

# **Second Evaluation Report of the UP-RES project**

February 2013  
Ari-Matti Auvinen  
Managing Partner

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction and rationale .....	3
2	General notions of the UP-RES project evaluation.....	5
3	WP1: Project management .....	8
4	WP2: Training needs analysis and tools modification.....	10
5	WP3: Short training courses: Training design and delivery.....	11
6	WP4: Long training courses: Training design and delivery.....	12
7	WP5: Evaluation .....	13
8	WP6: Communication and dissemination .....	14
9	WP7: Certification.....	15
10	Conclusions and summary.....	16

Ari-Matti Auvinen  
Managing Partner

## Second Evaluation Report of the UP-RES project

### 1 Introduction and rationale

The second evaluation report of the UP-RES project covers the whole contract period of the UP-RES project (01.09.2010 – 28.02.2013). This evaluation report is based on three other reports created during the evaluation task of the project, namely

- risk analysis report of the project (July 2012)
- first evaluation report (October 2012)
- stakeholder report (February 2013).

This second evaluation report includes content also presented already in the first evaluation report; this ensures that this second evaluation report can be also read as an independent document without reading the first evaluation report. However, the findings of the reports of risk analysis and stakeholders are used only partially in this second evaluation.

The work in evaluation was based on competitive tendering. On this basis Aalto University selected the evaluator and the evaluator presented the evaluation plan during early Spring 2012. During late Autumn 2012 the evaluation plan was amended. As discussed later in detail, the evaluation work started later than planned and foreseen, and thus also the first actual evaluation report was covering already 80 % of the work of the project. The risk analysis was also undertaken relatively late (during late Spring 2012), as it was not possible to undertake this work earlier. This meant also that the potential corrective actions for the project – as identified and proposed by the evaluator – were limited in their nature.

The work of the UP-RES project was evaluated on three different levels – the level of the project, the level of the work packages and the level of individual actions. In particular, the evaluation on the level of individual actions was based on the work by the project partners. This work included, among others, the collection and analysis of feedback and evaluations of short training courses and long training courses. In addition, the evaluator was also organizing the assessment of the stakeholders, which was seen as an important element in the evaluation work of the project. During the evaluation task, the evaluator participated in three project meetings (April 2012 in Erfurt, October 2012 in Brussels and January 2013 in Espoo). The various sources utilized in the evaluation work were as follows (applied from the evaluation plan) (see *Table 1*).

---

	application & contract	planning docs of the project	reports and minutes	questionnaires	interviews / monitoring	training materials
<b>LEVEL OF THE PROJECT</b>						
service promise of the project	x (1)	x	x (1)		(x) (3)	
relevance of the project					(x) (3)	
balance of WPs and various actions	x (1)	x (1)	x (1)			
implementation of the work plan		x (1)	x			
strategic success of the project	x (1)	x (1)		x (3)		(x) (2)
satisfaction of the stakeholders				x (3)		
satisfaction of the partners					(x) (3)	
operative effectiveness of the project		x (1)	x (1)			
economic effectiveness of the project	x (1)	x (1)	x (1)			
collaboration of the partners	(x) (1)	(x) (1)	x (1)			
risk analysis of the project				x (3)	(x) (3)	
<b>LEVEL OF THE WORK PACKAGES (WPs)</b>						
relevance of the work packages					(x) (3)	
balance of the various actions in the WPs	x (1)	x (1)	x (1)			
functional quality of the work packages			(x) (1,2)		(x) (3)	(x) (2)
technical quality of the work packages			(x) (1,2)		(x) (3)	(x) (2)
<b>LEVEL OF THE ACTIONS</b>						
training sessions undertaken				x (1,2,3)	(x) (1,2,3)	
other actions undertaken				x (1,2,3)	(x) (1,2,3)	
	x=primary source				1=collected and provided by the coordinator	
	(x)=secondary source				2=collected and provided by the partners	
					3=collected and provided by the evaluator	

