



Collaborate for Resilience

Strengthening University-Enterprise Collaboration
for Resilient Communities in Asia - (SECRA)

1st MONITORING & EVALUATION REPORT

January 15th 2021 – December 15th 2021

WP 7: Quality Assurance

Produced by David Alpera

Grant Agreement
619022-EPP-1-2020-1 -SE-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP

JANUARY 2022



Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union



CONTENT

SUMMARY	3
1. WORK PACKAGES & DELIVERABLES	4
1.1 WP1 Mapping the Collaborative Landscape	4
WP1-D1 PARTNER COUNTRY REPORTS ON UECs.....	4
1.2 WP2 Institutional Landscape Optimization	7
WP2-D1 UEC RELATIONAL FRAMEWORK.....	7
WP2-D2 POLICY BRIEFS (ONE FOR EACH PARTNER COUNTRY).....	7
WP2-D3 ONLINE AND ON-SITE WORKSHOPS.....	7
WP2-D4 POLICY DIALOGUES (ONE FOR EACH PARTNER COUNTRY).....	8
1.3 WP3 University Enterprise Collaboration Community of Practice	8
WP3-D1 ONLINE PLATFORM FOR UEC COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE.....	8
WP3-D2 COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON-SITE TRAINING.....	8
WP3-D3 COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON LINE TRAINING.....	8
1.4 WP4 Innovation and Enterprise	8
WP4-D1 CORPORATE START-UP LAB.....	8
WP4-D2 UNIVERSITY ENTERPRISE ENGAGEMENT DAY.....	8
WP4-D3 ONLINE TRAINING SESSIONS.....	8
WP4-D4 PARTNER INSTITUTION STAFF MOBILITY.....	9
1.5 WP5 University Enterprise Collaboration Compass	9
WP5-D1 UEC COMPASS MODEL AND TOOL.....	9
WP5-D2 ON-SITE AND ONLINE TRAINING SESSIONS.....	10
WP5-D3 SENSITIZATION PROGRAMME.....	10
1.6 WP6 Dissemination and Exploitation	10
WP6-D1 DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION STRATEGY.....	10
WP6-D2 WEBSITE AND ONLINE PRESENCE.....	11
WP6-D3 QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER.....	12
WP6-D4 PRESS-RELEASES.....	12
WP6-D5 PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL.....	12
WP6-D6 ARTICLES IN LOCAL TRADE PUBLICATION.....	12
WP6-D7 SUSTAINABILITY AND CONTINUITY PLAN.....	13
1.7 WP7 Quality Assurance	13
WP7-D1 QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN.....	13
WP7-D2 ONGOING EVALUATION REPORTS.....	14
WP7-D3 ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT REVIEW.....	14
1.8 WP8 Project Management	14
WP8-D1 CONSOLIDATED WORK PLAN.....	14
WP8-D2 RISK AND CONTINUITY PLAN.....	15
WP8-D3 KICK-OFF MEETING.....	15
WP8-D4 MANAGEMENT MEETINGS MINUTES.....	16
WP8-D5 INTERIM REPORTS.....	16
WP8-D6 FINAL REPORT.....	16
2. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS	17
2.1 General Aspects	17
2.2 Institutional perspective	24
2.3 Individual perspective	25
2.4 Sustainability, Impact, Efficiency	26
2.5 Recommendations / Considerations for the Consortium	29



SUMMARY

The aim of the Quality Control of a project is to ensure that - project objectives and outcomes- are fit to the purpose timely, technically according to the project proposal and, if needed for the efficiency of the project, the necessary changes are undertaken.

In SECRA, WP 7 (Quality Assurance), aims to ensure that all tasks are to the Project's specifications.

Besides establishing the Quality Assurance Plan, setting up the monitoring mechanisms, conducting ongoing evaluations and annual self-assessment reviews, an annual external review (a total of three Monitoring & Evaluation Reports) is to be produced, evaluating the project progress and quality; Deliverable WP7-D3 'Annual self-assessment review' is part of the Monitoring & Evaluation Report-s.

The 1st Monitoring & Evaluation Report analyzes activities/outcomes/outputs for the period starting January 15th 2021 throughout December 15th 2021.



1. WORK PACKAGES & DELIVERABLES

1.1 WP1 Mapping the Collaborative Landscape

WP1-D1 PARTNER COUNTRY REPORTS ON UECs

Deliverable produced: “Mapping the Collaborative Landscape Institutional Landscape Optimisation – Synthesis of Partner Country Reports”, by UCLAN, October 2021.

Main content/structure, of this comprehensive document: A) General Literature Review [Purpose; Methodology; UEC; Formation of UEC; Considerations when Forming a UEC; Barriers; Enablers; Availability of Policies; Good Practice; Conclusions] B) Synthesis of Country Reports [Purpose; Layout; Methods; Current Context] C) Good Practices [Research Trends; Local Context] D) Potential Framework E) Discussion/Conclusions F) References.

The **overarching aim** of the Report is developing a UEC framework, towards establishing and maintaining UECs for DR in Philippines, Thailand and Sri Lanka. Its two main sections are the literature review and the synthesis of the research findings conducted in the three said countries.

