



Final Quality Report

Stress Prevention Activities for the Road Transport Drivers and SME
(SPA-ROAD) 2010-1-ES1-LEO05-21000





This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



FINAL QUALITY REPORT





ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present report has been prepared by Wisamar Bildungsgesellschaft within the framework of SPA-ROAD project (2010-1-ES1-LEO05-21000) in collaboration with:



Table of Contents

1. Introduction
2. Meeting Evaluation Reports
3. Summary Self Evaluation & Monitoring
 - 3.1 WP 1 Project Management and coordination
 - 3.2 WP 2 Analysis of the state of the art of Stress Prevention
Training in road Transport
 - 3.3 WP 3 Update and Adapt the SPA contents
 - 3.4 WP 4 Development of the training platform
 - 3.5 WP 5 Validation of the training platform
 - 3.6 WP 6 Valorization
 - 3.7 WP 7 Monitoring and evaluation
3. Interim Evaluation Questionnaire Results
4. Final Evaluation Questionnaire Results
5. Summary

1. Introduction

The Final Quality Report intends to evaluate and present the activities developed in the framework of the SPA-ROAD project - Stress Prevention Activities for the Road Transport Drivers and SMEs (2010-1-ES1-LEO05-21000) - by its partners during the two years project period. It summarizes the four meeting evaluation reports and the four self evaluation and monitoring reports, as well as the final evaluation questionnaire of the second project year. The results are seen in relation to the activities and the activities deadlines determined in the application form.

2. Meeting Evaluation Reports

The meeting evaluation reports are based on questionnaires handed out after the project meetings in Piraeus, Nagykovácsi, Paris and Valladolid. The participants were asked about their degree of satisfaction concerning:

- Work sessions
- Partnership
- Meeting

Meeting in Piraeus, Greece

In the first evaluation report the most valued aspects were the *exchange of experience and know-how* as well as *the development of positive attitudes towards Europe and transnational activities*.

The *realistic timescales* (4,20), the *extent to which each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan* (4,40) and the *clear evidence in the workplan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners* (4,40) have been the least valued aspects of the first evaluation report. Given the fact that these aspect were valued with 4,20 and 4,40 out of a total of 5 by the partners no real weaknesses accrued. Moreover some of these aspects, such as for example the realistic timescale and the *clear evidence in the workplan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners* was rated with a gradually higher score of 4,40 and 4,60 in the second evaluation.

The meeting in Piraeus was rated very good. Particularly *the clear planning, realistic timescales, appropriate selection of participants* and the point *appropriate prior information issued to participants / relevance and quality of materials issued during the event* were evaluated as positive aspects. Contrary to that the *appropriate content, relevant mixture of presentations* were rated with the least value. But with respect to the fact that the lowest score was 4,2 out of 5 no really weak points have to be considered.

Meeting in Nagykovácsi, Hungary

The second evaluation forms were handed out after the second meeting in Nagykovácsi. As a positive aspect the *detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans and clarity of project co-ordination* and the *willingness of all partners to resolve problems* were mentioned. As weak points were considered, the *effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe* as well as the *extent to which each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan*. The meeting in Nagykovácsi was also assessed very positive. So the *appropriate content, relevant mixture of presentations* and the *evidence that the needs and expectations of participants have been taken into account* were both rated with the highest level.

All in all it can be said, that the partnership rated itself with an overall average of 4,70 as very good. The 5 level rating scale from poor (1) to high (5) showed no result lower than 4,1.

In the second evaluation questionnaire some partners used the opportunity to give comments. One partner pointed out in the qualitative part that most of the partners do not have the specialised knowledge of stress factors in the road transport sector. Therefore this partner at this point of the project still had some concerns about one of the next project steps during that project phase, the writing of the modules.

Another person remarked that not all deadlines were met, but finally the project workplan was in time. In addition to that, one person emphasized that the working atmosphere has been very good. The good cooperation between the workgroup leaders of WP3 and WP4 allowed a better understanding of the transfer process and the development of the SPA-Road training content. Besides, the good organization of the meeting in Budapest was mentioned.

