

# THE EPISOUTH PLUS PROJECT

## Final Evaluation Report

Reporting period: October 2010 – October 2013

**Final (20.12.2013)<sup>1</sup>**

**This report was prepared by a subcontractor as requested by the EpiSouth Plus partnership and in accordance with a Terms of Reference (ToR).**

### **Subcontractor:**

University of Thessaly, School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Medicine,  
Laboratory of Hygiene and Epidemiology, Larissa, Greece

### *Evaluator:*

**Prof. Christos Hadjichristodoulou,**  
SHIPSAN ACT Joint Action Coordinator,  
Professor of Hygiene and Epidemiology  
[xhatzi@med.uth.gr](mailto:xhatzi@med.uth.gr)

### *Evaluation assistant researcher:*

**Elina Kostara, MSc., Researcher**



The project is cofunded by the European Union DG-SANCO/EABC and DEVCO/EuropeAid together with the participating national partner Institutions.  
The financial support of the Italian Ministry of Health and ECDC is also acknowledged.

<sup>1</sup> Final Report version including revisions and further analysis as requested during the Evaluation session of the EpiSouth Plus final Conference (20-21 November 2013)



## Contents

<b>1.</b>	<b>Scope and Objective of Final Project Evaluation.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.</b>	<b>Methodology for the Final Project Evaluation .....</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1.	EpiSouth Plus project stakeholders .....	6
2.2.	Evaluation tools .....	7
2.2.1.	<i>Review of available resources .....</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.2.	<i>Evaluation tools for the Internal Stakeholders (Project and WP leaders, Focal Points) .....</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.3.	<i>Evaluation tools for the External and Interface Stakeholders (Advisory Board, WHO).....</i>	<i>8</i>
2.3.	Questionnaire Dissemination .....	8
2.4.	Questionnaire Analysis.....	8
2.5.	SWOT analysis .....	9
<b>3.</b>	<b>Results from the review of available resources .....</b>	<b>10</b>
3.1.	Timeliness and completeness of scheduled milestones and deliverables according to the project Work Packages (WPs) .....	10
3.2.	Evaluation of achievement of project indicators, both for quantitative and qualitative aspects.....	14
3.3.	Participation rate in meetings and training activities .....	19
3.4.	Dissemination Activities Evaluation .....	20
<b>4.</b>	<b>Questionnaire Analysis Results .....</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1.	Questionnaire Response Rate .....	23
4.2.	Project Management .....	23
4.3.	Website .....	25
4.4.	EPISOUTH Network.....	27
4.5.	EPIS for EPISOUTH Platform .....	31
4.6.	Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network Activities .....	32
4.7.	EPISOUTH PLUS Outputs and deliverables produced .....	38
4.8.	Activities of the EPISOUTH plus project that should continue .....	42
<b>5.</b>	<b>Interviews .....</b>	<b>43</b>
5.1.	Strengths.....	43
5.2.	Weaknesses of the EpiSouth Network.....	43
5.3.	Threats the network should have anticipated and resolved in order to succeed in the implementation of its objectives .....	45
5.4.	Benefits from the activities/documents etc. done by the EpiSouth Network .....	46
5.5.	Impact that the EpiSouth has had and the sectors that will benefit of its impact in the future development of preparedness and response to cross-border health threats .....	47
5.6.	Proposed means that the partnership should use in order to become sustainable .....	48
5.7.	Activities that should become sustainable.....	49



<b>6.</b>	<b>Added value of the EpiSouth Plus as identified by the partners .....</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>7.</b>	<b>Limitations .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>8.</b>	<b>Conclusions .....</b>	<b>53</b>
8.1.	Review of available resources (indicators, milestones, and deliverables) .....	53
8.2.	Conclusions from the questionnaires analysis (filled in by EpiSouth Focal Points, Members of the Lab Network and Members of the Advisory Board) .....	53
8.3.	Conclusions from the interviews to internal, interface and external stakeholders (conducted with representatives from DG SANCO, DG DEVCO, the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers, the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control, World Health Organisation – Europe, Italian Focal Point Ministry of health and project coordinator) .....	55
8.4.	Overall remark.....	57
<b>9.</b>	<b>Annexes .....</b>	<b>58</b>

## Table Content

<b>Table 1:</b> Deliverables Evaluation .....	10
<b>Table 2:</b> Milestones Evaluation .....	11
<b>Table 3:</b> Level of Achievement of WP4 Indicators .....	14
<b>Table 4:</b> Level of Achievement of WP5 Indicators .....	15
<b>Table 5:</b> Level of Achievement of WP6 Indicators .....	16
<b>Table 6:</b> Level of Achievement of WP7 Indicators .....	17
<b>Table 7:</b> Participation rate in the Epi Trainings (WP5) .....	19
<b>Table 8:</b> Participation rate in Lab trainings (Work Package 4) .....	19
<b>Table 9:</b> Participation rate in project's meetings .....	20
<b>Table 10:</b> Website Statistics .....	21
<b>Table 11:</b> List of presentation/participations to conference and meetings by work package .....	21
<b>Table 12:</b> Response rate of the evaluating questionnaires .....	23
<b>Table 13:</b> Management and timeframe .....	24
<b>Table 14:</b> Website .....	25
<b>Table 15:</b> EpiSouth Network .....	27
<b>Table 16:</b> EPIS EpiSouth Platform intention of use .....	31
<b>Table 17:</b> EPIS EpiSouth Platform Functionalities .....	32
<b>Table 18:</b> Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Newtwork Activities .....	33
<b>Table 19:</b> Evaluation of WP4 training courses .....	34
<b>Table 20:</b> Evaluation of MRLN meetings .....	37
<b>Table 21:</b> Expression of intention for use of the the Strategic document "Tool for generic preparedness plan development" .....	38
<b>Table 22:</b> Evaluation of methodology and performance criteria of outputs/deliverables .....	38
<b>Table 23:</b> Activities the partnership wants to become sustainable .....	42
<b>Table 24:</b> Activities the interviewees wants to become sustainable .....	49

## 1. Scope and Objective of Final Project Evaluation

This report is Deliverable No 4 of the Work Package 3 –Evaluation and is the external<sup>2</sup> final evaluation of the EPISOUTH PLUS project covering the period from October 2010 until October 2013. The evaluation was conducted with the participation of the EPISOUTH PLUS Network partners, the EU institutions (Executive Agency for Health and Consumers, DG SANCO, DG DEVCO, ECDC) and international institutions such as the World Health Organisation.

### Objective

The objective of the Final Evaluation is to highlight successful results and outcomes and critical aspects in the implementation of the four specific objectives of the project, together with the assessment of correct timing and adequacy of planned deliverables.

The main aspects that were evaluated were:

- respect of scheduled milestones and deliverables according to the project Work Packages (WPs);
- achievement of project indicators, both for quantitative and qualitative aspects;
- active participation and networking of both associated and collaborating countries in the project activities;
- measure the benefits / added value gained on health and security cooperation among the associated and collaborating countries
- relevant recommendations for sustainability to support the finalization of the sustainability assessment of the project and possible further sectors of activities for the EpiSouth

---

<sup>2</sup> It has to be noted that the project's evaluation was originally meant to be internal and to be done in the WP3-evaluation framework by the WP3 leader. Due to unexpected constraints the midterm and final evaluations were subcontracted to an external institution.

## 2. Methodology for the Final Project Evaluation

To implement the evaluation strategy evaluation tools were designed. The evaluation, both process and outcome evaluations, included the following activities:

- analysis of the project's documentation;
- analysis and verification of the project's indicators;
- preparation of tools (questionnaire and interview's check list) for collecting information from the institution partners of the Project and Focal Points of the Countries involved in the EpiSouth Network aimed at evaluating project management and core activities;
- preparation of a questionnaire to assess network consolidation;
- collection of information from the institution partners of the Project and Focal Points of the countries involved in the EpiSouth Network;
- interviews conducted through telephone calls;
- incorporation of results of the Midterm Evaluation report to the Final Evaluation report
- preparation of an evaluation report in draft;
- finalisation of the Final evaluation report.

The evaluation process assessed the relativeness, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability utility, coherence, completeness, complementarily, coordination and additionally of processes and outcomes.

### 2.1. EpiSouth Plus project stakeholders

The stakeholders of the EpiSouth PLUS project that participated in the evaluation of the project were all primary stakeholders. Primary stakeholders are those that are immediately affected by and at the same time immediately affect the project outputs and are caterogised as follows:

- Internal stakeholders are those groupings of people who operate entirely within the boundaries of the project (e.g. Project and WP leaders, Focal Points)
- Interface stakeholders are those who function both internally and externally in relation to the project (e.g. WHO both WP coleader and concerned International Organization).
- External stakeholders fall into three categories in their relationship to the project:
  - Those who provide inputs to the organisation - (e.g. EpiSouth PLUS Advisory Board members, EC Project Officers)
  - Those with a special interest in how the organisation functions – e.g. funders (DG SANCO, DG DEVCO, EAHC)

## 2.2. Evaluation tools

---

### 2.2.1. Review of available resources

The following available resources were used:

- Documents produced by the Project (Reports, Meeting Minutes, Presentations and abstracts, Bulletins, Draft of Sustainability Plan etc.)
- Information on the use of the Members area of EpiSouth web site (content, frequency of use, frequency of downloads, etc).
- The monitoring sheets filled every six months by each WP leader which were integral part of the bi-annual reports to DGDEVCO and interim report to DGSANCO (Five rounds WPs monitoring sheets are available)
- The report (October 2011) where the EpiSouth Project was evaluated by DG DEVCO with a Result Oriented Monitoring (ROM) Mission
- The report (April 2012) where the EpiSouth Project was evaluated by DG DEVCO with an evaluation mission for the Instrument for Stability Programme
- The Mid-Term Evaluation report, November 2012 (Annex 1)

### 2.2.2. Evaluation tools for the Internal Stakeholders (Project and WP leaders, Focal Points)

- Focal Point Questionnaire:** An evaluation questionnaire for collecting information from the EPISOUTH Focal Points was developed. The questionnaire evaluated the following aspects:
  - a. Management and timeframe
  - b. Website
  - c. EPISOUTH Network
  - d. EPIS EpiSouth Platform
  - e. Evaluation of the Outputs and Deliverables
  - f. Sustainability aspects

The questionnaire template is presented in Annex 2.

- Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (MRLN) activities questionnaire:** An evaluation questionnaire for collecting information from the MRLN members was developed. The questionnaire evaluated the following aspects:
  - a. EPISOUTH Network
  - b. Training of Work Package 4
  - c. Outputs and deliverable of Work Package 4

The questionnaire template is presented in Annex 3.

### 2.2.3. Evaluation tools for the External and Interface Stakeholders (Advisory Board, WHO)

- i. **Advisory Board Questionnaire:** An evaluation questionnaire for collecting information from the Advisory Board was developed. The questionnaire evaluated the following aspects:
  - a. Management and timeframe
  - b. EPISOUTH Network
  - c. Sustainability aspects

The questionnaire template is presented in Annex 4.

#### ii. Interviews

A checklist for conducting telephone interviews with the internal, the interface stakeholders (WHO) and the external stakeholders of the project (Advisory Board Members) was developed and is presented in Annex 5.

The topics for discussion included in the checklist were:

- Strengths, weaknesses and impact of the EPISOUTH PLUS project
- Sustainability aspects

## 2.3. Questionnaire Dissemination

---

The questionnaires were disseminated to the following target groups:

- Focal Point Questionnaire: EPISOUTH PLUS Focal Points (72 members)
- Advisory Board questionnaire: Advisory Board (17 members)
- Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network activities questionnaire: Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (33 members)

During the collection period it was communicated by certain responders that they would respond collectively by sending one questionnaire. Hence the original list of the members of the target groups was reviewed accordingly.

## 2.4. Questionnaire Analysis

---

The questionnaires were entered into an Excel spread sheet and analysed using Epi Info software. A descriptive analysis of the collected questionnaires is presented in the sections below.

Statistical analysis of the results was conducted exploring differences on the response rate and results among the EU, candidate and Non EU participants using the fisher exact or chi-square test.



## 2.5. SWOT analysis

---

The evaluation strategy used to implement all actions specified in the ToR was based on a SWOT analysis. SWOT analysis is a strategic planning method used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses/Limitations, Opportunities, and Threats involved in a project. It involves specifying the objectives of the project and identifying the internal and external factors that are favourable and unfavourable to achieve the objectives. The SWOT analysis brings a clearer common purpose and understanding of factors for success and provides linearity to the decision making process allowing complex ideas to be presented systematically. The SWOT analysis not only provides the basis for completing the evaluation tasks and to assess core capacities and competencies but to also lead to an action plan that will identify the most distinctive actions that must be addressed immediately, actions that need to be researched further and actions to be planned for the future.

### 3. Results from the review of available resources

#### 3.1. Timeliness and completeness of scheduled milestones and deliverables according to the project Work Packages (WPs)

The EpiSouth Plus partnership, in accordance with the Technical Annex and the annual work plans, had to produce a total of 10 Deliverables (D) out of which seven have been delivered and the other three are currently in the process of being prepared. In *Table 1* the list of deliverables and their status are presented.

*Table 1: Deliverables Evaluation*

Deliverable Number	Deliverable Title	As planned	Status Until Month (M) 24
1	Interim and final technical implementation reports, including financial reports (WP1)	M3 Inception – M17 Interim –	DG SANCO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Interim: Delivered M17</li> <li>Final: pending</li> </ul> DG DEVCO: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inception : Delivered M4</li> <li>Biannual delivered: 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup></li> </ul> <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/interim-and-final-technical-reports">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/interim-and-final-technical-reports</a>
2	Reports of the Project Meetings (WP1)	M4, M38 M27,	Delivered M5, M28 <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/deliverable-1-report-project-meetings">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/deliverable-1-report-project-meetings</a>
3	EpiSouth quarterly electronic Bulletin (WP2)	Quarterly	1 <sup>st</sup> Issue delivered in M 9 (June 2011) 10 Issues prepared until October 2013 <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/episouth-electronic-bulletin">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/episouth-electronic-bulletin</a>
4	Final Evaluation Report (WP3)	M38	1 <sup>st</sup> Draft Completed M37
5	Laboratory Training packages  Recommendation for training and capacity building program (WP4)	M20	Completed <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp4-report_training_dengue-biosafety.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp4-report_training_dengue-biosafety.pdf</a>
		M39	Pending to be delivered in M39
6	Directory of Regional Laboratories involved in surveillance/early warning system in South Europe and Mediterranean area (WP4)	M29	M24 <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/directory_mrlnandassociated_july2013.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/directory_mrlnandassociated_july2013.pdf</a>
7	Preparedness plans & Risk management capacity building materials for Workshops and Sessions and Simulation Exercise. (WP5)	M9, M21, M28 M12, M24,	<b>Completed</b> - Capacity building materials for Workshops and Sessions and Simulation Exercises <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise#overlay-context=content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise#overlay-context=content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise</a>
8	Strategic document on Capacity building development regarding Preparedness plans & Risk management procedures (WP5): Tool for drafting Generic Preparedness plans	M39	In progress - to be delivered in M39
9	EPIS based secured platform interop. with EU & other EWs(subject to ECDC	M1	Interoperable Mediterranean Cross-border secured platform delivered;



	delivery & countries agreement)& Epi Bulletins (WP6)		A total of 129 E-web bulletins published from October 2010-April 2013 and five thematic notes <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/e-pisouth-weekly-epi-bulletin-e-web">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/e-pisouth-weekly-epi-bulletin-e-web</a>
10	Strategic document on national/international issues which may interact/ interfere with IHR implementation (WP7)	M39	First draft to be presented in Final Project meeting in M37

In Table 2, the Milestones and their implementation in terms of timeliness are presented. Minor delays were noted in all work packages with the majority of the delays not exceeding one month. The most important delays are noted in Work Package 4 and in particular the Milestone 4: “The identification of needs of laboratories for diagnoses for priority diseases in the region: human, technical and organizational” where a seven month delay was noted. However, this delay was due to the political instability which resulted in delays in collecting the questionnaires. Moreover, the Stages at Pasteur or other Institute of the MRLN had to be postponed after the countries’ request to conduct the External Quality Assurance prior to the Stages. As it was explained in detail in the Midterm Evaluation Report, the delays in Work Package 6, in particular the review of functional specification for EPIS were due to the freezing of the work package whereas the delays in Work Package 7 were due to change of strategies to reach the set objectives.