Literature review - Search strategy was to use key terms –already identified from scoping searches in relevant databases [Web of Science, Google Scholar and Embase]-, from eligible literature (only in English). Said search yielded approximately 497000 articles, leaving 600 eligible papers (first 200 highest cited/database); after applying inclusion criteria, 99 articles were eligible for further consideration and analysis.

Synthesis of documentary research conducted in the Philippines, Sri Lanka, and Thailand – It mainly addresses (for the three cited countries) the current context, the good practices and the research trends of UEC. Its results lead to a framework proposal (based on the review of the good practices, the consideration of enablers and barriers and the availability of specific policies for UEC).

As one of the **main conclusions**, few UECs for DR were identified and, existing ones, were supported by the government; on the other hand, good practices were compiled for the three countries.



In terms of recommendations from the Report: A) Conducting additional research, not only for a complete understanding of the current priorities for DR (and their utility for DR) in Sri Lanka, Thailand and the Philippines B) In depth analysis of existing UEC links between institutions C) Identify barriers and enablers, regarding effective UECs.

MIUN, as Project Coordinator, has confirmed that, above assessed Report, was reviewed thoroughly by the Quality Board/Steering Committee. As well, in the March 2022 meeting, the Social Network Analysis will be presented, for discussion, amendment and validation.

Besides the above assessed Report, **Survey Results** for **Task 1.2** - surveying university staff with links to UEC- and **Task 1.3** -surveying staff in leadership roles on their views regarding UEC-, must be noted.

For instance, in terms of **Institutional Landscape** (Task 1.3), 59 valid responses were compiled (22 from the Philippines, 20 from Sri Lanka, 17 from Thailand), towards the Thematic analysis, in order to identify UECs' enablers and barriers, within four main themes such as Administrative (Structural), Financial (Material), Cultural (Relational), Capability (Cultural). As per the Top 5 barriers and enablers/promoters, more than 200 valid responses were gathered.

Regarding Task 1.2 –**University Questionnaire**- 190 responses were considered as valid (71 from the Philippines, 63 from Sri Lanka, 56 from Thailand). Questions dealt with aspects such as Academic background, Job role, Barriers faced, UEC part of the workload, External relations agreement, Priorities of the Sendai Agreement, UEC being outlined in internal policy or Types of barriers faced.

And, in terms of the Egonet data, there were 153 respondents, evenly distributed from the Project partners, except from CMU (who did not deliver any Egonet data).

Some **other relevant documents** on file, include the **3 National Reports** (addressing the National context-s –Policies, Types of UECs, Gaps, Enablers, Barriers-, Best Practices, Research Trends focused on UEC, Conclusions), **Database Guidelines** , **Qualitative Analysis** (by UCLAN) or **Overall Conclusions** [Relevance of implementation of UECs in the 3 countries, serving innovation and developing the economy/society; DRR – few UEC and R&I, with focus on it; Best Practices – both, HEIs and private sector,



can be strengthened through several types of UEC; UEC focused on DRM, need support from the government-s).

Compiled feedback, from Project partners, in terms of describing the data collection process and rating of the final result of said process, being valid and serving its purpose:

→ **Process:** receiving link to the questionnaire, distributing it to target participants, identifying appropriate institutional structure and university prospective participants, contacting them -requesting assistance- and asking contacts to disseminate the questionnaire link to colleagues/further contacts.

The online questionnaire was conducted to the academic staff of the institute, administrative staff and industry collaborators.

→ **National reports**, prepared following primary and secondary data collection, which included **three surveys**. And, data collection, based on literature review –hence, being valid and methodical-.

→ **Challenges**, and delays, due to, local Project partners, not having ‘live’ access to records of who already submitted the surveys – data privacy issues-. Data collection and analysis, performed by UCLAN.

→ Also challenges, in terms of the balance of standardization/uniformity, of the instruments for comparison across the 3 countries, versus the context-specific nuances affecting respondents’ replies.

→ As well, some **issues** did arise in terms of reaching out to enterprises -for the market analysis survey-, caused by, some faculty/researchers interviewed, being hesitant to disclose contact information of their contacts in enterprises (once more, data privacy). Therefore, additional time was needed to make connections with the enterprises.

→ As a **common barrier**, mentioned was the insufficient support given to the collaboration from the administration of the institute-s.



- Overall, the **process** could be considered as **valid** and serving its purpose, definitely, with interesting and useful insights.

According to the final results of the document studies and the three questionnaires, SECRA Project members were able to identify enablers, barriers and policy requirements in a clear manner.

The said results included current situation, best practices and research trend, serving the purpose of the status of UECs.

- As a **recommendation** towards future improvement, the consideration of how to empower -Asian partner countries- with more of the survey design and development, monitoring of the data-gathering process and data quality assurance.

1.2 WP2 Institutional Landscape Optimization

As confirmed by MIUN (Project Coordinator), following suggestion from WP2 co-leads, it was **decided to postpone** the start of this **WP**; policy briefs can not commence **until** –**WP1 content**- is **ready**. Also, it is to be noted that, policy dialogues, must take place in situ.