Meeting in Paris, France

The third project meeting took place in Paris, France. In the meeting evaluation, the partner mentioned the *clear rationale and clarity of objectives, the willingness to resolve problems of participants, clear evidence in the work plan of sharing roles and responsibilities amongst partners* as well as *the location of the hotel* as most positive aspects. The least valued aspects have been *the realistic timescales, the development of teamwork, the exchange of experience and know-how* and *the facilities at the hotel*. With 4,61 the transnational partnership itself is seen as very good in the qualitative part.

All in all it can be noted, that the partners of SPA-Road project rate the project progress very positive. In comparison to the second Evaluation Report in October 2011 slide degradation can be pronounced, as the overall average was 4,70.

In the qualitative part one partner pointed out the brevity and the productivity of the meeting in Paris. No further information was given through the comments of the partners.

Meeting in Valladolid, Spain

The forth and final project meeting took place in Valladolid, Spain from 27th to 28th of September 2012. The meeting evaluation by all partners stated that there are slight doubts concerning the *effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe, the quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project, the realistic timescales, the clear evidence in the work plan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners*. The facilities at the hotel in Valladolid are as well amongst the least valued facts.

Nevertheless with 4,50 the transnational partnership itself is seen as very good in the qualitative part, scoring just a little bit less than in the third meeting evaluation questionnaire in Paris. On the other hand the *detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans and clarity of project coordination, the clear rationale and clarity of objectives, the quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/ European level*. The *willingness to resolve problems* and *the appropriate prior information issued to participants / relevance* as well as the *quality of materials issued during the event* were as well the most valued aspects of the whole project development and meeting. Some of the most and least valued aspects were evaluated the same throughout the duration of the project, while some aspects, such as the *realistic timescales*

or the *effectiveness and clarity of communication with account being taken of any language difficulties*, could be improved.

Overall with respect to the fact that again the lowest score was 4,00 out of 5 no really weak points had to be considered. Another very positive fact that as to be stated for the whole two years project period.

3. Summary Self Evaluation & Monitoring

The following results are based on the self evaluation questionnaires as well as on the publication and/or distribution of the relevant project outcomes/products.

3.1 WP 1 Project Management and coordination

The planned products of the WP 1 are *the Interim Report, the Final Report* as well as the *Transnational meeting dossier*. The work package leader was TCM-UGT Castilla y León. In the activities of the work package were some slight delays, concerning the financial reports, but nevertheless it can be stated, the work package “Project Management and coordination” was completed very successfully and without any further problems.

The first product, *the Interim Report* was finished in time on 30 November 2011, as well as the *Final Report* and the *Transnational Meetings Dossier*, that were expected to be ready on 30 November 2011.

3.2 WP 2 Analysis of the state of the art of Stress Prevention Training in road Transport

Two products were planned in the work package Analysis of the state of the art of Stress Prevention Training in road Transport, led by XXI INVESLAN S.L. – the *Methodological Tool Dossier* and the *Report of the state-of-the-art of stress prevention training in road transport*.

The *Methodological Tool Dossier* was sent to the partners on 5 January 2011 and served as basis for the country reports. Therefore it was finished in time. In the following month, every partner

had to develop a nation report on the state of the art of Stress Prevention Training in road Transport in his country.

Some partners needed more time than planned to complete their national reports, the coordinator team brought the state of the art report on the agenda of the kick-off meeting in Piraeus. During this first meeting all partners presented the draft versions. Some slight adaptations were needed in the common report and so the final version was published with a slight delay of approximately one month in March 2011.

3.3 WP 3 Update and Adapt the SPA contents

IDEC S.A was the work package leader of the WP 3 Update and Adapt the SPA ROAD contents. The *Training Platform Dossier* was the product of this WP. It was first finished in a draft version in July 2011, before the official deadline. The final document was available after a few improvements in September 2011 at the project platform to be accessed by all partners. It established the guidelines to adapt the SPA training contents to the target group and included outlines for the structure of the platform.

3.4 WP 4 Development of the training platform

The *Methodological dossier for the elaboration of the contents and training platform* is the first product of the work package 4 Development of the training platform, let by NET-MEX. The draft version was available in September 2011. After some improvements the final document was posted on the forum with a delay of three month at the beginning of October 2011.

