



Evaluation of the European Commission's Civil Protection Prevention and Preparedness Projects (2014-2020) – Executive summary

June 2021



EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (DG ECHO)

Directorate Disaster Preparedness and Prevention

Unit B.2 – Disaster Risk Management

Contact : ECHO-EVAL@ec.europa.eu

European Commission

B-1049 Brussels

Evaluation of the European Commission's Civil Protection Prevention and Preparedness Projects (2014-2020)

Executive Summary

Evaluation team:

- ICF: Vittorio Furci (Project Manager), Nicoletta Enria, Sofia Esteves, Maurice van der Velden, Rocio Naranjo Sandalio, Maria Rosales
- Independent experts: Andrea de Guttry, Antonin Petr, Juergen Hoegl, Kenn Christensen, Laurent de Pierrefeu

Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
(DG ECHO)

**Europe Direct is a service to help you find answers
to your questions about the European Union.**

Freephone number (*):

00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

LEGAL NOTICE

This document has been prepared for the European Commission however it reflects the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

More information on the European Union is available on the Internet (<http://www.europa.eu>).

Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2021

ISBN 978-92-76-38084-9

DOI 10.2795/01355

© European Union, 2021

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

Table of Contents

1	Objectives and scope of the study	1
2	Prevention and Preparedness Projects Programme (PPP Programme).....	1
3	Methodology.....	2
4	Key findings and conclusions	2
4.1	Effectiveness	2
4.2	Efficiency	3
4.3	Relevance	4
4.4	Coherence	5
4.5	EU added value.....	5
4.6	Sustainability.....	6
5	Recommendations.....	7

Executive summary

This is the Executive Summary of the Evaluation of the European Commission's Civil Protection Prevention and Preparedness Projects (2014-2020), an assignment undertaken by ICF on behalf of Directorate-General European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (DG ECHO) of the European Commission.

1 Objectives and scope of the study

This study aimed to provide DG ECHO with an independent external evaluation of the results of the Prevention and Preparedness Projects financed by the Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM) budget during 2014-2020. Specific study objectives were:

- Highlighting the factors most critical to the success of selected Prevention and Preparedness Projects (hereafter PPPs);
- Identifying a list of best practice projects that fulfil the evaluation criteria; and
- Recommending options for the short/long-term future of the programme and thereby informing the conception of future calls for proposals, beginning with the design of the 2021-2027 MFF programming cycle.

The study covered the 132 cross-border PPPs (Track 2)¹ financed by the UCPM budget throughout the seven call cycles from 2014-2020 (the evaluation period) in the 28² EU Member States and six UCPM Participating States³, as well as 19 eligible third countries (including EU Neighbourhood countries⁴ and Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) beneficiary countries that are not Participating States⁵).

2 Prevention and Preparedness Projects Programme (PPP Programme)

Established by Decision No 1313/2013/EU, the **Union Civil Protection Mechanism (UCPM)** aims to enhance cooperation and coordination in the field of civil protection and to develop the effectiveness of systems for preventing, preparing for and responding to natural and man-made hazards. DG ECHO, under the UCPM budget lines, **co-finances⁶ prevention and preparedness in civil protection and marine pollution** through the **PPP Programme**. **Prevention projects** seek to support EU Member States, Participating States and eligible third countries to attain a higher level of protection and resilience against disasters by preventing or reducing their effects⁷. **Preparedness projects** strive to raise the level of preparedness of civil protection

¹ Call for proposals to award multi-beneficiary grants in civil protection and marine pollution.

² EU Member States: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Greece, Spain, France, Croatia, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, UK*.

*The UK was eligible as an EU Member State until 2020 (inclusive).

³ UCPM Participating States: Iceland, Norway, Serbia, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Turkey.

⁴ Southern Neighbourhood countries: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine**, Syria***, Tunisia.

** This designation shall not be construed as recognition of a State of Palestine and is without prejudice to the individual positions of the Member States on this issue.