WP2-D1 UEC RELATIONAL FRAMEWORK

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP2-D2 POLICY BRIEFS (ONE FOR EACH PARTNER COUNTRY)

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP2-D3 ONLINE AND ON-SITE WORKSHOPS

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report



WP2-D4 POLICY DIALOGUES (ONE FOR EACH PARTNER COUNTRY)

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

1.3 WP3 University Enterprise Collaboration Community of Practice

WP3 is **to start** along with Project Meeting in **March 2022**; MIUN has confirmed that, preparatory work, should be in place before said date.

WP3-D1 ONLINE PLATFORM FOR UEC COMMUNITIES OF PRACTICE

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP3-D2 COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON-SITE TRAINING

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP3-D3 COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON LINE TRAINING

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

1.4 WP4 Innovation and Enterprise

WP4-D1 CORPORATE START-UP LAB

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP4-D2 UNIVERSITY ENTERPRISE ENGAGEMENT DAY

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP4-D3 ONLINE TRAINING SESSIONS

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report



WP4-D4 PARTNER INSTITUTION STAFF MOBILITY

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

1.5 WP5 University Enterprise Collaboration Compass

The Consortium has started working on WP5 –UEC Compass-, since it is not contingent on WP1 results.

WP5-D1 UEC COMPASS MODEL AND TOOL

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

At the time of delivering this Report, main work in place has been to **conceptualize** the **UEC Compass** and to **develop** the **Compass Questionnaire** – core of the assessment in the Compass. A complete draft of the Questionnaire has been produced and, Consortium, is preparing to launch the pilot in order to assess the need for adaptation to the local context.

On file:

- ➔ **“UEC Compass in brief”** – Compass description, addressing the definition of a UEC Compass, Application Levels, Components [Self-Assessment, Survey], Dimensions [7] & Indicators [19] –Table-, Workflow and Conclusions.
- ➔ **“UEC Compass”** – Presentation, dealing , among other aspects, with Stakeholders Purposes, Dimensions, several Examples of Results (‘spidergram’), Workflow and Implementation.
- ➔ **“Collaboration Compass”** – Excel sheet, addressing Indicators, Questions and Answers [a scoring system of questions, loading different weights into indicators] for: Structure, QA, Initiatives, Integration, Activities, Institutional Support, Environment and Questions for Students. This tool, it is completed with Background and Self-Assessment of Working Life Linkages.



WP5-D2 ON-SITE AND ONLINE TRAINING SESSIONS

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

WP5-D3 SENSITIZATION PROGRAMME

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

1.6 WP6 Dissemination and Exploitation

WP6-D1 DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION STRATEGY

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

Dissemination and Exploitation Plan, delivered on October 2021 – Besides addressing its aims, the structure of the Plan and the communication and exploitation, a comprehensive Table compiles dissemination/exploitable results and potential corresponding actions per WP and Task-s.

As well, two Templates are included in the Plan: 1) Planned dissemination and exploitation actions - List of dissemination action type, Description of specific dissemination actions, Target Groups, Expected dates and Measurable indicators 2) Dissemination actions table (to be updated during each Steering Committee Meeting) - Institution, Description (Resource-s, person in charge, place, date), Dissemination Content, Target Group, Mechanism-s to reach Target Group, Number of participants, Date.

Examples of **digital dissemination**: <https://www.mcl.edu.ph/mcl-joins-eu-funded-project-for-resilience-in-asia/>

<https://www.agro.cmu.ac.th/agro60/en/secra.php>

<https://www.sjp.ac.lk/news/usi-partner-in-project-funded-by-the-european-commission/>

A relevant dissemination action/event, for SECRA Project, has been the **ICSEM2021** <http://icsecm.org/> 12th International Conference on Structural Engineering and



Construction Management ; a special session was dedicated to SECRA at the Kandy Conference, on December 21st 2021.

In terms of gathered **feedback** (from **Project partners**, at Mid Term External Evaluation Report), **Internal Target Groups** (within the institutions) are: community partners, faculty, researchers and research support staff, students, administrators, offices providing university-enterprise-related facilities and support services (e.g. assisting with student internships, student/faculty mobility, incubators,) .

Dissemination actions for these Groups, include: creating a policy, to determine specific measures on establishing DRRM mitigation strategies, targeted meetings with relevant offices, use of social media (web articles), bulletin articles, hosting events (open to the public), faculty/HEI website, Research conferences, Project awareness meetings/sessions with academics and administration staff, Interview via questionnaire, improving existing incubator, e-newsletter.

As per **External Target Groups** [community partners, partners in industry, government, NGOs/civil society, other universities], **Dissemination actions** -for these Groups-, include: collaboration with Project country reports, promoting its results at a Conference –to be held-, use of social media (web articles), bulletin articles, hosting events (open to the public), faculty website, Research conferences, Interview via questionnaire, Newsletters, i.e. UoR Jointly organizing the ‘Special session on Strengthening University Enterprise Collaborations for Resilient Community “SECRA”’. - The Kandy conference (ICSECM (2021) – held on 18/12/2021-, Journal papers, workshops with international Project partners, e.g. HUD - several keynote speeches, delivered by the representatives (SECRA related).