The working stage of WP 3 and WP 4 marked itself by a very strong cooperation by the work package leaders. Through the fruitful and productive teamwork and cooperation between the project partners, they not only improved both documents, but made sure that each partner has a clear understanding of the training platform and its content. It resulted in the comprehensive products of the WP 3 und WP 4 - *Training platform dossier* and the *Methodological dossier for the elaboration of the contents and training platform*.

The work package 4 included a very hard working period for every partner. Each partner (except IDEC) developed a training module for the platform (including glossary, additional material, downloads and bibliography) and a case study to illustrate the learning content of each module. IDEC had the important tasks to revise all modules in order to guarantee its coherence.

The six modules and case studies were handed in according to the deadline by 15 December 2011. TCM UGT CyL also provided six physical and physiological exercises at that date. Identical SPA-ROAD Templates for the training modules and case studies were available for all partners on the training platform by 7 October 2011.

IDEC sent a *Training Material Revision Methodology* to all partners on 9 January 2012 by which the first version of the training platform content was revised. The deadline for the revision by IDEC of all modules was the 31 January 2012. For sending the revision comments to all partners the final date was 15 February 2012. There were no delays for both deadlines and partners continued to work on time on changes of the training material according to IDECs comments. The final deadline on March 1 2012 for all partners to send in the prototype version of training material was very slightly delayed by a second round of revision of training content issued by IDEC on March 5 2012 in order to improve the platform even further. The translation process of all material into every partner language and English therefore started on 12 March 2012 and had to be finished by 30 March 2012 due to the projects timetable. The translated modules and training content for both e-and m-learning were fully available on the SPA-ROAD platform by April 20 due to slight delays by some partners caused by the high workload.

By 30 January 2012 NET MEX presented a draft version of the training platform (within the deadline of the project work plan which was 31 January 2012) to all partners. The development and uploading of training content on the prototype of the SPA ROAD trainings platform by April 30 2012 was on time and the prototype was presented to all partners at the transnational meeting in Mai 2012 in Paris. Slide adaptations and improvements were made also after the beginning of the validation process till 15th June 2012. The final version of the SPA-ROAD trainings platform will be available by 30 October 2012.

3.5 WP 5 Validation of the training platform

AFT-IFTIM was the work package leader of WP5 “Validation of the trainings platform” that started in April 2012. The planned validation activities were presented in Nagykovácsi at the second project meeting by the work package leader. The deadline for the *Validation plan*, as a result of WP5 was in April 2012. It includes strategies for the national piloting of the training course as well as an evaluation questionnaire for the participants. This part of the WP 5 is closely connected with the WP 7 Monitoring and Evaluation. In a very productive and fruitful cooperation between the two work package leaders, the evaluation questionnaire was improved a few times. Because of this improvements and due to the high workload in the work package 4 during November-April, the *Final Validation plan* was published on 15 June 2012. Between June and July 2012 the validation process started in every partner country. The national reports were send to the work package leader in time. AFT-IFTIM presented the *Final Validation report* at the final meeting in Valladolid. According to the results of the validation process the partners agreed on the *Final Version of the training platform*. Some final corrections and changes were agreed upon during the meeting and worked for by all partners. After NET-MEX implemented all changes the *Final Version* was published on October 2012.

3.6 WP 6 Valorization

TCM-UGT CyL and INVESLAN were the work package leaders of the WP 6 Valorization. Both were responsible for the design, the exploitation and dissemination strategies, as well as, for establishing the tools to be used for the dissemination of the project. All project partners contributed to the dissemination of the project among different social actors through their contact network and translated the dissemination materials to their national languages.

The *Dissemination plan* as the first product of WP6 “Valorisation & Dissemination” was published with a delay of four months in April 2011. Based on that plan, the work package co-leader TCM UGT CyL developed a leaflet, which was translated in all partner languages and is available on the project platform as well as on the SPA-ROAD web page since May 2011. TCM UGT CyL created also a newsletter about the project activities. The first one was published in May 2011, the second one was available in December 2011, a third one followed after the third national meeting in Paris 2012. Another dissemination activity was the creation of sites in different social networks. Both

are online and are permanently development further. Different other dissemination activities were executed by all partners and an overview of these presented at the second partner meeting by the WP6 leader TCM UGT CyL. Among those activities were for example: the presentation of the project at different websites in all partner countries, the presentation at conferences (in Bulgaria and Hungary) and in different networks of organisations working in the road sector (Germany and France) as well as the publication in articles of local newspapers.