Table 2: Milestones Evaluation

Work Package	Milestones	Month	Actual	Comments
WP 1	1st Steering Committee in Luxembourg	3	4	Delayed 1 month
	Sustainability plan (1 <sup>st</sup> draft on the basis of discussion at the SC in LXB)	4	6	Delayed 2 months
	Annual Project Work Plans	4, 16 and 30	5, 16, 30	As planned
	3 <sup>rd</sup> Steering Committee/AB & 1 <sup>st</sup> Project Meeting in Rome	26	26	As planned
	2 <sup>nd</sup> Project Meeting (with SC) & Final Conference in Rome	37	37	As planned
WP2	Dissemination plan	3	4	Delayed 1 month
	Promotional leaflet and outline	4	4	As planned
	EpiSouth-plus website updating	6	8	Delayed 2 months to launch new website
	Presentations at conferences	12	12	As planned A total of 31 presentation See Table 11
WP3	Evaluation plan	4	4	As planned
	WPs Monitoring sheets	6	6	As planned
	WPs activities evaluation questionnaires	inserted in the midterm evaluation (external service)>24	24	As planned
	Meeting evaluation Questionnaires	25	25	As planned
	Networking Evaluation Questionnaires	inserted in the midterm evaluation (external service)> 24	24	As planned

	Mid-term Evaluation Report	18 (external service)> 26	26	As planned
	Presentation of the Final Evaluation results to the Review Meeting with EC Experts Committees	After 18> at the final Project Meeting M37	37	As planned
	Final Evaluation and Report	35-38	38	As planned
<b>WP4</b>	Meeting of expert committee and assessment to set minimum requirements needed (Paris)	15	15	As planned
	Mapping of existing biological expertise	14	14	As planned
	Meeting with the heads of Laboratories interested in the approach and corresponding to the minimum requirements	17	17	As planned
	Identification of needs of laboratories for diagnoses for priority diseases in the region: human, technical and organizational	23	30	Delayed 7 months Delays in collecting the questionnaires due to political instability
	Piloting of the Directory of Regional Laboratories on the website	23-36	23-38	As planned
	Preliminary recommendations on training and capacity building	33	39	Delayed 3 months
	One week training module at PI Paris for 26 lab staff (17 non-EU participants)	21	22	Delayed 1 month
	One week training module (ISCIII, Spain) for 17 non-EU lab staff	32	33	Delayed 1 month
	Stages at Pasteur or other Institute of the MRLN (2 persons for 1 month each or more for shorter period of time, according to the local possibilities)	27-30	35-36	Lab report from Algeria had 3 weeks training at IP
	Follow up	Until 38	Until 38	As planned
<b>WP5</b>	Report on in-depth core-capacity needs assessment	20	21	Delayed 1 month
	one-week training in non-EU Country	30	31	Delayed 1 month
	Workshop 1 and Capacity building Session 1 in Madrid for 30 people	16	18	Delayed 2 months
	one-week training in non-EU Country	31	32	Delayed 1 month
	Workshop 2 and Capacity building Session 2 in Madrid for 30 people	29	30	Delayed 1 month
	Updated of the Directory of Training and Fellowships	During the whole period	During the whole period	As planned
	Simulation Exercise	35	37	Delayed 1 month
<b>WP6</b>	Management of the Mediterranean Cross-border secured platform	From 1	13-18	As planned
	Review of functional specification for EPIS	6	13-24	Delayed due to work package freezing
	One-week stage at InVS of non-EU participants	29	30	Delayed 1 month
	Testing phase for EW Platform in	16-27	21-27	As planned



	EPIS and assessment process, including formalisation of agreements with Partners and training			
	Launching of EpiSouth/EPIS (if consensus met) after 1st Project Meeting	27	27	As planned
	<b>Handing over to ECDC and EpiSouth Partners:</b>	<b>29-30</b>	30	As planned
	ECDC: EPIS for EpiSouth Platform technical management	31-39	31-39	As planned
	<b>Activities under EpiSouth Partners:</b>			
	Stages at Spanish Ministry of Health (Spanish MoH) and Istituto Superiore di Sanità (ISS)	35-38	35-38	At ISS: Done 35 <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/trainingstage-epidemic-intelligence-iss-rome-17-20-september-2013">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/trainingstage-epidemic-intelligence-iss-rome-17-20-september-2013</a> At Spanish MoH: To be done 38
	WP6ST Workshop on EpiS and Simulation Exercise	36	35	As planned <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/workshop-preparation-simulation-exercise-and-connected-use-episouth-platform-rome-italy">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/workshop-preparation-simulation-exercise-and-connected-use-episouth-platform-rome-italy</a>
<b>WP7</b>	Analysis of WHO available data to identify priority areas to be addressed to enhance IHR implementation in the EpiSouth Region	10	14	Delayed 4 months
	Preliminary report of first investigation (see analysis above)	20	14	Available in draft since M14. Final available now after WHO clearance for copyright <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp7-episouth_ihr_assessment_final.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp7-episouth_ihr_assessment_final.pdf</a>
	In depth analysis of priority area identified through literature review and analysis of existing monitoring frameworks	16	16	As planned
	Expert consultation for the definition of guidance tool to be developed in the priority area of interest	21	21	As planned Meeting in Lyon July 2012
	Preliminary report of in depth analysis	21	M16	The same provided at M16 <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp7-in depth analysis of coordination of surveillance and response between points of entry and national systems.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp7-in depth analysis of coordination of surveillance and response between points of entry and national systems.pdf</a>
	Situation analysis of PoE Guidance in EpiSouth in coordination with WP5 Simulation Exercise	32-35	39	In progress Site visits done in Italy, Jordan and Malta Report in progress in coordination with WHO <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-italy-3-7-june-2013">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-italy-3-7-june-2013</a> <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-malta-15-18-july-2013">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-malta-15-18-july-2013</a> <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-jordan-26-29-august-2013">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/site-visit-jordan-26-29-august-2013</a>
	Preliminary strategic document report	36	37	Delay 1 month



### 3.2. Evaluation of achievement of project indicators, both for quantitative and qualitative aspects

In order to achieve the projects objectives a set of process, output and outcome indicators have been established to measure the level and quality of the achievement.

The evaluation of the indicators per work package is presented below.

In *Table 3*, the indicators of Work Package 4 are presented. It can be observed that all indicators were completed successfully. One indicator could not be evaluated because it will be delivered in Month 39.

*Table 3: Level of Achievement of WP4 Indicators*

Indicators	Level of Achievement
<b>Specific Objective 1: Establishment of a Mediterranean Regional Laboratories network (WP4)</b>	
<b>Process Indicators</b>	
Number of participants attending the Meeting organised by the Pasteur Institute for Laboratories Representatives out of the total number of those selected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed - 12 participants out of 18 MRLN analysis team</li> </ul>
The list of the laboratories from the EUROMED region eligible to participate in the network is developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>
Capacities assessment of the laboratories participating in the network is completed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>
Training material is developed on time	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed (M22)</li> </ul>
<b>Output Indicators</b>	
Number of trainees attending the training courses ( $\geq 60\%$ ) and the number of participants attending the meetings organised by the Pasteur Institute ( $\geq 60\%$ )	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Training on Dengue and Biosafety in the Laboratory 2-6 July 2012</u>: Nineteen laboratories (over the 21 of the MRLN) have proposed a candidate for this training, but only 17 could participate (7 EU and 10 non-EU) = 80.95%</li> <li><u>Training on West Nile and Biosafety II in the Laboratory</u>: 20 out of 24 Head of laboratories participated (7 EU 13 Non EU) (83%)</li> <li><u>1<sup>st</sup> Episouth plus project meeting in Rome October 2012</u>: 83% of Heads have participated (19/23 labs were represented)</li> <li><u>Meeting with the Heads of the Laboratories (8th-9th March 2012)</u>: Of the 21 heads of laboratory invited, 13 countries were represented (participation rate 62%).</li> <li><u>Expert committee meeting was to select the laboratories to involve in the Mediterranean regional laboratories network (MRLN)</u>: 14 participants</li> <li><u>Steering team teleconference, 22 November 2012</u>: 7 out of 10 attended (70%)</li> </ul>
>80% satisfied trainees from the training courses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Training on Dengue and Biosafety in the Laboratory 2-6 July 2012</u>: Trainees were very satisfied of the training and 94% have declared that the training met their expectations (16/17)</li> <li><u>Training on West Nile and Biosafety II in the Laboratory</u>: All the trainees were very satisfied by the training (overall score of the quality: 4.5/5) and 100% of the trainees declared that the training met their expectations.</li> </ul>
Number of Laboratories which accept to participate in the Network out of the total number of those whose standards were adequate to the project's objectives (50%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>30 laboratories from 21 countries responded out of 27. A total number of 26 Human labs and 3 Veterinary Labs identified. 20 human labs and 3 Veterinary Labs identified fulfilled the selection criteria (76.6%).</li> </ul>

Outcome Indicators	
Reference procedures available in the recommendation for training and capacity building program and considered by each country for the collaboration between PH Institutions and laboratories of the EpiSouth Network	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A – to be delivered in Month 39</li> </ul>
Laboratory needs in the Mediterranean Area identified and shared with stakeholders and European and international Institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>

In *Table 4* the level of achievement of the WP5 indicators is presented. All process, output and outcome indicators of this WP were achieved.

*Table 4: Level of Achievement of WP5 Indicators*

Indicators	Level of Achievement
<b>Specific Objective 2: Promotion of common procedures in interoperable Generic Preparedness and Risk management among the countries involved in the Network (WP5)</b>	
<b>Process Indicators</b>	
<b>In-depth capacity needs assessment carried out, based on information collected from a sample of participating countries</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed: 21 out of 27 (77.7%) countries participated in the assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>Two Workshops carried out</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1st Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Spatial Analysis of Surveillance Data, Madrid, Spain 27 February - 2 March 2012 (M18)</li> <li>2nd Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Risk Assessment, Madrid, Spain 4-8 March 2013 (M29)</li> </ul>
<b>Training material and simulation exercise is prepared</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Training material is prepared</li> <li>Simulation exercise completed October 2013 (M36)</li> </ul>
<b>Training courses are organised</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WP5 Training on Outbreak Investigation and Spatial Analysis of Surveillance Data: Cluster Data Analysis - First course, Belgrade, Serbia 8-12 April 2013</li> <li>WP5 Training on Outbreak Investigation and Spatial Analysis of Surveillance Data: Cluster Data Analysis - Second course, Belgrade, Serbia 20-24 May 2013</li> </ul>
<b>Output Indicators</b>	
<b>At least 70% of EpiSouth countries participate in the simulation exercise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A total of 20 out of 27 EPISOUTH (74%) countries participated out of which eight (40%) were EU Member States and the other 12 (60%) Non EU / candidate countries</li> </ul>
<b>At least 70% satisfied participants in the simulation exercise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of the SE participants were satisfied and rated highly the contact with the organisers, the information provided, the details on their role and the overall coordination during the preparatory and implementation phase (&gt;78%).</li> <li>The participants of the SE further responded that the SE are of very high or high value in creating networks (&gt;92%) and that the SE had a very high or high value for their organisations operations (&gt;70%). For details see Annex 6 <b>Simulation Exercise External Evaluation Report</b></li> </ul>
<b>At least 70% of EpiSouth countries attending each Workshop out of the 27 countries in the Network</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1st Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Spatial Analysis of Surveillance Data, Madrid, Spain 27 February - 2 March 2012 (M18) : 47 participants, 22 out of 27 ( 81.5%) countries - institutions</li> <li>2nd Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Risk Assessment, Madrid, Spain 4-8 March 2013 (M29) 29 Participants from 19 countries attended the module, 13 of them where Non EU countries. (70%)</li> </ul>



<b>At least 70% satisfied participants from the workshop</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1st Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Spatial Analysis of Surveillance Data, Madrid, Spain 27 February - 2 March 2012 (M18) 7/9 (77.8%) responders rated the course content as excellent (See Mid Term Evaluation Report)</li> <li>2nd Workshop on Public Health Preparedness and Response &amp; Training Session on Risk Assessment, Madrid, Spain 4-8 March 2013 (M29) The training was much appreciated by participants and highly valorized. <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/wp5-second-workshop-public-health-preparedness-and-response-training-session-risk-assessment#overlay-context=content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/wp5-second-workshop-public-health-preparedness-and-response-training-session-risk-assessment#overlay-context=content/deliverable-7-capacity-building-training-materials-workshop-sessions-and-simulation-exercise</a></li> </ul>
<b>Outcome Indicators</b>	
<b>At least 50% of EpiSouth countries consider the usage of the tool for generic preparedness plan development</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8/19 (42%) of responders in the final evaluation questionnaire replied they would use the tool</li> <li>11/19 (58%) of responders replied they would partially use the tool - See <i>Table 21</i> for details</li> </ul>

In *Table 5* it is observed that all indicators for WP6 were achieved. Outcome indicators 1 and 2 could not be fully evaluated since they refer to the period after this current evaluation is taking place. In output indicator 1 information was available and is presented for the period from 2010 to 2012.

*Table 5: Level of Achievement of WP6 Indicators*

Indicators	Level of Achievement
<b>Specific Objective 3: Enhance Mediterranean Early Warning Systems (EWS) allowing alerts and Epidemic intelligence information sharing among EpiSouth countries and developing interoperability with other Early Warning Systems (including European) (WP6)</b>	
<b>Process Indicators</b>	
Epis based cross-border secured platform developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>
Reference procedures available and endorsed by countries for information sharing within EpiSouth secured platform and among it and other EW systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed (October 2011)</li> </ul>
Development of eweb bulletins (EpiSouth Weekly Epidemic Intelligence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completed</li> </ul>
<b>Output Indicators</b>	
>70% satisfied with the platform's functionality (accessibility, user-friendly, timeliness)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MIDTERM EVALUATION REPORT: 11/23 (47.8%) responders rated the functionality of the platform as Excellent whereas 11/23 (47.8%) rated it as satisfactory</li> <li>FINAL EVALUATION: 69% rate the platform functionality as excellent and satisfactory - See <i>Table 17</i> for details</li> </ul>
Number of eweb bulletins (EpiSouth Weekly Epidemic Intelligence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>129 E-web bulletins published from October 2010- April 2013</li> </ul>
Number of registration in the e-web bulletin mailing list	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>486 members are registered in the e-web list (until 28<sup>th</sup> November 2012)</li> </ul>
<b>Outcome Indicators</b>	
Increase the number of alerts published and their distribution among the Partners during the last 6 months of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>From 19 March 2008 to 01 January 2013 812 health events were reported through the e-web bulletins</li> <li>The proportion of events occurring in EpiSouth countries regularly rose from 37% in 2010 to 53% in 2012 and is underlying an increased understanding and commitment of countries to publicly share information <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/eweb_250_03_01_13.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/eweb_250_03_01_13.pdf</a></li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Since EPIS for EpiSouth platform was opened in January 2013 there have been: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 67 new cross-border alerts posted</li> <li>○ 81 follow-up for a total of 148 posts.</li> <li>○ 19 ad hoc forums</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Increase the number of episodes of collaboration within the network between EU and non-EU countries and between the Network and other EW platforms during the last 6 months of the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A – to be delivered at a later stage</li> <li>• ECDC COMMUNICABLE DISEASE THREATS REPORTS (CDTR) August-December 2012</li> <li>• ProMED - International Society for Infectious Diseases (Sept – October 2012)</li> <li>• ECDC:</li> <li>• Updating of West Nile Fever Maps</li> <li>• Rapid Risk Assessment - (AH5N1) Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza in Egypt - Implications for human health in Europe (Sept 2011)</li> <li>• WHO Global Alert and Response (GAR): WNV Infection in Europe (August 2011)</li> </ul> <p><a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/collaborations-episouth-network-international-organizations">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/content/collaborations-episouth-network-international-organizations</a></p>
Willingness of countries to continue the usage of the platform and appreciation of the platform's usefulness and need measured through core packages evaluation questionnaires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11/21 (52%) of the responders expressed their intention to continue using the platform</li> <li>• 5/21 (24%) responded they would use it partially</li> </ul> <p>See Table 16</p>

In Table 6 the WP7 indicators are presented. All indicators were achieved. Outcome indicator 1 could not be evaluated since the situation analysis was presented in the Final project meeting in November 2013 and will be delivered on Month 39 (after the completion of the final evaluation).