WP6-D2 WEBSITE AND ONLINE PRESENCE

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

Project website: <https://drrcollab.org/> ; relevance of keeping the website updated with news of activities/events and uploading deliverables (if agreed by Consortium). A new section has been recently added to show Project’s progress and activity-ies.

Twitter: <https://twitter.com/drrcollab> ; needs update in terms of content, last posting



was from November 2021. As well, number of followers must increase – 5 at the time of issuing this Report-.

WP6-D3 QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

On file, **one Newsletter** (first one) issued in September 2021, as a 4 pages detailed introduction to SECRA Project.

MIUN, as Project Coordinator, has confirmed that, main reason for only producing one letter –and not three, as per Proposal, in this first year- has been the postponement/delays of the two items (WP1 output-s and November 2021 Meeting – now, in March 2022-) that were main features for the said newsletters.

WP6-D4 PRESS-RELEASES

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

On file, **three press releases**, issued by MIUN (2020) , USJ (2021) and MCL (2021); press releases are disseminated by Project partner HEIs, via their regular channels.

WP6-D5 PROMOTIONAL MATERIAL

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

On file, several **templates** and **logos**. And, as per promotional material in the three local languages, it has not been translated/produced yet, mainly due to the absence of local activities (COVID-19 restrictions).

WP6-D6 ARTICLES IN LOCAL TRADE PUBLICATION

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

So far, at the time of delivering the 1st M&E Report, **no articles** have been produced. As it has been confirmed by MIUN, these articles are planned to be published –mainly-



for advertising/disseminating the **on-site events**; and, said events, had to be **postponed** due to COVID-19.

On file, a comprehensive **Disseminations Table**, with information about **events** already **held** –description, content, target group, mechanisms to reach target group, number of participants and date-. MIUN does confirm that, WP6 co-leads, regularly remind Consortium members to submit any produced dissemination activities, to feed into said Table.

WP6-D7 SUSTAINABILITY AND CONTINUITY PLAN

To be evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

1.7 WP7 Quality Assurance

WP7-D1 QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

Quality Control and Assurance Plan – delivered by TTU, with its final version under revision. Table 1, summarizes requirements/standards/guidelines for the types of SECRA Project’s deliverables.

Table 2, compiles verifiable quality indicators (quantitative and qualitative) and means of verification (agreed by Project partners) for all Project’s Tasks.

Risk Analysis and Management Plan – It is a risk assessment document, approved by the Steering Committee and to be regularly updated by MIUN and MSU.

The first Table addresses assumptions and risks related to the six specific Project objectives, and risks related to the outcomes, outputs and activities.

The Plan also includes a Risk Evaluation section, with a probability of the risks happening and their consequences; risks are given a score (for probability / consequence), multiplied to obtain a risk value. Scoring (color coding, 3) with a risk matrix, representing the outcome of the said risk evaluation.

Last, but not least, the Mitigation and Management of Risks, with the course of action towards mitigating the identified risks and management planning of occurred risks.



MIUN –Project Coordinator- confirms that, the **Steering Committee, acts as Quality Board**, with –regular meetings- as recurrent checkpoints. If any particular/relevant issue arises, separate meetings will be in place.

Quality processes and measures implemented, so far, have been **positively rated** by Project **partners** – For instance, feedback is gathered after every meeting for quality assurance purposes (reflecting both, on the performance of the partners and the quality of the material).

In terms of **suggestions**: generating articles/papers, peer-reviewed and published, would strengthen the quality assurance in the deliverables

WP7-D2 ONGOING EVALUATION REPORTS

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

Corresponding **questionnaires** are made available **after each formal meeting** (mainly Steering Committee and Project meetings), with **feedback/results** being compiled in a **report**.

WP7-D3 ANNUAL SELF-ASSESSMENT REVIEW

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

It refers to the three **M&E Reports** to be produced; **first** one, already **delivered**. The self-assessment is part of this Report.

1.8 WP8 Project Management

WP8-D1 CONSOLIDATED WORK PLAN

GANTT Chart, in place, being used regularly at Management Meetings and at Steering Committee Meetings.

In terms of Project Management, no major deviations have been reported.



Compiled **feedback from Project partners**, indicate that –SECRA Project- is being **properly managed by MIUN**.

Some mentioned aspects, include: decision-making involving all partners, significant information being regularly, and timely, provided.

Regarding **COVID-19** effects (WP1, for instance, or switching into a virtual ‘mode’ for meetings/activities) on the Project have been **properly, timely and effectively, addressed** – overall, and given the uneasy circumstances and unwanted/unavoidable delays, there is a general agreement (by Project partners) about it.

Rating of **WP leaders’ performance**, considered as positive

WP8-D2 RISK AND CONTINUITY PLAN

Evaluated, Risk Assessment and Management Plan, at WP7-D1

WP8-D3 KICK-OFF MEETING

Held online, on February 2nd – 4th 2021; on file, evidences: program with agenda, keynotes and WPs/tasks, presentations, complete report (including screenshots, participants lists –close to 30 or more than 30, 2 days- Minutes or strands/questions emerging from this Meeting).