*** EU cooperation with Syria is currently suspended due to the political situation; however, as Syria is, in principle, eligible for cooperation under the Neighbourhood, Development and International Cooperation Instrument, activities may recommence when the situation improves.

Eastern Neighbourhood: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine.

⁵ Western Balkans: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo.

⁶ Co-funding takes place under the EU's MFF 2014-2020: <https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/policies/eu-budgetary-system/multiannual-financial-framework/mff-2014-2020>

⁷ Work Programmes 2014-2019: https://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding-evaluations/financing-civil-protection_en

systems at national and EU level to respond quickly and efficiently to disasters and to increase awareness of risk and disaster preparedness.⁸ During 2014-2020, funding for PPPs originated from two budget lines: an **internal budget** for EU Member States and UCPM Participating States; and an **external budget** targeting eligible third countries. The funding allocated between 2014-2020 was EUR 67.4 million, of which 33.1 million EUR was for prevention projects⁹ and EUR 34.3 million was for preparedness projects¹⁰.

3 Methodology

The evaluation approach was informed by research tools specifically developed and tailored for the purpose of this evaluation to build a rich and comprehensive evidence base covering a wide range of stakeholders. As this is the first evaluation of the PPP Programme, this evaluation could not rely on past baseline data nor on a performance assessment framework at programme level. Taking this into consideration, the evaluation team developed a set of specific indicators to assess the results of the Programme despite the lack of baseline data.

The research began in May 2020 and involved several tools:

- **Desk research of existing documentation, literature and data** on the PPP Programme;
- A **mapping of 132 PPPs**, which consisted of multiple layers of analysis of qualitative and quantitative data on PPPs. The analysis first created a repository of all quantifiable information from the 132 PPPs, with a second layer including a targeted review of 35 PPPs and an in-depth analysis of six case study PPPs;
- **Four online surveys** targeting PPP project coordinators, partners, national civil protection authorities and representatives of civil protection authorities in the Civil Protection Committee (CPC);
- A total of **74 interviews** with PPP project coordinators, national civil protection authorities and relevant EU stakeholders;
- A **network analysis**, creating a visual representation of the links between entities in different countries in PPPs, as well as an insight into the typology of hazards, end users and entities coordinating PPPs.

4 Key findings and conclusions

4.1 Effectiveness

Overall, the large majority of **prevention and preparedness projects selected for funding under the PPP Programme during the evaluation period achieved the objectives set out in their proposals**. While a number of projects faced obstacles in undertaking the planned activities, typically this did not have an adverse impact on the achievement of project results. Some of the **main factors hindering PPPs' effectiveness** were communication problems and different levels of commitment among beneficiaries, political challenges (e.g. lack of political will, changes in political priorities), complex administrative procedural rules, and difficulties in working with local partners. The **main factors increasing the effectiveness of PPPs** included: good internal cooperation and coordination among beneficiaries, as well as the possibility to build on already existing partnerships; good cooperation between beneficiaries and national civil protection authorities and other national and local stakeholders; cross-border nature of the consortia; comprehensive planning of project activities at proposal stage; involvement of end users in the project design and

⁸ Work Programmes 2014-2019: https://ec.europa.eu/echo/funding-evaluations/financing-civil-protection_en.

⁹ EUR 26.5 million from the internal budget and 6.6 million EUR from the external budget.

¹⁰ EUR 25.5 million from the internal budget and EUR 8.8 million from the external budget.

implementation; technical expertise of beneficiaries and their previous experience with similar projects; and the use of innovative methodologies.