**Table 6: Level of Achievement of WP7 Indicators**

Indicators	Level of Achievement
<b>Specific Objective 4: Production of guidelines and strategic document based on assessments and surveys aimed at facilitating IHR implementation (WP7)</b>	
<b>Process Indicators</b>	
WP7 Workshop conducted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed - 2 workshops in Rome and Lyon</li> </ul>
Literature review report on IHR implementation on the EpiSouth Region is prepared and areas of priority are identified	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed</li> </ul>
The methodology for the situation analysis on coordination of surveillance and response between points of entry and national surveillance systems is developed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed</li> </ul>
<b>Output Indicators</b>	
Number of participants in the workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting in Lyon: 13/14 participants</li> <li>• Meeting in Rome: 18/18 participants</li> </ul>
Final report of in depth analysis of priority area (literature review and analysis of existing monitoring frameworks)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed</li> </ul>
The situation analysis on coordination of surveillance and response between points of entry and national surveillance systems is	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Completed - deliverable in M39</li> </ul>



carried out and results fed into the WP7 strategic document

**Outcome Indicators**

Number of EpiSouth countries which have been helped by the results produced by the Situation Analysis and the lessons learned / case studies collected by the EpiSouth WP7 (>50%) measured through the core evaluation questionnaires.

- Not possible to evaluate since the situation analysis will be delivered in M39
- See Annex 7 and Annex 8 for presentations from the Final project meeting, November 2013

Number of EpiSouth countries which have been helped by the EpiSouth WP7 documentation in the identification of priority areas and the IHR implementation (≥50% measured through core packages evaluation questionnaires)

- In the Midterm Evaluation Questionnaire the “Usefulness” of the literature review was rated as Excellent by 7 out of 14 participants (50%) and 6 out of 14 (42.9%) rated its usefulness as satisfactory.

### 3.3. Participation rate in meetings and training activities

The participation rate of EU and Non-EU countries in the EpiSouth Plus training courses is presented in *Table 7* and *Table 8*.

It is observed that both the EU and Non EU countries have achieved a good level of participation in the training courses. In particular for the 2<sup>nd</sup> module of the ISCI

*Table 7: Participation rate in the Epi Trainings (WP5)*

Epi Trainings (WP5)*						
1st module- ISCI- 27 Feb-2 March 2012						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
EU	10	6	60%	16	14	88%
Non EU	17	11	65%	21	13	62%
2nd module ISCI -4-8 March 2013						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
EU	10	6	60%	13	11	85%
Non EU	17	13	76%	24	21	88%
* see DEVCO Reports for further details & annexed list of participants						

*Table 8: Participation rate in Lab trainings (Work Package 4)*

Lab Trainings (WP4)§***						
Dengue Training at IP 2-6 July 2012						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
EU	10	7	70%	10	7	70%
Non EU	14	10	71%	14	10	71%
WNV Training ISCI 24-28 June 2013						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
EU	10	7	70%	10	7	70%
Non EU	14	13	93%	14	13	93%

§ total Lab in the Network 24 (EU 10 and non-EU 14) see

[http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/directory\\_mrlnandassociated\\_july2013.pdf](http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/directory_mrlnandassociated_july2013.pdf)

\*\*\* see Lab Trainings Reports for further details: [http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp4-report\\_training\\_dengue-biosafety.pdf](http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp4-report_training_dengue-biosafety.pdf) ;

[http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/episouth\\_plus\\_report\\_9-2013\\_-\\_training\\_on\\_west\\_nile\\_and\\_biosafety\\_ii\\_in\\_the\\_laboratory.pdf](http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/episouth_plus_report_9-2013_-_training_on_west_nile_and_biosafety_ii_in_the_laboratory.pdf)

In *Table 9* the participation rate of the EU and Non EU countries and participants in the project's meetings is presented. A lower participation rate was recorded in Non EU partners (29/48, 60%) in comparison with the EU countries (30/37, 81%) (p-value: 0.04) to the 1<sup>st</sup> project meeting in December 2012. The participation rate of the Non EU countries was improved in the 2<sup>nd</sup> project meeting in November 2013 (36/48, 75%) in comparison to the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting (29/48, 60%).

*Table 9: Participation rate in project's meetings*

Project's Meetings						
1st Meeting ISS 5-7 December 2012****						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
<b>EU</b>	10	10	100%	<b>37*</b>	<b>30*</b>	81%
<b>Non EU</b>	17	15	88%	<b>48*</b>	<b>29*</b>	60%
2nd Meeting ISS 20-21 November 2013*****						
	Number of Countries			Number of participants		
	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate	Invited	Participated	Participation Rate
<b>EU</b>	10	10	100%	44	32	73%
<b>Non EU</b>	17	14	82%	48	36	75%
**** see Meeting Report for further details <a href="http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp1-report_1st_project_meeting_fin.pdf">http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/wp1-report_1st_project_meeting_fin.pdf</a>						
***** Final Report with details in progress						

\*p-value=0.04

### 3.4. Dissemination Activities Evaluation

In *Table 11*, the website statistics are presented. A total of 16,453 visits were conducted on the EpiSouth Plus website (<http://www.episouthnetwork.org>) from May 2011 until September 2013 with an average of 4.6 pages visited and duration of about 4 minutes for visit (about half of visits from different visitors).

In the same table, the detailed number of visits per three months is presented. A small decrease (35%) is presented in the last three months (July-September 2013) in comparison to the previous months. The highest activity was recorded between October – December 2012. However, the geographical coverage has increased from 83 countries in the first five months of the website's operation to 100 in the last three months.

Most visits were from Europe (76.2%, including 10.3% from Balkans), while only 7.3% from Middle-East and 4.8% from North-Africa.

French and Arabic sections of the web-site rarely visited and for a shorter time/page compared with English section.

**Table 10: Website Statistics**

Period	Number of Visits
<b>May-September 2011</b>	<b>2,283 visits came from 83 countries/territories</b>
<b>October – December 2011</b>	<b>1,993 visits came from 89 countries/territories</b>
<b>January– March 2012</b>	<b>1,783 visits came from 104 countries/territories</b>
<b>April - June 2012</b>	<b>1,733 visits came from 93 countries/territories</b>
<b>July - September 2012</b>	<b>1,206 visits came from 100 countries/territories</b>
<b>October-December 2012</b>	<b>2,709 visits came from 103 countries/territories</b>
<b>January-March 2013</b>	<b>2,012 visits came from 107 countries/territories</b>
<b>April-June 2013</b>	<b>1,528 visits came from 108 countries/territories</b>
<b>July 2013- September 2013</b>	<b>1,206 visits came from 100 countries/territories</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,453 total visits</b>

The EpiSouth Plus partnership participated in 31 conferences/meetings demonstrating good level of representation at international conferences promoting the awareness level of the project's objectives and activities.

In Table 11, the detailed list of the presentation and participation of the EpiSouth Plus project to conferences and meeting is presented by work package.

**Table 11: List of presentation/participations to conference and meetings by work package**

WP No	Number of Presentations/ Participations to Conferences/ Meetings
WP1/WP2 Coordination / Networking	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Presentation at the Meeting of ECDC National Focal Points for Threat Detection, Stockholm Sweden 4 November 2013</li> <li>2. Presentation to participants to the Health Governance Unit Project during the study visit "Research and Surveillance for Health", Rome, Italy 15 May 2013</li> <li>3. Speech at the Cypriot Presidency Conference on Cross Border Health Threats in the EU and Neighbouring Countries, Nicosia, Cyprus 5 July 2012 (with mention to EpiSouth)</li> <li>4. Presentation at the Cypriot Presidency Conference on Cross Border Health Threats in the EU and Neighbouring Countries, Nicosia, Cyprus 5 July 2012 (with mention to EpiSouth)</li> <li>5. Poster presented at the High Level Conference "EU Health Programmes: results and perspectives", Brussels, Belgium 3 May 2012</li> <li>6. Presentation at Inter-Agency Meeting on environmental health in Southern and Eastern Mediterranean , Marseille, France 14 March 2012</li> <li>7. Poster presented at the 14th European Health Forum - Workshop on Health Security, Gastein, Austria 5 October 2011</li> <li>8. Presentation at the Union for the Mediterranean-Health Forum, Brussels, Belgium, 30 June 2011</li> <li>9. Presentation at the 4th Eurasia Congress of Infectious Diseases, Sarajevo, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina, 1-5 June 2011</li> <li>10. Presentation at the Forum Mediterraneo in Sanità 2011, Palermo, Italy 24-26 May 2011</li> <li>11. Presentation at the Subregional Meeting on Shared Solutions to Common Threats - Vaccination and Vulnerable Populations in South East Europe, Tirana, Albania 28-29 April 2011</li> <li>12. Presentation at the International Meeting on Emerging Diseases and Surveillance - IMED 2011, Vienna, Austria 4-7 February 2011</li> <li>13. Presentation at Mecids Executive Boarding Meeting, Jerusalem, Israel 26-27 November 2010</li> <li>14. Presentation at the annual meeting of Arbo-zoonet, Rabat, Morocco 22-24 November 2010</li> <li>15. Presentation to Delegation of Egyptian Ministry of Health , Rome, Italy 19 October 2010</li> </ol>
WP4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15. Presentation at the International Society for Neglected Tropical Diseases (ISNTD) Bites 2013 Conference, London, UK 15 October 2013</li> <li>16. Poster presented at the 15th Annual Conference of the European BioSafety Association (EBSA),</li> </ol>



	<p>Manchester, UK 11-13 June 2012</p> <p>17. Poster presented at the 4th Eurasia Congress of Infectious Diseases, Sarajevo, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina 1-5 June 2011</p> <p>18. Presentation at the ENVID Meeting, Antalya, Turkey 12-14 May 2011</p> <p>19. Presentation at the Final Meeting of the EU Project EQADeBa, Brussels, Belgium 11-12 April 2011</p>
WP6	<p>20. Presentation at the Meeting of ECDC National Focal Points for Threat Detection, Stockholm, Sweden 4 November 2013</p> <p>21. Presentation at the "1er Forum International Veille Sanitaire et Réponse en Territoires Insulaires", La Réunion, France 11-13 June 2013</p> <p>22. First poster presented at the 15th International Congress on Infectious Diseases, Bangkok, Thailand 13-16 June 2012</p> <p>23. Second poster presented at the 15th International Congress on Infectious Diseases, Bangkok, Thailand 13-16 June 2012</p> <p>24. Presentation at EWRS Meeting, Luxembourg, 24 January 2012</p> <p>25. Presentation at the 4th Eurasia Congress of Infectious Diseases, Sarajevo, Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina 1-5 June 2011</p> <p>26. Presentation at the Advanced Research Workshop on Internet-based Intelligence for Public Health Emergencies and Disease Outbreak, Haifa, Israel 13-15 March 2011</p> <p>27. Presentation at the International Meeting on Emerging Diseases and Surveillance - IMED 2011, Vienna, Austria 4-7 February 2011</p> <p>28. Presentation at EWRS Meeting, Luxembourg 1-2 December 2010</p> <p>29. Presentation at the annual meeting of Arbo-zoonet, Rabat, Morocco 22-24 November 2010</p>
WP7	<p>30. Presentation at the Intercountry Meeting on Strengthening of Surveillance and Response Capacities under IHR 2005, Beirut, Lebanon 26-28 March 2012</p> <p>31. Presentation at XXIV Meeting of the South-eastern Europe Health Network, Tirana, Albania 10-11 November 2010</p>

## 4. Questionnaire Analysis Results

### 4.1. Questionnaire Response Rate

A total of **105** questionnaires (**EU: 55/105, 52%, Candidate: 20/105, 19% Non EU: 30/105, 29%**) were disseminated. The questionnaire collection period was from 6/11/13 until 6/12/13. A total of **44 out of 105 (42%)** questionnaires were collected (**EU: 28/55, 51%, Candidate: 11/20, 55% and Non EU: 5/30, 17%**). **Twenty eight of the 44 (64%)** questionnaires collected were from EU countries whereas **11 out of 44 (25%)** were from Candidate countries and **five out of 44 (11%)** were from **Non EU countries**. In *Table 12*, the number of questionnaires disseminated (total, EU, Candidate and Non EU) as well as the number of questionnaires collected and the response rate by target group are presented.

Lower response rate was recorded in Non EU partners (**5 out of 30, 17%**) in comparison with EU countries (**28 out of 55, 51%**) (**p-value: 0.002**). As a result the Non EU countries' views and opinions are not equally represented. This was also evident in the midterm evaluation report (Annex 1) and it could be considered as an indication on the commitment of the Non EU countries. This should be further explored.

*Table 12: Response rate of the evaluating questionnaires*

	Total			EU countries				Candidate countries				Non EU countries			
Target Group	Diss.**	Coll.***	Resp. Rate****	Diss.		Coll.	Resp. Rate	Diss		Coll.	Resp. Rate	Diss		Coll.	Resp. Rate
Advisory Board	16	5	31%	12	75%	4	33%	1	6%	0	0%	3	19%	1	33%
Focal Points	56	23	41%	28	50%	15	54%	8	14%	6	75%	20	36%	2	10%
MRLN	33	16	48%	15	45%	9	60%	11	33%	5	45%	7	21%	2	29%
Total	105	44	42%	55*	52%	28*	51%	20	19%	11	55%	30*	29%	5*	17%

\*\*Disseminated \*\*\*Collected \*\*\*\*Response Rate

\*p-value: 0.002

### 4.2. Project Management

The management of EpiSouth Plus project and the timeframe was assessed through the evaluation questionnaire by internal (Focal Points, Project and Work Package leaders), interface (WHO) and external stakeholders (Advisory Board) and the results are presented in *Table 13*. It is observed, that the majority of the responders (**>67%**) rated the management, the Steering Committees and the Steering Teams as fully effective for achieving the project objectives. However, **>25%** responded that these structures were partially effective for achieving the project objectives.



The communication means and frequency was rated as **fully effective** by **68% (19/28)** of the responders.

A total of **61%** of the responders believed that the monitoring and evaluation of activities were fully effective and **39% (11/28)** partially effective in keeping on track in terms of quality and timeliness.

The majority of the responders (**16/28, 57%**) believed that the project objectives were fully achieved and **43% (12/28)** that they were partially achieved.

*Table 13: Management and timeframe*

		<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
1. Do you think that the management (planning and organising) of the project was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<b>Total:</b>	20/28 (71%)	7/28 (25%)	1/28 (4%)
	<b>EU:</b>	14/19 (74%)	4/19 (21%)	1/19 (5%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6 (67%)	2/6 (33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)	0/3 (0%)
2. Do you think that the Steering Committee was effective for achieving the projects objectives?	<b>Total:</b>	18/27 (67%)	7/27 (26%)	2/27 (7%)
	<b>EU:</b>	12/18 (67%)	4/18 (22%)	2/18 (11%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6 (67%)	2/6 (33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)	0/3 (0%)
3. Do you think that the Steering Teams established for each work package (WP) were effective in achieving the specific objective of the WP and in facilitating collaboration?	<b>Total:</b>	18/28 (64%)	10/28 (36%)	0/28 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	11/19 (58%)	8/19 (42%)	0/19 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	5/6 (83%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)	0/3 (0%)
4. Do you think the communication means and frequency was an effective process?	<b>Total:</b>	19/28 (68%)	9/28 (32%)	0/28 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	12/19 (63%)	7/19 (37%)	0/19 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	5/6 (83%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)	0/3 (0%)
5. Do you think that the problem – solving process was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<b>Total:</b>	15/27 (56%)	11/27 (41%)	1/27 (4%)
	<b>EU:</b>	11/19 (58%)	7/19 (37%)	1/19 (5%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
6. Do you think that the monitoring and evaluation of activities are adequate and assist in keeping on track in terms of quality and timeliness?	<b>Total:</b>	17/28 (61%)	11/28 (39%)	0/28 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	11/19 (58%)	8/19 (42%)	0/19 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6 (67%)	2/6 (33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)	0/3 (0%)
7. To what extent have the project objectives been achieved in your opinion?	<b>Total:</b>	16/28 (57%)	12/28 (43%)	0/28 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	13/19 (68%)	6/19 (32%)	0/19 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	3/3 (100%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)



### 4.3. Website

The website was evaluated by the internal stakeholders (Focal Points, Project and Work Package leaders).

