

**Development and application of mitigation and adaptation
strategies and measures for counteracting the global
Urban Heat Islands phenomenon (UHI)**

WP1 - Activity 1.3.2

Appraisal

*Explanatory-methodological document on the
applied evaluation system*

January 2013

TABLE of CONTENT

0 INTRODUCTION

The Project
Project Partnership
The Work Packages & the Outputs

1 THE EVALUATION APPROACH

Approach for Project Monitoring and Evaluation of Outcomes
The Purposes of Evaluation
The Scope of Evaluation
Evaluation Criteria
Management and Co-ordination Structures
Evaluation Techniques
Utilization of the Evaluation Results

3. EVALUATION TOOLS

The monitoring file (internal evaluation)
The questionnaire (external stakeholders evaluation)

4. EVALUATION

0. INTRODUCTION

This document presents the main guidelines and procedures that will be used for the establishment of an appraisal of coherence among expected outputs and achieved outputs and results of the UHI project. The assessments will be carried out on the basis of this explanatory-methodological document on the applied evaluation system, presented and approved by the SC (Steering Committee).

The main purposes of the document are:

- To achieve a shared vision of all partners concerning the procedures within the partnership for carrying out the project contractual obligations;
- To facilitate a collaborative working style within the project partnership;
- To contribute to the efficient implementation of the planned tasks;
- To facilitate ongoing and reflexive self-review of the project activities.

This Plan is divided into three main parts, following this introduction:

- Section 1 presents an overview of the Project Management structure and approach;
- Section 2 highlights the relevance of evaluation;
- Section 3 describes the evaluation tools applied in the UHI project.

Evaluations will be performed by an independent person, committed by the LP (Lead Partner).

It is foreseen a mid-term and a final evaluation.

Assessment report in the Chapter 4 will contain eventual suggestions concerning suitable corrective measures to be adopted by the partnership.

The project “Development and application of mitigation and adaptation strategies and measures for counteracting the global – UHI”

The urban heat island (UHI) is a microclimatic phenomenon that occurs in the metropolitan areas. It consists in a significant increasing of the temperature in the urban area respect to the surrounding peri-urban and rural neighbourhoods. This phenomenon is known and studied since eighties and is caused by:

- physical characteristics of the surfaces: because of the thermal and radiative proprieties of the materials composing urban surfaces, such as concrete and asphalt, that absorb rather than reflecting solar radiation;
- lack of natural evaporative surfaces (vegetation) that, in rural areas, contribute to maintain a stable energy balance;

- augmentation of the vertical surface that both provide an increased surface absorbing and reflecting solar radiation as well as block winds that could contribute to the lowering of the temperature (canyon effect);
- human activities that mainly consists in heat produced by heating and cooling plants, industrial activities, vehicles, etc.;
- high level of pollutants that alter the radiative proprieties of the atmosphere.

The intensity of UHI phenomenon raises proportionally to the dimension and population of the urban area; consequently, it is doomed to become more severe in the coming years due to the constant growing of number of people living in urban areas. The UHI effects are directly related to (and worsened by) the climate change phenomena, where it is expected that an increase of the average temperature has a stronger and immediate effect on the health of people living in cities, and particularly in weak categories (diseased and aged citizens, etc.).

The project, starting from a deep analysis of the phenomenon carried out with traditional micrometeorology techniques and remote sensing techniques, is designed to both develop mitigation and risk prevention and management strategies.

In particular, mitigation strategies consist in the adoption of urban and land planning models that prevent the establishment of UHI, while risk prevention/management strategies aim at reducing the impact of phenomena related to UHI, such as summer bioclimatic discomfort.

The general objective of the project is to establish a Transnational attention, as well as policies and practical actions, for the prevention, adaptation and mitigation of the natural and man-made risks arising from the urban heat island phenomenon.

In particular, the project is indented to:

- provide a deeper knowledge on the man-made risk of the UHIs and its interactions with global climate change;
- establish a permanent transnational network for monitoring the phenomenon and its development;
- set up suitable strategies for the mitigation of- and the adaptation to UHI;
- improve current land-use planning tools and civil management systems according to mitigation and adaptation strategies.