<https://drrcollab.org/project-kickoff-meeting/>

In terms of **Quality**, Feedback survey-s (Evaluation of the Meeting), with 19 replies and questions regarding aspects of the Meeting (internet connection, participants being actively involved, time management, purpose and objectives being clear, suitability of meeting format, satisfaction with taken decisions, ...) were, overall, positively rated (majority of ratings were “agree” and “strongly agree”). Suggestions were also compiled.

The above mentioned feedback/results, was reviewed at the Project Meeting that took place on October 18th 2021.



WP8-D4 MANAGEMENT MEETINGS MINUTES

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

As originally planned, **2 Project Meetings** have been **delivered**, so far; the Kick-Off-Meeting and the Project Meeting on October 18th 2021 –this was an extra meeting, online, since the 2nd Project Meeting [November 2021, Sri Lanka] was postponed due to COVID-19 restrictions-. Said October 2021 Meeting’s main goal was to review WP1 results.

Project Meeting 3, to be held on March 2022

Regarding **Steering Committee Meetings**: 1) February 4th 2021 2) June 10th 2021 3) October 18th 2021; all, online, with evidences on file. A fourth one, to be held, as well, on March 2022. And, an extra meeting, took place –September 15th 2021-, for deciding on the postponement/format of the latter Project Meeting.

WP8-D5 INTERIM REPORTS

To be fully evaluated, assessed at 2nd / 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report

MIUN, as Project Coordinator, has confirmed that, **all Project partners –but one-** have **timely reported**. Next interim reporting period is for months 8 – 14.

WP8-D6 FINAL REPORT

To be evaluated, assessed at 3rd Monitoring & Evaluation Report



2. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 General Aspects

- SECRA **Project** is, considering the evaluated period, **progressing adequately**, even with the impact of COVID-19, that caused delays, changes, and switching from face-to-face to virtual scenario-s, in some activities/outputs.
- The persisting **COVID-19 situation** has been a **major problem** for the implementation of the Project; but, negative effects have been overcome with the collaboration, and commitment, of all the Consortium.
- Good collaboration between Project Partners, in place
- An **efficient implementation**, is also confirmed, so far
- **Project Management** – perceived as **effective** and with **good ratings** from Project partners.
- **WP1** has produced **comprehensive content**, including the synthesis of the 3 Partner Country Reports.

Data collection process (WP1) has received, overall, **positive remarks**; as well, some mentions to improvable matters/suggestions, were compiled.

CMU did encounter some practical problems at this phase that led to not delivering all complete data.

- **WP5**, has seen **some developed content**, which also needs to be given a positive consideration.
- Own perception and rating from SECRA Project partners, of **dissemination activities** is **positive**.
- In terms of **quality measures** and processes, **same as above**
- So far, the Consortium has **not requested any extension** and, Project partners, regularly do check the WPs/deliverables, to ensure progress is appropriate or if any adjustment is requested.



- Collaboration between Project partners –
 - Roles and goals of the partnership among SECRA Project members are clear and defined.
 - **Trust, among SECRA Project partners, in place**, contributing to the achievement of the Project's deliverables.
 - SECRA Project **partners are, overall, committed to their tasks/roles** and to the Project results and with an **active** participation.
 - As well, decision-making system has been, so far and overall, considered as transparent, involving all Project partners.
 - In terms of, **Associated Partners**, providing valuable input to the Project and being actively involved – the vast majority of Project partners do agree with the diagnosis.
- Challenges towards full development of SECRA Project at local Project partner HEIs:
 - Operationalization of the **Project's budget**, due to the **differences** in the guidelines **between SECRA and government's financial policies**.
 - **COVID-19** effects/restrictions, among other matters, affecting the engagement of different stakeholders, data collection process, face-to-face meetings, workshops; this was mentioned by several partners.
 - For some HEIs, **finding Disaster Related Research Collaborations**
 - Understanding Disaster's risk and Resilience
 - Overcome the **barriers** of the **UEC collaboration implementation**, particular to Climate Change and DR, such as the strengthening of network, trust between university and enterprises or the UEC mechanism and supporting system.



- Important challenges so to widening the impact and reach of SECRA Project to other (none partner) HEIs/organizations/stakeholders and/or at local/regional level:
 - **Commitment, of stakeholders**, to strengthen collaboration
 - For instance, in **Philippines**, the **3** Project partner **universities may not be not representative** of the HEIs, **at national level** (i.e. areas such as the Visayas or Mindanao, would have different cultures and practices).
 - Lack of support
 - **Absence of collaboration efforts**, especially from/with resilient communities.
 - **Lack of policy initiative** -at national level, Sri Lanka- at development and implementation.
 - **Lack of proper awareness** about **current state of affairs**, regarding UEC and, how critically it affects the growth and wellbeing of the wider community at large.
 - Understanding the impact of disasters and learning how to prevent it
 - Financial barriers
 - Administrative barriers
 - Heavy academic **workload**
 - Less awareness on Entrepreneurial culture in HEIs
 - Raise interest in the sector to get involved in HEIs' activities
 - **Enhancing the UEC collaboration model** from the institutional level to the national level, towards successful implementation.
 - **COVID-19** and its negative effects



- **Cultural and linguistic barriers** –this could be overcome via involving experts-.
- Lack of willingness of participants to partner up with the industry and vice versa.
- **Objectives and activities** of the Project have been **considered realistic** by Project **partners**; as well, rated as **very specific** and clearly communicated, along with -identified barriers and enablers, in WPs- are to reach its objectives and to achieve realistic results.