The impact that the EPISOUTH PLUS website has in disseminating the projects results and the information it contains were **highly rated by the responders (>65%)**.

It is worth noticing that the majority of the responders stated that they **seldom visit the public area (52%)** and the **Network Working Area (70%)** of the website.

More than **90%** of the responders rated the Meeting and Events Area, the Document Area in the Network Working Area and the activities of the Network sections as excellent and satisfactory.

A total of **95%** of the responders rated as excellent and satisfactory the Bulletin and the News section of the website.

The lowest rated section of the website was the Discussion Forum in the NWA that was rated as excellent and satisfactory by **56%** of the responders.

This also agrees with the website statistics where it was observed that the forum tool was rarely used with only 14 new topics and 24 replies in the whole period (1.7 replies per topic), showing a decreasing trend in utilization over time.

*Table 14: Website*

		<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
<b>8. Do you think that the website contributes to the dissemination of the project results?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	15/23 (65%)	8/23 (35%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	11/15 (74%)	4/15 (27%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6 (67%)	2/6 (33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	0/2 (0%)	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>9. Do you think that the website provides the visitor with all the necessary information concerning the project?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	18/22 (82%)	4/22 (18%)	0/22 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	13/14 (93%)	1/14 (7%)	0/14 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	5/6 (83%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	0/2 (0%)	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)
		<i>Often</i>	<i>Seldom</i>	<i>Never</i>
<b>10. How often do you visit the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	11/23 (48%)	12/23 (52%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	7/15 (67%)	8/15 (53%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>11. How often do you visit the Network Working Area (NWA) of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	7/23 (30%)	16/23 (70%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	6/15 (40%)	9/15 (60%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	1/6 (17%)	5/6 (83%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>		2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)

		<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Relatively Satisfactory</i>	<i>Requires Improvement</i>
<b>12. How do you rate the Meeting and Events Area in the NWA?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	2/23 (9%)	19/23 (83%)	2/23 (9%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	1/15 (7%)	13/15 (87%)	1/15 (7%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	1/6 (17%)	5/6 (83%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>13. How do you rate the Document Area in the NWA?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	9/23 (39%)	12/23 (52%)	2/23 (9%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	5/15 (33%)	9/15 (60%)	1/15 (7%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	2/6 (33%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)	0/6 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>14. How do you rate the Discussion Forum in the NWA?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	3/23 (13%)	10/23 (43%)	7/23 (30%)	3/23 (13%)
	<b>EU:</b>	1/15 (7%)	6/15 (40%)	5/15 (33%)	3/15 (20%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	1/6 (17%)	4/6 (67%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>15. How do you rate the Activities of the Network sections in the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	10/22 (45%)	10/22 (45%)	2/22 (9%)	0/22 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	6/15 (40%)	9/15 (60%)	0/15 (0%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/5 (60%)	1/5 (20%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>16. How do you rate the Events section in the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	9/23 (39%)	12/23 (52%)	2/23 (9%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	7/15 (47%)	7/15 (47%)	1/15 (7%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	2/6 (33%)	3/6 (50%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	0/2 (0%)	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>17. How do you rate the Bulletin section in the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	15/23 (65%)	7/23 (30%)	1/23 (4%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	11/15 (73%)	4/15 (27%)	0/15 (0%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>18. How do you rate the Directories section in the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	10/23 (43%)	9/23 (39%)	3/23 (13%)	1/23 (4%)
	<b>EU:</b>	7/15 (47%)	6/15 (40%)	2/15 (13%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	2/6 (33%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)	1/6 (17%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>19. How do you rate the News section in the public area of the website?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	12/23 (52%)	9/23 (39%)	2/23 (9%)	0/23 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	8/15 (53%)	7/15 (47%)	0/15 (0%)	0/15 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	3/6 (50%)	2/6 (33%)	1/6 (17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)

#### 4.4. EPISOUTH Network

In *Table 15* the evaluation of the EpiSouth Network by internal (Focal Points, Project and Work Package leaders), interface (WHO) and external stakeholders (Advisory Board) is presented.

A total of **70% (31/44)** of the responders believes that the EPISOUTH Network is **fully** facilitating the exchange of alerts and health information.

More than half of the responders (**54%**) believe that the EPISOUTH Network has **fully** enhanced the coordinated response to public health events in the Mediterranean area whereas **the other 43% (10/21)** believe that this is **partially** achieved.

About **65% (18/28)** believe that the EPISOUTH Network is **fully** contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building whereas **>35% (10/28)** responded that this is only partially achieved.

A total of **77% (34/44)** of the responders believe that the EPISOUTH Network **fully** works towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals.

Fourteen out of 28 (**50%**) of the responders believe that the EPISOUTH Network has **fully** contributed to the development of interoperability with other early warning systems and **55% (23/42)** that has fully enhanced their capacity to better respond to alerts.

The enhancement of their capacity for communicable disease surveillance and response has only been achieved **fully** according to **50% (13/26)** of the responders whereas **46% (12/26)** believes it was achieved **partially**.

About **55% (15/28)** of the responders believed that the network has fully used their organisations strengths and expertise in implementing its activities and **36% (10/28)** that it was used only partially.

*Table 15: EpiSouth Network*

EPISOUTH Network		Fully	Partially	Not at all
<b>20. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network is facilitating the exchange of alerts and health information?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	31/44 (70%)	12/44 (27%)	1/44 (2%)
	<b>EU:</b>	18/28 (65%)	10/18 (36%)	0/18 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	10/11(91%)	1/11(9%)	0/11 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	3/5(60%)	1/5(20%)	1/5(20%)
<b>21. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced the coordinated response to public health events in the Mediterranean Area?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	15/28 (54%)	12/28 (43%)	1/28 (4%)
	<b>EU:</b>	10/19 (53%)	8/19 (42%)	1/19 (5%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/3(33%)	2/3(67%)	0/3 (0%)
<b>22. Do you think that that the EPISOUTH Network is contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	18/28 (64%)	10/28 (36%)	0/28 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	12/19 (63%)	7/19 (37%)	0/19 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/3(33%)	2/3(67%)	0/3 (0%)
<b>23. Do you think that the EPISOUTH</b>	<b>Total:</b>	34/44 (77%)	10/44 (23%)	0/44(0%)

<b>EPISOUTH Network</b>		<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
<b>Network work towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals?</b>	<b>EU:</b>	22/28 (79%)	6/28 (21%)	0/28(0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	8/11(73%)	3/11(27%)	0/11 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)	0/5 (0%)
<b>24. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has contributed to the development of interoperability with other early warning systems?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	14/28 (50%)	11/28 (39%)	3/28 (11%)
	<b>EU:</b>	9/19 (53%)	8/19 (42%)	2/19 (11%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/3(33%)	1/3(33%)	1/3(33%)
<b>25. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity to better respond to alerts?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	23/42 (55%)	17/42 (40%)	2/42 (5%)
	<b>EU:</b>	13/26 (50%)	11/26 (42%)	2/26 (8%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	8/11(73%)	3/11(27%)	0/11 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/5(40%)	3/5(60%)	0/5 (0%)
<b>26. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity for communicable disease surveillance and response?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	13/26 (50%)	12/26 (46%)	1/26 (4%)
	<b>EU:</b>	7/17 (41%)	9/17 (53%)	1/17(6%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/3(67%)	1/3(33%)	0/3(0%)
<b>27. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has used your organisation's strengths and expertise in implementing its activities?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	15/28 (54%)	10/28(36%)	3/28 (11%)
	<b>EU:</b>	10/19 (53%)	6/19 (32%)	3/19 (16%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)	0/6 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/3(33%)	2/3(67%)	0/3 (0%)

**Most important achievements of the EPISOUTH Network as these were identified by the evaluation questionnaire responders:**

**Network (16 responders):**

- Establishment of collaboration and networking between countries of three different WHO and political regions. Unique collaborative effort in a geographical area with common public health problems that is not addressed, as a whole, neither by the European Union nor by WHO (9 responders). EPISOUTH Plus Project work towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals. (5 responders)
- Building ownership: EpiSouth identity has been generated: EpiSouth now belongs to the participating countries. Ownership of the network gained through the governance and the sharing - responsibilities - way to do. (2 responders)
- The approach based on countries expectations and regional needs has facilitated countries' interest in participation and impact of the activities
- It has consolidated the network as a strong collaborative space. The trust gained should be kept alive.
- The capacity to define areas of intervention and the methodology on the basis of discussed specific Mediterranean regional needs and priorities, through a consensus building participative approach
- The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network (MRLN) (4 responders);
- Main hot points to work around in a collaborative way (for instance: specific diseases, epidemic intelligence, strengthen capacities)
- Establishment of a working strategy to prioritize needs and to cover gaps at regional level and with a participatory approach

- New contacts, through EpiSouth we had communications with neighboring countries that usually we do not share information. The ability to share experiences and build capacity in priority areas for the control of public health threats. Enhanced the EpiSouth Network's capacity of sharing knowledge and info without reservation that is critical for addressing specific global and trans-regional threats which may have both an impact on public health and a destabilizing effect. (4 responders)
- Timely exchange of information

### Training

- Good opportunity for training activities that should be extended and improved. (3 responders)
- Capacity building and Simulation exercise related activities (4 responders)
- EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 activities enhanced the capacity for diagnosis of the emergent pathogens considered during of the project period (i.e. Dengue virus infections and West Nile virus infections) (2 responders)
- Raised understanding about the infectious disease surveillance in neighboring countries

### Preparedness and Response, Early warning system and cross-border epidemic intelligence (11 responders):

- Strengthening cross border epidemic intelligence and enhanced surveillance of communicable diseases through EPIS platform (6 responders). EpiSouth platform as a tool for communication among countries of the Mediterranean region for sharing the information of common health threats and rapid responses in the region. (5 responders)
- Introducing and implementation of new diagnostic methods and techniques
- Support to the WHO guidance on Point of Entry

### EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin (2 responders)

### Face to face meetings are crucial maybe through scientific societies

### The website is an excellent chance of information

**Summary:** The network was identified by the responders as an important achievement that brought together public health officials from different regions in a trusty environment achieving information sharing and addressing specific global and trans-regional threats. The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network was also identified as an achievement. The training both the simulation exercise and the laboratory training were identified as achievements. Moreover, the responders commended that the EPIS EpiSouth Platform enabled them to strengthen cross border epidemic intelligence and enhance surveillance of communicable diseases. The meetings, the website and the quarterly electronic bulletin were also identified as achievements.



### **Most important threats of the EPISOUTH Network**

- Large Network with a variety of cultures (3 responders)
- Lack of human resources
  - Lack of human resources in a number of countries (3 responders)
  - Lack of staff to be fully dedicated to EpiSouth (2 responders)
- Lack of funds (13 responders)
- Lack of political willingness from DG SANCO and DG DEVCO to maintain and foster such a network and related funding (4 responders)
- Overlapping of activities (2 responders). PHEIC should remain under the umbrella of WHO IHR2005. Duplicating activities related to report health threats. Inconsistency with the existing mechanisms in the same work areas.
- ECDC and SANCO decision to take over some activities (WP5 and WP6) in a context to much EU centric. Different agenda of the institutions involved. Non-availability to undertake a constructive process of dialogue between institutions and EU realities. The domination of the funding organizations. (3 responders)
- Lost of ownership / Identify if an even representation of EU non EU countries is not maintained or if the project becomes too EU centered
- Lack of adequate objectives and enrollment of participating countries (A network is much more than simply asking for data)
- Political Situation in some countries (5 responders)
- Limited information sharing between EU and Non EU (2 responders)
- The big gap that EpiSouth will leave in the Mediterranean Area
- To lose the strong collaborative way of doing gained so far with big effort, that allow EU and NON EU countries working together.
- No clear link between the different work. No clear added value. Existence of a network is not sufficient. Existence of a Network is common product (1 responder)
- Non-coordination. There was a need for coordination of all the stakeholders involved EpiSouth leader needs to collaborate with focal points. Requirement for communication among countries for sharing the information of common health threats and response. All the participants should be encouraged to become full members of the Network, individuals feeling separated should be identified and the problems behind this should be solved. (5 responders).
- The withdrawal of the French INVS partner.
- The weaknesses of the platform should be determined objectively and overall effects depicted.

**Summary:** *The most important threats identified by the responders were the size of the network, the lack of human resources and lack of fund as well as the lack of political willingness to support the continuation of the project. Certain responders also identified as a threat the fact that there were overlapping activities and others the decision of the European funding bodies to take over certain activities which led to loss of ownership. A responder also commended that there was not clear link between the different activities and*

*no clear added value of the project. The lack of effective coordination was identified as well as the lack of adequate objectives and enrollment of participating countries.*

#### 4.5. EPIS for EPISOUTH Platform

The EPIS for EPISOUTH platform was evaluated via the questionnaires by the internal stakeholders (Focal Points, Project and Work Package leaders) since they are the primary users of the platform.

A total of **11 out of 21 (52%)** responders stated that they will be using the EPIS EpiSouth Platform to communicate a public health event of international concern whereas five out of 21 stated they would partially use the platform. Five out of 21 (24%) stated they will not be using it.

As it was presented in *Table 5* above when the level of achievement of indicators were assessed, a total of 812 health events were reported through the e-web bulletins from 19 March 2008 to 01 January 2013. The proportion of events occurring in EpiSouth countries regularly rose from 37% in 2010 to 53% in 2012 and is underlying an increased understanding and commitment of countries to publicly share information ([http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/eweb\\_250\\_03\\_01\\_13.pdf](http://www.episouthnetwork.org/sites/default/files/outputs/eweb_250_03_01_13.pdf)).

Since EPIS for EpiSouth platform was opened in January 2013 there have been:

- 67 new cross-border alerts posted
- 81 follow-up for a total of 148 posts.
- 19 ad hoc forums

*Table 16: EPIS EpiSouth Platform intention of use*

		Yes	Partially	No
<b>28. Will you be using the EPIS EpiSouth platform to communicate a public health event of international concern?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	11/21 (52%)	5/21 (24%)	5/21 (24%)
	<b>EU:</b>	6/13 (46%)	4/13 (31%)	3/13 (23%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)	1/6(17%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2(50%)

As excellent or satisfactory were rated by about **70%** of the responders the EPIS EpiSouth platform functionality and by **78%** the usefulness and effectiveness.

The time response was rated by **59%** of the responders as excellent or satisfactory.

The responders do not seem as satisfied with the userfriendliness of the platform since **50%** rated it as excellent and satisfactory.

A total of **57%** rated as excellent or satisfactory the navigation mechanism.

The majority of the responders (**>81%**) rated the quality of the content and analysis of the information as excellent or satisfactory.



