



## D3.2

### Interim evaluation report

#### Document Information:

<b>Document status:</b>	Final
<b>Approved by JAseHN oPSC</b>	Yes
<b>Document Version:</b>	V6.0
<b>WP3 QM process:</b>	Yes
<b>Document produced by:</b>	Joint Action to support the eHealth Network WP 3: Evaluation
<b>Author(s):</b>	Mara Timofe, BBU (Romania)
<b>Contributor(s):</b>	Isabella Weber, ATNA (Austria) Barbara Schmeissl, ATNA (Austria) Alain Périé, ASIP Santé (France)

## TABLE OF CHANGE HISTORY

VERSION	DATE	SUBJECT	MODIFIED BY
V1.0	21/12/2016	DRAFT DEVELOPMENT	MARA TIMOFÉ (BBU)
V2.0	26/01/2017	DRAFT UPDATE	MARA TIMOFÉ (BBU)
V3.0	02/02/2017	INPUT FROM WP1	ISABELLA WEBER (ATNA)
V3.0	03/02/2017	INPUT FROM JASEHN RISK MANAGER	ALAIN PÉRIÉ (ASIP Santé)
V4.0	29/05/2017	DRAFT UPDATE	MARA TIMOFÉ (BBU)
V5.0	22/08/2017	INPUT FROM WP1	BARBARA SCHMEISSL (ATNA)
V6.0	18/09/2017	FINALIZATION OF D3.2	MARA TIMOFÉ (BBU)

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Background</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>3. Intended outcomes, outputs and the success indicators at the project half-way</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>4. Continuous involvement</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>5. Outcomes</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>6. References</b> .....	<b>9</b>

## 1. Executive summary

The interim evaluation report assesses the intended outcomes, outputs and the success indicators at the project half-way.

There are 2 objectives for the evaluation:

- To assess the degree to which the JAseHN project achieved the proposed objectives. WP3 has focused both, on the project as a whole, as well as on individual WPs, being in charge of the process and outcome evaluation.
- To evaluate the quality of the deliverables, making sure that each specific template is used according to the project's quality standards.

To achieve these 2 objectives, WP3 will have to put in place several activities.

## 2. Background

WP3 has performed evaluation of the JAseHN project at regular intervals. Its key deliverables are the interim evaluation report and the final report.

In order to achieve the objectives of this WP, several steps have been taken. An evaluation strategy was developed, along with the Quality Management Scheme, based on process, output and outcome indicators for each WP. The WP3 team is responsible for collecting and analyzing data and further on for providing conclusions in the final report. Special attention will be given to deviation from work plan(s). Therefore, the Risk Management Framework, including risk identification and risk assessment, has been developed. Possible discrepancies and measures to counteract may be proposed to and discussed with the TLs, WPLs and the Coordination Group. **The final evaluation report will be based on the registry of milestones and deliverables achieved by each WP, including the quality of outputs.**

To ensure timeliness and consistent quality of deliverables this WP installed a Quality Management (QM) scheme. Under the leadership of a designated QM person every deliverable undergoes predefined revision and elaboration steps. This ensures high quality of content and presentation, but also due consideration of stakeholder input. To ensure the quality of the grammar usage, WP3 has been in charge of contacting an external agency and making sure that the deliverable is returned to its task leader in the proper format.

## 3. Intended outcomes, outputs and the success indicators at the project half-way

The overall objective is to better include eHealth into health policy and better align eHealth investments to health needs. A central aspect is the transferability of health data across borders and the interoperability of eHealth. Taking this into account, JAseHN acts as the

main preparatory body for the eHN by developing political recommendations and instruments for cooperation in the four specific priority areas: (1) interoperability and standardisation, (2) monitoring and assessment of implementation, (3) exchange of knowledge and (4) global cooperation and positioning.

Each priority area has been covered by the deliverables (draft versions or final versions) that were sent to WP3 for quality check. According to the WP3 review, each deliverable corresponding to these priority areas followed the guidelines and were assessed as being proper qualitative outcomes.

Preparation of eHealth Network meetings		
Process Indicator Structured involvement of strategic experts Coordination of overlapping tasks between the JA and the eHN secretariat		On-going task performed by Strategic PSC, WP1, eHN secretariat - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Preparation of relevant meetings WP1 Collaboration between the MS's co-chair and the EC's co-chair of the eHN		On-going task performed by WP1, EC/eHN secretariat - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Increased awareness of content to be presented at the eHN meetings and contribution of strategic experts in meetings PSC approved documents that were submitted to the eHN		On-going task performed by Strategic PSC - properly implemented
Dissemination of content produced within MS and Stakeholder Groups		
Process Indicator Planning of actions related to a dissemination strategy at EU level		Task performed by WP2 - properly implemented
Output Indicator Establishment of specific dissemination communication tools within 4 months after the beginning of JAseHN		Task performed by WP2 - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Increased awareness of JAseHN and related eHN activities through dissemination actions		On-going task performed by WP2 - properly implemented
Dialogue with relevant EU eHealth stakeholder groups and standardisation organizations		
Process Indicator(s) Selection of relevant EU eHealth stakeholder groups and standardization organizations for each defined priority area (1)-(4) Involvement of relevant stakeholders (EU eHealth stakeholder groups and standardisation organizations) in the consortium in a structured way		Task performed by WP4 - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Target		Task performed by the