Regions) of Central Europe Cooperation Programme: the metropolitan cluster of Bologna – Modena (IT) and the urban corridor of Venice – Padua (IT), the cities of Wien (AT), Stuttgart (D), Lodz & Warsaw (PL), Ljubljana (SI), Budapest (HU) and Prague (CZ). The broad participation of cities belonging to 7 CE Countries assures an optimal coverage of the Programme spaces and potential of replication into other territorial contexts. Additionally, the direct participation into the project of the regional planning directions as well as the City Council assure a concrete impact of the project deliverables into the pilot areas and the effective ownership of strategies and planning options.

Project partnership

Regional Agency for Environmental Protection in Emilia-Romagna (IT)

Emilia Romagna Region. General Directorate Territorial and negotiated planning, agreements (IT)

Veneto Region - Spatial Planning and Parks Department (IT)

Consortium for Coordination of Research Activities Concerning the Venice Lagoon System (CORILA) (IT)

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology (DE)

Municipality of Stuttgart (DE)

Meteorological Institute - University of Freiburg (DE)

Institute of Geography and Spatial Organization, Polish Academy Of Sciences (PL)

Nofer Institute of Occupational Health (PL)

Vienna University of Technology - Department of Building Physics and Building Ecology - Institute of Architectural Sciences (AT)

PMunicipal Department 22 - Environmental Protection Department in Vienna (MA 22) (AT)

Hungarian Meteorological Service (HU)

Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Mathematics and Physics (CZ)

City Development Authority of Prague (CZ)

Czech Hydrometeorological Institute (CZ)

Scientific Research Centre of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts (SI)

Municipality of Ljubljana (SI)

Work Packages and Outputs

WP1 - Project management and coordination

- 1.1.1 Negotiation
- 1.1.2 Contracting
- 1.2.1 Project management
- 1.2.2 Project technical secretariat
- 1.3.1 Set up of Project Steering Committee
- 1.3.2 External independent Appraisal
- 1.4.1 Financial management

1.4.2 Audit

WP2 - Communication, knowledge management and dissemination

- 2.1.1 MEDIA articles and press released
- 2.2.1 Electronic newsletter
- 2.2.2 Local Dissemination material
- 2.2.3 Web site and multimedia dissemination
- 2.2.4 Regional handbook
- 2.2.5 Final publication
- 2.3.1 Kick off event
- 2.3.2 Local events (sensitizations) 2 per area
- 2.3.3 Final Conference
- 2.4.1 Communication Plan
- 2.4.2 Project communication team
- 2.4.3 Results Exploitation Action Plan

WP3 - Framework analysis

- 3.1.1 drafting of UHI knowledge review
- 3.1.2 Urban planning rules review
- 3.1.3 1st Transnational Scientific Board (TSB) mtg
- 3.1.4 Collection of most relevant experiences on UHI
- 3.2.1 Forecasting model
- 3.2.2 Report on UHI vs climate change

WP4 - Transnational Network and UHI assessment's tools

- 4.1.1 Transnational Scientific Board (TSB)
- 4.1.2 Local Working Groups
- 4.2.1 Preliminary recognition action
- 4.2.2 UHI assessment manual
- 4.2.3 Gold standard for an UHI evaluation
- 4.2.4 2nd Transnational Scientific Board (TSB) mtg
- 4.3.1 Data collection for web data base
- 4.3.2 Web data base methodology
- 4.3.3 WEB database
- 4.3.4 Central Europe UHIs Atlas

WP5 - Mitigation and adaptation strategies

- 5.1.1 Description of the different Urban areas
- 5.1.2 Catalogue of M&A strategies
- 5.1.3 3rd Transnational Scientific Board (TSB) mtg
- 5.2.1 Preliminary analysis for the UHI modelling

5.2.2 UHI modelling

5.2.3 4th Transnational Scientific Board (TSB) mtg

5.3.1 Prelim. study for definition of Urban Areas & spatial planning strategy

5.3.2 Transnational strategy for Urban Areas & spatial planning

5.3.3 Mitigation: Area specific portfolio

5.3.4 Adaptation: area specific portfolio

WP6 - Pilot and capitalization actions for limiting UHIs effects

6.1.1 Preliminary phase for the Decision support system (DSS)

6.1.2 Decision support system (DSS)

6.2.1 5th Transnational Scientific Board (TSB) mtg

6.2.2 Pilot action: mitigation UHI effects

6.2.3 Pilot actions: adaptation UHI effects

2. EVALUATION APPROACH

Approach for Project Monitoring and Evaluation of Outcomes

The evaluation process, as an integrated part of the UHI project will tackle both the operations (the way the project is conducted, the extent to which it is following the design) and the outcomes and effects.