Regarding the **overall effectiveness of the PPP Programme**, funded PPPs produced results in line with all the objectives of the PPP Programme in the field of preparedness and a majority of those in prevention. Some of the factors hindering the effectiveness of the PPP Programme included the lack of visibility of project results, lack of access to information on previous PPPs, complex administrative requirements, and the absence of continuation plans for some of the projects. **Networking opportunities provided by the Programme were the main factor contributing to the effectiveness of the PPP Programme.**

Through the **PPPs' results**, the **PPP Programme contributed to increasing the level of disaster preparedness and prevention** in EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries. This impact was largely achieved through the reinforcement of cooperation and a higher level of awareness of disaster risk preparedness and prevention. For instance, the PPP Programme successfully promoted the use of EU funds to support sustainable disaster risk preparedness and prevention in EU Member States. However, there is room for improvement with awareness raising on disaster risk and preparedness, especially regarding level of knowledge of the UCPM and its role in this field among eligible third countries.

PPPs did not systematically identify project indicators at proposal stage or adopt common project-level indicators. This was likely due to the varied guidance provided in proposal templates in the calls for proposals. The basic 'results framework' introduced in the 2019 call for proposals was a significant step towards the standardisation of indicators. Despite the lack of consistency in project-level indicators, seven indicators were used in five to 17 PPPs during the evaluation period:

- **Activity-level:** number of stakeholders involved, number of active participants in coordination meetings, number of timely submissions of deliverables;
- **Output-level:** number of event participants, number of staff trained;
- **Outcome-level:** number of organisations/countries that adopted PPP outputs; and,
- **Impact-level:** number of end users satisfied with PPP outputs.

The large majority of stakeholders agreed that standardised key performance indicators measuring the impact of PPPs should be introduced in the PPP calls for proposals.

At programme-level, there are currently no indicators to demonstrate the impact of the PPP Programme or to generate programme-level data, with a large majority of national stakeholders in favour of introducing such indicators. Therefore, a framework of programme-level key performance indicators could be set ex ante and informed by the single annual calls for proposals.

4.2 Efficiency

The financial support provided by the PPP Programme was sufficient to facilitate the successful implementation of the selected PPPs. The resources provided under the PPP Programme were also sufficient to achieve its objectives. In cases of PPPs where the financial support was insufficient, this was mostly attributed to higher-than-expected costs of personnel, travel, subsistence and equipment.

The PPPs incurred a variety of quantifiable eligible and non-eligible costs that were considered proportionate to or outweighed by their benefits. Personnel and subsistence costs formed the bulk of the absolute and relative costs. This differed across the internal and external budget line: personnel and subcontracting costs taking up the larger part of overall funding under the internal budget line, and travel, subsistence and equipment the largest costs under the external budget. Nevertheless, the overall benefits of the PPPs significantly outweighed their costs: in particular, the

achievement of certain outputs or outcomes would not have been possible through national systems, and some outputs were beyond what was originally promised. The benefits of PPPs generated operational efficiency savings and/or contributed to reducing the consequences of natural and man-made hazards. PPPs mostly contributed to lowering the vulnerability of assets and/or improving the response to disasters.

Significant efforts were made to improve the efficiency of the PPP

Programme, such as the introduction of the e-Grants Electronic Submission system. Nevertheless, some inefficiencies were detected, especially at project level. These stemmed from disproportionate administrative and bureaucratic burdens, such as lengthy process timelines and management requirements of the e-Grants system, e.g. when updating the submission forms. However, the reporting and monitoring mechanism of the PPP Programme was not considered excessively burdensome.

4.3 Relevance

The PPP Programme's objectives, priorities and activities were generally well aligned with the needs of the UCPM, EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries, especially regarding innovative solutions to civil protection and cross-border cooperation issues. At national level, concerted efforts were made to incorporate the needs of national stakeholders in PPP Programme priorities and objectives, especially those of EU Member States and UCPM Participating States, through the CPC. There remains scope for improvement in consultation methods for national stakeholders to express their needs and expectations of the PPP Programme (e.g. through the CPC), especially those from eligible third countries. Indeed, the PPP Programme successfully addressed the need to enhance their cooperation with EU Member States and the UCPM. However, the lack of an official channel for eligible third countries to express their prevention and preparedness needs is seen as a limiting factor for the relevance of the Programme.