Main Project's objectives and activities, have been **generated from the clear understanding of the problems of UEC collaboration**, particular to climate change and DR, between universities and enterprises in the three countries.

And, the CoP, is to be created towards overcoming UEC related problems

- As well, **activities** are rated as **relevant** to the **needs** of the **target groups** of SECRA Project.

HEIs will benefit from **capacity development**, enterprises will benefit from **collaborative work**, and -the combined effect- will contribute to build a resilient community.

SECRA, aims to strengthen -or initiate- UEC among its partner countries which need to strengthen their resilience. And, through **strengthening the UECs**, it does fulfil a valuable gap within the said three countries.

- **Main strengths of SECRA**, cited by Project partners, include:
 - **Collaboration**, among universities -locally and globally-.
 - **Data from 3 different countries** (and **3 different universities**) made it **valid and conclusive**.
 - Available expertise/know-how through its Consortium, experience and resourcefulness.



- **Diversity** among Project partners
- Financial strength and support
- Initiative
- Wider understanding of the UEC towards stakeholders, getting the Project's objectives refined with the industrial collaboration.
- Efficient leadership and partnership
- Wide audience
- Interdisciplinarity
- Involvement of **experts**, who understand **UEC problems**, particular to **Climate Change** and **DR**, and the need to overcome these problems.
- Project's **objectives**
- SECRA Project, perceived as different from other initiatives –
 - Focus on collaborating for DRRM
 - Broader scope of “enterprises” and its focus on “resilience”
 - Focused on university and enterprise relationship
 - Project **theme**, Disaster Resilience (**DR**), is of timely **importance**, **relevant** and **impactful**.
 - Wide collaboration
 - More direct towards industry collaboration
 - Having 13 diverse partners
 - Promoting University-Enterprise Collaboration, through policy impact and building trustworthiness among government, HEIs and private sector to build healthy PPP.



- Project's 6 objectives
- Promotion of gender equity and diversity in the UEC collaboration
- **Contribution** towards **resilient communities** through **increasing** the **capacity** of **HEIs** to initiate, manage, maintain, and benefit from **UEC**.
- Providing a **framework** of **structured collaboration** promoting understanding between people; and, **further contribution** to the sustainable **development** of **HE**, mostly through enhanced cooperation between academic communities and societal partners.
- **National initiatives** -fostered by the Authorities- **in the target field of SECRA**, in the **participating countries** – for instance, HUD, cited: a UEC, initiated between Dialogue Axiata PLC and the UoR and the University of Moratuwa (2018, Sri Lanka); UEC, between the Ministry of Primary Industries and Social Empowerment (PI&SE), in 2016, with UoR, as a modernisation program in the cinnamon agricultural sector; or, the Faculty of Agro-Industry at Chang Mai University –Thailand-, has had collaborations with local and national enterprises.

Some others: in Thailand, research funding agencies (such as NIA, STI), provide special track of the research funding for the collaboration research project.

Or, in Philippines, there are initiatives related to supporting academe-industry partnerships and innovation: Dept. of Science and Technology CRADLE <https://s4cp.dost.gov.ph/programs/cradle/>

- Overall rating/assessment of the Project, relevant for qualitative analysis, for issues such as: serving its purpose, if institutions involved are performing well so far, policy support, ownership by beneficiaries, use of appropriate technology, gender equality, consistency of activities with objectives of the project, SECRA meeting its specific objectives and/or future transferability of Project results.
- SECRA Project, **serving its purpose**, receiving full policy support. And,



activities are **consistent** and with Project goals. Project's results, would be transferable and, SECRA, is already meeting some of its specific objectives.

- Project is running smoothly, despite COVID-19 effects
- As per **satisfaction** with the **overall progress** of SECRA Project – ‘satisfactory’ (with some ‘very satisfactory’) rating-s, according to Project partners.
- In terms of **matters to be improved** until now and what **changes** may **positively affect** this initiative:
 - **Financial** operations; **clarifying financial regulation-s**, and allowing an alternative budget as well as an adjusting plan - related to the COVID-19 situation-. Overall, being flexible in terms of amendments to the budget.
 - Developing the outcomes in peer-reviewed journal articles, with all the Project partner HEIs as authors.
 - Once possible, going back to a **face-to-face scenario** for activities and events.
 - Build up background for formulation of additional projects with international collaboration.
- Regarding the **possibilities** (or already existing) of **synergies with similar projects, related with SECRA Project main topic-s** – Some Project partners do agree with those possibilities; the ones mentioned: a) network Thailand Disaster was mentioned <https://www.facebook.com/tndrtdpf> b) Match with other projects in the field of DR and the UEC collaboration c) Potential synergies with government-supported initiatives relating to academia-industry partnerships.
- **Awareness** of any other **EU funded project or similar initiatives** within this **field** – following ones were cited, with several Project partners not being aware of similar Projects:
 - **CABARET** <https://cabaret.buildresilience.org/>



- **ASCENT** <https://news-archive.hud.ac.uk/news/2016/march/launchinganeweprojectaimstoreduceimpactofdisasters.php>
- **BECK** <http://beck-erasmus.com/>
- **BRITAE** <https://www.britae.lk/>
- **CCA-DRR** - Research Training Network on Tackling Climate change as an underlying Disaster Risk Driver.