In this evaluation plan, it is assumed that:

- Evaluation is expected to feedback information to the Project Staff and Managers as the project goes along. In this context, it will refer to the project lifecycle, focusing on a variety of activities, interactions, procedures, products, feedbacks, and goal-matching results. During the project lifetime, formative and summative evaluation will be combined.
- Evaluation can emphasize the project goals. Taking into account that the project aims will be used as criteria against which outcomes are weighed, the evaluation activities will reinforce the concern of the partners towards them.

Evaluation is an ongoing process, made of “formal” procedures as well as of “informal” interactions, and unpredictable contingencies. It would be restrictive to consider the present evaluation plan complete and not changeable. It contains only the guidelines for the evaluation activities.

Evaluation is relevant to a variety of actors:

- project partners, for whom it is a tool to improve the project activities, to take corrective measures, and in the end of the project to draw a conclusion;
- networks, as a kind of community with own identity, objectives and internal organization;
- relevant stakeholders and user groups for whom it represents an overview of the sustainability and potential of dissemination of the project’s contents;
- Other CE projects;
- Urban and Climate sector at regional, national and European level;
- Policy makers at regional, national and European level.

The evaluation framework is designed to provide valid tools to assess the development of the project in relation to the expected results and achievements.

| COMPONENT | FOCUS ON... |
|--|---|
| Purposes of the evaluation | What are the main purposes of, and who are the main audiences for the evaluation? |
| Scope of the evaluation | What is the “object” of the evaluation? What should be evaluated? |
| Stakeholders | Which main stakeholders are involved or implicated in the project and its evaluation? |
| Project lifecycle | What are the lifecycle stages of the project and what evaluation activities are appropriate at each stage? |
| Evaluation criteria | What kind of evaluation criteria will be used? |
| Evaluation and project management | How will evaluation be integrated into the overall project activities? |
| Evaluation techniques | What evaluation tools and which questions will be asked? |
| Utilization of the evaluation results | How will the evaluation main findings be used and disseminated and what activities will be carried out to facilitate their use? |

The following “building blocks” will be presented and explained in the next chapters:

- the purposes;
- the scope;
- evaluation criteria;
- methods and techniques
- management and co-ordination structure
- data analysis
- utilization of evaluation results

The Purposes of Evaluation

Evaluation is not an audit; it is rather a chance to decide whether the project has met its wider objectives. The main reasons for the evaluation activities are:

- the opportunity to learn from the experience of what succeeded and what did not
- considering if there were better ways of designing the project
- checking that the objectives of the project have been achieved.

Evaluation is seen as a way to increase the rationality of project development and as a tool that can provide objective information on the implementation and outcomes of the project.

The methodologies, solutions, and tools explained in the present evaluation framework globally aim at defining a threefold purpose: operational, summative, and learning purposes.

- ✓ Operational purposes (how the project is being developed, project management, the quality of partners’ participation, respect of deadlines, the modalities according to which work is being carried out, and the respect of quality criteria, potential corrective measures etc.).
- ✓ Summative purposes (the match between expected results and achieved results, also considering the resources used (efficiency) and the impact (effectiveness) of the intervention on the target groups).
- ✓ Learning purposes (identifying the critical factors at the origin of the success/failure of the project activities, the overall assessment of the “lesson” that can be drawn from the project).

The Scope of Evaluation

In order to design a coherent evaluation plan, it is necessary to identify the scope, or unit of analysis, of the evaluation.

The evaluation activities will comprise all the monitoring activities, which aim at making sure that the project develops along the directions described in the proposal.

Monitoring and evaluation can provide the information project planners and managers need to determine whether a project has been implemented as planned. It can also help them identify the problems that need to be solved, the expected or unexpected impacts that have occurred, and the lessons that should guide them in selecting and designing future projects.

Monitoring and evaluation studies can provide the kind of information required by project managers and planners at each of the stages of a project.

In response to learning purposes, evaluation will focus on the following activities:

- Assessment of the project partners’ degree of satisfaction about the project outputs and results.
- Assessment of the nature of the relationship between project partnership and external stakeholders.