*Table 1. Information sources for evaluation*

In the actual evaluation work, there was also a shift of emphasis according to one element of the evaluation work (Training material evaluation). The Description of the Action highlighted the role of the evaluator in assessing the training materials produced within the UP-RES project. However, the evaluator was able to start his work close to the time when the training materials were already prepared and also translated. Thus it was agreed that specific evaluation of the training materials at this late stage was not productive for the overall outcomes of the project. The evaluator provided during 2012 the project with insights and materials for the overall design of the training approach at the start of his work, and thus the work emphasis of evaluation to support the foreseen dissemination activities. This included also support in the business planning of the UP-RES project beyond the actual project contract period. As a part of the evaluation work, the evaluator supported the project consortium to deepen the understanding of the required operations to reach the professional development and training market.

## 2 General notions of the UP-RES project evaluation

According to its objective and mission, the UP-RES project is addressing an important and essential subject area. The UP-RES project was tackling a novel subject area and thus also an obvious training challenge: there was a lack of research tradition combining urban planning with energy and emission issues – let alone renewable energy issues. Teaching in the various training activities had to be started with a scarcity of research results on integrating urban planning with energy and emissions.

The preparatory work of the project –in particular, the project application and its Description of the Action – was of a high quality and sufficient detail. The Description of the Action was also documenting appropriately the actual need for the project and its activities. However, the amount of various activities listed in the Description of Action was massive and not all of them were directly related to the mission of the project. The challenge for the UP-RES project with its Description of Action was that the work of the project was versatile and included many different elements. For instance, the UP-RES project was expected to provide high-level training sessions, but also journals articles for scientific publications. Thus the actual focus of the project might get fuzzy, if too many not-directed-related activities are loaded to the same project.

The consortium of the UP-RES project was well-planned and brought together versatile academic and practical experience. However, the work of the consortium was suffering in its early stages from the alteration of the partnership, and the actual challenge for the project was the lengthened procedure with the Agency of the contractual changes. According to the planning of the UP-RES project, the project consortium was relying much on a fluent “critical path” in its planning of the project. This made the project vulnerable to delays of some critical work packages and caused obvious challenges.

The implementation of the UP-RES project has been clearly suffering from the economic crisis, which has been hitting hard the training resources (both time for training as well as funds for training courses) by the potential customers of the UP-RES courses. The UP-RES project reached a large number of customers by short courses, although the intensity of the short courses was different in various partner countries. The short courses varied from afternoon information sessions to intensive professional two-three day courses. According to numbers of participants on the short training courses, the project consortium reached its quantitative goals, although the nature of the short training courses varied widely. The project consortium was also successful in reaching sufficiently its quantitative goals according to the number of participants on the long training courses. Due to the altering economic climate, the work of the project consortium in reaching such a good number of participants should be praised. Based on all the available evidence to judge, the training courses have been of a good quality and have been well received by the participants as well as by the stakeholders.

The UP-RES project did valuable work in creating new resources for training and professional development in the area of renewable energy. During the project ten comprehensive slide sets (in all 300 slides per language) were published on 10 European languages – these were provided to the users with a creative commons license. In addition, some practical Excel tools were also provided with the same principle. The project collected and documented a wide number of good practices in renewable energies. These are important assets for the various training organizations who would like to promote the objectives of the UP-

RES project. The UP-RES project partners were also active in various conferences with their presentation and papers. The UP-RES project was also visible in various professional magazines and during the project, the project partners also published their research findings in scientific conferences and journals.

An essential expectation for the long-term impact of the UP-RES project was founded on the model to assist certified programs of urban and regional planners with renewable energy skills within other universities and higher education institutions. Although the planning of the UP-RES project was well undertaken, the partnership was not successful with its efforts to promote professional development for urban planners with renewable energy skills to other universities or higher education institutions. The UP-RES project was not equipped to the procedure and manner how high-level universities and professional training institutions actually procure and/or use training resources for professional development courses produced by other actors. In retrospect it can be safely stated that the timeframe for such an action was too short and also the resources for such an action too limited.