2.2 Institutional perspective

- Positive changes / added value, due to SECRA, perceived within the institutions –
 - I.e. PNU, having an international program for DRRM
 - Data, and outputs, from **WP1**
 - Institutional level efforts for the ultimate betterment of the country-ies and its people while developing human capital at the university.
 - International collaboration
 - Supporting and strengthening the existing incubator and the external relations office.
 - Inter-institute relationships, both within the country and foreign countries
 - **Attitudinal changes of administrative staff**, in collaborating with research programs, being exposed to **international practices**.
 - Better contacts with private sector/enterprises
 - Enhancing networking abilities
 - **Clear understanding** of the **UEC problems**, via the survey results



- Building of expertise network, focusing on the Climate Change and DR
- **Sharing ideas of implementing UEC** (both from partner and program countries), useful to be used as guidelines for proper UEC collaboration.
- **Main positive inputs** and contributions, from SECRA, until now –
 - Expertise
 - Capacity building
 - Financial resources
 - Prestige
 - Increased awareness on the lack of policies and regulations for UEC
 - New/useful contacts
 - Providing the opportunity to work with new and existing partners from different countries
 - SECRA Project, supporting the necessary knowledge and resources for developing the successful model of UEC collaboration

2.3 Individual perspective

- **Main results**, from a **personal aspect**, derived from the involvement in SECRA –
 - Collaborating and **establishing linkages** with national and **ASEAN partners**
 - **Capacity building**, sharpening skills
 - Progress in research and developing teaching careers
 - Recognition
 - Networking



- Learning from new experiences
- Understanding the needs, of university staff, towards developing the UEC and the model of the UEC collaboration

2.4 Sustainability, Impact, Efficiency

□ SUSTAINABILITY

- There is a **perception, at this stage**, among **Project partners**, that **–SECRA Project results-** will be **maintained after the ending of the EU funding**; cited were: A) Existing (i.e. ADMU) offices and mechanisms for academy - industry partnerships, that will integrate outcomes from SECRA B) Opportunity for collaboration with enterprises C) Policy dialogue D) Platform for UEC Communities of Practice E) Regularly monitoring and understanding the UEC landscape, indispensable to sustain long term studies F) Research knowledge/experience, through network analysis, methodologies/applications learnt, associations and dissemination G) International collaboration H) Knowledge transfer I) Incubator and awareness about the importance of UEC J) Developed website K) Staff and institutional relationships built through SECRA L) Activities linked to administrative collaboration, awareness building along with academic involvement (all this, should strengthen the systems to apply for future funds) M) Compass tool, that will build a platform for further development N) Forum-s/workshop-s of UEC application O) Collaboration –among Project partners- through co-research, co-curriculum development and/or mobility programs P) Online materials Q) Networks among members of the universities, industry and other stakeholders R) Future SECRA based publications.
- **Issues** that need to be **taken into account**, regarding how **to ensure the resources to sustain Project results once no longer EU funding is in place**: A) For existing offices/centers, since some budget allocation is in place, it is easier –if needed- to apply for other grant mechanisms B) Develop proposals



for future projects, from local and international funding agency, or collaborate with public sector C) Updated database-s and events D) Strengthening the industry, inter-institute-s collaboration and allocation of resources from the institute-s E) Future collaboration, such as extensions to SECRA Project F) International collaboration; network among academia, most likely, the most effective tool for knowledge transfer and experience-s sharing G) Capacity building actions H) Local Project partner HEIs, to incorporate the necessary reoccurring needs within their current structures I) Publications and institutionalisation of the outputs.

- In terms of **recommendations/matters regarding overall future sustainability of SECRA Project, and its results** – A) Evaluate the set-up/mechanisms, at each local Project partner university, enabling the conduct of UECs; confirming there is a policy and layout already in place, ensures sustainability B) Further networking and collaboration between Project partners (i.e. conferences/symposiums, research collaborations, applying learnt experiences to other future projects,...) C) Developing the industry setup to cater UEC in the future D) To set up a SECRA network, as an international platform, focusing on all activities concerning UEC E) Compile ideas about sustainability from Thailand and Sri Lanka’s network-s of academia focusing on DRR F) Submit a proposal for mobility project to the EC, based on SECRA network G) 2nd phase of SECRA Project, evaluating the outcome of the Project, redesign and conceptualising its initial framework, towards further improvement.