Table 17: EPIS EpiSouth Platform Functionalities

		Excellent	Satisfactory	Relatively Satisfactory	Requires Improvement	Comments for improvement
29. Functionality	Total:	7/23 (30%)	9/23 (39%)	5/23 (22%)	2/23(9%)	Comments are referred to the EPIS and not the previous EPISOUTH platform for alerts. Animation of the platform and organisation of the information is required.
	EU:	4/15(27%)	5/15(33%)	4/15(27%)	2/15 (13%)	
	Candidate:	3/6(50%)	3/6(50%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	-	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	
30. Usefulness/ Effectiveness	Total:	4/23 (17%)	14/23 (61%)	4/23 (17%)	1/23 (4%)	Some delays due to the platform change
	EU:	2/15(13%)	9/15(60%)	3/15(20%)	1/15(7%)	
	Candidate:	2/6(33%)	4/6(67%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	
31. Accessibility	Total:	5/23 (22%)	8/23 (35%)	5/23 (22%)	5/23 (22%)	PWD expiring too soon Too many problems for accessing
	EU:	3/15(20%)	2/15(13%)	5/15(33%)	5/15(33%)	
	Candidate:	2/6(33%)	4/6(67%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	2/2(100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	
32. Time response	Total:	4/22 (18%)	9/22 (41%)	6/22 (41%)	3/22 (14%)	
	EU:	2/14(14%)	4/14(29%)	5/14(36%)	3/14(21%)	
	Candidate:	2/6(33%)	4/6(67%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	
33. User friendly	Total:	5/22 (23%)	6/22 (27%)	5/22 (23%)	6/22 (27%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need of animation difficult to see an alert info</li> <li>Requires training for use in a proper way</li> </ul>
	EU:	3/15(20%)	3/15(20%)	3/15(20%)	6/15(40%)	
	Candidate:	2/5(40%)	2/5(40%)	1/5(20%)	0/5 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	
34. Easy navigation mechanism	Total:	5/23 (22%)	8/23 (35%)	7/23 (30%)	3/23(13%)	
	EU:	3/15(20%)	5/15(33%)	4/15(27%)	3/15 (20%)	
	Candidate:	2/6(33%)	3/6(50%)	1/6(17%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	2/2(100%)	0/2 (0%)	
35. Quality of the content of the Alerts	Total:	7/23 (30%)	12/23 (52%)	3/23(13%)	1/23 (4%)	
	EU:	4/15(27%)	8/15(53%)	2/15(13%)	1/15 (7%)	
	Candidate:	3/6(50%)	3/6 (50%)	0/6 (0%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)	0/2 (0%)	
36. Quality of the analysis of the information	Total:	6/21 (29%)	11/21 (52%)	2/21 (10%)	2/22 (10%)	there is no analysis at the moment
	EU:	4/13(69%)	6/13(46%)	1/13(8%)	2/13(15%)	
	Candidate:	2/6(33%)	3/6(50%)	1/6(17%)	0/6 (0%)	
	Non EU:	0/2 (0%)	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	

#### 4.6. Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network Activities



As it can be seen in *Table 18*, **88% (14/19)** of the responders believe that the activities of the Network are contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building and **69% (11/16)** of the responders that the WP4 activities have enhanced their capacity for diagnosis. Moreover **all of the responders** putted into practice what they have learned during the EpiSouth training activities either fully or partially.

*Table 18: Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Newtwork Activities*

		<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
<b>37. Do you think that that the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 activities are contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	14/16(88%)	2/16 (23%)	0/16 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	7/9 (78%)	2/9 (22%)	0/9(0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	5/5(100%)	0/5 (0%)	0/5 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/2(100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>38. Do you think that the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 activities enhanced your capacity for diagnosis?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	11/16(69%)	5/16 (31 %)	0/16 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	5/9 (56%)	4/9 (44%)	0/9 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)	0/5 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
<b>39. Did you put into practice what you have learned during the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 training activities?</b>	<b>Total:</b>	8/16 (50%)	8/16 (50%)	0/16 (0%)
	<b>EU:</b>	4/9 (44%)	5/9 (56%)	0/9 (0%)
	<b>Candidate:</b>	4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)	0/5 (0%)
	<b>Non EU:</b>	0/2 (0%)	2/2(100%)	0/2 (0%)

In *Table 19* the evaluation results of the two training courses organised by the WP4 team are presented in detail. Overall the majority of the responders highly rated all aspects of the training courses.

In *Table 20*, the evaluation results of the meetings organised under WP4 are presented.



Table 19: Evaluation of WP4 training courses

		WP4 Training on Dengue and Biosafety in the lab., Paris, France 2-6 July 2012				WP4 Training on West Nile and Biosafety II in the Lab, Madrid, Spain 24-28 June 2013			
		E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI
40. Contact with EPISOUTH prior to the training courses	Total:	10/12(83%)	0/12 (0%)	2/12(17%)	0/12 (0%)	11/13 (85%)	2/13 (15%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	4/6(67%)		2/6(33%)		5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				4/5 (80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)			
41. Information regarding your participation	Total:	10/12 (83%)	1/12 (8%)	0/12 (0%)	1/12 (8%)	11/13 (85%)	2/13 (15%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)		1/6(17%)	5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)			
42. Details on the venue	Total:	12/12(100%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	12/13 (92%)	1/13 (8%)	0/13(0%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	6/6 (100%)				6/6(100%)			
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)			
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
43. Instructions for the course	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12 (17%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	11/13 (85%)	2/13 (15%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)			5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)			
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
44. Administrative support	Total:	11/12 (92%)	1/12 (8%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	12/13(92%)	1/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	5/6(83%)	1/6 (17%)			5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)			
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)			
45. Comfort of meeting venue	Total:	6/12 (50%)	6/12 (50%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	7/13 (54%)	5/13 (38%)	1/13 (8%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	3/6 (50%)	3/6 (50%)			4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)	1/6 (17)	
	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:		2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)		
46. Trainee's selection requirements	Total:	7/11 (64%)	3/11 (27%)	1/11 (9%)	0/11 (0%)	8/12 (67%)	3/12 (25%)	1/12 (8%)	0/12 (0%)
	EU:	4/6 (67%)	1/6 (17%)	1/6(17%)		5/6 (83%)		1/6(17%)	
	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:		1/1(100%)				1/1(100%)		
47. Publicity of the course to	Total:	6/11 (55%)	4/11 (36%)	1/11 (9%)	0/11(0%)	7/12 (58%)	5/12 (42%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)
	EU:	3/6 (50%)	2/6(33%)	1/6(17%)		4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)		



target audience	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:		1/1(100%)				1/1(100%)		
48. Description of the objectives	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12 (17%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	11/13 (85%)	2/13 (15%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)			5/6(83%)	1/6 (17%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)			
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
49. Course content	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12(17%)	0/12(0%)	0/12 (0%)	10/13(77%)	2/13 (15%)	1/13(8%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	5/6 (83%)	1/6(17%)			4/6(67%)	1/6 (17%)	1/6 (17%)	
	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)			
50. Course materials	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12(17%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	9/13 (69%)	4/13 (31%)	0/13(0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	5/6 (83%)	1/6(17%)			4/6 (67%)	2/6 (33%)		
	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				1/5(50%)	1/2(50%)		
51. Participants (number and adequacy)	Total:	6/12 (50%)	6/12 (50%)	0/12(0%)	0/12 (0%)	8/13 (62%)	5/13 (38%)	0/13 (0%)	0/13 (0%)
	EU:	4/6 (67%)	2/6(33%)			5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
	Candidate:	2/4(50%)	2/4(100%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:		2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)		
52. Trainers performance	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12(17%)	0/12(0%)	0/12(0%)	11/13 (85%)	2/13(85%)		
	EU:	5/6 (83%)	1/6(17%)			5/6 (83%)			
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)	1/6(17%)		
	Non EU:	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)			1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
53. Teaching methods	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12 (17%)	0/12(0%)	0/12(0%)	10/13 (77%)	2/13(15%)	1/13(8%)	0/13(0%)
54. Length of course	EU:	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)			4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)	1/6(17%)	
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				2/2(100%)			
	Total:	9/12(75%)	3/12(25%)	0/12(0%)	0/12(0%)	7/13 (54%)	6/13(46%)	0/13(0%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)			3/6(50%)	3/6(50%)		
	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)			1/2 (50%)	1/2 (50%)		
	Total:	8/12 (67%)	2/12 (17%)	2/12 (17%)	0/12 (0%)	9/14 (64%)	3/14 (21%)	1/14 (7%)	0/14 (0%)
55. Time keeping	EU:	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)			4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)	1/6(17%)	



56. Opportunity for networking	Candidate:	3/4(75%)	1/4(25%)			4/5(80%)	1/5(20%)		
	Non EU:	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)			1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
	Total:	8/12(67%)	3/12(25%)	0/12(0%)	1/12(8%)	9/13(69%)	4/13(31%)	0/13(0%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	4/6(67%)	1/6(17%)		1/6(17%)	4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)		
57. Relevance to job	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				5/5(100%)			
	Non EU:		2/2 (100%)				2/2(100%)		
	Total:	10/12 (83%)	2/12(17%)	0/12 (0%)	0/12 (0%)	10/13 (77%)	2/13(15%)	1/13(8%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)			5/6 (83%)	1/6(17%)		
58. Enjoyment	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				4/5(80%)		1/5(20%)	
	Non EU:	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)			1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
	Total:	10/12 (83%)	1/12(8%)	1/12(8%)	0/12(0%)	9/13(69%)	4/13(31%)	0/13(0%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	5/6(83%)				5/6(83%)	1/6(17%)		
59. Work environment	Candidate:	3/4 (75%)	1/4(25%)			3/5(60%)	2/5(40%)		
	Non EU:	2/2(100%)				1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		
	Total:	11/12(92%)	1/12(8%)	0/12(0%)	0/12(0%)	9/13(69%)	3/13(23%)	1/13(8%)	0/13(0%)
	EU:	6/6 (100%)				4/6(67%)	2/6(33%)		
	Candidate:	4/4(100%)				4/5(80%)		1/5 (20%)	
	Non EU:	1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)			1/2(50%)	1/2(50%)		



Table 20: Evaluation of MRLN meetings

		The meeting's usefulness and effectiveness for the development of the project's processes				Material for discussion disseminated contributed to the achievement of the meeting's objectives				Quality of the material disseminated for discussion				How do you rate the coordination of discussion?				How do you rate the quality of the meetings report (did it include all issues raised during the meeting)?			
		E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI
60. WP4 Experts Meeting, Paris, France 13 January 2012	Total:	4/4 (100%)	0	0	0	3/4 (75%)	1/4 (25%)	0	0	3/4 (75%)	1/4 (25%)	0	0	3/4 (75%)	1/4 (25%)	0	0	4/4 (100%)	0	0	0
	EU:	3/3 (100%)				2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)			2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)			2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)			3/3 (100%)			
	Candidate:																				
	Non EU:	1/1 (100%)				1/1 (100%)				1/1 (100%)				1/1 (100%)				1/1 (100%)			
61. WP4 Heads of Laboratories Meeting, Ankara, Turkey 8-9 Marzo 2012	Total:	5/7 (71%)	2/7 (29%)	0	0	5/7 (71%)	2/7 (29%)	0	0	4/7 (57%)	3/7 (43%)	0	0	5/7 (71%)	2/7 (29%)	0	0	6/7 (86%)	1/7 (14%)	0	0
	EU:	2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)			2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)			2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)			2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)			3/4 (75%)	1/4 (25%)		
	Candidate:	3/3 (100%)				3/3 (100%)				2/3 (67%)	1/3 (33%)			3/3 (100%)				3/3 (100%)			
	Non EU:																				

\*E: Excellent S: Satisfactory RS: Relatively Satisfactory RI: Requires Improvement

#### 4.7. EPISOUTH PLUS Outputs and deliverables produced

As it can be observed in *Table 21*, **42%** (8/19) of the responders will be using the tool for generic preparedness plan development whereas the majority (**11/19, 58%**) will partially use it.

*Table 21: Expression of intention for use of the the Strategic document “Tool for generic preparedness plan development”*

	Yes	Partially	No
<b>62. Will you be using the Strategic document “Tool for generic preparedness plan development” for developing a generic preparedness and response plan in your country?</b>	<b>Total: 8/19 (42%)</b> EU: 5/11 (46%) Candidate: 2/6(33%) Non EU: 1/2(50%)	<b>Total: 11/19 (58%)</b> EU: 6/11 (55%) Candidate: 4/6(67%) Non EU: 1/2(50%)	<b>Total: 0/19 (0%)</b>

In *Table 22* the results from the evaluation of the outputs and deliverable of the project is presented. Overall, the documents are highly rated by participants.

*Table 22: Evaluation of methodology and performance criteria of outputs/deliverables*

Deliverables / Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the deliverable /document?				Performance criteria																			
									Clarity*				Consistency**				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness***			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	R	RI
63. EPISOUTH quarterly electronic bulletin	14/22 (64%)	6/22 (27%)	2/22 (9%)	0	13/22 (59%)	7/22 (32%)	2/22 (9%)	0	13/21 (62%)	7/21 (33%)	1/21 (5%)	0	11/22 (50%)	9/22 (41%)	2/22 (9%)	0	13/22 (59%)	7/22 (32%)	2/22 (9%)	0	13/22 (59%)	8/22 (36%)	1/22 (5%)	0	11/22 (50%)	10/22 (45%)	1/22 (5%)	0
64. EpiSouth Leaflet	11/21 (52%)	10/21 (48%)	0	0	10/21 (48%)	11/21 (52%)	0	0	10/21 (48%)	10/21 (48%)	1/21 (5%)	0	11/21 (52%)	9/21 (43%)	1/21 (5%)	0	11/21 (52%)	8/21 (38%)	2/21 (10%)	0	13/21 (62%)	7/21 (33%)	1/21 (5%)	0	8/21 (38%)	12/21 (57%)	1/21 (5%)	0
65. EpiSouth Outline	8/19 (42%)	10/19 (53%)	1/19 (5%)	0	8/18 (44%)	10/18 (56%)	0	0	9/18 (50%)	8/18 (44%)	1/18 (6%)	0	8/18 (44%)	9/18 (50%)	1/18 (6%)	0	7/18 (39%)	11/18 (61%)	0	0	8/18 (44%)	10/18 (56%)	0	0	6/18 (33%)	11/18 (61%)	1/18 (6%)	0
66. WP4 – List of Networks and laboratories related to EpiSouth	19/36 (53%)	15/36 (42%)	2/36 (6%)	0	18/35 (51%)	15/35 (43%)	2/35 (6%)	0	20/35 (57%)	13/35 (37%)	2/35 (6%)	0	19/35 (54%)	15/35 (43%)	1/35 (3%)	0	19/35 (54%)	14/35 (40%)	2/35 (6%)	0	19/35 (54%)	14/35 (40%)	2/35 (6%)	0	16/35 (46%)	16/35 (46%)	3/35 (9%)	0
67. WP4 - The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network (MRLN) - Needs assessment of the laboratories	14/29 (48%)	14/29 (48%)	1/29 (3%)	0	15/29 (52%)	13/29 (45%)	1/29 (3%)	0	15/29 (52%)	13/29 (45%)	1/29 (3%)	0	15/29 (52%)	13/29 (45%)	1/29 (3%)	0	15/29 (52%)	13/29 (45%)	1/29 (3%)	0	15/28 (54%)	12/28 (43%)	1/28 (4%)	0	13/28 (46%)	14/28 (50%)	1/28 (4%)	0

