



<b>Organisation</b>	The Co-operative College
<b>IRENE.T WP</b>	29
<b>Deliverable</b>	28. Exploitation feedback survey and impact analysis report
<b>Annex</b>	Appendices 1-13
<b>Version and date</b>	1 <sup>st</sup> 15.09.2011
<b>Note</b>	To be revised and refined by Partnership

[www.irenetwork.eu](http://www.irenetwork.eu)

Contractor: AS.FOR.IN.  
Via Fratelli Bisogno n. 27, 83100 Avellino - ITALY  
Phone +39(0)825 22711 Fax +39 (0)825 281497  
[www.asforin.it](http://www.asforin.it)  
Project Manager: Lorenzo Corona - lcorona@asforin.it

Coordinator: ASIS Consorzio di Cooperative Sociali  
Via Santa Maria Avvocata n. 2, 80134 Napoli - ITALY  
Phone +39(0)81 5844993 Fax +39(0)81 2141441  
[www.asis.it](http://www.asis.it)  
Project Coordinators: Lorenzo Scirocco (Deputy)/Mario Massa  
(Chief) - irenet\_projectcoordinator@consorzioasis.it

**CONTENTS**

<b>SERIAL NUMBER</b>	<b>TITLE</b>	<b>PAGE NUMBER</b>
1.0	INTRODUCTION	
2.0	TRANSNATIONAL MEETING EVALUATION	
3.0	THE THREE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE	
4.0	LOCAL SEMINARS	
5.0	PRE-NAPLES - FINAL EVALUATION	
6.0	SUMMARY	
7.0	POST PROJECT ACTION PLAN	
8.0	APPENDICES	

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The result from this work package is a final report about the exploitation activities and the impact they registered. During the exploitation period all partners were involved in contacting participating end-users and in registering all feedback. The intermediate results were used to work on refinement of the website, services and products and this report on exploitation will give an overview of the impact. This document will include a synthesis of all recent surveys and evaluations about how the results and how they have impacted on stakeholders, providing indications about the future activities of the Network, in terms of organisation and services.

The IRENE.T Project has been a three-year project that has developed a range of products and services that are made available to organisations and individuals via the project website at [www.irenetwork.eu](http://www.irenetwork.eu). In order to achieve the aims and objectives of the project the partners engaged in a thorough review and evaluation process that challenged each partner and the management of the project to achieve the highest standards. This process took place during transnational meetings in Barcelona, Manchester, Copenhagen and Milan and strove to be constructively critical of the work undertaken and to ensure that there was an effective process of review and ongoing evaluation taking place through two main methodologies

### 1. Peer Evaluation

The partners experience was drawn from academia, training, development, marketing and research and the project brought together a group of professionals who automatically undertook a process of peer review focused on the performance of the professionals within the partnership, with a view to improving quality, upholding standards, and achieving the project's aims and objectives. The professional peer review activities reflect methodologies that are embedded within the educational and research worlds. The peer review aimed to achieve the project objectives and to constantly reach higher order processes to improve the work of the project. Hence, there was a particular focus on the performance of professionals within the partnership and the management of the project.

An important component of the evaluation process was the comparison of actual impacts against the project strategic plan, aims and objectives. In this the partners constantly looked at the original objectives, at what was accomplished and how it was accomplished. This produced formative evaluation i.e. taking place during the life of a project, with the intention of improving the strategy or way of functioning of the project.

### 2. Participant Evaluation

The organisations who were providing research information and background detail for the project were engaged in formative evaluation throughout the project either as a part of the research process or as participants in conferences and seminars. This enabled the project partners to amend and adjust the services and tools that were being prepared at an early stage, thus avoiding wholesale revisions at a later point in the project. These organisations were also involved in the pre-Naples summative evaluation process. Formative and summative evaluation is often seen as a theoretically informed approach but it was tailored in the IRENE.T project towards the approach, needs, purpose and methodology of the project itself.

From the theoretical perspective evaluation is seen as a systematic, rigorous, and meticulous application of methods to assess the design, implementation, improvement or outcomes of a project. It is a resource-intensive process, requiring resources, evaluator expertise, labour, time and a sizeable budget

Within the IRENET project the partners aimed to undertake a critical assessment, in as objective a manner as possible in order to assist some audience to assess the projects value and to focus on facts as well as value laden judgments of the projects outcomes and worth.