Although the accurate training materials the UP-RES project consortium produced and translated were professionally written, actual and already tested during the courses held, the real important question is whether these materials were sufficient for other academic and training entities to apply in their own environment and how should the various resources (curriculum for the courses, training materials, support materials etc.) be packed. The UP-RES consortium did not promote the idea of “system selling” and the provision of various resources and services, but relied on the training materials only.

In the internal work of the UP-RES project, the obvious problem was the delay of the various actions of the project. Although the project started well and crisply (with the reservation of the delays with the amendment procedure to the contract), during the actual work of the project, small delays grew to longer delays, and the consortium had to struggle with keeping the deadlines, in particular, regarding the authoring and delivery of various required deliverables. Many of key deliverables were very late – some of them several months. For instance, the important deliverables of the work package 3 (short training courses), work package 4 (long training courses) and work package 7 (certification of planners) were practically in their documented form available first at the end of the project. Although within the project consortium their actual content was available already prior to the actual documentation, these severe delays meant also that the important “cross-pollution” between different work packages was difficult. Thus the project lost some of its good potential for real European impact and the energy of the project consortium was during the last months of the project rather directed to finalizing the required documentation (to fulfill all its contractual obligations) than into developing its concept to the next level.

Despite the challenges of the UP-RES project, its results still are notable. The partners of the UP-RES project have organized training courses and information sessions reaching more than 1000 individuals, the partners have organized intensive long training courses reaching over 100 professionals and they have created an important training material reservoir with professionally made slide sets in several European languages. The partners of the project have communicated actively with their stakeholders, they have given tens of presentations at national conferences and published tens of articles both in professional journals as well as academic journals. All these actions show that the project consortium has been working actively to promote and advocate renewable energy skills. The project can be well regarded as sustainable, as its has been undertaking much of important fundamental work both in the partner countries as well as within Europe.

The stakeholders in various partner countries were also assessing of the results and achievements of the UP-RES project. The questionnaire of stakeholders was returned by 52 informants with an even distribution from all the five partner countries and the results of stakeholder satisfaction to the UP-RES project are displayed in Table 2. The informants were asked ten questions, which were concentrating on the successful implementation of the work of the UP-RES project and on the impact and sustainability of the UP-RES project. *Table 2* summarizes the results of these questions. The scale used was a Likert scale 1-7 (scale 1= very unsatisfactory – 7=very satisfactory).

	Finland	Germany	Hungary	Spain	United Kingdom		mean	median	deviation
The UP-RES project has communicated effectively on its goals and objectives.	5,4	4,3	6,5	5,4	6,9		5,7	5	1,0
The UP-RES project has communicated effectively on its activities (such as courses).	5,4	3,2	6,2	5,9	6,8		5,5	6	1,4
The UP-RES project has improved the awareness of the role of renewable energy sources in urban planning in my country.	5,1	4,7	6,5	5,6	5,7		5,5	6	0,7
The UP-RES project has increased the interest on renewable energy sources in urban planning in my country.	4,9	3,1	5,8	5,3	5,0		4,8	5	1,0
The UP-RES project has fulfilled its promises with its actions.	5,5	4,2	6,2	4,8	6,1		5,4	6	0,9
The UP-RES project has increased the practical skills of urban planners.	5,5	4,4	6,3	6,3	6,8		5,9	6	0,9
The UP-RES project has motivated the participants to deepen their professional development.	6,2	4,7	6,6	5,9	6,9		6,1	6	0,9
The UP-RES project has created a community of interested urban planners in the field renewable energy sources.	4,5	3,8	4,4	5,1	4,9		4,5	5	0,5
The UP-RES project has created a sustainable training concept for urban planners.	5,1	4,2	5,6	5,8	5,5		5,2	6	0,6
The UP-RES project has improved the communication and co-operation between the different key actors in professional development according to renewable energy sources in urban planning in my country.	4,6	4,5	5,6	4,8	4,6		4,8	5	0,4

*Table 2. Stakeholder assessment of the UP-RES project*

The results show that the implementation of the UP-RES project was generally assessed good or even high by the informants. In particular, the impact was assessed high in motivating the participants to deepen their professional development and in increasing their practical skills. The assessment by the stakeholders varied widely in different partner countries - the results of the German informants were clearly in every area lower than in other partner countries. It is remarkable that the German informants have assessed in seven questions at least one full number lower than the mean average and in all questions below the mean average. On the other hand, Hungary and United Kingdom have scored in great majority of questions (nine out of ten) clearly above the mean average. This shows that both the actual implementation as well as the expected impact varies in partner countries.

