observations	Failure of WP7 members to engage at least once yearly with the platform should lead WP7 leadership to check, by email, if that member is still interested to be involved

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.5_WP7 web-based community of practice indicators: number of posts
Definition	Number of posts performed by WP7 leadership or partners in the WP7 platform
Justification	To assess the effective participation of WP7 members through the work WP7 platform
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Contribution of WP7 members to the platform
Data collection instrument	Platform statistics
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Twice a year (October/May - M18, M20, M22, M30, M32)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	5 posts of registered WP7 members per semester
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.6_WP7 web-based community of practice indicators: number of views
Definition	Number of post views in the platform
Justification	To assess the effective participation of WP7 members through the work WP7 platform
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Access of WP7 members to the platform
Data collection instrument	Platform statistics
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Twice a year (October/May - M18, M20, M22, M30, M32)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	50 post views per semester
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.7_Papers and other publications produced
Definition	Number of papers and other special publications produced by initiative of WP7
Justification	To quantify the scientific production, in terms of peer-review and invited publications or special reports, of WP7
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP7 leadership
Data collection instrument	Activities Reports
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (October – M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	This is not a planned WP7 deliverable

(code)_Indicator	WP7.1.8_Satisfaction of WP members
Definition	Satisfaction of WP members with organization, information received, feedback of their work
Justification	To evaluate the self-reported degree of involvement and knowledge of WP7-specific, as well as general Joint Action, activities and objectives
Type of indicator	Process
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Self-reported WP7 partners
Data collection instrument	WP7 Meeting and Event surveys
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once yearly (October – M10, M22, M34)
Completion criteria	100% of WP7 respondent partners report a medium/high degree of satisfaction and involvement
Acceptance criteria	75% of WP7 respondent partners report a medium/high degree of satisfaction and involvement
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.1_Literature review
Definition	Literature review for each of Tasks 1 through 4
Justification	Mapping of current knowledge and gaps in Task 1: Prevention of Diabetes: focus on people at high-risk, Task 2: Prevention of complications of type 2 diabetes; Task 3: Health promotion interventions, and Task 4: Education strategies and approaches
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP7 Tasks 1-4 leaders
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	100% of Task leaders provide a literature review
Acceptance criteria	100% of Task leaders provide a literature review
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.2_Development of questionnaire for data collection
Definition	Development of an integrated questionnaire for data collection of Tasks 1 to 4
Justification	Development of a structured questionnaire to be filled by WP7 partners to provide information on successful strategies, needs and gaps, to address Tasks 1 to 4
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Integrated questionnaire for data collection on Tasks 1-4 developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.3_Long list of criteria for description
Definition	Development of long list of criteria for description of successful strategies in Tasks 1 to 4
Justification	Development of a long list of criteria adequate to describe initiatives identified by WP7 partners as successful in Tasks 1 to 4.
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Long list of criteria for description of successful strategies on Tasks 1-4 developed and available for discussion
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.4_Potential good practices sent to WP4
Definition	Number of potential good practices in Tasks 1 to 4, described by selected set of criteria, sent to WP4
Justification	The potential good practices produced by WP7 are to be integrated in the PKE by WP4
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	WP7 leadership
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M32)
Completion criteria	
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	This is not a planned WP7 deliverable

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.5_Number of questionnaires collected
Definition	Number of questionnaires collected concerning Tasks 1 to 4
Justification	Number of filled questionnaires concerning identification and preliminary description of strategies related to Tasks 1 to 4 submitted by WP7 partners
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaires
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	26 questionnaires
Acceptance criteria	17 questionnaires
Observations	These criteria take into account the countries represented in JA-CHRODIS (see further indicator WP7.2.7)

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.6_% of questionnaire fully completed
Definition	Percentage of questionnaires collected concerning Tasks 1 to 4 that are fully completed
Justification	Percentage of questionnaires submitted by WP7 partners concerning identification and preliminary description of strategies related to Tasks 1 to 4 that are fully filled
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaires
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	100% of submitted questionnaires are fully completed
Acceptance criteria	80% of submitted questionnaires are fully completed
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.7_Coverage of EU + Associated Countries
Definition	Geographical coverage of partners submitting questionnaires describing strategies in Tasks 1 to 4
Justification	JA-CHRODIS aims to provide an overview of practices and successful strategies throughout Europe
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaires
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	100% of EU and associated countries are represented in the submitted questionnaires
Acceptance criteria	17 EU countries represented in JA-CHRODIS plus at least 2 associated countries submitted questionnaires
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.2.8_Final document produced
Definition	The existence of a final document detailing successful strategies for Tasks 1 to 4
Justification	This document will provide recommendations to improve prevention of diabetes and complications, and to improve quality of care of people with diabetes
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Final document on Tasks 1 to 4 recommendations
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M32)
Completion criteria	Final document on Tasks 1-4 recommendations developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.1_Questionnaire for NDP mapping
Definition	Development of a questionnaire to map and characterise National Diabetes Plans (NDP)
Justification	Development of a structured questionnaire to be filled by WP7 partners to provide information on existing NDP, or lack of thereof
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaire
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M18)
Completion criteria	Questionnaire for NDP mapping developed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.2_ Number of collected NDP questionnaires
Definition	Number of collected questionnaires concerning National Diabetes Plans (NDP)
Justification	Number of questionnaire completed to provide information on the status and characteristics of NDP
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaires
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	32 questionnaires (all EU and EFTA countries)
Acceptance criteria	17 questionnaires
Observations	These criteria take into account the countries represented in JA-CHRODIS (see further indicator WP7.3.3)

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.3_Coverage of EU + Associated Countries
Definition	Geographical distribution of the States, respondents from which questionnaires describing National Diabetes Plans (NDP) were submitted
Justification	JA-CHRODIS aims to provide an overview of practices and successful strategies throughout Europe
Type of indicator	Outcome
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Questionnaires
Data collection instrument	WP7 intranet platform
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	100% of EU and associated countries are represented in the submitted questionnaires
Acceptance criteria	17 EU countries represented in JA-CHRODIS plus at least 3 associated countries submitted questionnaires
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.4_Cross-National NDP Guidelines
Definition	Cross-National NDP Guidelines document
Justification	Production of a document highlighting cross-national NDP guidelines to support improvement and cooperation among Member States on diabetes prevention and care
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP7 leadership
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M24)
Completion criteria	Cross-National NDP Guidelines document completed and available
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.5_Workshop about NDP
Definition	Expert meeting to provide workshop on the information gathered about NDP
Justification	Workshop to discuss the state of the art of NDP, as uncovered by WP7 activities, and to support the development and implementation of NDP by Member States
Type of indicator	Output
Methodology	Qualitative
Data source(s)	WP7 leadership
Data collection instrument	CHRODIS website
Responsible	WP7 & WP3
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M32)
Completion criteria	Workshop on NDP organised by WP7 leadership
Acceptance criteria	
Observations	

(code)_Indicator	WP7.3.6_ Number of workshop participants
Definition	Number of participant in the workshop about National Diabetes Plans (NDP), organised by WP7
Justification	Representation and active involvement of partners and stakeholders on the NDP vworkshop
Type of indicator	Outcomes
Methodology	Quantitative
Data source(s)	Members confirmation of participation
Data collection instrument	Presence sheets
Responsible	WP7
Periodicity of data collection	Once (M32)
Completion criteria	100% of European countries represented
Acceptance criteria	80% of JA-CHRODIS partner countries represented
Observations	