An Intermediate dissemination report was due on 10 October 2011 and reports from each partner on their dissemination activities for the first SPA-ROAD project year was uploaded to the partner platform by November 4 2011. The activities included presentation of the project and upcoming SPA-ROAD trainings platform at various events with important stakeholders and possible future users, networking through different channels both face to face and via internet as well as mailing lists and ongoing coverage on facebook and other networking platforms and newspapers. A Final dissemination report was created by all partners until 10 October 2012, which included the all dissemination activities by all project partners of the second project year. During the second year partners could now present first versions of the SPA_ROAD training platform and partners therefore increased there activities through all above mentioned channels of dissemination.

XXI INVESLAN S.L. presented the draft of the *Exploitation Plan* at the second project meeting in Nagykovácsi. After a small adaption the final version was finished with a slight delay on 2 December 2011.

The first outcome of the exploitation activities according to the *Exploitation Plan* by all partners was the *Identifiaction of potential group of users* document which was available on the platform by 23 March 2012 with a delay of two month. These document identified potential users of the SPA-ROAD trainings platform and also provided a list of distribution channels in order to the Commercialization. By July 15 2012 these documents were once again adapted to the target groups by all partners, if it was necessary, to increase the interest once more. Since the partners decided for slight changes from the original workplan the final exploitation document was available by all partners on October 30. This document provides an overview on the needs of the identified target groups, the analysis of the viability of the project products, the list of potential groups of users to transfer the project results and how it could be positive for them on national

level. Therefore all activities were successfully completed by the end of the SPA-ROAD project on 30 October 2012 and are created to make a sustainable impact on future developments in the area of Stress Prevention Activities for the Road Transport Drivers and SMEs.

3.7 WP 7 Monitoring and evaluation

The first result of WP7 “Monitoring and Evaluation”, the *Quality Management Plan* was presented by the work package leader wisamar Bildungsgesellschaft gGmbH to the coordinator in a bilateral meeting on 28 March 2011 in Madrid. This framework was sent together with the *Meeting evaluation* as well as *Self-monitoring and evaluation* questionnaires to all partners on 31 March 2011. Based on this, wisamar Bildungsgesellschaft gGmbH developed the first *Evaluation report* and the *Summary Self Evaluation & Monitoring* for the first half year in May 2011.

The second *Self-monitoring and evaluation* form was sent to the partners at the beginning of October 2011, while the *Meeting evaluation* was handed out and collected at the partner meeting in Budapest on 20 October 2011.

The work package leader uploaded the report based on the results of these questionnaires on 28 October 2011. Another questionnaire for an evaluation of the first project year was sent to all partners on 14 November. Based on that, the *Final Evaluation report of the whole first project year* was published with a delay of 3 weeks in the middle of November 2011.

The third and fourth *Self-monitoring and evaluation* reports were published before the partner meetings in Paris and Valladolid. After both meetings the Meeting evaluation questionnaires was sent to the project partners and based on that the *Meeting valuation reports* were prepared.

The present document, the *Final Quality Report* will be published by 30 October 2012 and will give an overview on all activities of all workpackages with focus on their evaluation and implementation and availability according the project workplan.

4. Interim Evaluation Questionnaire of the first year

The Interim Evaluation Questionnaire was sent to the partners according to the Quality management work plan in November 2011 with the objective to evaluate the whole first year of the project. The participants were asked about their degree of satisfaction concerning:

- Relevance of the project
- Administration of the project
- Content
- Communication between partners

According to the Interim evaluation questionnaire filled out by all partners the *Communication between the partners* is considered to be very good and the most positive factor for the partners (4,80), while there seem to be slight concerns regarding the *Content matters*, such as the *Quality of content of materials/guides/reports/products* with an average of 4,40 as well as the *Relevance of the Project* with has been valued with 4,30.