Joint Action to support the eHealth Network

Contribution of relevant eHealth stakeholder groups and standardization organizations to each defined priority area (1)-(4) in time Transparent mechanism of eHealth stakeholder involvement of all interested groups operating at EU level within 3 months after the beginning of the JA	Consortium - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Target Awareness and Contribution of relevant EU eHealth stakeholder groups and standardisation organizations to JAseHN Suitable and transparent involvement process for relevant EU eHealth stakeholder groups and standardisation organizations to JAseHN	On-going task performed by all involved eHealth stakeholder groups - properly implemented

Translation of defined priority area (1) of the MWP 2015-2018 into actions (incl. related specific requests made by the eHN)

Process Indicator(s) Target Planning of actions related to the defined priority area on interoperability and standardization	Task performed by WP5 - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Target Preparation of reports, guidelines, frameworks and other policy documents in the field of interoperability and standardization in time for the eHN meetings	On-going task performed by WP5, MS - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Target Consolidated alignment in the field of interoperability and standardization as basis for actions in the defined priority area (1)	On-going task performed by WP5 - properly implemented

Translation of defined priority area (2) of the MWP 2015-2018 into actions (incl. related specific requests made by the eHN)

Process Indicator(s) Target Planning of actions related to the defined priority area on monitoring and assessment of implementation	Task performed by WP6 - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Target Preparation of implementation reports and a sustainable legal basis for cross-border exchange of health data in the field of eHealth in time for the eHN meetings	On-going task performed by WP6, MS - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Target Up-to-date information on the current state of play as basis for actions in the defined priority area (2)	On-going task performed by eHN - properly implemented

Translation of defined priority area (3) of the MWP 2015-2018 into actions (incl. related specific requests made by the eHN)

Process Indicator(s) Target Planning of actions related to the defined priority area on exchange of knowledge	Task performed by WP7 - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Target Preparation of reports, recommendations and other policy documents on all tasks related to the exchange of knowledge in time for the eHN meetings	On-going task performed by WP7, MS - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Target Improved awareness and disseminated knowledge in the field of eHealth as basis for actions in the defined priority area (3)	On-going task performed by eHN, MS, eHealth Stakeholder Groups - properly implemented

Translation of defined priority area (4) of the MWP 2015-2018 into actions (incl. related specific requests made by the eHN)

Process Indicator(s) Target Planning of actions related to the defined priority area on global cooperation and positioning	Task performed by WP8 - properly implemented
Output Indicator(s) Target Preparation of information, policy reports and recommendations on global cooperation and positioning in the field of eHealth in time for the eHN meetings	On-going task performed by WP8, MS - properly implemented
Outcome/Impact Indicator(s) Target Consolidated opinion on global cooperation and positioning as basis for actions in the defined priority area (4)	On-going task performed by eHN, MS - properly implemented

#### 4. Continuous involvement

WP3 is responsible for performing the quality check for each deliverable elaborated by the content-related WPs. In this context, periodically the Evaluation team is in charge of collecting and reviewing the elaborated deliverables in order to make sure that each document follows the pre-defined standards regarding the format and content. Therefore, task leaders are sending their deliverable(s) to WP3 according to the predefined schedule. In case one or more task leaders are not meeting the deadline for sending the document(s), WP3 is responsible for contacting them and making sure that the deliverable(s) are received. Following that, WP3 has a determined period of time for reviewing the deliverables by following the standards set at the beginning of the project. Each deliverable needs to correspond to the standardized templates that were created for each type of deliverable. The reviewed documents are saved in two formats: one including all track changes performed and all comments delivered to the task leader and one in a clear version (with all track changes accepted). These two formats are sent back to the task leader for each deliverable received.

Another task performed by WP3 involves the contact with the external agency that performs the grammar check on deliverables. Therefore, whenever there is the need for grammar check

on final version deliverables, these are sent to the external agency and following the task leader's approval on any changes brought by the agency, WP3 is responsible of delivering the final version of the deliverable(s), including all these approved changes and following the standards regarding the formatting of the documents.

## **5. Outcomes**

### **5.1 D3.1 Quality Management Scheme**

This document gives the overview of the quality approach of the project describing the organization, objectives, tools, environment, quality criteria and information sources. Therefore, each project deliverable should be validated throughout the whole process. Furthermore, along with the deliverables, processes should also adhere to certain quality guidelines.

In order to achieve the desired quality, the deliverable needs to:

1. conform to the FORMAT according to checklist and corresponding template
2. to deliver a CONTENT that resolves the issue / problem/ question stated in the Introduction chapter
3. be in line with PROJECT OBJECTIVE
4. to be delivered according to PLAN

### **5.2 M3.2.1 Evaluation Strategy**

The general objective of the Evaluation WP is to assess the degree to which the JAseHN achieved the proposed objectives. The final evaluation report will be based on the registry of milestones and deliverables achieved by each WP, including the quality of outputs.

### **5.3 M3.2.2 Risk Management Framework**

The Risk Management Framework is used to document and manage risks that may occur during the project. The Risk Management Framework can be divided into three major activities: Risk Identification, Risk analysis and mitigation, and Risk monitoring, reporting and control.

### **5.4 JAseHN Glossary**

The objectives of the JAseHN glossary are to provide an overview about all major terms (acronyms) used under the scope of JAseHN, create a shared understanding among all JAseHN project members about the meaning of the respective terms used throughout the entire project duration, enable all JAseHN project members to use the same acronym for the same term instead of using different acronyms for same term, build future deliverables upon this shared understanding and to use as a basis to build the table of acronyms for future deliverables.

## **6. References**

- 6.1. D3.1 Quality Management Scheme**
- 6.2. M3.2.1 Evaluation Strategy, Quality Management Scheme and Risk Management Framework**