□ IMPACT

- As one of the primary impacts, so far, it is foreseen a future strengthened University - Enterprise Collaboration for Resilient Communities in Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand – mainly, due to: A) WP1 outcomes, have helped identified the gaps/barriers –and enablers- in UEC, particularly for the purpose of enhancing resilience, in order to develop the succeeding activities and outputs accordingly B) Due to SECRA, fresh institutionalized interactions



are being built, along with uplifting any already existing collaborations with enterprise, and sustaining them in the long run for the progress of all stakeholders towards resilient communities C) Importance of collecting data, workshops and meetings. And, all local Project partners are in academia, thus, adapting this concept for Resilient Communities in the future D) Knowledge (universities) and financial resources/capabilities (enterprise-s/private sector), as the two major factors to determine the success of implementation.

- In terms of, SECRA Project, impacting (or its expected future impact) a variety of entities and individuals and –in general- all stakeholders, engaged in addressing SECRA related topics – A) Great potential to engage, and impact, a variety of stakeholders, due to the broad definition of “enterprise” (industry and other sectors as well) B) Opportunities for, universities, conducting Research with partners, delivering workshops, and working with local enterprises and public sector-s C) Combined outcome (of students exploring opportunities and, private sector, meeting diverse prospective individuals), is to facilitate the much needed exchange/HEIs universities and enterprises, which will eventually contribute to enhance community resilience D) Best practices and lessons learnt from Project partners and collaboration E) Positive engagement of Project partners and, stakeholders, contributing with innovative ideas -to improve HEIs-, to incorporate innovative models (i.e. Triple, Quadruple Helix) F) Creating the idea of setting up UEC, considering the Compass and functions G) Potential future collaboration between enterprises (engaged via the literature review process) and HEIs H) Impact, as well, from capacity building actions.
- **Perception of, SECRA, at regional level, overall, highlighting the capacities of HEIs, when referring to University – Enterprise Collaboration – This diagnosis is confirmed by Project partners, with below examples as confirmation:**
 - Via the collaborative analysis (country reports, landscape), learning is in place about the communities of practice and best practices, and this will be expanded regionally.
 - Project’s reach is for wider audience than expected



- Regional-level institutes are working together, creating a broader understanding and a potential future improvement in the UECs.
- SECRA Project, clearly states the relevance of enhancing, HEIs' capacities, on UEC.

□ EFFICIENCY

- It is **confirmed** and agreed that, SECRA **Project**, it is being **delivered, overall, in a cost efficient manner**, despite travel restrictions and absence, so far, of face-to-face meetings.
- The **vast majority** of **activities** have been, **overall, considered** as **timely produced**; but, **again, COVID-19** –noted by several Project partners- **caused setback**, and **challenges**, in **certain activities** (WP1, survey/questionnaire-s and related data collection), and switching to a **virtual scenario**.

2.5 Recommendations / Considerations for the Consortium

- ⦿ Emphasize the task of **accomplishing indicators**, by the end of the Project; in the Proposal, i.e., the ones addressing short/long term impact, dissemination and exploitation.

This, should be reviewed –along with assessment results of this Report- , with the external Evaluator, in a Consortium Meeting (March 2022).

- ⦿ Ensure that, all **deliverables**, are **reviewed**, not only **by** the **Quality Board**, but **benchmarked** with the **Quality indicators** (quantitative/qualitative) and means of verification –already produced by the Consortium, **WP7**-.
- ⦿ If agreed by Consortium members and no copyright/IP issues arise, **upload** the relevant **deliverables** on the project's **website**.
- ⦿ Address the issue of **updating** the Chronogram/**Gantt chart** of activities, **regularly**, as a sort of dynamic Contingency Plan; unforeseen COVID-19



related circumstances are not to be written off.

- ⦿ Produce **feedback surveys** at all remaining **events and activities**; this tool is very useful in terms of qualitative analysis, for any given Project.
- ⦿ **Once feasible, foster all possible face-to-face trainings**, and –overall- interaction, not only at internal level but with external stakeholders as well. This view is also shared by Consortium members.
- ⦿ It is **always recommended** (for several reasons) for any Project – to produce and **deliver/upload** at the earliest, **evidences of activities** (e.g. meetings, training/workshops), such as photos [recording/screenshots, if virtual events], signed participants list –face-to-face-, agenda/program, Minutes, feedback survey, presentations, link to corresponding news,...
- ⦿ Dissemination actions need to be fostered, creating a higher degree of awareness and impact.
- ⦿ **Maximize engagement** with **Associated Partners**, so they can provide valuable input/feedback about Project deliverables/activities/outcomes as well as acting as ‘**champions**’ of SECRA Project.
- ⦿ Start working on a **Sustainability Plan**, once the platform with the UEC Compass, the CoP and training material-s is up and running.

Relevant, among other aspects, for sustainability purposes, to address and foster engagement with several actors within the ecosystem, such as Faculty members, administrative staff, policy makers, HEIs’ networks, other similar Projects, local/regional stakeholders, students, private sector, funding agencies, NGOs, Researchers.

- ⦿ It is of relevance, for quality purposes, to check/benchmark all deliverables versus Quality Indicators and LFM Indicators.