

## ANNEX A2.5:

### SELECTION OF PROJECTS FOR CASE STUDY N°II:

The evaluation team would like to propose the following projects for the second case study within the global evaluation in the field of civil protection:

- 1) CIVP AP n° 4: "Major project on Fire prevention and other incidents – Actions to protect European citizens against fire", Sweden, December 2002-February 2004.
- 2) CIVP AP n° 16: "Disaster medicine: Managing the psycho-social aftermath of collective emergency situations", Belgium, July 2000- September 2001 and its link to CIVP AP n° 23 "Atelier destiné aux formateurs pour le suivi psychosocial de victimes et familles de victimes en cas d'accidents majeurs".
- 3) CIVP MP n° 05/2001: "NEBAJEX (Net Environmental Benefit Analysis) Exercise combined with a pilot project", MUMM (Belgium), CEDRE (France) and SINTEF (Norway), 2002.

#### The reasons for this decision are:

1. The key issues to be considered within this second case study will be mainly **effectiveness and impact**, as well as some aspects of efficiency.
2. In accordance with the discussion held in the kick-off meeting, **case study n°2** will comprise *three workshops* dealing with contribution to *information exchange, to public information, to awareness-raising and improvement of response* within the Civil Protection Action Programme and Marine Pollution projects.
3. As has been pointed out in the kick-off note, the decision to include only a small number of case studies in this global evaluation was not taken based on criteria such as budget, subject, etc., but rather, taking into account the two existing mid-term evaluations (which already include several case studies) and the discussion in the kick-off meeting. These case studies aim at filling gaps and at supplementing the overall data collection, primarily regarding the key issues of effectiveness and impact.
4. It was agreed to select two of the workshops out of the CIVP AP projects that have been completed after the mid-term evaluation, because their impacts could not be included previously.
5. The above-mentioned selection was made in accordance with indications from the interviews (with Management Committee members and EC staff) that pointed to noticeable effects from the projects.
6. Nr. 1: This major project followed the "major project on prevention of natural and technological disasters", which was included as a case study in the mid term evaluation. The action was finished after the mid term evaluation, but the ending date exceeds the evaluation scope (Dec. 2003) by two months (finished in Feb. 04), meaning we would deviate from the agreement in the kick-off notes that defined the end of 2003 as the scope for the evaluation for the CIVP Action programme.
7. Nr. 2: This action was chosen because of clear indications we received during the interviews with the members of the Management Committee that there would be national follow-up to this action. However, in this case we would deviate from the suggestion in the kick off note to choose as case studies projects that have been finished after the CIVP AP midterm evaluation.
8. Nr. 3 is a pilot project from the MP, which combines a pilot project with an exercise. The information gathered in the mid-term evaluation indicates that the impacts of the pilot projects could not be evaluated adequately then. This action was also chosen due to indications of noticeable effects.

For these three projects, qualitative interviews will be carried out by telephone with organizers and participants.