According to the long-term impact of the UP-RES project, the real danger is that this contemporary project consortium (or at least their key partners) does not work in the future together and thus this remains as another European project, which was able to produce high-level training materials, but was not able to create a sustainable, durable mechanism to disseminate their results and to maintain and update their materials.

In the following after these key notions, the evaluation of the work of the project is presented work package by work package. The severe delays in the work of the consortium meant, unfortunately, also that the evaluator had limited time to get acquainted with the key deliverables, as many of them were actually delivered just by the end of the project.

### 3 WP1: Project management

The project management function has been lead by Aalto University. The organization of the work of the UP-RES project at Aalto consisting of a European project expert (project coordinator) and subject matter expert was a valid and good model.

The Description of the Action was a valid and solid document describing the various activities and their relationships in a well-structured manner. The basic idea of starting with training needs analysis, going further in the work of the project with short courses and long courses (both in creating interest on the market as well as in proofing the concept) and then wrapping up the experiences for further dissemination by certification concept was very logical and solid. As discussed later, the project consortium was underestimating the challenge to commit other universities and higher education institutions within a short given time period.

In retrospect, the Description of the Action created two major challenges. Firstly, it was not allowing much lag for any delays and was as such quite vulnerable to changes, alterations and delays. These fears, unfortunately, materialized during the work of the project, as the project was not able to reach its full potential due to delays in some critical actions and deliverables. Secondly, the Description of the Action was too ambitious and too versatile with the given budget and timeframe. It included also some peripheral activities, which were not promoting the essential goals of the project.

The consortium – after finding its composition in the early stages of the project – was working of all to judge well and in a cooperative and productive manner. The partners of the project consortium had not previously worked closely together. Alterations of the project consortium and the representatives of the project partners meant that the implementation of joint working methods and approaches have had a natural learning curve. Despite the good working relationship within the consortium, some partners had serious delays in the submission of their deliverables. This meant also that unnecessary energy of project management actors went into reminding partners and chasing for required deliverables.

As stated earlier, the UP-RES consortium struggled with meeting the deadlines of its deliverables, and thus also the various work phases. The Agency also pointed out this aspect in its assessment of the interim report. The workload of the project management was even more intense during the final months of the project in ensuring that all required deliverables were finalized within a relatively short period of time. The “snowball effect” of delays in various work packages meant also that technically the UP-RES project reached its objectives, but the obvious potential of the project (in creating e.g. European certification) did not materialize in full.



The project consortium has had both actual meetings as well as regular audio conference meetings. The minutes of the meetings are adequate, but the consortium did not make clear, binding decisions often – rather the minutes were describing discussions in the meetings and listings of work partners have been declaring to do. Thus the work of the consortium would have been benefitting from more detailed, stricter decisions, which would have been followed in consequent meetings – this modality was first adapted quite late in the work of the project.

The delay in the amendment process by the Agency according to the documentation available seemed unreasonable. The lengthened amendment procedure hampered in a severe way the planning of the project activities and implementation of the project actions. Also the communication with the Agency – due e.g. to the changes of the project officers of the Agency – could have been smoother and more fluent throughout the UP-RES project.

The delays in the amendment process were not the sole contractual challenges. The project consortium agreement was very late and just signed by the very last months of the project. Delay with such elementary documentation is puzzling, as most of the partners are experienced European project actors.

The project has utilized the mechanism of National Steering Groups (NSG) in the partner countries. This was an appropriate and good way to communicate with the stakeholders. It is natural that in various countries the NSGs work in a varying way. In general, the NSGs brought the project clearly added value and enabled fluent communication with the stakeholders. In retrospect it could be asked, whether also an external advisory group on the European level would have been beneficial for the project, as the project during its implementation has met many such challenges (e.g. the certification issue) which could have been discussed on the level of European stakeholders. The assessment by the stakeholders of the UP-RES project (as documented in the stakeholder analysis) was positive, although there were clear variations between different partner countries.