Deliverables / Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the deliverable /document?				Performance criteria																			
									Clarity*				Consistency**				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness***			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	R	RI
es (March 2013)																												
68. WP4 - Deliverable 6: "Directory of Regional Laboratories"	18/31 (58%)	12/31 (39%)	1/31 (3%)	0	17/31 (55%)	13/31 (42%)	1/31 (3%)	0	18/31 (58%)	13/31 (42%)	1/31 (3%)	0	17/31 (55%)	13/31 (42%)	1/31 (3%)	0	15/31 (48%)	15/31 (48%)	1/31 (3%)	0	18/29 (62%)	10/29 (34%)	1/29 (3%)	0	13/29 (45%)	15/29 (52%)	1/29 (3%)	0
69. WP5 Directory of Training Course and Fellowship	7/17 (41%)	6/17 (35%)	4/17 (24%)	0	7/17 (41%)	5/17 (29%)	5/17 (29%)	0	8/17 (47%)	6/17 (35%)	3/17 (18%)	0	7/17 (41%)	6/17 (35%)	4/17 (24%)	0	6/17 (35%)	8/17 (47%)	3/17 (18%)	0	7/17 (41%)	8/17 (47%)	2/17 (12%)	0	4/17 (24%)	7/17 (41%)	4/17 (24%)	2/17 (12%)
70. WP5 EpiSouth plus Report 4/2012 - Public Health Preparedness and Response Core Capacity Assessment	12/21 (57%)	6/21 (29%)	3/21 (14%)	0	12/21 (57%)	7/21 (33%)	2/21 (10%)	0	11/21 (52%)	8/21 (38%)	2/21 (10%)	0	10/21 (48%)	8/21 (38%)	3/21 (14%)	0	10/20 (50%)	8/20 (40%)	2/20 (10%)	0	12/21 (57%)	7/21 (33%)	2/21 (10%)	0	9/21 (43%)	8/21 (38%)	3/21 (14%)	1/21 (5%)
71. WP6 EpiSouth plus Report 3/2011 - Cross-border Epidemic Intelligence Evaluation	11/21 (52%)	10/21 (48%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	10/21 (48%)	11/21 (52%)	0	0	10/21 (48%)	11/21 (52%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	11/21 (52%)	9/21 (43%)	0	1/21 (5%)
72. WP6 West Nile Virus circulation in the EpiSouth countries and neighbouring areas (2010 and	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	15/21 (71%)	6/21 (29%)	0	0	13/20 (65%)	7/20 (35%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	8/21 (38%)	1/21 (5%)	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	13/21 (62%)	8/21 (38%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0

Deliverables / Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the deliverable /document?				Performance criteria																			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	Clarity*				Consistency**				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness***			
2011 seasons)																												
73. WP6 250th eWEB: a retrospective analysis of the health events reported (March 2008 - December 2012)	12/19 (63%)	7/19 (37%)	0	0	13/19 (68%)	6/19 (32%)	0	0	9/19 (47%)	10/19 (53%)	0	0	9/19 (47%)	10/19 (53%)	0	0	11/19 (58%)	8/19 (42%)	0	0	10/19 (53%)	9/19 (47%)	0	0	9/19 (47%)	10/19 (53%)	0	0
74. WP6 Novel Coronavirus worldwide situation, up to 1 March 2013	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	13/21 (62%)	7/21 (33%)	1/21 (5%)	0	13/21 (62%)	8/21 (38%)	0	0	14/21 (67%)	7/21 (33%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0	11/21 (52%)	10/21 (48%)	0	0
75. WP6 West Nile Virus circulation in the EpiSouth countries and neighboring areas (2010, 2011 and 2012 seasons)	13/21 (62%)	8/21 (38%)	0	0	15/21 (71%)	6/21 (29%)	0	0	14/21 (67%)	7/21 (33%)	0	0	14/21 (67%)	7/21 (33%)	0	0	14/21 (67%)	7/21 (33%)	0	0	13/21 (62%)	8/21 (38%)	0	0	12/21 (57%)	9/21 (43%)	0	0
76. WP6 Impact of MERS CoV on epidemic preparedness in countries of the EpiSouth Network in view of Hajj 2013	12/21 (57%)	7/21 (33%)	2/21 (10%)	0	13/21 (62%)	7/21 (33%)	1/21(5%)	0	12/21 (57%)	8/21 (38%)	1/21 (5%)	0	13/21 (62%)	7/21 (33%)	1/21(5%)	0	12/21 (57%)	8/21 (38%)	1/21 (5%)	0	11/21 (52%)	9/21 (43%)	1/21 (5%)	0	11/21 (52%)	9/21 (43%)	1/21 (5%)	0



Deliverables / Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the deliverable /document?				Performance criteria																			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	Clarity*				Consistency**				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness***			
77. WP6 Deliverable 9: “Weekly epidemic intelligence bulletin” known as the eWEB - “EpiSouth secured platform interoperable with EU and other EWS”	16/22 (73%)	6/22 (27%)	0	0	15/22 (68%)	7/22 (32%)	0	0	13/22 (59%)	9/22 (41%)	0	0	13/22 (59%)	9/22 (41%)	0	0	14/22 (64%)	8/22 (36%)	0	0	12/22 (55%)	10/22 (45%)	0	0	11/22 (50%)	11/22 (50%)	0	0
78. WP7 EpiSouth plus Report 2/2011 - In Depth Analysis of Coordination of Surveillance and Response Between Points of Entry and National System in the EpiSouth Region	11/18 (61%)	6/18 (33%)	1/18 (6%)	0	11/18 (61%)	6/18 (33%)	1/18 (6%)	0	9/18 (50%)	7/18 (39%)	2/18 (11%)	0	8/18 (44%)	9/18 (50%)	1/18 (6%)	0	10/18 (56%)	6/18 (33%)	2/18 (11%)	0	9/18 (50%)	8/18 (44%)	1/18 (6%)	0	9/18 (50%)	7/18 (39%)	2/18 (11%)	0

\* Clarity: free from obscurity and easy to understand \*\*Consistency: logical coherence and accordance with the facts \*\*\*Completeness: complete and entire; having everything that is needed

#### 4.8. Activities of the EPISOUTH plus project that should continue

Internal (Focal Points, Project and Work Package leaders), interface (WHO) and external stakeholders (Advisory Board) were asked to identify the activities they would prefer see continuing and becoming sustainable.

The results are presented in

. It can be seen that the majority of the responders (**20/26, 77%**) would like to see the training for Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network, the training activities on general preparedness and response and the EPIS for EPISOUTH platform to become sustainable. A total of **73%** of the responders would like to see the website becoming sustainable. The lowest rated activity was the quarterly electronic bulletin (**50%**).

**Additional activities that the responders identified were the following:**

- A framework through which to continue to pursue future research activities involving Mediterranean countries
- Annual face to face meeting
- A proposal for the future would be to develop semiautomatic mechanisms linking the EPIS EPISOUTH, the EWRS and WHO IHR

*Table 23: Activities the partnership wants to become sustainable*

		YES	Total	%
a) Training activities for the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (MRLN)	Total	20	26	77%
	EU	14	17	82%
	Candidate	5	6	83%
	Non - EU	1	3	33%
b) Training activities on general preparedness and response	Total	20	26	77%
	EU	11	17	67%
	Candidate	6	6	100%
	Non - EU	3	3	100%
c) Early warning system and cross-border epidemic intelligence (EPIS EpiSouth Platform)	Total	20	26	77%
	EU	12	17	71%
	Candidate	6	6	100%
	Non - EU	2	3	67%
d) EpiSouth Plus website	Total	19	26	73%
	EU	12	17	71%
	Candidate	5	6	83%
	Non - EU	2	3	67%
e) EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin	Total	13	26	50%
	EU	8	17	47%
	Candidate	3	5	60%
	Non - EU	2	3	67%
f) Other - Please specify	Total	5	26	19%
	EU	5	16	31%
	Candidate	0	0	0
	Non - EU	0	0	0

## 5. Interviews

Interviews were conducted with interface and external stakeholders and in particular representatives from DG SANCO (2) , DG DEVCO(1), the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers(1), the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control(1). World Health Organisation – Europe (3), Italian Focal Point Ministry of health (2) and project coordinator(1).

A total of **11** interviews were conducted using the interview questionnaire presented in Annex 5.

### 5.1. Strengths

- All interviewees identified as the network itself the most important strength and achievement of the EPISOUTH project (*11 interviewees*). It was characterised as a historic, people based network (2 interviewees). The links created by the network with different political and geographical areas was identified as very important so as to exchange views and information that could be difficult to gain otherwise (*9 interviews*)
- Not always speedy information but linking 3 different WHO regions into an epidemiological block. (*2 interviewees*)
- The environment of trust created, especially between the Ministries of Health, by working together regularly was identified (*2 interviewees*). It was highly commended that this network of experts work together for many years bringing together countries from different WHO regions, different cultures overcoming politics (*1 interviewee*).
- The cooperation between international agencies was also identified. (*2 interviewees*)
- Good environment (*2 interviewees*)
- Good secretariat, engaging people (*2 interviewees*)

**Summary:** *The network, the environment of trust and the link of three different WHO regions were identified as the most important strengths and achievements of the EpiSouth Plus project.*

### 5.2. Weaknesses of the EpiSouth Network

- The network was functioning at some extent but when assessing the network it is not sufficient to say it was created (*3 interviewees*).
- The network was seen as an EU network and not so much focused on Non EU countries needs. It is important to tailor more efficiently the needs in the future (*3 interviewees*).
- The combination of the Arab spring and the large size of the project which was underestimated at the beginning. (*1 interviewee*)
- The coordination underestimated the risk of failure behind each activity (*2 interviewees*)

- The management structure had a multi stratified function that did not work well. It was too complex to work in a functional way in order to provide concrete results. Too much complexity is the main weakness which jeopardise the main results. (1 interviewee)
- Over ambition of what it could be achieved and on dealing at multi sectoral dynamics (2 interviewees). It seems that the project touched everything but not in depth. Would have benefited more if the EpiSouth Plus was more focused (2 interviewees).
- Not as high level of scientific quality of the work as it was expected (1 interviewee)
- Lack of understanding of the EPISOUTH PLUS role. Some EU partners were functioning as regional national centres and not as a European entity. (1 interviewee)
- The level of activity of Non EU countries could have been higher and a weak flow of information from the South to the North countries of the Mediterranean sea was identified (6 interviewees). This could be explained by the fact that Non EU countries are used to more traditional means of communication
- Some interviewees that there was little activity from the countries for both EU and NON EU. A more balance participation would have been better. (5 interviewees)
- The language barrier is an important aspect. The language barrier was very important. The Arabic translation of the network would be very beneficial and assist in making the Non EU countries to take ownership of the network. (4 interviewees)
- Maybe the network could be beneficial to have two secretariats, one in EU country and one in a Non EU. (2 interviewees)
- Lack of flexibility the coordination team when discussing with the funders (3 interviewees)
- EPISOUTH is a platform of different networks (training, epidemic intelligence, laboratory). It is a big “box” where smaller “boxes” are inside. (1 interviewee)
- Not certain if the founders had a clear plan of the sustainability of the outputs. (1 interviewee)
- Shortage of personnel is a weakness of our own institution. One person is appointed to several posts (i.e. EPISOUTH Focal Point, EWRS FP, WHO FP) which increases the workload and is difficult to keep track of all. (2 interviewees)
- Some technical issues with the EPISOUTH platform (2 interviewees)
- Information sharing needs to be improved. The countries from the south are very familiar with certain issues and have knowledge that could be shared with the Non EU countries and maybe this is an opportunity missed. We would have expected to have more events reporting (3 interviewees)
- Insufficient coordination with WHO Regional offices in the planning and implementation of activities related to the project. Having an identified coordination mechanism in place would avoid duplicating efforts and support filling several gaps. If the project would be extended, we strongly recommend having more discussion, through emails, phone call, meetings, etc. between the project managers/responsible officers with concerned departments of WHO Regional offices. This will help a lot.

**Summary:** *The main weaknesses identified were the fact that the network was not focused so much on the Non-EU countries needs, the lack of flexibility of the management, the management structure, the over ambition of the EPISOUTH Network coordinators and the underestimation of the risk of failure behind each activity. Moreover, the low level of activity and participation of the Non-EU countries was commented as well as the language barrier. The low level of information sharing, the lack of understanding of the role of the EPISOUTH plus and insufficient coordination with WHO regional offices were also identified as weaknesses.*

### 5.3. Threats the network should have anticipated and resolved in order to succeed in the implementation of its objectives

---

#### Political Threats:

- Lack of political commitment. EPISOUTH network is a technical network that did not have necessarily the political commitment in all the participating countries. The WHO can play a crucial role to get the political commitment. (2 interviewees)
- The political and external threats – some should have been foreseen (5 interviewees)

#### The network:

- Not accepted that they are a European project and were unable to cope with DG SANCO (1 interviewee).
- The willingness of some people/organisations to use the network for their own purposes (1 interviewee)
- The size of the network. The design of the network should have changed to facilitate better implementation. (1 interviewee)
- When such large numbers of countries participate it is challenging. (1 interviewee)
- A link with other networks to convert information into action should have been foreseen. (1 interviewee)

#### Funding

- The sustainability issue of the whole project beyond EC funds (should have tried to attract other sponsors, such as the Bill Gate foundation, etc.) (1 interviewee)

#### Alignment with EU policy

- Alignment of policy with EU was not considered. One of the main points that jeopardise the project was the non-alignment with the EU policies (2 interviewees)
- Not fully accepted that the EU MS should follow the EU legislation. The non EU are not obligated to follow EU policy. (1 interviewee)

#### Not sufficient planning at the beginning of the project

- All projects have a section on risk management but this was not very well developed during the planning phase of the EPISOUTH. (1 interviewee)
- Superficial estimation of capacity. (1 interviewee)
- No serious discussions on vulnerability (1 interviewee)

- Sustainability and risk of not achieving the broad objectives is always a risk in projects. (1 interviewee)

**Overlapping (8 interviewees):**

- In theory there is technical overlapping with EWRS and WHO IHR. The network did not anticipate the overlapping. They could have been more clear and involve WHO earlier (5 interviewees)

**Summary:** *The interviewees identified as threats the lack of political commitment and other political external threats that could have been foreseen to some extent. In relation to the network, the size and the fact that they did not accept their European identity as a project were identified as threats. Other threats identified were the lack of funding, the lack of alignment with EU policy, the insufficient planning as well as the overlapping of activities.*

#### **5.4. Benefits from the activities/documents etc. done by the EpiSouth Network**

---

- No or very limited benefit (2 interviewees)
- The activities of the EPISOUTH were not in the WHO work plan hence it was not easy to benefit from the benefits of the network. WHO was not able to provide full support since there was in some instances conflict with other priorities. WHO was able to provide advice but not core work. For the future initiatives it would be good to include from the beginning WHO and ensure that EPISOUTH activities are included in the WHO work plan and some funds i.e. for travel are included. (2 interviewees)
- Not certain about the impact on Non EU countries (1 interviewee)
- Very interesting project for the ascending countries (1 interviewee)
- The EpiSouth helped to build the trust of the Non EU with the EC and assisted the visibility of Commission action in the EU neighbourhood (2 interviewees)
- Assisted the development of the Mediterranean EPIET (2 interviewees)
- The EPIS platform. (1 interviewee)
- Information input through the network during so called crisis (eg Smallpox / pest in Algeria) (1 interviewee)
- Use of the network during the Arabian spring and influx of refugees (1 interviewee)
- The main benefit is the network of Ministries at Non EU countries (1 interviewee)
- Epidemiological reports (2 interviewees)
- Laboratories network (3 interviewees)
- The benefits are several since sustainable activities will come out of this. (1 interviewee).