- Assessment of the sustainability of the project results.
- Potential for dissemination.

The project partners are the main audience of the evaluation activity, which provides them with the real-time picture of the project development. All project partners will be involved in the evaluation tasks.

In response to summative purposes, evaluation will refer to the following activities:

- Evaluation of overall project results vs. planned objectives.
- Evaluation of the impact of the planned activities in terms of, i.e. increased awareness on UHI among relevant stakeholders and user groups.
- Assessment of the online devices and services (Website & Newsletter).
- Evaluation of dissemination impact, exploitation and sustainability potential.

In response to operational purposes, evaluation will focus on the following activities:

- Monitoring of project progress, with particular attention on the respect of deadlines.
- Effectiveness of project management.
- Modalities of communication among partners.
- Match between the nature of the results obtained and the quality criteria.

Evaluation Criteria

Once having collected evidence on process and outcomes, the evaluation assesses the merit of the project by comparing the evidence to some set of expectations.

Official goals are not the only possible source for criteria that the evaluation applies. Other standards of judgment can come from the expectations of other actors. Usually, the objectives are the benchmark for measuring success.

According to the three different evaluation purposes (operational, summative, and learning purposes), the evaluation criteria for UHI will be both quantitative and qualitative.

Objectively verifiable indicators describe overall goals and purposes, turning them into operationally measurable terms. They focus on the overall coherence of the project activities with the work plan, in terms of timing, respect of deadlines, consistency of the outputs delivered etc.

Concerning **quantitative criteria**, ad hoc grids will be prepared beforehand, and partners and especially Work Package Leaders will be asked at regular intervals to provide feedback on the project development and results achieved with regard to these criteria.

Some activity charts will be the basis for the assessment of project development, in terms of timing, respect of deadlines, consistency of the outputs delivered etc.

As far as **qualitative criteria** are concerned, the following dimensions will be addressed at the project “system” level:

- communication style, referring to the communication flow among partners, which should guarantee good management and sharing of information among the actors involved;
- actions’ strategic orientation, referring to the coherence between each partner’s priorities and the implemented activities;
- project internal integration, referring to planning and partners collaboration;
- added value for partners and stakeholders, etc.

Management and Co-ordination Structures

The UHI evaluation activities need to incorporate specific management and coordination structures. As already mentioned, the “bridge” between quality and management will be formative evaluation.

The independent person in charge of the evaluation activities, is responsible for the following functions:

- definition of the evaluation methodology and plan;
- identification of the tools for periodic self-assessment and final project assessment;
- design and implementation of periodic evaluation and monitoring activities, both online and during meetings.

The management and co-ordination activities carried out will aim to:

- facilitate co-ordination between WP activities and the overall project plan;
- provide common guidelines to the partners;
- provide links and feedbacks between the evaluation activities and the project management, to manage contingencies which may occur during the project lifecycle.

The evaluation managers regularly interact with the Project Steering Committee.

Evaluation Tools & Procedures

The appraisal will be based on a dual level of tools, a joint interaction and co-working with the project’s Technical secretariat and a dialogue with the WPs’ Leaders. The main evaluation instruments that will be prepared and used will be the following:

Formal tools

- Intermediate report: The intermediate report will be implemented checking and matching the evaluation of the achievement of the deliverables and the administrative reporting periods (till period 3).
- Assessment tools:
 - Feedback from the WPs’ leaders based on a specific questionnaire
 - Questionnaires for collection of feedback from external stakeholders developed in co-operation with the respective Work Package Leaders, so that these questionnaires reflect as much as possible the concrete project outcomes / results / products.
- Final report: The final report will be implemented checking and matching the evaluation of the achievement of the deliverables and the administrative reporting periods (till period 6) and analyzing and reporting the information gained by the assessment tools.

Informal tools

- Reporting of the discussion groups and formative evaluation sessions to be carried out during the last two Steering Committee meeting involving the key actors of the UHI project.

Utilization of the Evaluation Results

Monitoring and evaluation will feed back into project management providing it with instruments for project self-review. Moreover, the foreseen meetings will include specific sessions aimed at reviewing project activities and products and at highlighting strengths and weaknesses of the consortium work.

Financial economic efficiency will be monitored in the framework of the periodic activity reports, all including the overall project and individual partner cost claims.