The UP-RES project had an internal “Optima” web environment hosted by Aalto University. The basic planning to utilize Optima was well done and it had a very clear and logical structure. It was useful to collect all the documentation into one web environment, although the partners submitted their documents to this environment without a strict joint policy. This Optima web environment would have served better the project purposes, if the all the partners would have been complying with the same standards and routines. The challenge for the sustainability of the UP-RES project is also to ensure that such joint work environments are also available to the partners after the project.

The UP-RES project built up an own open access website. The website was quite traditional, but it worked fluently. As the key public outcomes of the UP-RES project were the training materials in ten languages, according to the sustainability of the project it is important to ensure the mechanisms of maintaining and updating (and translating) these training materials. Furthermore, one can ask why the website was provided only in English, although the key argument in the dissemination of the training materials was the availability of the materials in ten different European languages.

As discussed in more detail in work package 5, the competitive tendering for the evaluation work was late and thus also the contracting of the evaluator took place almost a year later than foreseen. Unfortunately, this meant that the work of the evaluator could not support the project management work during the earlier stages of the project.

In all, the UP-RES project was fluently managed and the project partnership worked well together towards joint goals. The planning documents were adequate and the implementation of the challenging project was on an acceptable level. The communication between the partners was active; the communication with the Agency could have been more fluent, but such a training and development concept was also in some levels novel to the Agency.

#### **4 WP2: Training needs analysis and tools modification**

This work package was well documented and is a consistent work package both according to its deliverables as well as scheduling. The UP-RES consortium worked well with the training needs analysis, and also assessed and produced a number of meaningful tools and techniques. Although there were minor delays, the consortium performed well in this area and approached a hundreds number of various actors in partner countries – and beyond. The project consortium has also updated and maintained the deliverables of this work package, which shows good commitment to the high-quality work in this field.

The documents of the training needs analysis and tools modification would have deserved wider publication during the project – for instance, the website of the UP-RES project does not utilize in a fresh way the results of the training needs analysis, although these results would be essential for the marketing of the UP-RES products and concept. Furthermore, the potential customers of UP-RES could have used the well-prepared training needs analysis questionnaires in directing and fine-tuning their own training provision. In addition, the UP-RES consortium could have used this European comparative material for conference papers and articles, but there was no evidence that the UP-RES consortium would have been thinking further of utilizing these results in public.

The results of the training needs analysis were well presented and accurate, but the documentation of the consequent work packages (in particular, work packages 3, 4 and 7) made limited direct links to the training needs analysis undertaken. This does not necessarily mean that the results would have not been used, but at least it can be stated that explicit links in the deliverables were not frequent. Thus it seemed that (according to the project flow) the following work packages did not fully utilize the good work done in this work package.

The UP-RES consortium did well-structured and good level work in gathering existing planning guidelines and recommendations. In all, this work package was well planned and well documented, but its full utilization within the work of the project was far from sufficient and thus the full potential created by this work package was not fully reflected in the activities of the UP-RES project.

The position of the short training courses in the project concept and in the Description of the Action was designed to be both valuable in marketing of the long training courses as well as in “proofing-the-concept” of the training contents of the UP-RES project. The actual concept of the short training courses included wide variations. In some countries – such as United Kingdom – the short courses were well-structured and had a clear training function. In other countries – such as Finland – the short courses were used mainly to market the long training courses and thus they were structured more as information sessions. It seems unfair to classify all these under the umbrella title of “short training courses”.

According to the quantitative performance indicators, the UP-RES project met the quantitative objectives described in the Description of the Action according to the number of participants. However, the UP-RES consortium has counted also all participants of mainly information sessions as short course participants. It would have been better to show both the number of attendees as well as the total number of learner hours to give a full picture of the short training courses.