**Summary:** *Two interviewees could not identify benefits gained from the EpiSouth Plus project. Non EU Ministries of Health and the laboratory networks were the main benefits gained according to the responders. The training and the EPIS EpiSouth Plus platform were also identified by the responders.*



### 5.5. Impact that the EpiSouth has had and the sectors that will benefit of its impact in the future development of preparedness and response to cross-border health threats

---

- Difficult considering the very poor or absence of impact (1 interviewee)
- The laboratory network which will benefit all national laboratories. The partnership should build on this training activity and on quality assurance. (1 interviewee)
- The network must invest in areas which are not covered by ECDC, but are part of the EU security policy / stability instrument / neighbourhood policy (1 interviewee)
- The future development of preparedness and response to cross-border health threats (1 interviewee)
- The activities collaboration of Mediterranean countries is very important but under a different institutional network. (1 interviewee)
- The idea of having links between Mediterranean countries is a necessity but the maturity of the existing network is not enough. The model of EPISOUTH did not work and should be avoided. (1 interviewee)
- The MED EPIET was established and developed through EpiSouth Plus project (1 interviewee)
- On the threat detection side the main impact is the network of professionals and trust even through difficult political situations. (1 interviewee)
- It is very important the active level of commitment from the larger EU MS like Italy and Spain and their understanding of the importance of collaboration with the Non EU Mediterranean countries. EU MS have specific interest for Mediterranean collaboration and this should continue. (1 interviewee)
- The impact is the training courses conducted (1 interviewee)
- Brought together so many countries. It is a big network of experts that WHO did not know before (2 interviewees)
- Having a clear idea about the communication and links the PoE have with the surveillance centers. (1 interviewee)
- Network has a valuable structure but for the future, they should try to avoid duplications and work on activities such as vector borne diseases and migrants health. (1 interviewee)

**Summary:** *The impact of the EpiSouth Plus project was challenged by some responders. The main impact identified were the creation of the network, the environment of trust and the network of experts and professionals brought together as well as the training that led to the development of the MED EPIET.*



## 5.6. Proposed means that the partnership should use in order to become sustainable

- As a network, to hold annual meeting, the funds from the DG SANCO operating grants for meetings could be used (1 interviewee)
- Private sector, foundations (1 interviewee)
- Better coordination and interaction with existing mechanisms (1 interviewee)
- The ECDC cannot be the agency that is promoting the initiative. Their current mandate does not include regional coordination. Maybe an umbrella for the EpiSouth activities could be EUROMED and WHO that is the main partner for issues outside the EU. (1 interviewee)
- The model of EPINORTH that was successful was not followed. (1 interviewee)
- Almost all interviewees mentioned that the following should be considered for the future:
  - Funding through DG DEVCO
  - Decision 1082/2013/EC on serious cross-border threats to health and repealing Decision No 2119/98/EC (This new Decision aligns the EU policy with WHO IHR (2005) that has an all health threats approach (biological, chemical and environmental)
  - HORIZON 2020
  - Health programme 2014-2020
- WHO will be willing to support meetings etc maybe not financially but logistically
- Be better linked with WHO EMRO (2 interviewees)
- EPISOUTH is an informal network that should be linked to formal networks/institutions (2 interviewees)
- Get the political support to the technical network. (1 interviewee)
- Ensure the sustainability of the functional network in the short run that it was not easy to create and then decide on the long term sustainable structure. (1 interviewee)
- Improve dissemination and communication the project results to make it recognised and accountable network. (1 interviewee)
- DG DEVCO provides an opportunity for sustainability through its willingness to continue funding certain activities. (1 interviewee)
- All of them should continue – DG SANCO and DG DEVCO funding was a good combination and should involve also other sources e.g. Horizon 2020 (1 interviewee)
- For the laboratories there is a lot of activity and should link into SANCO laboratory activities or receive funding from DEVCO (1 interviewee)

**Summary:** The majority of the responders identified as a possible funding option, DG DEVCO, the Health Programme 2014-2020 and the Horizon 2020. Interviewees also commented that the new Decision 2119/98/EC on serious cross border threats to health that has an all health approach should be taken into consideration when planning future initiatives.

## 5.7. Activities that should become sustainable

All interviewees were asked to identify the activities they would prefer see continuing and becoming sustainable.

The results are presented in *Table 24*. It can be seen that the majority of the responders (82%) would like to see the training for Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network to become sustainable. A total of 55% believe that the training activities on general preparedness and response should also become sustainable.

All responders identified that the EPIS for EpiSouth platform will continue since it is now under ECDC. A total of 18% of the interviewees mentioned that would like to see the EPIS for EPISOUTH becoming sustainable in the sense that it needs further work.

The lowest rated activity was the website and the quarterly electronic bulletin (9%).

Additional activities that the responders identified were the following:

- Network has a valuable structure but for the future they should try to avoid duplications and work on activities such as vector borne diseases and migrants health.
- Keep alive the experts network.
- Training activities on general preparedness and response - The MED EPIS is not the same as the EPISOUTH training activities –hence these could continue.
- EPIS: a call for tender for the platform has been published this activity needs to be strengthened.
- Simulation Exercises.
- All hazard approach - think the big picture.
- As a Network there are also the operating grants for meetings and the website and meetings. Mainly for dissemination activities.
- DG DEVCO provides the opportunity for sustainability.

*Table 24: Activities the interviewees wants to become sustainable*

	Yes	%
<b>a. Training activities for the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (MRLN)</b>	9/11	82%
<b>b. Training activities on general preparedness and response</b>	6/11	55%
<b>c. Early warning system and cross-border epidemic intelligence (EPIS EpiSouth Platform)</b>	2/11	18%
<b>d. EpiSouth Plus website</b>	1/11	9%
<b>e. EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin</b>	1/11	9%
<b>f. Other - Please specify</b>	5/11	45%

## 6. Added value of the EpiSouth Plus as identified by the partners

In the 2<sup>nd</sup> project meeting in November 2013, internal stakeholders (Focal Points) were asked to identify and present the added value of the EpiSouth Plus project.

A brief summary of the presentations given are presented below. For a detail description of the presentations please refer to the project meeting report.

- A. The added value of the Work Package 4 - Mediterranean Regional Laboratory network from the Algerian perspective was presented. The training provided was highly valued and assisted the Algerian partners to exchange protocols and standards (e.g. in house ELISA & PRNT protocol (IP, ISS), to set-up modular tests, to share information and advice and change in procedures and plans.
- B. Lebanon gave a presentation on the current situation regarding surveillance and the need to start digital event-based surveillance. Israel also shared their experience from the Cross Border Epidemic Intelligence Stages in the InVs and expressed the importance of this activity in identifying Israel's needs from the Epidemic Intelligence system.
- C. Regarding the Simulation Exercise conducted as part of the Work Package 5 activities, Lebanon presented their experience and in accordance with the External Evaluation Report, it identified the importance of such activities as training tools. In particular, for Lebanon, gaps were identified such as to translate the National Plans in Arabic, to disseminate to peripheral teams and train them and the importance to collaborate with national and international laboratories was identified.
- D. Italy also presented the added value of the EpiSouth Plus project identifying the following:
  - Enhanced capacity in Early Warning (EW) and Event Based Surveillance (EBS) at national level
  - Enhanced capacity in cross-border health threats preparedness and response at national level
  - Enhanced capacity in scientific coordination and technical management of complex framework for Infectious Disease and Health Threats surveillance
  - Enhanced capacity in coordination and collaboration with International Stakeholders and Institutions
- E. The Republic of Serbia identified the following as the added value of the EpiSouth Plus project:
  - Build and strengthened cooperation mechanisms and coordination processes between different countries
  - Identified common tools and best practices that create synergies, bring added value and lead to economies of scale
  - Fostering the networking of specialised European centres of reference
  - Identification, exchange and dissemination of good practices by developing shared solutions and guidelines

- Help to shape national policies by (a) providing best practices, (b) sharing and exchanging practical experience, expertise and knowledge and (c) giving support on health issues on the national political agenda (WNV infection surveillance etc.)
  - The added value of the network and the platform should be assessed through real situation events where the network facilitates the management and response to health threats.
- F. The Montenegro identified the following in terms of the added value as a result of involvement in EpiSouth:
- Gained insight in complexity of generic preparedness planning that made us more relaxed and less frustrated with planning process as we realized that almost all other states are in the same phase as we were, and as a result of all mentioned we have enhanced implementation activities of IHR 2005 along with Ministry of health and other stakeholders.
  - is reconsidering adoption of many other modules gained through EpiSouth project, such as establishing of event based surveillance system and regular periodic national simulation Exercises.
  - As part of work package2 (that we co-led with Italian colleagues), have gained experience of dissemination of epidemiological data that is now used in process of national epidemiology bulletins production and dissemination and I would take the opportunity to express our thanks to Istituto Superiore di Sanità team for this.
  - Regarding the training activities, very beginning of the project wasn't fulfilling our expectations but as time was passing quality was growing. Now, unfortunately project is at its end, but we are looking forward its logical continuance in form of common Mediterranean epidemiology training network - MedEpiet. Our expectations for this continuance are very high.
  - Tremendous cooperation with colleagues from Institute Veille Sanitaire (InVS) of France, as well as insight of Epis for EpiSouth platform, gave us needed knowledge of event based surveillance that will be very useful in forthcoming activities regarding process of upgrading and adaptation of our surveillance network and system as part of EU admittance.
  - Finally, seven years of capacity building resulted in unique laboratory network of the Mediterranean's, that -didn't exist before. We would like that this network will run and be functional even after project ending

## 7. Limitations

The questionnaires were disseminated initially to 125 members of the EpiSouth Plus project (Focal Points, Advisory Board and MRLN members). However, the responders that were from the same organization decided to respond collectively. For this reason, a total of 20 questionnaires were excluded from the analysis in order to calculate the response rate.

A total of **105** questionnaires (**EU: 55/105, 52%, Candidate: 20/105, 19% Non EU: 30/105, 29%**) were disseminated. The questionnaire collection period was from 6/11/13 until 6/12/13. A total of **44 out of 105 (42%)** questionnaires were collected (**EU: 28/55, 51%, Candidate: 11/20, 55% and Non EU: 5/30, 17%**). **Twenty eight of the 44 (64%)** questionnaires collected were from **EU** countries whereas **11 out of 44 (25%)** were from **Candidate** countries and **five out of 44 (11%)** were from **Non EU countries**.

Lower response rate was recorded in Non EU partners (5 out of 30, 17%) in comparison with EU countries (28 out of 55, 51%) (p-value: 0.002). As a result the Non EU countries' views and opinions are not equally represented. This was also evident in the midterm evaluation report and it could be considered as an indication on the commitment of the Non EU countries. This should be further explored.

## 8. Conclusions

The final evaluation covering 37 months of the implementation of the EpiSouth Plus project has led to the following concluding remarks reflecting the evaluation of the milestones and indicators and the views of the partnership as expressed by the project's stakeholders (internal, interface and external) through the questionnaires and interviews.

### 8.1. Review of available resources (indicators, milestones, and deliverables)

- The evaluation of milestones has shown that minor and major delays occurred in all work packages. The reason for the major delays as identified in previous sections and in the Midterm Evaluation report was due to the political instability in certain countries as well as the freezing of Work Package 6 - Epidemic Intelligent platform due to negotiations between EpiSouth Plus and the European Commission (EAHC/DG SANCO, DEVCO).
- Three out of 10 deliverables are due for completion after the final evaluation report will be submitted. The initial scheduling of the deliverables was not appropriate in order to facilitate the evaluation of this deliverables both from the external evaluator and the partnership.
- The evaluation of indicators shows that all process, output and outcome indicators in all work packages were achieved. Three outcome indicators were not able to be fully evaluated since the deliverables concerning these indicators will be delivered at the end of the project (Month 39). It is highly recommended to include this outcome indicators and their level of achievement in the Final Project report.

### 8.2. Conclusions from the questionnaires analysis (filled in by EpiSouth Focal Points, Members of the Lab Network and Members of the Advisory Board)

**In the following paragraphs the main conclusions from the questionnaire analysis are presented in summary:**

- The EpiSouth Plus project is a large and complex project that, as it was noted by all responders, has created a valuable network of experts from EU and non EU countries bringing together three different WHO areas. The network created important links of communication and collaboration between the EU and the neighbouring countries.
- The project management structure was characterised in general as excellent and satisfactory.
- The majority of the responders believe that the EpiSouth Plus Network:
  - fully facilitates the exchange of alerts and health information,
  - fully contributes in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building and



- fully works towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals
- Almost half of the responders believe that the EpiSouth Plus Network has fully enhanced the coordinated response to public health events in the Mediterranean area, has fully contributed to the development of interoperability with other early warning systems, has fully strengthen their capacity for communicable disease surveillance and response and to better respond to alerts whereas almost the other half believe this was partially achieved.
- The project deliverables were all rated highly from the responders identifying at the same time opportunities for improvement.
- The responders believe they were helped by the EpiSouth WP7 documentation in the identification of priority areas and the IHR implementation.
- The majority of the responders stated that they will be using the Strategic document “Tool for generic preparedness plan development” for developing a generic preparedness and response plan in their countries either fully or partially.
- The training activities both for the laboratory network and for general preparedness and response were highly valued by the responders and were listed as the main benefits of the EpiSouth Plus project.
  - The Simulation Exercise conducted under WP5 was not only identified as a benefit but also as an activity that should be continued in the future (>77%). The success of the simulation exercise as a training tool was also identified in the report of the External Evaluation of the Simulation Exercise (Annex 6).
  - The training for the Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network was the activity that was most highly rated in terms of becoming sustainable (77%).
- The EPIS EpiSouth Plus platform was also identified as a benefit of the project and an activity that the questionnaire responders would like to see becoming sustainable (>73%). Questionnaire responders expressed their intention to use the platform either fully or partially (>75%) but at the same time identified that improvements should be made to the user-friendliness and accessibility of the platform.
- The website was highly rated by the responders although the majority stated that they seldom visit it. The Network Working Area and the discussion forum were the lowest rated by the participants.
- The network was identified by the responders as an important achievement that brought together public health officials from different regions in a trusty environment achieving information sharing and addressing specific global and trans-regional threats. The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network was also identified as an achievement. The training both the simulation exercise and the laboratory training were identified as achievements. Moreover, the responders commented that the EPIS EpiSouth Platform enabled them to strengthen cross border epidemic intelligence and enhance surveillance of communicable diseases. The meetings, the website and the quarterly electronic bulletin were also identified as achievements.
- The most important threats identified by the responders were the size of the network, the lack of human resources and lack of funds as well as the lack of political



willingness to support the continuation of the project. Certain responders also identified as a threat the fact that there were overlapping activities and others the decision of the European funding bodies to take over certain activities which led to loss of ownership. A number of responders also commented that there was not clear link between the different activities and no clear added value of the project. The lack of effective coordination was identified as well as the lack of adequate objectives and enrollment of participating countries.

### **8.3. Conclusions from the interviews to internal, interface and external stakeholders (conducted with representatives from DG SANCO, DG DEVCO, the Executive Agency for Health and Consumers, the European Center for Disease Prevention and Control, World Health Organisation – Europe, Italian Focal Point Ministry of health and project coordinator)**

---

**In the following paragraphs the main conclusions from the interviewees are presented in summary:**

#### **Strengths:**

- The most important strengths and achievements of the EpiSouth Plus project identified by the interviewees were the network, the environment of trust and the link of three different WHO regions.

#### **Weaknesses:**

- The main weaknesses identified were the fact that the network did not take into consideration the Non-EU countries needs and this may be related with the low level of activity and participation of the Non-EU countries. The language barrier could have contributed to the low level of commitment.
- The lack of flexibility of the management, together with the over ambition of the EpiSouth Network coordinators and the underestimation of the risk of failure behind each activity were indicated as weaknesses from a number of interviewees.
- The overlapping with the EWRS and WHO IHR systems and the increase in the workload of limited personnel in the competent authorities was commented by the participants to the evaluation.
- The lack of understanding of the role of the EPISOUTH plus and insufficient coordination with WHO regional offices were also identified as weaknesses.

#### **Threats:**

- The interviewees identified as threats the lack of political commitment and other political external threats that could have been foreseen to some extent.
- In relation to the network, the size and the fact that they did not accept their European identity as a project were identified as threats.
- The lack of alignment with EU policy.

- The insufficient planning as well as the overlapping of activities.
- The lack of funding.

**Benefits:**

- Two interviewees could not identify benefits gained from the EpiSouth Plus project.
- Collaboration with the Non EU Ministries of Health and the laboratory networks were the main benefits gained according to the responders.

**Impact:**

- The impact of the EpiSouth Plus project was challenged by some responders.
- The main impact identified were the creation of the network, the environment of trust and the network of experts and professionals brought together as well as the training that led to the development of the MED EPIET.

**Sustainability:**

- Regarding the sustainability of certain activities, the internal, interface and external stakeholders interviewed identified the following:
  - the EPIS EpiSouth Platform is already sustainable since it is now operating under ECDC but improvements should be made.
  - the training activities of the Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network should continue (82%).
  - A total of 55% of the responders believed that the training on general preparedness and response should become sustainable. The Simulation Exercises was identified as an activity that should be continued in the future.
  - A small percentage of the responders believed that the website and EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin should become sustainable (9%).