## 2.0 TRANSNATIONAL MEETING EVALUATION

Through the key transnational meetings the partnership undertook a thorough and challenging process of evaluation.

### 1. Barcelona

The project got off to an uncertain and delayed start due largely to a change of management of the project. This deeply affected some of the members of the project as well as losing significant institutional knowledge regarding the project. The Barcelona meeting adopted a partly confrontational approach to address issues that had been dormant or neglected for some time. This proved useful in giving the project the beginning of a new direction and enabling partners to be clearer about their role and purpose in the project. See Appendix 1.

### 2. Manchester

The meeting in Manchester proved to be a positive one and led to a detailed action plan recorded by an independent minute taker. This meeting was run along side a conference for social enterprises and enabled the partnership to build on the work begun in Barcelona and to prepare a further detailed action plan. (see Appendix 2).

### 3. Copenhagen

The Copenhagen was a well structured meeting that again let to much debate about the quality and level of the products and services as well as the management of the project. This meeting let to a detailed initial action plan that undertook to move the project forward in meeting its objectives (see Appendix 3)

### 4. Milan

At the Transnational meeting and conference in Milan in May 2011 the partners and the participants to the conference took part in a lengthy evaluation of the website and its products and services. See Appendix 3. In this process they were asked to review the outcomes of the project and to complete a series of questionnaire that sought their opinion in a detailed way regarding the:

- General project background and information
- Chart of Competencies
- Map of the Third Sector
- Guidelines on Dialogue and Co-operation

In response to the questions about the project background and information the respondents identified a number of clear strengths including the:

- ✓ building of a strong and relevant network
- ✓ creation of a different type of network with a powerful European dimension as resource
- ✓ development of a range of useful tools designed to improve and enhance social enterprises across Europe and to develop dialogue within the Third Sector and its stakeholders

- ✓ IRENE.T project as an agent of change and developing the European perspective

The respondents also identified clear and potential weaknesses in the outcomes of the project including:

- ✓ some tools were not complete at the point of the evaluation
- ✓ there was evidence that only partial use of information collected was being made
- ✓ it was hard for some respondent to understand the concept of the external stakeholder
- ✓ for those with low linguistic competencies accessibility was limited as the website is only available in Italian and English
- ✓ certain services appeared to be unconnected with different structures being used to prepare and present them
- ✓ a lack of an effective project summary to enable an easy understanding of the website and its products and services
- ✓ there was no easy search engine available

At the end of this meeting the final detailed action plan was prepared and all partners agreed to meet the targets and dates set. (see Appendix 4)

### 3.0 THE THREE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRES

As a result of the activities undertaken in Milan a series of recommendations were made regarding the improvement of each topic and this led to a detailed action plan in which all partners undertook to complete the work necessary to meet the requirements of their peers and the external participants.

#### A. THE CHART OF COMPETENCIES (Now Methods for Third Sector Implementation – METI)

##### Recommendations

- ✓ A more uniform and user-friendly layout was needed for the website to be effective
- ✓ The website filter system is too complex and is not easy to understand
- ✓ It is necessary to create a fit for purpose filter system to enable ease of access on a word search or topic based approach
- ✓ There were several formal errors with diverse tools that need to be corrected i.e. failed links
- ✓ It is necessary to separate the levels and the target group as they are very similar in the current website. Researchers need to be able to filter their search and be more specific than they are currently enabled to be

See Appendix 5

#### B. MAP OF THIRD SECTOR (Now MATS)

##### Recommendations

- ✓ The creation of a “Wiki tool” would be useful
- ✓ The map needs to be interactive
- ✓ There is a lack of clarity in the words and phrases used as they are not written by a native speaker. The contents need to be reviewed by a native English speaker.
- ✓ A help and guidelines section should be created
- ✓ The filters used are not clear
- ✓ It is not easy to deselect options
- ✓ Some summaries of the Third Sector are too short and need expansion
- ✓ The layout is not clear and it is not user friendly
- ✓ The name of the service is ambiguous compared to visible contents
- ✓ There is no visible link with research examples
- ✓ The data is not coherent and homogeneous i.e. some have links, some phone number, some just description
- ✓ There needs to be much more text and some additional links about different types of education or training
- ✓ A clear method of enabling updates should be created
- ✓ The rationale for this section needs to be clearer
- ✓ A free or commercial option for training offer should be added
- ✓ The links should be to the organisations' training web page (wherever possible) and not to organisation home page