Despite the generally well-aligned needs, **there was considerable variation in the participation of entities from different EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries as PPP beneficiaries.** Reasons attributed to this lower level of participation in the PPP Programme were: administrative burdens, low awareness of the Programme, lack of human and financial resources or experience with the UCPM mechanism and EU funding, reliance on other sources of funding, language barriers, and lower national priority given to tackling natural and man-made hazards.

National authorities considered the PPP Programme particularly relevant in providing innovative solutions to national problems and enhancing cross-border cooperation. Despite the generally well-aligned needs between the PPP Programme and the UCPM, EU Member States and UCPM Participating States, **a minority of needs remained unaddressed.** At UCPM-level, needs that were not sufficiently addressed included the systematic mapping of existing civil protection projects within DG ECHO and by other EU funds, more awareness-raising among the general public, and the inclusion of acute health emergencies. At national level, these needs included innovative capacity-building, cross-sectoral cooperation, early warning systems, and the consideration of long-term societal impacts of disasters.

Factors that hindered the relevance of the PPP Programme to UCPM needs included the lack of multi-annual indicators and monitoring system (at programme level) as well as, to a lesser extent, the low alignment of some proposals with prevention and preparedness needs at either EU level. **Factors that facilitated the alignment of needs** included DG ECHO's formulation of UCPM general and specific objectives when drafting Programme Calls for Proposals, ad hoc consultations with several DG ECHO units and EU institution stakeholders at priority-setting stage, and the merging of the prevention and preparedness calls for proposals. The main obstacle towards the alignment of the PPP Programme with national needs was the lack of a

comprehensive awareness of existing civil protection PPPs at national/EU/UCPM-level. Other hindering factors included the lack of a forum for national stakeholders from eligible third countries to discuss their expectations and needs of the PPP Programme. A factor that facilitated the alignment of needs between the PPP Programme and EU Member States and UCPM Participating States was that some countries had centralised civil protection structures and national civil protection strategies. For eligible third countries, the level of information provided by DG ECHO on the Programme was a positive factor.

The PPP Programme objectives, outcomes, activities and results were relevant for end users. The meaningful involvement of national civil protection authorities throughout project conception and across the PPPs (i.e. through workshops or steering committees) ensured that outputs were tailored to the needs, as well as assuring the human, financial and absorption capacity of the end users. End users' needs that were not sufficiently addressed were the inclusion of local actors in cross-sectoral cooperation and the involvement and meaningful consideration of vulnerable groups.

COVID-19, climate change and the capacity to deal with the increasing intensity and frequency of disasters were perceived as the most important emerging needs across stakeholder categories. The most pertinent emerging needs cutting across sectors and hazards were: 1) climate change, and 2) the capacity to deal with the increasing intensity and frequency of disasters. The most pressing emerging needs specific to a particular hazard type and sector were: 1) the COVID-19 pandemic, 2) rising sea levels, 3) forest fires, 4) urban resilience, 5) cyber threats and 6) more frequent windstorms. These remained broadly similar across the evaluation period, with a recent increase in relevance in public health emergencies. The PPP Programme was suitable to address emerging needs, which were addressed throughout the evaluation period to varying extents. It was also sufficiently flexible to adapt to evolving needs on the ground.

4.4 Coherence

The PPP Programme builds on and provides a basis for other prevention and preparedness-related projects and investments under the UCPM. There was synergy and complementarity between PPPs across the evaluation period, with projects often relying on existing results, tools and methodologies from previous or ongoing PPPs. These synergies were often facilitated where pre-existing activities allowed project stakeholders to meet and/or retain the institutional memory to build on previous PPP results.