Evaluation activities also focus on how users and stakeholders participate in the project activities design, implementation and utilization. The methodological soundness of the project approach, the processes implemented and the quality of project results will be in general assessed on a continuous basis. The

assessment strategy will constitute – if required – the flexible basis for corrective and adaptive actions, according to the judgment and needs expressed.

Finally, an ‘in-progress’ assessment of the dissemination potential, sustainability and transferability of project activities and results to other contexts will be performed.

It is therefore crucial that stakeholders and users get involved and feel engaged in the various stages of the project. Lack of participation should be addressed immediately, so as to enact strategies to (re-)engage parties lacking interest.

TIMETABLE

The following time schedule is foreseen for the evaluation activities:

| Quality evaluation plan | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Evaluation report no. 1 | By January 2013 |
| Assessment tools | From January 2013 to the end of the project |
| WPLeaders questionnaire | By September 2013 |
| Stakeholders questionnaires | By February 2013 |
| Evaluation report no. 2 | By the end of the project |

3 EVALUATION TOOLS

The monitoring file (internal evaluation)

The following monitoring chart has been produced according to:

- the main official documents of the project (Application Form and Gantt) and to the material present in the private area of the official website (www.gift-project.eu).
- The joint and daily interaction with the Projects' Technical Secretariat

Legend

"Finalized" column reports if the output has been finalized or not, or if the activity is on-going. Here is the legend of the used colors.

ORANGE cells indicate on-going activities, for that reason those activities are not concluded according also to the AF.

RED cells indicate that the output has not yet concluded/reported/found according to the AF and to the Gantt.

GREEN cells indicates that the output has been reached, when this document is prepared.

BLUE section below the activity's row are comments/suggestions on the output's state of the art.

WP1 - Project management and coordination

| ACTION | | Output | | Responsible Partner | involved PPs | AF start | AF end | Finalized | Comments (if any) | |
|--------|--|---|---|---|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|---|---|
| 1.1 | Fulfillment of start up requirements | 1.1.1 | Negotiation | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | May 2011 | ✓ | |
| | | 1.1.2 | Contracting | LP | ARPA ER | LP only | May 2011 | June 2011 | ✓ | |
| 1.2 | Day-to-day project management, coordination and internal communication | 1.2.1 | Project management | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | Each partner has established a working project management | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.2.2 | Project technical secretariat | LP | ARPA ER | LP only | July 2011 | Apr.2014 | | The external support has been appointed |
| | | | | | | | | | - | |
| 1.3 | Steering and monitoring of the project implementation | 1.3.1 | Set up of project Steering Committee (SC) | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | | | 6 mtgs: incoincidence with TSB mtgs (see outputs 2.3.2, 3.1.3, 4.2.4, 5.1.3, 5.2.3, 6.2.1, 2.3.3) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | The 4 Steering Committees forecasted have been held regularly and agenda, minutes, attendance list and photos are available on the website. Presentations from all participants are available also. | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------|--------------------------------|---|----|---------|---------|-----------|----------|--|---|
| | | 1.3.2 | External Independent Appraisal | Peer review (intermediate-final): output/results foreseen VS achieved | LP | ARPA ER | LP only | Oct.2012 | Apr.2014 | | The external support has been appointed |
| 1.4 | Financial management, certification of expenditures | 1.4.1 | Financial Management | 1 FM per Partner | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | 1.4.2 | Audit (FLC) | 6 reports, 6 validation of Expenditures | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | July 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| There are delays in reporting (PR1 and PCR) caused by changes of FLC by some partners. | | | | | | | | | | | |

