



**HEALTH-NCP-NET**

<http://www.healthncpnet.eu>

**Your Support Network**





# HEALTH-NCP-NET

## Project and evaluation results

Joint meeting of the  
Advisory Board of External Experts (ABEE),  
the Quality Assurance Panel (QAP) and  
the Project Executive Committee (PEC)

Frankfurt, 3-4 March 2010

Almudena Gonzalez  
Marta Barrionuevo  
Katharina Kuss



Instituto  
de Salud  
Carlos III



# What is HEALTH-NCP-NET ?



- HEALTH-NCP-NET is a network of Health National Contact Points (NCPs) and Contact Points (CPs) in non-European countries
- HEALTH-NCP-NET is a project funded by the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme (FP7) of the European Commission
- HEALTH-NCP-NET started in May 2008 for the period of 4 years

## Overall objective

Improve Health NCP and ICPC CP service under FP7



Higher quality of submitted proposals



Instituto  
de Salud  
Carlos III



# Mission of HEALTH-NCP-NET



- To improve the Health NCP services across Europe and beyond
- To provide all Health NCPs and ICPC CPs with the necessary tools, guidelines and training to carry out their duty efficiently
- To create a dynamic network which will allow
  - the exchange of experiences and best practices
  - learning from each other
- To provide a service which will result in a higher quality of submitted proposals
- To enlarge the CP community beyond Europe



Instituto  
de Salud  
Carlos III



SEVENTH FRAMEWORK  
PROGRAMME



# First year achievements



- Awareness raising on Ethics
- Increased expertise of Health NCPs by General and Specific Training courses, Staff Exchange and Twinning Programme
- Increased interactions and more direct communication between NCPs as a result of networking
- Better flow of information and wider dissemination as a result of networking with other projects
- Reaching International Cooperation Partner Countries



# Evaluation



## Executive summary

- **HEALTH-NCP-NET has demonstrated good capacities of planning and plan implementation, and good networking and collaboration among partners.**
- **Good progress** (the project has achieved most of its objectives and technical goals for the period with relatively minor deviations).

## Overall recommendations

- The structure of the project, organised in four comprehensive WPs, is reasonable and **does not need corrections or re-shaping.**
- All together it would be good to see greater feedback from the beneficiaries with least experience of the NCP and CP roles. They should be more strongly represented on the QAP.



# Objectives and Workplan



**Have the objectives for the period been achieved?**

**Partially**, the large majority of the deliverables in year 1 were achieved. However, several of the deliverables are in very preliminary form.

**Has each work package (WP) been making satisfactory progress in relation to the Description of Work ?**

**Yes**, there are shortfalls on deliverables, but if the reasons are understood then the progress is definitely satisfactory.

**Have planned milestones and deliverables been achieved for the reporting period?**

Technically the answer is “partially” but as explained in a. above the better answer is **yes**, since some were too ambitious for best delivery.



Instituto  
de Salud  
Carlos III



# Status of Deliverables



2.10	Assessment report on staff exchanges to be sent by the WP Leader to the Coordinator	No	A pro-active action to implement the staff exchange will need to be taken, as it does not seem to work if left on a voluntary basis.
2.11	Health NCP handbook	No	Delivery, due by month 12, has been postponed.
3.11	Standard forms to exchange information (partner profile/search)	Partial	It is not clear where these forms are published and how their use will be implemented. No mention is made in the first year report.
4.1	Mapping of ICPC CPs' offices / assessment needs based on SWOT analysis	Yes	It is notable that only half of the ICPC CP contacted have responded (13). This issue needs to be tackled and data from as many ICPC CP as possible should be collected.
4.7	Geographical mapping of research excellence	Partial	special effort should be made to increase participation and improve the mapping



# Objectives relevant and achievable?



Are the objectives for the coming periods still relevant? **YES**

Are the objectives for the coming periods still achievable within the time and resources available to the project? **YES**



# Resources



To the best of your estimate, have resources used, i.e. personnel resources and other major cost items, been utilised for achieving the progress?

**YES**

...in a manner consistent with the principle of economy, efficiency and effectiveness?

**YES**



# Implementation



**Has the project management been performed as required?**

**YES, ...** It is impressive how much the project had kept to task and to time from the start of year 1. ... The PEC has a clear view of its goals, and it has a strong hold on delivery.

**Has the collaboration between the beneficiaries been effective?**

**YES, ...** The co-leader arrangement has not been the subject of any report, which was always to be an important aspect of enhancing the skills and knowledge of newer NCPs.

**Do you identify evidence of underperforming beneficiaries, lack of commitment or change of interest of any beneficiaries?**

**NO,** the PEC members seem to be very active in drawing their NCP partners into engagement.



# Use and Dissemination



Is there evidence that the project has/will produce significant scientific, technical, commercial, social, or environmental impacts (where applicable)? **Partially**

Is the plan for the use of foreground, including any update, appropriate? Namely, please comment on the plan for the exploitation and use of foreground for the consortium as a whole, or for individual beneficiary or groups of beneficiaries and its progress to date. **Partially**

Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results and information adequately (publications, conferences...)? **YES**

Are potential users and other stakeholders (outside the consortium) suitably involved? **Partially**

Is the consortium interacting in a satisfactory manner with other related Framework Programme projects or other R&D national/international programmes, standardization bodies?  
**YES**



# Other Issues



**Have policy-related and/or regulatory issues been properly handled ?**

**Yes**, it is impressive how formally these issues have been addressed, with a separate ABEE in addition to the PSC and QAP. ... PSC decisions to modify the project implementation seem to have been very sensible.

**Have ethical issues been appropriately handled?**

**Yes**, the EAWG seems to have achieved early visibility and to have been used and appreciated by NCPs and researchers.

**Has progress on Gender Equality Actions been satisfactory?**

**Yes**, ... is more than evident that most of the involved NCPs, both in Europe and in ICPC countries are females.



# Recommendations from ABEE and QAP



- Success story, movie
- Measure NCP success: contact with researchers vs success
- WP1: E-mail alert about new postings on web site
- WP2: Use new media: Facebook, Wikipedia, YouTube
- WP2: ICPC participation in training activities is recommended
- WP3: article on NIH program to be published on web page
- WP3: strategy on networking activities: network goes to conferences where the EC is present, increase visibility of NCPs and network in own country
- WP4: brokerage events in ICPC, Asia (India, China), Latin America (Argentina, Brasil). Identify good opportunities
- WP4: Letter supporting nomination of ICPC CPs





Thanks for your attention !

Questions and Suggestions are welcome!!

Instituto de Salud Carlos III  
Sinesio Delgado 6, Pabellón 6  
ES-28029 Madrid  
+34 91 822 2171

Almudena Gonzalez [agonzalez@isciii.es](mailto:agonzalez@isciii.es)

Marta Barrionuevo [mbarrionuevo@isciii.es](mailto:mbarrionuevo@isciii.es)

Gonzalo Arevalo: [garevalo@isciii.es](mailto:garevalo@isciii.es)

Katharina Kuss [kkuss@isciii.es](mailto:kkuss@isciii.es)