There were increasing synergies between the PPP Programme and other EU funded programmes, albeit to varying degrees. Existing tools and procedures to exchange information on results and outputs of PPP projects at EU level for similar activities are either insufficient (e.g. internal consultation processes) or not well advertised (e.g. Community of Users), hampering the development of further synergies with other EU programmes and regional strategies. A comparative analysis of the PPP Programme's objectives and other EU programmes providing financial support to national authorities showed potential for complementarity, alongside some overlap in their operational objectives.

4.5 EU added value

The PPP Programme had substantial EU added value compared to what could have been achieved by EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries at national or regional level. The PPP Programme filled a gap created by the limited availability of funding at national or regional level for cross-border cooperation projects in civil protection. In cases where funding was available, this support alone would not have been sufficient to ensure a cross-border dimension

to the project, limiting the reach, transferability and upscaling possibilities of project outputs.

Compared to alternative sources of EU funding (e.g. Horizon 2020 and INTERREG), the PPP Programme filled a gap in EU support for cooperation between EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries in prevention and preparedness activities. The PPP Programme often provided crucial support for innovative operational civil protection projects, adding credibility and visibility to PPPs and helping project coordinators to attract additional sources of funding for the continuation or upscaling of their preparedness and prevention projects.

4.6 Sustainability

The analysis of a sample of PPPs carried out during the evaluation period suggests that at least half of their outputs and outcomes are highly likely to remain sustainable beyond the end of the project. Here, the sustainability of PPP project outputs and results relates to the extent to which their outcomes last beyond the end of the project. However, this analysis was limited to a sample of 35 PPPs and there is insufficient evidence to formulate a conclusion on the overall degree of sustainability of the Programme.

The uptake of PPP outputs and results varied considerably across PPPs. It was often difficult for PPP project coordinators to measure the reach or impact of their project beyond their own national context. PPPs usually led to improved cooperation between beneficiaries and this was considered highly likely to remain sustainable beyond the end of the project. Fewer PPPs had an impact on policy or investment, however, at least in part because they targeted their impact at operational rather than political level, seeking to contribute through increased awareness, new methodologies, increased capacities or new tools.

Key factors that facilitated the sustainability of PPP results beyond the end of the project included the transfer of knowledge through training activities and capacity-building; development of tools or methodologies that can be used beyond the end of the project; establishment of working procedures between partners, such as Memoranda of Understanding (MoU); risk mitigation planning; and the involvement of civil protection authorities in PPPs, preferably from an early stage of the project. The most prominent factors limiting sustainability were the high turnover of staff (which can lead to loss of the knowledge acquired from PPPs), the limiting effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on planned project activities and the availability of civil protection authorities; and the difficulty and uncertainty experienced by project applicants in trying to secure additional funding for follow-up projects.