The short courses – and even more so the long training courses - were hit by the economic crisis, as the municipalities and regions were cutting their training budgets and also restricting the time of their co-workers to participate to the short training courses.

The variation of the format of the short training courses was visible within the UP-RES consortium. The variations were acceptable, but the UP-RES project consortium seems to have had too many differing concepts of the short training courses. Furthermore, the joint analysis of what was learned from the different formats of short training courses was not sufficiently documented in the deliverables of the project.

The evaluation task of this work package was more than challenging. This work package was elementary as a work package in the project, but practically all the key deliverables of this work package were delivered on the last month of the project. This meant also that the possibility of the other work packages to learn from these experiences was limited. The internal evaluation of the results of the short training courses was hampered by the fact that the various partners collected feedback of their short training courses unsystematically and without a joint structure. Thus it was impossible to compare the evaluations of the short training courses with another. Most of the short training course evaluation documentation is written on an anecdotal basis, which is not in line with the requirements of such documentation.

The evaluation task of this work package was furthermore hampered by the fact that there was not a unified and standardized format what the partners should have included in their reporting to the Optima project environment and what not.

In addition, the deliverables of this work package lack a decent analysis of the short training courses and the deliverables only listed in a minimalistic way the activities undertaken. This is a striking difference in documentation with the well-structured and well-reasoned documentation of the training needs analysis in work package 2.

The problems with keeping the schedules in the project have been discussed above. However, it should be pointed out once again, that as the design and delivery of the short training courses took in some countries longer than foreseen, the delay in short training courses lead also to “domino effect” in delaying the planning and implementation of long training courses.

The short training courses were meant to include also development plans prepared by the participants and feedback to be given by the project team. The UP-RES project did very valuable and important work in creating the questionnaire and thus identifying the key issues on a municipal/organization level. The questionnaire developed for development plans is an elementary tool also for the future actions within the field. The requirement of development plans was far too ambitious as a goal for short training courses, and development planes were practically not implemented at all within the UP-RES project. In retrospect it can be stated that this objective was not realistic to be fulfilled within the short training courses.

Of all to judge, the short training courses were an important and needed element and the soft, anecdotal evidence shows that the short training courses were well received by their audiences. Also it was important to see, that the demand of the short training courses was steadily growing in some key countries (such as United Kingdom). The UP-RES consortium performed well in reaching with this format a large audience, but it failed to report it and thus learning from the experiences of the short training courses was limited.

## **6 WP4: Long training courses: Training design and delivery**

This work package was the most important work package of the UP-RES project both by its significance to the project as well as its budget proportion. The basic idea of the UP-RES project was to prepare the success of the long training courses by training needs analysis (to identify the critical needs in the target population) and short training courses (to market the comprehensive long training course). Subsequently, the training material produced for the long training courses was meant to serve the dissemination and marketing activities of the UP-RES products (and services) to other high-level educational and training institutions. This fundamental conceptual approach was very valid and suitable for a future oriented project, such as UP-RES. Unfortunately, the UP-RES consortium did not utilize in full the results of the training needs analysis and the experiences of the short training courses, as the results and experiences of the short training courses were documented late and in a limited manner.

It is understandable that due to reasons discussed already earlier (economic crisis, difficulty in recruiting participants etc.), the UP-RES project consortium was accurately modifying the format of the long training courses and allowed very different types of implementation of the long training courses. This showed good adaptability of the UP-RES project to the altering market conditions. For instance, the Spanish model to organize the long course training sessions during evenings – and also assisted by modern ICT solutions – was innovative and efficient. Although there were some important delays in the implementation of this work package as the long training course still continues in Germany even after the project timeline, the actual planning work has been undertaken during the project duration period.

In the difficult operating environment faced with the economic crisis, it is a remarkable achievement to get long training courses organized of a new subject area. The UP-RES consortium was able to fulfill its plans with the long training courses, although it had to alter and revise its original plan. The long training courses served were also the primary platform to develop and pilot training materials which were then provided in ten European languages. The relatively good success of the long training courses showed also the commitment of the key partners to the project and its cause.