WP2 - Communication, knowledge management and dissemination

| ACTION | | Output | | Responsible Partner | | involved PPs | AF start | AF end | Finalized | Comments (if any) | |
|--|---|--------|--|---|---|--------------|--|----------|-----------|-------------------|--|
| 2.1 | Media Communication / dissemination | 2.1.1 | Media articles and press release | 9 press releases + 2 press conferences | P2 | RER | LP,P2,P3,P6,P12,P13,P15,P17,P18 | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | | | There aren't press releases available on the website dedicated section. There is no documentation that testifies press conferences. | | | | | | | |
| 2.2 | Non-media communication / dissemination and website | 2.2.1 | E-newsletter | 4 issues in EN with translations | P4 | CORILA | P5,P8,P11,P13,P17,P18 | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | | | The 1st Newsletter has been issued in October and it's available on the web site in the dedicated. There are no evident information on the spreading of it among partners at local level (mailing-list) and any translation is available. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2.2 | Local dissemination material | 1 brochure in EN leaflets in 7 languages (EN,IT,DE,PL,HU,CZ,SI) | P2 | RER | LP,P2,P4,P5,P6,P7,P8,P10,P11,P12,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | The external support has been appointed. |
| | | | | No leaflet and brochure have been yet produced. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2.3 | Website and multimedia dissemination | 1 UHI website 1 video | P13 | HMS | LP | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | | | The UHI website seems to be unattractive, a bit empty of content and non-intuitive. Number of log-in from the partners (to the intranet section) and visits (google statistics) could be good ways to identify the real interest. | | | | | | | |
| 2.2.4 | Regional handbook | | P3 | RVE | - | Nov.2012 | Apr.2014 | | | | |
| 2.2.5 | Final publication | | P4 | CORILA | LP,P3,P4,P5,P7,P8,P10,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | Nov.2012 | Apr.2014 | | | | |
| 2.3 | PR events | 2.3.1 | Kick-off event in Bologna (set up of SC) | | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | May 2011 | ✓ | |
| The kick-off meeting has been organized regularly in Bologna and agenda, minutes, attendance list and photos have been produced. | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | Presentations from all participants are available also. | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------------|-----|---|------------|------------|-----------|---|
| | | 2.3.2 | Local events (sensitization) - 2 per area | P2 | RER | P2,P3,P7,P8,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P17,P18 | May 2011 | Apr.2014 | | |
| | | There is any public evidence regarding the local organization of events (NEWS), even if the task is already on-going from the beginning of the project. The suggestion is to put all the news related to local events on the website in order to keep track of the activity made towards stakeholders. | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3.3 | Final Conference (Vienna), last SC | P1 1 | VUT | ALL | Apr.2014 | Apr.2014 | | |
| 2.4 | Communication strategy | 2.4.1 | Communication plan | Communication strategy | P2 | RER | - | May 2011 | Oct.2011 | ✓ |
| | | The documents have been produced and contain all relevant issues. The communication strategy is divided into Internal communication and external dissemination. It would be interesting to know what is the real implementation and use of the strategy/methodologies by the partnership. | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.4.2 | Project Communication team | 1 Communication manager per Partner | P2 | RER | ALL | May 2011 | June 2011 | ✓ |
| | | The team is formed, it would be interesting to know what is the real function of the team and what is the communicative relation between the managers appointed. | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.4.3 | Results exploitation action plan | P2 | RER | - | March 2014 | March 2014 | | |

WP3 - Framework Analysis

| ACTION | | Output | Responsible Partner | | involved PPs | AF start | AF end | Rescheduled end | duration | Finalized |
|--|-----------------------|---|---------------------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------------|----------|-----------|
| 3.1 | State of the art | 3.1.1 UHI knowledge review | P5 | KIT | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P10,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | June 2011 | Sept.2011 | Oct.2012 | | ✓ |
| | | The contents of the document are consistent and exhaustive with the request, all partners have participated to the creation of the review. | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3.1.2 Urban Planning rules review | P6 | Mun Stutt | P2,P3,P6,P12,P15,P18 | June 2011 | Sept.2011 | Oct.2012 | | ✓ |
| | | The contents of the document are consistent and exhaustive with the request, all partners have participated to the creation of the review. | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | State of the art | 3.1.3 1° TSB and 2° SC MEETING - Stuttgart (DE) | P6 | Mun Stutt | ALL | 9/9/11 | 10/9/11 | | 2 days | ✓ |
| | | The TSB forecasted has been held regularly and agenda, minute, attendance list and photos are available on the website. Presentations from all participants are available also. | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3.1.4 Collection of most relevant experiences | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | June 2011 | Nov.2011 | | | ✓ |
| The contents of the document are consistent and exhaustive with the request, all partners have participated to the creation of the review. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | UHI vs CLIMATE CHANGE | 3.2.1 Forecasting model | P5 | KIT | LP,P4,P5,P11,P14,P17,P18 | Oct.2011 | Oct.2012 | | | ✓ |
| | | The model has been issued after a constructive discussion among partners according to the minutes, but there is no public evidence of it. | | | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | UHI vs CLIMATE CHANGE | 3.2.2 Report on UHI vs Climate change | P5 | KIT | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | Oct.2011 | Dec.2012 | | | |
| | | The document is in production, the delay of the activity was communicated to the Project Management. | | | | | | | | |