See Appendix 6

## C. GUIDELINES ON DIALOGUE AND COOPERATION (Now DiaCo4)

### Recommendations

- ✓ The first part of this section (WP and technical information) is not interesting for external stakeholders
- ✓ There are technical problems with accessing the information
- ✓ The attachments section was not clearly visible
- ✓ Ensure organisational logos are present and correct
- ✓ Review the information and data for currency
- ✓ Contents need to be more accessible to stakeholders i.e. delete internal language such as Work package etc
- ✓ DK and SE are not included and this needs to be corrected
- ✓ Ensure that there is a list or an explanation of acronyms (IRENET, MOSE, VET, technical terms)
- ✓ Consider using an alternative description to Case study as this is not accurate term
- ✓ Some descriptions are too short to be a Good practice
- ✓ Improve the organisation of file names

See Appendix 7.

The completion of these questionnaires resulted in the development of a Post Milan Action Plan (see Appendix 4). For detail on the outcomes of each questionnaire see Appendices 5 (Chart of Competencies), 6 (Map of the Third Sector) and 7 Guidelines on Dialogue and Co-operation.

The majority of the points identified in the above evaluation were auctioned in the revision and updating of the website and the project services and products.

## 4.0 LOCAL SEMINARS

A series of local seminars were held throughout the project and these were delivered to local enterprises, VET institutions, individuals and other organisations interested in the work of the IRENE.T project. Their purpose was to inform and interact with the participants and led to further evaluation and feedback for each partner.

	PARTNER	PLACE/COUNTRY	DATE	Topic
1.	Consorzio Alta Irpinia	Lioni (AV)/Italy	17 March 2010	Good practices in third sector training on local basis
2.	CEBS	Wroclaw/Poland	15 April 2010	The contribution of Training to the Polish Third Sector
3.	Amledo	Stockholm/Sweden	24 April 2010	Training for employees in the social economy

4.	VHS	Taunusstein/Germany	28 October 2010	Vocational education in Europe - numerous ways, one aim
5.	HOU	Athens/Greece	1 November 2010	The Chart of Competencies in TS enterprises
6.	VHS	Ljubljana/Slovenja	27 January 2011	State of dialogue and co-operation in the Third Sector in Slovenia
7.	Casa Caritat	Valls (Catalunya)/Spain	16 June 2011	Corporate Social Responsibility, Social Networking and Training.
8.	APOPSI	Greece	22 September 2011	The future of social enterprises

## 5.0 PRE-NAPLES FINAL EVALUATION

Prior to the final Naples Transnational meeting and conference a final evaluation was carried out by the partnership. Building on the information provided in the "Sustainability Plan" (see Appendix 8 and the creation of the new IRENE.T website the final evaluation was planned involving the partners, stakeholders and affiliates. It was decided to involve as many new members as possible and to provide them with a chance to test and evaluate the website, products and services.

Each partner was requested to contact at least 5 social enterprises within or outside of its own networks and invite the organisations to join the IRENE.T network through the website. After joining each organisation was requested to evaluate the IRENE.T services by using the four online questionnaires. The key findings from this evaluation are shown below and the detail is at Appendices 9, 10, 11 and 12.

A full presentation of the results and comparisons was made to the Milan meeting and conference and the PowerPoint is at Appendix 13.

In Milan in May 2011 a clear set of strengths and weaknesses of the products and services were identified by the participants. These also provided the starting point for the pre-Naples evaluation and included:

### STRENGTHS

- Network
- European dimension as resource
- Useful tools to improving the European dimension
- Developing dialogue among the Third Sector and stakeholders
- Tool for the Third Sector to increase/improve networking
- A change of perspective

### WEAKNESSES

- Some tools not yet complete
- Partial use of information collected
- Hard to understand for external stakeholder
- Low linguistic accessibility
- Structure of services unconnected
- Lack of project summary
- No easy search engine

## PRE-NAPLES QUESTIONNAIRES

Respondents were requested to complete the four questionnaire in one sitting enabling the collection of data and a standard approach to the exercise.

### General Questionnaire

Qu1. Which Country are you from?