**Means for sustainability:**

- The responders identified a variety of means for the project's activities to become sustainable and especially in securing funding for the activities. The Horizon 2020 and further funding from DG DEVCO was proposed. Moreover, if the EpiSouth Plus network decides to hold annual meetings at is was proposed by certain members of the partnership, there are operating grants available under DG SANCO for specialised networks such as EpiSouth. Close collaboration with the WHO and ECDC was strongly suggested by all responders as well as the focus on the Non EU needs and a consideration of the new all health approach European Decision.

#### 8.4. Overall remark

---

The overall feeling was that the EpiSouth Plus project made an impact in the Mediterranean area in terms of capacity building, general preparedness and response and epidemic intelligence. The indicators and milestones of the project were successfully achieved. The majority of the deliverables were highly rated by the members of the EpiSouth plus network. However, a number of interface and external stakeholders interviewed indicated that the over ambition of the EpiSouth Network to achieve a variety of objectives combined with the underestimated threats and lack of flexibility as well as lack of risk management strategy, potentially created obstacles for the project to achieve greater and more in depth results.

An important weakness and threat identified from both the midterm evaluation and the final evaluation is the low level of activity and participation of the Non EU countries either in the form of information sharing or active participation in the projects activities. It has however to be noted that the non-EU participation to trainings and technical meetings was comparable to that of EU as it has been reported in the tables 7, 8 and 9. The low response rate in the evaluation questionnaires of both the midterm and final evaluation raises question on the level of commitment of the Non EU countries. The language barrier was identified as a possible reason and especially for the usage of the EPIS EpiSouth platform that will be benefited and possible increase its usage from a translation in Arabic. Another possible explanation is the political instability in these countries. Moreover, the needs of the Non EU countries and how well these were addressed during the project implementation was questioned by both the questionnaire responders and the interviewees.

On the basis of the discussion held during the session on the Project's evaluation at the Final EpiSouth Conference (20-21 November 2013), which was held after having shared all the project's achievements through specific sessions, it might be added that overall the Project's outcomes and related impact were well received both by the members of the Networks and the stakeholders (internal, interface, external) present at the Conference (see the related Conference's Report for further details), although consolidation of some lines of activities was hoped to enhance further the impact.

The EpiSouth Project filled satisfactorily an important gap in the Mediterranean area related to cross border health threats preparedness and response and some activities should become sustainable (e.g. the Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network) as were indicated by the partnership and the interviewees through the evaluation process.

## 9. Annexes

### Annex 1: Midterm External Evaluation Report



Annex  
1\_Final\_MIDTERM\_EV

### Annex 2: Final Project Questionnaire for Focal Points



EpiSouth

Network for the Control of Public Health Threats  
in the Mediterranean Region and South East Europe

## EPISOUTH PLUS PROJECT

### Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire

*To be completed by all Focal Points of Institution partners and Countries involved in the EpiSouth Network*

**Reference Period:** October 2010 – October 2013

The objective of the **Final Project Evaluation** is to highlight successful results and outcomes and critical aspects in the implementation of the four specific objectives of the project, together with the assessment of correct timing and adequacy of planned deliverables.

**Instructions for completion:**

- This questionnaire should be completed by all **Focal Points of Institution partners and Countries involved in the EpiSouth Network**
- Complete individually the questionnaire. If you prefer to complete one questionnaire as an organization/country please specify this in your email.
- Return the completed questionnaire to Mrs Elina Kostara via email ([elkost@med.uth.gr](mailto:elkost@med.uth.gr)) or fax 00302410565051 no later than **Friday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2013**

**Responder's details:**

**Name/Surname:**

**Country:**

*(these information will remain confidential)*

Management and timeframe evaluation	Fully	Partially	Not at all
1. Do you think that the <b>management</b> (planning and organising) of the project was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you think that the <b>Steering Committee</b> was effective for achieving the projects objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you think that the <b>Steering Teams</b> established for each work package (WP) were effective in achieving the specific objective of the WP and in facilitating collaboration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you think the communication means and frequency was an effective process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you think that the <b>problem – solving process</b> was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Do you think that the <b>monitoring and evaluation of activities</b> are adequate and assist in keeping on track in terms of quality and timeliness?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. To what extent have the <b>project objectives</b> been achieved in your opinion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Website	Fully	Partially	Not at all	
8. Do you think that the website contributes to the dissemination of the project results?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9. Do you think that the website provides the visitor with all the necessary information concerning the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Often	Seldom	Never	
10. How often do you visit the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
11. How often do you visit the Network Working Area (NWA) of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Excellent	Satisfactory	Relatively Satisfactory	Requires Improvement
12. How do you rate the Meeting and Events Area in the NWA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. How do you rate the Document Area in the NWA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. How do you rate the Discussion Forum in the NWA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. How do you rate the Activities of the Network sections in the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. How do you rate the Events section in the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. How do you rate the Bulletin section in the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. How do you rate the Directories section in the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. How do you rate the News section in the public area of the website?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>EPISOUTH Network</b>	<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
20. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network is facilitating the exchange of alerts and health information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced the coordinated response to public health events in the Mediterranean Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Do you think that that the EPISOUTH Network is contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network work towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has contributed to the development of interoperability with other early warning systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity to better respond to alerts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity for communicable disease surveillance and response?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has used your organisation's strengths and expertise in implementing its activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>No</i>
28. Will you be using the Strategic document "Tool for generic preparedness plan development" for developing a generic preparedness and response plan in your country?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. Will you be using the EPIS EpiSouth platform to communicate a public health event of international concern?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>EpiSouth Platform</b>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Relatively Satisfactory</i>	<i>Requires Improvement</i>	<i>Comments for improvement</i>
30. Functionality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
31. Usefulness/Effectiveness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
32. Accessibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
33. Time response	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
34. User friendly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
35. Easy navigation mechanism	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
36. Quality of the content of the Alerts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
37. Quality of the analysis of the information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	



**Evaluation of the Outputs and Deliverables**

Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the document?				Performance criteria																			
									Clarity**				Consistency***				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness****			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI				
38. EPISOUTH quarterly electronic bulletin																												
39. EpiSouth Leaflet																												
40. EpiSouth Outline																												
41. WP4 – List of Networks and laboratories related to EpiSouth																												
42. WP4 - The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network (MRLN) - Needs assessment of the laboratories (March 2013)																												
43. WP4 - Deliverable 6: "Directory of Regional Laboratories"																												
44. WP5 Directory of Training Course and Fellowship																												
45. WP5 EpiSouth plus Report 4/2012 - Public Health Preparedness and Response Core Capacity Assessment																												
46. WP6 EpiSouth plus Report 3/2011 -																												

Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the document?				Performance criteria																			
									Clarity**				Consistency***				Usefulness/Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness****			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI
Cross-border Epidemic Intelligence Evaluation																												
47. WP6 West Nile Virus circulation in the EpiSouth countries and neighbouring areas (2010 and 2011 seasons)																												
48. WP6 250th eWEB: a retrospective analysis of the health events reported (March 2008 - December 2012)																												
49. WP6 Novel Coronavirus worldwide situation, up to 1 March 2013																												
50. WP6 West Nile Virus circulation in the EpiSouth countries and neighboring areas (2010, 2011 and 2012 seasons)																												
51. WP6 Impact of MERS CoV on epidemic preparedness in countries of the EpiSouth Network in view of Hajj 2013																												
52. WP6 Deliverable 9: "Weekly epidemic intelligence bulletin" known as the eWEB - "EpiSouth secured platform"																												

Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the document?				Performance criteria																			
									Clarity**				Consistency***				Usefulness/Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness****			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI
interoperable with EU and other EWS*																												
53. WP7 EpiSouth plus Report 2/2011 - In Depth Analysis of Coordination of Surveillance and Response Between Points of Entry and National System in the EpiSouth Region																												

E: Excellent S: Satisfactory RS: Relatively Satisfactory RI: Requires Improvement

\*Clarity: free from obscurity and easy to understand \*\*\*Consistency: logical coherence and accordance with the facts \*\*\*\*Completeness: complete and entire; having everything that is needed



## Annex 3: Mediterranean Regional Laboratories activities questionnaire

# EPISOUTH PLUS PROJECT

## Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network Activities Evaluation Questionnaire

To be completed by the members of the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network

**Reference Period:** October 2010 – October 2013

The objective of the **Final Project Evaluation** is to highlight successful results and outcomes and critical aspects in the implementation of the four specific objectives of the project, together with the assessment of correct timing and adequacy of planned deliverables.

### Instructions for completion:

- This questionnaire should be completed by the members of the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network
- Complete individually the questionnaire. If you prefer to complete one questionnaire as an organization/country please specify this in your email.
- Return the completed questionnaire to Mrs Elina Kostara via email ([elkost@med.uth.gr](mailto:elkost@med.uth.gr)) or fax 00302410565051 no later than **Friday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2013**

### Responder's details:

**Name/Surname:**

**Country:**

*(these information will remain confidential)*

## Evaluation of the EpiSouth Network

	<i>Fully</i>	<i>Partially</i>	<i>Not at all</i>
1. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network is facilitating the exchange of alerts and health information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you think that that the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 activities is contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network work towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity to better respond to alerts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you think that the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 activities enhanced your capacity for diagnosis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Did you put into practice what you have learned during the EPISOUTH PLUS WP4 training activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Evaluation of the training

	WP4 Training on <b>Dengue and Biosafety in the lab.</b> , Paris, France 2-6 July 2012				WP4 Training on <b>West Nile and Biosafety II in the Lab</b> , Madrid, Spain 24-28 June 2013			
	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor	Excellent	Good	Average	Poor
7. Contact with EPISOUTH prior to the training courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Information regarding your participation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Details on the venue	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Instructions for the course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Administrative support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Comfort of meeting venue	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Trainee's selection requirements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Publicity of the course to target audience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Description of the objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. Course content	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. Course materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18. Participants (number and adequacy)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. Trainers performance	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. Teaching methods	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. Length of course	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
22. Time keeping	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. Opportunity for networking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. Relevance to job	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. Enjoyment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. Work environment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Evaluation of the Outputs and Deliverables

Documents	Methodology Used				How do you rate the document?				Performance criteria																
									Clarity**				Consistency***				Usefulness/ Effectiveness				Conformity to Objectives				Completeness****
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	
27. WP4 – List of Networks and laboratories related to EpiSouth																									
28. WP4 - The Mediterranean Regional Laboratory Network (MRLN) - Needs assessment of the laboratories (March 2013)																									
29. WP4 - Deliverable 6: “Directory of Regional Laboratories”																									

\*E: Excellent S: Satisfactory RS: Relatively Satisfactory RI: Requires Improvement

\* Clarity: free from obscurity and easy to understand \*\*\*Consistency: logical coherence and accordance with the facts \*\*\*\*Completeness: complete and entire; having everything that is needed

### Evaluation of the Meetings

	The meeting's usefulness and effectiveness for the development of the project's processes				Material for discussion disseminated contributed to the achievement of the meeting's objectives				Quality of the material disseminated for discussion				How do you rate the coordination of discussion?				How do you rate the quality of the meetings report (did it include all issues raised during the meeting)?			
	E*	S*	RS*	RI*	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI	E	S	RS	RI
30. WP4 Experts Meeting, Paris, France 13 January 2012																				
31. WP4 Heads of Laboratories Meeting, Ankara, Turkey 8-9 Marzo 2012																				

\*E: Excellent S: Satisfactory RS: Relatively Satisfactory RI: Requires Improvement

## Annex 4: Final Project Questionnaire for Advisory Board

## EPISOUTH PLUS PROJECT

### Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire

To be completed by the Advisory Board members

**Reference Period:** October 2010 – October 2013

The objective of the **Final Project Evaluation** is to highlight successful results and outcomes and critical aspects in the implementation of the four specific objectives of the project, together with the assessment of correct timing and adequacy of planned deliverables.

**Instructions for completion:**

- This questionnaire should be completed by all **Advisory Board members**
- Complete individually the questionnaire. If you prefer to complete one questionnaire as an organization/country please specify this in your email.
- Return the completed questionnaire to Mrs Elina Kostara via email ([elkost@med.uth.gr](mailto:elkost@med.uth.gr)) or fax 00302410565051 no later than **Friday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2013**

**Responder's details:**

**Name/Surname:**

**Country:**

*(these information will remain confidential)*

Management and timeframe evaluation	Fully	Partially	Not at all
1. Do you think that the <b>management</b> (planning and organising) of the project was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Do you think that the <b>Steering Committee</b> was effective for achieving the projects objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you think that the <b>Steering Teams</b> established for each work package (WP) were effective in achieving the specific objective of the WP and in facilitating collaboration?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you think the <b>communication means and frequency</b> was an effective process?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Do you think that the <b>problem – solving process</b> was effective for achieving the project objectives?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Do you think that the <b>monitoring and evaluation of activities</b> are adequate and assist in keeping on track in terms of quality and timeliness?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. To what extent have the <b>project objectives</b> been achieved in your opinion?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
EPISOUTH Network	Fully	Partially	Not at all
8. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network is facilitating the exchange of alerts and health information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced the coordinated response to public health events in the Mediterranean Area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. Do you think that that the EPISOUTH Network is contributing in the strengthening of Mediterranean countries capacities building?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network work towards building reliable and collaborative relationships among public health professionals?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has contributed to the development of interoperability with other early warning systems?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity to better respond to alerts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has enhanced your capacity for communicable disease surveillance and response?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
15. Do you think that the EPISOUTH Network has used your organisation's strengths and expertise in implementing its activities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Sustainability aspects

16. List the three most important achievements of the EpiSouth Plus project

17. List the three biggest threats for the sustainability of the EpiSouth Plus project

18. Please tick the activities of the EpiSouth Plus project you believe should become sustainable

- |   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| a) Training activities for the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (MRLN)       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b) Training activities on general preparedness and response                             | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c) Early warning system and cross-border epidemic intelligence (EPIS EpiSouth Platform) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) EpiSouth Plus website  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin  | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Other - Please specify.....  | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## Annex 5: Interview Checklist

### Telephone Interview Checklist

*The results of this telephone interview will be consolidated in the Final Evaluation Report*

**Reference Period:** Oct 2010 – Oct 2013

#### Strengths-Weaknesses- Impact:

- What are in your opinion the **strengths** of the EpiSouth Network?
- What are in your opinion the **weaknesses** of the EpiSouth Network?
- What are the **threats** that the network should have anticipated and resolved in order to succeed in the implementation of its objectives?
- Have your Organisation/Institution had any benefit from the activities/documents etc. done by the EpiSouth Network ?
- Could you identify which impact EpiSouth has had and which sectors will benefit of its impact in the future development of preparedness and response to cross-border health threats?

#### Sustainability:

##### *Discussion and proposals on how the EpiSouth Plus activities could become sustainable*

- Which of the activities implemented so far do you believe should be sustainable - Please tick the activities of the EpiSouth Plus project you would like to see becoming sustainable
 

a) Training activities for the Mediterranean Regional Laboratories Network (MRLN)	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Training activities on general preparedness and response	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Early warning system and cross-border epidemic intelligence (EPIS EpiSouth Platform)	<input type="checkbox"/>

- d) EpiSouth Plus website ☐
- e) EpiSouth Plus quarterly electronic bulletin ☐
- f) Other – Please specify..... ☐
- 7. What are the means that the partnership should use in order to become sustainable?
- 8. Are there any issues that you would like to raise?

## Annex 6: Simulation Exercise External Evaluation Report



Annex 6  
SE\_Evaluation\_Report

## Annex 7: Facilitating WHO-IHR implementation in the Mediterranean in the Mediterranean Basin The National Situation – Italy



Annex 7\_Italy USMAF  
per EPISOUTH nov201

## Annex 8: Facilitating WHO-IHR implementation in the Mediterranean in the Mediterranean Basin The National Situation – Malta



Annex 8 Malta  
EpiSouth- IHR Implem