WP4 - Transnational Network and UHI assessment's tools

| ACTION | | Output | | Responsible Partner | | involved PPs | AF start | AF end | Rescheduled end | Finalized | |
|--|--|---|--|---------------------|---------|--|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| 4 1 | Report on UHI vs CLIMATE CHANGE | 4.1.1 | Transnational Scientific Board | LP | ARPA ER | ALL | May 2011 | April 2014 | | | |
| | | It has been implemented a joint and continuous debate between partners thought questions underling specific issues. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.1.2 | Local Working Groups | LP | ARPA ER | LP,P3,P4,P6,P12,P13,P14,P17,P18 | May 2011 | April 2014 | | | |
| There is no evidence on execution of LWG, even if stress have been made on this issues on all partners meetings. It is suggested to monitor the implementation of local events, even by stimulating the debate during the TWG. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 2 | Methodology and Area definition | 4.2.1 | Preliminary recognition action | P13 | HMS | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P10, P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | Sept. 2011 | Febr.2012 | | ✓ | |
| | | An initial draft document has been shared, but it has to be finalized. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.2.2 | UHI assessment manual | P13 | HMS | Sept. 2011 | April 2012 | Dec.2012 | | | |
| | | An initial draft document has been shared, but it has to be finalized. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.2.3 | Gold standard for UHI evaluation | P13 | HMS | LP,P13,P17,P18 | Sept. 2011 | Jan.2013 | Febr.2013 | | |
| There is no evidence of this output, a discussion on the issue has started. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.2.4 | 2° TSB + 3° SC MEETING - Budapest (HU) -2 days | P13 | HMS | ALL | 9/9/11 | 10/9/11 | | ✓ | |
| The TSB forecasted has been held regularly and agenda, minute, attendance list and photos are available on the website. Presentations from all participants are available also. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 3 | Central Europe UHIs web database and Atlas | 4.3.1-2-3 | Web database | P13 | HMS | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P10,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | June 2012 | Dec.2012 | | | |
| | | There is no evidence of this output. | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.3.4 | CE UHI Atlas | P13 | HMS | P4,P13,P17,P18 | June 2012 | Jan.2013 | Febr.2013 | | |
| The atlas is in progress and the Lead partner of the task together with the Slovenian partners are actively cooperating | | | | | | | | | | | |

WP5 - Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies

| ACTION | Output | Responsible Partner | involved PPs | AF start | AF end | Rescheduled end (if any) | Finalized | comments (if any) |
|---|---|---------------------|---|------------|----------|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 5.1 Extent of UHI effects and corresponding potential M&A measures | 5.1.1 1 report for 8 Urban areas | P11 VUT | LP,P4,P7,P8,P11,P13,P16,P17,P18 | March 2012 | Aug.2012 | Nov.2012 | | |
| | The report has been realized (in a single document together with 5.1.2 and 5.2.1) | | | | | | | |
| | 5.1.2 1 M&A catalogue | P11 VUT | LP,P2,P4,P8,P10,P17,P18 | March 2012 | Aug.2012 | | | |
| The report has been realized (in a single document together with 5.1.1 and 5.2.1) | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1.3 3° TSB and 4° SC MEETING - Warsaw (PL) 2 days | P8 IGIPAN | ALL | 3/10/12 | 4/10/12 | | ✓ | in collaboration with PP10 | |
| The TSB forecasted has been held regularly and agenda, minute, attendance list and photos are available on the website. Presentations from all participants are available also. | | | | | | | | |
| 5.2 Establishment of an effective UHI modelling environment | 5.2.1 1 prelim. Analysis for the UHI modelling | P11 VUT | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | Aug.2012 | Dec.2012 | | | |
| | The report has been realized (in a single document together with 5.1.1 and 5.1.2) | | | | | | | |
| | 5.2.2 1 environment computational model | P11 VUT | LP,P4,P5,P7,P8,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | Aug.2012 | May 2013 | | | |
| 5.2.3 4° TSB and 5° SC MEETING - Prague (CZ) 2 days | P15 CDA Prague | ALL | Feb.2013 | Feb.2013 | Apr.1013 | | | |
| The meeting will be held on 17-18 April 2013 | | | | | | | | |
| 5.3 Definition of mitigation and adaptation strategies | 5.3.1 1 prelim. study for Urban areas & spatial planning strategy | P11 VUT | P2,P3,P4,P6,P8,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | March 2013 | Oct.2013 | | | |
| | 5.3.2 1 transn. strategy for Urban areas & spatial planning strategy | P11 VUT | P2,P3,P4,P6,P8,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | March 2013 | Feb.2014 | | | |
| | 5.3.3 1 portfolio of mitigation strategies | P11 VUT | P2,P3,P4,P5,P7,P8,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | March 2013 | Feb.2014 | | | |
| | 5.3.4 1 portfolio of adaptation strategies | P11 VUT | LP,P3,P4,P5,P7,P8,P11,P13,P14,P16,P17,P18 | March 2013 | Feb.2014 | | | |