The long training courses were well planned and their programs (deliverables 4.1 and 4.2) were sufficiently documented and presented. However, the consortium could have paid more attention to the European added value and structure in more detail. Due to the late delivery of the report on the feedback and evaluations of the long training courses, the consortium missed the opportunity to develop these curricula to the next level.

Particular attention and recognition should be given to the Hungarian project partner, who developed an extensive training course of 60 ECTS points. Also the other partners involved in this work package were developing solid long training courses with good potential for accreditation. The consortium has done important work also in the development of long training course curricula – including the variations of the curriculum in different partner countries. An important element of the sustainability of the UP-RES project was the created network of experts and speakers utilized in the long training courses. The partners should be encouraged to maintain and utilize this important network in their future actions.

According to the quantitative performance indicators, the UP-RES project met in a reasonable way the quantitative objectives described in the Description of the Action according to the number of participants. However, also in this work package it would have been better to show both the number of attendees as well as the total number of learner hours to give a full picture of the long training courses and their implementation. The assessment of the achievements and results of this work package suffered of the similar problem than the deliverables work package 3 –the internal evaluation documentation (deliverable 4.5) lacked analysis of the results of the assessment by the participants. Furthermore, sufficient unification of the assessment results of the various countries was missing and it remained unclear how evaluation of the long training courses was undertaken. The deliverable lacked also comparison between different countries and their results and experiences.

## 7 WP5: Evaluation

Due to the nature of the second evaluation report – which is written by the evaluator – this chapter is relatively short. However, as indicated previously, the contracting process for the evaluator was started nearly a year later than foreseen and this meant also that the evaluator was not in place during critical work phases – such as design of the courses or design of the training materials.

The work plan of the evaluation task was altered during the project. The evaluation task included also a risk analysis undertaken during late Spring 2012 as well as a stakeholder analysis undertaken in early 2013. In

addition, the evaluator was assisting the project coordinator with various issues regarding the learning material strategy and sustainability of the UP-RES project.

The delays in many deliverables have also made the evaluation tasks more challenging; some challenges were also been created by the versatility of the project material in the Optima web environment.

The feedback of the interim report of the Agency highlighted that the important task for evaluation work was the evaluation of the training material. The challenge in this area was that the training materials were developed and translated prior to the actual start of the evaluation activities. Thus it was meaningful also to alter the focus of the evaluation task.

The novel documents compiled by the evaluator (risk analysis, stakeholder report) were generally assessed as useful documents. The risk analysis assisted the UP-RES consortium to identify and focus on important risk aspects. The stakeholder report collected feedback of the stakeholders, but also created an initial understanding of the key stakeholders, which is an important element for the sustainability of the project.

## **8 WP6: Communication and dissemination**

The communication and promotion plan (deliverable 6.1) and marketing materials (deliverable 6.2) were well-prepared and well-reasoned documents; these documents concentrated mainly on the marketing of the UP-RES short and long training courses. However, these documents were not covering the additional elements (such as marketing of the accreditation) of the UP-RES project.

The consolidated training materials (deliverable 6.3) are an important element in the building up of training for urban and regional planners. However, the adequate challenge is their active and productive use within the professional development community. It remains doubtful whether any high-level university or training institution would use only PowerPoint slide sets without further support material (curricula, reference literature, course outlines, supporting materials of training needs analysis, feedback questionnaires etc.). The consortium relied too heavily on the actual production of information as a basis to establish accredited programs, and thus also the results in work package 7 were limited.

The UP-RES consortium deserves great credit for creating these training materials and, in particular, of the translation to 10 European languages. The UP-RES consortium should ensure that these valuable resources remain available for the public, and the consortium should make sure that these materials are maintained and updated.

The consortium followed up well its presence in the media and partners have reported actively their marketing and public relations activities. The UP-RES project was active in giving presentations on various fora. In addition, the project partners were active in professional press, and a good amount of articles were published in various countries. The publishing of five scientific articles in journals was a high-level achievement, taking into consideration that publishing in scientific, peer-reviewed journals takes a long time due to the usually lengthy review and publishing procedures.