Italy	20%
Denmark	4%
Germany	8%
Greece	4%
Spain	0%
Poland	0%
Slovenia	20%
Sweden	8%
United Kingdom	36%

Qu2. Which type of social enterprise are you from?

Co-operative	24%
Educational Agency (VET)	36%
Foundation	4%
Association	8%
University	4%
Institutional Body	0%
Other	24%

Qu3. Who are (mainly) the final users of your project?

Children	27%
Teen-agers	45%
Elder	50%
General disease families	23%
Drop-out	18%
Homeless	9%
Drugs and alcohol addicted	18%
Migrants	23%
Lonely mothers	5%
Lonely fathers	0%

Unable people	27%
Other	18%

Qu4. What is your role?

Director	20%
Executive manager	8%
Manager	44%
Administrator	12%
Field worker	4%
Volunteer	8%
Member	0%
Other	4%

Qu5. How long has your social enterprise been established?

Less than 5 years	8%
5-10 years	40%
10-15 years	28%
15-20 years	4%
20-30 years	4%
More than 30 years	16%

Qu6. How have you been able to apply IRENE.T services to your organisations?

- Using the tools to inform and advise those running the organisation.
- We have used them within the organisation.
- We have been able to show them to clients and encourage them to register and to use them in their organisations.
- The information provided has been very useful in preparing the organisations people development plans
- The information has been valuable but we have not really had an opportunity to implement it.

Qu7. What are the lessons your organisation has learnt from IRENE.T services?

- Added value of the seminars and workshop
- We have gained a wider perspective in the European SE scene
- We use the tools for education analysis
- The complexity of the social enterprise sector and the differences between countries
- There is a very varied social enterprise network in Europe with a very wide understanding of what a social enterprise is.

- How big and diverse the social enterprises sector is across Europe.
- We now have a source of information and support that can assist us greatly.
- The sharing of experiences
- Too early to say but we are hopeful.

Q8. If your organisation has used IRENE.T services, how has your organisation changed or develop as a result?

- More robust teaching
- Improving knowledge to reflect on the way we develop employees
- It has contributed to the development of people in the organization
- It is too early to comment on this
- Not applicable in terms of usage but very helpful as an information source
- We are testing it now Services have not been yet experienced on my Organization

Comments on the website

- The graphic is very static and needs to be more active and engaging as a modern website should be. The colours, background and text are good
- The website is quite flat or one dimensional and would benefit from more movement, improved graphics and more ways to engage users
- The website is very 'flat' and would be better if it had updates on the homepage and was more interactive
- I think this is a very useful website and I look forward to using its tools and services in the future
- This is a very interesting website and we hope to make good use of it
- In my opinion there is sometimes too much text and a lot of descriptions.
- Needs to be available on other languages

NB: In the following three questionnaires the positive variations from the Milan baseline have been highlighted in bold green. Negative movements are shown in bold red. Neutral responses are in black.

#### DiaCo4 - (Previously Dialogue and Co-operation Questionnaire)

Qu 1. The accessibility from the IRENE.T portal to the service “Guidelines on dialogue and cooperation in the TS and between Ts and VET” is:

	Milan	Naples
Fast, simple and very user-friendly	47%	<b>57%</b>
Simple and user friendly, but slow access	20%	<b>29%</b>
Fast, but complicated and not clear	13%	<b>14%</b>
Slow access, unintelligible and not user-friendly	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	20%	<b>0%</b>

Qu 2. The layout of service is:

	Milan	Naples

Appealing	13%	29%
Easily understandable	47%	57%
Unattractive	7%	7%
Confusing	27%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	7%	7%

Qu3. The aim and goals of the service are:

	Milan	Naples
Very clear	13%	22%
Clear	47%	57%
Not clear	33%	21%
Unintelligible	0%	0%
I don't know	7%	0%
Other	0%	0%

Qu4. The contents of the service are

	Milan	Naples
In-line with the project's general aims	53%	7%
In-line with service's specific aims	27%	79%
Not-in-line with the project's general aims	0%	7%
Not-in line with service's specific aims	7%	0%
I don't know	7%	0%
Other	7%	7%

Qu5. Does the service facilitate communication and cooperation between Third Sector and education?

