**Evaluation and results**

**IV Transnational Partner Forum, 12.10.2011, Stockholm, Sweden**

1. **General data:**

No of participants: 119

No of organizations: 89

No of registered project: 82

No of project promoters: 70

No of countries: 7 (Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, Poland, Sweden)

No of countries with projects represented: 5 (Czech Republic, Germany, Lithuania, Poland, Sweden)

No of evaluation form return during the forum: 65 (55%)

1. **Participants**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Project promoters** | **MA** | **Speaker/facilitator/observer** | **Total** |
| Czech Republic | 4 |  |  | 4 |
| Germany | 14 | 1 |  | 15 |
| Lithuania | 2 |  |  | 2 |
| Poland | 9 |  | 2 | 11 |
| Sweden | 19 | 2 | 7 | 28 |
| Other | 4 |  | 1 | 5 |
| **Total** | 52 | 3 | 10 |  |

\*some of persons market more than 1 function, e.g. facilitator & MA but they are treated as one person here.

Most of the evaluation forms come from project promoters, mainly from Germany and Sweden. The percentage of evaluation forms received is relatively low, 55% (65 out of 119 participants). Thus the ratio is higher on the project promoters, since 74% of the project promoters (52 out of 70) handed in the evaluation form.

1. **Evaluation of the forum**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Scale** | **Invitation** | **Registration** | **Logistics (conference hall, catering, hosting, equipment)** | **Handouts / Information pack** | **Information from participants** | **Speakers contribution** | **Facilitation** | **Debates and exchanges** | **TOTAL** |
| Very poor |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poor |  |  | 1% |  | 1% |  | 3% |  | 1% |
| Sufficient | 11% | 3% | 6% | 15% | 23% | 11% | 9% | 17% | 14% |
| Good | 45% | 37% | 25% | 37% | 41% | 40% | 38% | 30% | 39% |
| Very good | 38% | 55% | 61% | 40% | 30% | 30% | 41% | 47% | 46% |
| \* Some participants did not answer all questions. | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |

Altogether the average rating was good with distinction. Most of the participators were content with the practical matters concerning the conference. As to the contents the most appreciated section was the debates and the exchange among project representatives.

1. **Partner match by evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Did not find a project partner** | **Found a potential partner** | **Conversation is carrying on** | **Letter of intent was signed** |
| Czech Republic | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| Germany | 2 | 12 | 27 | 2 |
| Lithuania |  | 1 | 1 |  |
| Poland | 1 | 8 | 16 |  |
| Sweden | 6 | 13 | 29 |  |
| Other |  | 4 | 11 | 1 |
| Total | 10 | 41 | 86 | 4 |

The evaluation shows that 79 % of the project promoters who answered the evaluation form (41 out of 52) found at least one potential partner.

1. **Partner match by documentation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Registrated Number of projects** | **Present Number of projects** | **none** | **one** | **two** | **three** | **four** | **five** | **six** | **7+** | **number of matches** |
| Czech Republic | 5 | 5 | - | 2 | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 10 |
| Germany | 21 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 |  | 2 | 2 | 64 |
| Lithuania | 6 | 5 | - | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 14 |
| Poland | 11 | 7 | - | 3 | 3 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 14 |
| Sweden | 38 | 33 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 4 |  | 5 |  | 86 |
| Other | 1 | - | - | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |
| total | 82 | 70 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 193 |

As to the number of partnerships established during the table matching session, 93 % of the project promoters (65 of 70) were matched to at least one potential partner. Of those the average partner match was 2.75 partners (193 matches on 70 projects) found.

1. **Final conclusions and recommendations**
2. On the whole the Partner Search Forum was appreciated. The plenary presentations and discussions was seen as informative and important, thus this depends on the participants' prior knowledge within the area.
3. Especially valued were the possibilities to meet other project stakeholders and make new contacts. The role of the facilitators as well as the table matching appears to be essential to a partner match success. Likewise is the possibility to prepare by reading the “project fiches” as well as let the projects function within different themes seems relevant to make the partner search efficacious.
4. The result is that 93 % of the participating projects did find at least one partner match. There is a difference in self-rated partner match and the outcome from the table session. This can be explained by the fact that some projects who had a match at a table, later experienced that they did not match sufficiently. This discrepancy give good reasons to the evaluation we will have in three months time, which gives us the opportunityto follow-up the partner matches.
5. There are different reasons for not finding a partner; mentioned in the evaluation are different procedures and legal frameworks, having too different target groups, or not finding other projects concerning the same specific theme as their own projects. Several participators who did not find a project partner however stresses that they perceived the networking and establishing of contacts as equally fruitful in relation to future cooperation.
6. One way to make the Partner Search Forum even better seems to be more time to work on the project matching and networking. There is several ways to do this, among them some suggestions was mixing several table sessions within different themes, and following up the table session with working in other procedures, like open space methods or open project market places.