The UP-RES consortium has also been in active connection with the professional associations in the field, which has deepened also the impact of the project.

The main vehicle of the dissemination was an active web site. Basically the web site of the UP-RES project included all the important elements, but the web site both in its design as well as its presentation of the content missed much of the potential. The improved structure as well as the potential by the partners to maintain and update the website would have been beneficial. Unfortunately, the web site was available only in English, although the UP-RES consortium did a fine work in providing its training materials in 10 languages.

The UP-RES consortium deserves also credit for its own publishing activities, included its publication on the final report “Making Cities Energy Efficient” and also the various project work activities by the participants of the training courses.

The work package 8 can be seen as a part of the overall dissemination activities and this work was undertaken by the consortium in a sufficient manner.

## 9 WP7: Certification

The potential of European certification was seen in the preparation of the UP-RES project as a critical success factor for the dissemination of the UP-RES products (and services). However, the work undertaken during the project showed that European certification at an expected level is difficult, if not impossible, to undertake. In retrospect one could speculate whether the project partnership should have been more acknowledgeable of the challenges with European-level certification in the early phases of the project. Also it seems that the linkage between work packages 2 (training needs analysis) and work package 7 (certification) was not strong enough.

Although the certification was seen as the key element in the solid dissemination of the results of the UP-RES project and thus also as a key element in the sustainability, the documentation of this work as deliverables was strikingly late: all the three deliverables were submitted during the last project month. The deliverables of this work package were describing sufficiently the European practices, but their late submission decreased their relative importance in the work of the project.

The late submission of the deliverables left practically no time at all for the project partnership to investigate alternative strategies for certification. The UP-RES consortium should have looked also to the different complementary models and scenarios for European certification, and develop various complementary strategies. For the documentation available it seems that the project consortium accepted the fact of the difficulties and did not in real terms look for alternatives.

However, it should also be emphasized that for the short and long training courses developed within the UP-RES project were adequately certified and thus provided for the participants a professionally acknowledged course accreditation.

## 10 Conclusions and summary

The work of the UP-RES project was covering an important area, in which high-level educational and training courses for professional development have been scarcely organized. The basic concept of the project as well as its Description of the Action were solid. The Description of Action was, however, in some cases overambitious and required the UP-RES consortium to undertake within a limited time with a limited budget a wide number of various activities, all of which did not promote the main goals of the project.

In general, the project reached most of its elementary goals. The project mapped well the training needs of its sector in Europe and mapped also the tools and techniques utilized in the professional context. It was able to reach in several European countries by the short and long training courses hundreds of professionals, which were professionally trained. The UP-RES project was also able to modify and tailor its training provision to different operating environments. The project was creating a unique set of training materials in 10 European languages, which is an important resource for the future actions in the area. The UP-RES project was active and successful in its dissemination activities and produced an impressive amount of articles and presentations. Most importantly, the UP-RES project was able to create a network of experts in the field, which is an important asset for the future.

However, the implementation of the project suffered from external and internal factors. The main external factor was the quickly accumulated economic crisis, which was cutting in a severe way the training opportunities of the designated target audiences – both budget wise and time wise. The committed work of the project partners enabled the project to reach basically its quantitative objectives, although the amount of marketing and communication work was harder and more time consuming as foreseen.

Internally, the project was fulfilling its fundamental and contractual obligations, but the UP-RES project suffered from several delays in its actions. This meant that the critical last stages of the project work were dominated by documentation actions of work undertaken instead of developing concepts and ideas for the future.

Unfortunately, the time pressure led also in some cases to compromises in the quality of the work and the deliverables. In particular, the synthesis of the whole work of the project remained slim, as the deliverables of the key work packages (short training courses, long training courses, certification) were finalized first during the last project month. In these key deliverables also the analytical elements were missing. Thus also the evaluation task of the UP-RES project was challenging.

In many aspects the UP-RES project was successful in fulfilling its many obligations in a difficult operating environment. With a tighter discipline of the actual implementation of the activities and preparation of the deliverables, the UP-RES project could have been even better utilizing its fine potential.