WP6 - Pilot and capitalization actions for limiting UHIs effects

| ACTION | | Output | | Responsible Partner | | involved PPs ¹ | AF start | AF end | Finalized |
|--------|--|--|---|---------------------|-----|---|--|-----------|-----------|
| 6.1 | Analysis of the experiences on a DSS and setup of the system | 6.1.1 | 1 Preliminary report for the DSS | P2 | RER | P2,P3,P6,P12,P14,P15,P18 | March 2012 | Dec.2012 | |
| | | The external support has been appointed. | | | | | | | |
| 6.2 | Urban planning feasibility studies | 6.1.2 | 1 DSS (decision support system) | P2 | RER | ALL | March 2012 | July 2013 | |
| | | 6.2.1 | 5° TSB and 6° SC MEETING - Venice (IT) – 2 days | P3 | RVE | | Sept.2013 | Oct.2013 | |
| | | 6.2.2 | 8 feasibility studies | P3 | RVE | | P2,P3,P4,P5,P6,P11,P12,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | Oct.2012 | Nov.2013 |
| | | 6.2.3 | 8 pilot actions | P3 | RVE | LP,P2,P3,P4,P5,P6,P10,P11,P12,P13,P14,P15,P16,P17,P18 | Oct.2012 | Nov.2013 | |

The questionnaire (external stakeholders evaluation)

This form is used to assess the satisfaction of the stakeholders that involved in the local events (WP2, WP4).

Then is required its translation in the local language and the distribution whenever requested. The results can be processed in a final report.

| PARTICIPANTS PLEASE FILL IN | 4 = excellent; 3 = good; 2 = reasonable 1 = hardly sufficient ; 0 = insufficient | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
|--|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Venue / equipment | • Suitability of working rooms | | | | | |
| | • Quality and suitability of equipment, hardware | | | | | |
| | • Organisational secretariat | | | | | |
| Programme | • Planning and timescale | | | | | |
| Content / delivery | • Relevancy of content of presentations with regard to the topic and the aims of the event | | | | | |
| | • Session management by event leaders / moderators | | | | | |
| | • Effectiveness of presentations | | | | | |
| | • Correspondence between the event and your expectations | | | | | |
| Issues | • Usefulness of the issues developed | | | | | |

| | |
|---|--|
| What are, according to you, the major benefits of this event? | |
| What are, according to you, the major weaknesses of the event? | |
| Suggestions for future events: | |

4. EVALUATION REPORT

The implementation of the project is overall in a good stage of development. The huge competences inherent in the partnership are underlined in the **technical and scientific documents** and report issued.

The critical mostly encountered are related to the **lack of evidence** of the outputs, that are, for the major part, realized.

On the other hand, some **delays** on some activities are monitored and controlled by the management of the project: some are delays “justified” and in other cases the deadlines were postponed.

A special note should be made on the organization of **local events**: if and when they are organized, they should absolutely be made by public, both at project level, both to the external audience/target groups to give as much as possible visibility to the project.

Related to the “visibility”, the issue of **website** is also relevant: this represent a crucial and fundamental tool related to dissemination: it’s in fact a powerful communication interface, a tool that is recommended to fully exploit its potential.

The general suggestion is to make the project visible and attractive underling and emphasizing the outputs by collecting them on the website and making them public to the audience and enhancing the content.

The same goes for the “advertising” of events, really and truly useful to communicate with key stakeholders.