	Milan	Naples
Very satisfying	0%	22%
Satisfying	53%	71%
Unsatisfactory	27%	7%
Very unsatisfactory	0%	0%
I don't know	13%	0%
Other	7%	0%

Qu6. For your organisation, the application of the service "Guidelines on dialogue and co-operation in the TS and between TS and VET" could be

	Milan	Naples
Very relevant	13%	43%
Relevant	47%	57%
Irrelevant	20%	0%
Very irrelevant	7%	0%
I don't know	7%	0%
Other	6%	0%

### Potential improvements to DiaCo4

- A better introduction and an improved breakdown of the sections
- It needs to become more interactive
- It could be made up of smaller sections and indexed
- The information was very good but it took a while to understand it and to be clear about it

### Main strengths of the “DiaCo4”.

- There is a great deal of detail and it could be very useful to people with the time to explore it
- The information contained here is very useful and detailed
- It gives a very interesting basis for dialogue
- The in-depth research that has been done to assemble the information

### METI ( Previously THE CHART OF COMPETENCIES)

QU1. The accessibility from the IRENE.T portal to the service e “Chart of competencies” is

	Milan	Naples
Fast, simple and very user-friendly	14%	50%
Simple and user-friendly, but slow access	21%	33%
Fast, but complicated and not clear	50%	11%
Slow access, unintelligible and not user-friendly	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	14%	6%

Qu2. The layout and presentation of service is:

	Milan	Naples
Appealing	0%	28%
Easily understandable	50%	44%
Unattractive	21%	17%
Confusing	21%	6%

I don't know	0%	0%
Other	7%	0%

Qu3. Aims and goals of service are:

	Milan	Naples
Very clear	0%	28%
Clear	71%	56%
Not clear	29%	11%
Unintelligible	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	0%	5%

Qu4. The contents of the service are:

	Milan	Naples
In-line with the project's general aims	36%	39%
In-line with service's specific aims	29%	44%
Not-in-line with the project's general aims	0%	6%
Not-in-line with service's specific aims	14%	0%
I don't know	14%	0%
Other	7%	11%

Qu5. Does the service facilitate professional and training needs analysis for the empowerment of the Third Sector organisations?

	Milan	Naples
Very satisfying	7%	17%
Satisfying	36%	67%
Unsatisfactory	21%	6%
Very unsatisfactory	0%	0%
I don't know	21%	0%
Other	14%	11%

Qu6. For your organisation, the application of the service e) "Chart of competencies" could be:

	Milan	Naples
Very relevant	14%	28%

Relevant	43%	50%
Irrelevant	14%	6%
Very irrelevant	7%	0%
I don't know	14%	6%
Other	7%	10%

### Potential Improvement to "METI"

- Regular updating.
- Break the sections down into bite sized chunks to increase the immediacy of their use.
- Clearer descriptions.
- Make it available in each EU language.

### Main strengths of the "METI"

- Development is aimed at enabling large and small organisations to participate
- The detail is excellent and the tools provided are very useful.
- The quality of content and the ability to select the material that is more interesting for each sector of the organization.
- This is a user friendly and detailed website.
- The quality of information offered.
- It allows you to share and exchange good practices at a EU level.

### MATS - Map of the Third Sector Questionnaire

Qu1. The accessibility from the IRENE.T portal to the service 7 “Map of the Third Sector” is

	Milan	Naples
Fast, simple and very user-friendly	50%	69%
Simple and user-friendly, but slow access	13%	19%
Fast, but complicated and not clear	25%	12%
Slow access, unintelligible and not user-friendly	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	13%	0%

Qu2. The layout and presentation of service is:

	Milan	Naples
Appealing	0%	38%
Easily understandable	56%	50%
Unattractive	13%	12%
Confusing	19%	0%

I don't know	0%	0%
Other	13%	0%

Qu3. Aims and goals of service are:

	Milan	Naples
Very clear	6%	25%
Clear	56%	63%
Not clear	19%	6%
Unintelligible	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	19%	6%

Qu4. The contents of the service are:

	Milan	Naples
In-line with the project's general aims	25%	50%
In-line with service's specific aims	44%	44%
Not-in-line with the project's general aims	0%	6%
Not-in line with service's specific aims	19%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	13%	0%

Qu5. Does the service facilitate to understand the characteristics of the Third Sector at European level and related professional profiles?