5 Recommendations

Table 1. Recommendations

Recommendations
<p>1. Increase awareness, access to and engagement with ongoing and past EU-funded projects on civil protection prevention and preparedness and their results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Currently, there is limited awareness of existing and former projects funded through the PPP Programme and other EU funds on civil protection issues.• DG ECHO could enhance the existing PPP repository of information on past and ongoing PPPs, e.g. by making them searchable by “tags” and disseminate information on EU-funded civil protection prevention and preparedness projects (i.e. existing platforms, such as the Community of Users platform (now the Community of European Research and Innovation for Security (CERIS))¹¹, keep.eu for Interreg projects).• DG ECHO could require PPP applicants to refer to relevant past and ongoing projects by including a dedicated section in the PPP proposal template where applicants would show their mapping of other relevant projects and how they will build on those existing results and foster synergies with ongoing ones.
<p>2. Establish an internal Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting (PMER) framework to assess the performance and quality of the PPP Programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unlike other European Commission Directorates-General that manage funding programmes (e.g. DG Regional and Urban Policy (DG REGIO) and DG Migration and Home Affairs (DG HOME)), no such monitoring or evaluation procedures are established in legislation or ‘soft policy’ measures for the PPP Programme.• DG ECHO should introduce a multi-annual framework to measure performance and achievements (e.g. Performance Measurement Framework - PMF). A PPP Programme-level PMF should include an intervention logic and indicator framework and be aligned with UCPM monitoring and evaluation activities.• DG ECHO should also provide more guidance for project-level indicators, including core common project-level indicators and minimum requirements for indicators (i.e. unit of measurement, target value and baseline value) in order to facilitate aggregating data for monitoring and evaluation at programme level.• Other improvements for monitoring and evaluation include: 1) more systematic and consistent use of Technical Evaluation Sheets, and 2) monitoring of PPP follow-up activities.
<p>3. Introduce clearer requirements of DG ECHO Desk Officers, including enhanced communication and engagement of DG ECHO Desk Officers with PPP beneficiaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To ensure compliance with DG ECHO’s procedures and clearer expectations from the PPP beneficiaries, a document could be produced that specifies the responsibilities of DG ECHO Desk Officers with regards to the management of PPPs.• DG ECHO Desk Officers could provide more technical support and advice throughout project implementation, as well as participate in more project activities (e.g. kick off meetings, workshops). This would also help to increase the credibility of the project with high-level national civil protection authorities and raise awareness of DG ECHO funding.
<p>4. Introduce the possibility to apply for project extensions/expansions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extension request: As provided for by other EU funding mechanisms (e.g. the Interreg Programme), DG ECHO could consider adding the option for PPP beneficiaries to request funding for an additional one year without having to submit a new proposal under the subsequent call for proposals (i.e. by

¹¹ <https://www.securityresearch-cou.eu/node/9215>

submitting "extension requests"). Extension requests should: 1) be available only for PPPs with remaining funds in their budget (by the end of contractual period); 2) demonstrate how they contribute to enhance the impact of the PPP – e.g. outreach, further dissemination, communication activities, etc. - by suggesting additional activities (i.e. not a prolongation of regular project activities) on the basis of the outcomes of the PPP. To avoid that all PPP beneficiaries submit such a request, the option should be limited to projects which fulfil certain criteria (e.g. have successfully achieved a percentage of objectives and activities, maintain the same organisational structure, and present a coherent plan to implement additional activities).

- **Expansion request:** The option to apply for a project expansion (Phase 2) through the submission of a new proposal in the subsequent call for proposals should remain, as some PPP beneficiaries may wish to reconsider the entities involved in the consortium and/ or the thematic/geographic scope of the expanded project. To support the expansion of particularly successful and promising PPPs, DG ECHO could consider introducing an additional and separate budget line for such Phase 2 proposals, which would be evaluated on the basis of, for example: 1) level of success of the Phase 1 project (e.g. achievement of objectives and results); 2) rationale for the conception of a Phase 2 (e.g. enlargement of geographic/ thematic scope, end users, etc.).

5. Continue to further simplify the PPP Programme reporting and monitoring mechanism

- Although the reporting and monitoring mechanism of the PPP Programme is considered less burdensome than other programmes (e.g. Interreg) and was significantly improved through the introduction of the e-Grants system, it could be further enhanced by simplifying project templates, within the confines of standardised templates for all EU-funds which cannot be customised. For example, DG ECHO could consider making it possible to submit the documents in non-PDF format.

6. Facilitate access to national-level data for PPP applicants

- National data relevant for civil protection matters should be more publicly accessible to PPP applicants and beneficiaries. To complement these efforts, DG ECHO could introduce a section in the endorsement form (or letter of support) underlining what national-level data the beneficiaries foresee they will need access to and whether this was granted/denied.

7. Support the creation of a forum where national civil protection authorities from eligible third countries can systematically discuss PPP-related needs and expectations

- There is currently no forum where eligible third country civil protection authorities express their expectations of the PPP Programme and prevention and preparedness needs. DG ECHO could seek ways to make use of existing and/or future fora (e.g. the UCPM Knowledge Network and/or potential PPRD East Regional Cooperation Platform) to promote and perform structured discussions on what needs and expectations national and regional civil protection authorities from eligible third countries have of the PPP Programme.
- Since not all EU Member States and UCPM Participating States will participate in these discussions, an annual survey of the main needs and expectations of eligible third countries regarding the PPP Programme could be carried out and presented at the CPC meetings.