After the first project year the most valued aspects of the project in detail are: *The development of positive attitudes towards Europe and transnational activities* was given the highest score of 5 out of 5. *The clarity and consistency of the general design of the project* was rated with 4,90 as the second best aspect by the partners. Whereas the *clear rationale and clarity of objectives, the detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans and clarity of project co-ordination, the strong commitment to the project by each partner - Willingness to resolve problems, as well as the effectiveness and clarity of communication with account being taken of any language difficulties and the development of teamwork* within the partnership were all valued as very good with 4,80.

The least valued aspects according to the partners evaluation are *the quality of the project in terms of impact at its short, medium and long term impact on local and regional level* (4,10) and *on national/ European level* (4,30). *The quality of the effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe and the quality of dissemination of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project* were also rated with 4,30.

But with respect to the fact that the lowest score was 4,10 out of 5 no real weak points have to be considered after the first year of the SPA-ROAD project.

There was no further information given through comments by the partners.

1. Relevance of the project

AVERAGE

No.	Topic	Performance Indicators	4,30%
1	Quality of the project	quality of the project in terms of impact at its short, medium and long term impact at its local/regional level	4,30%
		quality of the project in terms of impact at its short, medium and long term impact national/ European level	4,10 %
2	Quality of the promotion of the European Dimension	effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe	4,30%
3	Innovation and variety of approach	evidence of a varied range of approaches by all partners within the project	4,40%

2. Administration of the project

AVERAGE

No.	Topic	Performance Indicators	4,70%
4	Structure of the project activities	clear rationale and clarity of objectives	4,80%
		realistic timescales	4,40%
		clarity and consistency of the general design of the project	4,90%
5	Quality of work	detailed arrangements for implementation of	4,80%

	management arrangements	work plans and clarity of project co-ordination	
--	-------------------------	---	--

3. Content matter

AVERAGE

No.	Topic	Performance Indicators	4,40%
6	Quality of project materials/ products	Quality of content of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project	4,40%
		Quality of layout of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project	4,40%
		Quality of dissemination of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project	4,30%

4. Communication between partners

AVERAGE

No.	Topic	Performance Indicators	4,80%
7	Strong commitment to the project by each partner	extent to which each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan	4,60%
		willingness to resolve problems	4,80%

8	Effective communication amongst partners	effectiveness and clarity of communication with account being taken of any language difficulties	4,80%
9	Development of positive attitudes	development of positive attitudes towards Europe and transnational activities	5,00%
10	Agreement amongst partners	clear evidence in the workplan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners	4,70%
		development of teamwork	4,80%

4. Final Evaluation Questionnaire Results

The Final Evaluation Questionnaire was sent to the partners according to the Quality management work plan in November 2011 with the objective to evaluate the second first year of the project.

The participants were asked about their degree of satisfaction concerning:

- Relevance of the project
- Administration of the project
- Content
- Communication between partners

According to the Final evaluation questionnaire filled out by all partners the *detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans and clarity of project co-ordination* in the field of Quality of work management arrangements is considered to be very good and the most positive factor for the partners (5,10), while there seem to be slight concerns regarding the *Quality of the promotion of the European Dimension*, such as the *effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe* with an average of 4,00 as well as the *clear evidence in the work plan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners* regarding the *Agreement amongst partners* with has been valued with 4,10.

After the second and final project year the most valued aspects of the project in detail are: *detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans* was given the highest score of 5,10. Followed by *the appropriate prior information issued to participants / relevance and quality of materials issued during the event* with 4,90 and the *willingness to resolve problems* of all partners with 4,80 as the second and third best aspect. Whereas the *clear rationale and clarity of objectives*, the *quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/ European level*, the *appropriate prior information issued to participants / relevance and quality of materials issued during the event* and the *accommodation & venue – the meeting room* were also valued as very good with 4,80 or 4,70.

The least valued aspects according to the partners final evaluation are *the effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe* with 4,00 and the *clear evidence in the work plan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners* as well as *development of teamwork* both rated with 4,10. There was no further information given through comments by the partners.