	Milan	Naples
Very satisfying	13%	38%
Satisfying	25%	44%
Unsatisfactory	31%	13%
Very unsatisfactory	0%	0%
I don't know	0%	0%
Other	31%	5%

Qu6. For your organisation, the application of the service "Map of the Third Sector" could be:

	Milan	Naples
Very relevant	6%	31%
Relevant	50%	63%
Irrelevant	13%	0%

Very irrelevant	6%	0%
I don't know	6%	0%
Other	19%	6%

### Potential improvements to “MATS”

- Change the layout of each page. It is difficult to follow and should be broken down into each country with breaks and not just one long page.
- Include information on the legal framework for each country.
- There is too much blank space.
- Regular updating will be needed and a method of engaging new members.
- Perhaps some pictures can be added to make it more appealing.

## 6.0 SUMMARY

The results from the questionnaires completed prior to the Naples conference and final meeting are positive and show many improvements based on the baseline of the Milan evaluation. Importantly the pre-Naples outcomes show significant improvement and give positive indication of the impacts that the IRENE.T project, acting as a change agent, has had across the nine countries that it has been working in.

The following areas of impact were noted by respondents:

### THE WEBSITE

- Now AAA compliant
- Extensive re-organisation of the website, its products and services
- Website highly accessible
- Creation of email community with ability to make posts to whole community
- Improved perception of the IRENET project
- Enhanced understanding of the website and its content
- Enabling the sharing of experiences
- Assisting the development of more robust teaching
- A very useful website with tools and services for us to use in the future
- A user friendly and detailed website.
- High quality information offered.

### PRODUCTS AND SERVICES

- Using the tools to inform and advise those running the organisation
- Using the products and services with clients
- Encouraging clients and organizations to register as IRENE.T affiliates
- Very useful in preparing organizational people development plans
- Using the tools for education analysis
- Improving knowledge to reflect on the way we develop employees
- It has contributed to the development of people in the organisation
- The detail is excellent and the tools provided are very useful

### KNOWLEDGE AND INFORMATION

- Added value of the seminars and workshop
- A wider perspective in the European Social Enterprise scene
- Understanding the complexity of the social enterprise sector and the differences between countries
- Appreciating that there is a very varied social enterprise network in Europe
- Building a very wide understanding of what a social enterprise is.
- Realising how big and diverse the social enterprise sector is across Europe.
- Providing a source of information and support that can assist us greatly.

### NETWORKING

- Number of affiliates doubled from May to September 2011
- It gives a very interesting basis for dialogue
- In-depth research and valuable information to aid networking
- Development is aimed at enabling large and small organisations to participate
- The quality of content and the ability to select the material that is more interesting for each sector of the organisation
- It allows you to share and exchange good practices at a EU level

## 7.0 POST PROJECT ACTION PLAN

The action plan at this stage is limited and focusses mainly on refinement and regular updating based on the feedback from the respondents. The action plan should include the following points:

### General Website Issues

- The website could be more interactive, engaging and less static
- Make it available in each EU language.
- Regular updating will be needed and a method of engaging new members.
- Perhaps some pictures can be added to make it more appealing.

### Potential improvements to DiaCo4

- A better introduction and an improved breakdown of the sections.
- It could be made up of smaller sections and indexed.
- The information was very good but it took a while to understand it and to be clear about it.

### Potential Improvement to "METI"

- Break the sections down into bite sized chunks to increase the immediacy of their use.
- Clearer descriptions.

### Potential improvements to "MATS"

- Change the layout of each page. It is difficult to follow and should be broken down into each country with breaks and not just one long page.
- Include information on the legal framework for each country.
- There is too much blank space.

## 8.0 APPENDICES

Appendix Number	Appendix Content
1	Minutes - Barcelona Transnational Meeting
2	Minutes – Manchester Transnational Meeting
3	Minutes – Copenhagen Transnational Meeting
4	Post Milan Action Plan
5	Milan Evaluation – Chart of Competences (METI)
6	Milan Evaluation - Map of the Third Sector (MATS)
7	Milan Evaluation - Guidelines on Dialogue and Co-operation (DiaCo4)
8	IRENE.T Project Sustainability Plan
9	Pre-Naples Evaluation – General Questionnaire
10	Pre-Naples Evaluation – METI (Chart of Competences)
11	Pre-Naples Evaluation – MATS ( Map of the Third Sector)
12	Pre-Naples Evaluation - DiaCo4 (Guidelines on Dialogue and Co-operation)
13	Naples Conference WP9, Del 28, Presentation