8. Analyse EU and national-level needs prior to CPC meetings

- DG ECHO could conduct an analysis through the UCPM Knowledge Network, expert/technical working groups on national and EU needs and then feed it to CPC meetings, which are not the most appropriate forum to discuss them. Alternatively, a questionnaire could be sent to national authorities to complete, which is then analysed prior to the CPC meeting.

9. Raise awareness on the PPP Programme and provide guidance on how to prepare successful applications

- In some EU Member States, UCPM Participating States and eligible third countries, entities were less successful with PPP applications due to a variety of reasons such as lack of awareness of the Programme and its application process and language barriers. DG ECHO could provide national

authorities with resources from its own information days (i.e. presentations), with information on the PPP Programme, how to apply for PPP funding, lessons learned and successful PPPs. National authorities could hold national 'PPP information days', where these resources - translated into the local language - are presented and distributed.

- Resources could contain general tips on applying for EU funding, which stakeholders also report as barriers to involvement, and be complemented by guidance (i.e. documents, online webinars) on writing a successful PPP application, as well as on particular application aspects (i.e. finding partners).

10. Provide soft guidance on the minimum information that should be provided in applications to national authorities for endorsement

- PPP applications reach national end users with significantly varying amounts of information. DG ECHO could provide soft guidance for national civil protection authorities (as an annex to the endorsement letter) on setting a minimum requirement of information (e.g. proposal abstract, budget, and/or presentation) to be provided by PPP applicants.
- In addition, the soft guidance could include detail on introducing a requirement for PPP applicants to detail the international/national obligations in the field of civil protection prevention and preparedness the PPP proposal helps the national civil protection achieve.

11. Include end users and relevant stakeholders in project design through steering committees and regular workshops

- In the section on end users, DG ECHO could encourage PPP applicants to include details on how they plan to set up committees or regular workshops from project start-up in order to ensure the inclusion of relevant end users and relevant stakeholders in their PPPs.
- DG ECHO could give this section on end user inclusion greater weight in the award criteria.

12. Pay more attention to end users' capacity and sustainability in project proposals

- The sustainability requirement in PPP proposals should require an evaluation of the end users' capacity to incorporate and make effective use of project outputs, alongside a detailed sustainability strategy.
- These elements should be taken into consideration when establishing the award criteria and evaluating project proposals.

13. Place more importance on dissemination activities at proposal stage and introduce more detailed reporting requirements for PPP project coordinators on dissemination activities at project stage

- The evaluation found considerable variation on how dissemination activities are built in projects. At proposal stage, the application form could be revised to include a sub-section in the sustainability criteria for applicants to elaborate on dissemination strategies (i.e. mapping of stakeholders they wish to reach out to and tools they plan to use to do so). DG ECHO could consider increasing the score for the award criteria in this sub-section.
- At project stage, DG ECHO could also consider introducing a common template for reporting on project dissemination activities, as well as minimum requirements for the level of detail provided by project coordinators.

HOW TO OBTAIN EU PUBLICATIONS

Free publications:

- one copy:

via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>);

- more than one copy or posters/maps:
 - from the European Union's representations (http://ec.europa.eu/represent_en.htm);
 - from the delegations in non-EU countries (http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/index_en.htm);
 - by contacting the Europe Direct service (http://europa.eu/europedirect/index_en.htm) or calling 00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11 (freephone number from anywhere in the EU) (*).

(*) The information given is free, as are most calls (though some operators, phone boxes or hotels may charge you).

Priced publications:

- via EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu>).

Priced subscriptions:

- via one of the sales agents of the Publications Office of the European Union (http://publications.europa.eu/others/agents/index_en.htm).