As an overall average the project was evaluated with a high score of 4,50.

But again, with respect to the fact that the lowest score was 4,00 out of 5 no real weak points have to be considered after the seconde year of the SPA-ROAD project. As overall result it can be stated that the activities and outcome of the SPA-ROAD project have been rated on this high level throughout the whole duration of the two year project period.

Average 5,00

1. WORK SESSION EVALUATION			
1.1	Structure of the project activities	clear rationale and clarity of objectives	4,70
		realistic timescales	4,20
		clarity and consistency of the general design of the project	4,60
1.2	Quality of the project	quality of the project in terms of its short, medium and long term impact at local/regional/national/European level	4,70
1.3	Innovation and variety of approach	evidence of a varied range of approaches by all partners within the project	4,50
		exchange of experience and know-how	4,50
1.4	Quality of project materials/products	quality of materials/guides/reports/products throughout the life-cycle of the project	4,20
1.5	Quality of the promotion of the European Dimension	effective promotion of knowledge and understanding about Europe	4,00
1.6	Quality of work management arrangements	detailed arrangements for implementation of work plans and clarity of project co-ordination	5,10

AVERAGE 4,40

2. TRANSNATIONAL PARTNERSHIP EVALUATION			
2.1	Strong commitment to the project by each partner	extent to which each partner is prepared to commit time and resources as required in line with the jointly agreed work plan	4,40
		willingness to resolve problems	4,80
2.2	Effective communication amongst partners	effectiveness and clarity of communication with account being taken of any language difficulties	4,20
2.3	Development of positive attitudes	development of positive attitudes towards Europe and transnational activities	4,70
2.4	Agreement amongst partners	clear evidence in the work plan of sharing of roles and responsibilities amongst partners	4,10
		development of teamwork	4,10

AVERAGE 4,70

3. MEETING EVALUATION			
3.1	Organisation of the meeting	clear planning , realistic timescales , appropriate selection of participants	4,70
3.2	Effectiveness of content and appropriate range	appropriate content, relevant mixture of presentations	4,60

	and balance of activities		
3.3	Relevance of the meeting and shared ownership of the event	evidence that the needs and expectations of participants have been taken into account	4,60
3.4	Provision and suitability of materials, resources and equipment	appropriate prior information issued to participants / relevance and quality of materials issued during the event	4,90
3.5	Accommodation & venue	The location of the hotel	4,60
		The facilities at the hotel	4,50
		The meeting room	4,80

Overall average 4,50

5. Summary

As a final summary of all results of all evaluation activities carried out within the SPA-ROAD project - Stress Prevention Activities for the Road Transport Drivers and SME (2010-1-ES1-LEO05-21000) - the following can be stated:

The partnership rates itself very good in all evaluation questionnaires handed and filled out within the whole project period. The communication and development of teamwork, as well as willingness to solve problems amongst partners is considered to be the most positive aspects of the partnership. The cooperation between partners is mentioned as very good as well as the working atmosphere in the project. The excellent organisation of all partner meetings in Piraeus, Nagykovácsi, Paris as well as in Valladolid is considered to be another positive aspect, as well as the clarity and consistency of the general design of the project. These highly rated aspects have proved as a very good basis in order to successfully develop the SPA ROAD projects main outcome, the SPA ROAD training platform for both e- and m-learning versions, within the set timeframe. All partners, NET MEX in developing and setting up the internet platform as well as all other partners in researching, writing and translating the modules of the training platform, have put in considerable effort in order to manage their concentrated workload within 4-5 months until October 2012. AFTs focused efforts to validate the first version of the training platform resulted in even further improved finalized version of the SPA ROAD trainings platform, which has proved to function successfully and has gained already very positive feedback concerning the design and quality of content amongst road sector specialists, management as well as driver specialists, of all project partner countries.

First slight delays in starting up the smooth running of the project have been caught up within the first months of the two-year project and therefore did not influence the problem-free implementation of the project. All activities were on time, except for small delays, which were always perceived and caught up very fast and therefore the



projects activities and results were conducted and finished according to the SPA-ROAD project workplan.

SPA-ROAD PROJECT
2010-1-ES1-LEO05-2100



The consortium:

