



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



## **WP6.3 Quality and Monitoring Report (M12)**

June 2022

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	4
<b>2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE</b>	4
<b>2.1 Project Evaluation</b>	4
2.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions	5
2.1.2 Additional comments	10
2.1.3 Overall Conclusions	10
<b>3. POST MEETINGS' EVALUATIONS</b>	12
<b>3.1 Meetings' Evaluation</b>	12
3.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions	13
3.1.2 Additional comments	15
3.1.3 Overall Conclusions	16
<b>4. POST- WORKSHOPS' EVALUATIONS</b>	17
<b>4.1 Workshops' Evaluation</b>	17
4.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions	18
4.1.2 Additional comments	20
4.1.3 Overall Conclusions	23

<b>Project acronym</b>	Eco-Car
<b>Project full title</b>	Vocational Training Diploma on Electrical and Hybrid Vehicles
<b>WP No &amp; Title</b>	WP6 Quality and Impact Evaluation
<b>Responsible partner</b>	WP6 Leader: UD
<b>Contributing partners</b>	Co-leaders: TTU, ZUJ, BME Quality Committee: UJ, JUST, MU, TTU, BAU, HTU, ASU, ZUJ, TH OWL, RWTH, UD, BME, NTUA, UNIVAQ
<b>Distribution level</b>	Partnership
<b>Total number of pages</b>	23
<b>Version</b>	2
<b>Language</b>	English
<b>Reviewed by</b>	Co-leaders
<b>Status</b>	Approved

### Revision History

Version	Date	Description	Action	Page(s)
1	29/06/2022	Original document	C	23
2	01/09/2022	Updated and Approved document		23

(\* ) Action: C= creation, I=Insert, U=Update, R=Replace, D=Delete

### Disclaimer

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Quality and Impact Evaluation Co-Leaders have approved the report that is uploaded in the Quality Section of the shared file space.

This report will accumulate, analyse and summarise the results from the quality evaluations done in the first year of the Eco-Car project (01/01/2021 to 31/12/2021).

The elements that were identified and evaluated during the first year of the project were:

- Project performance.
- Partnership Meetings.
- Workshops.

## 2. PROJECT PERFORMANCE

The project evaluation among partners is performed at each half-year's end, except first year (M12, M18, M24, M30, M36). It aims to measure the efficiency of project management and the adequacy of the communication in the partnership, so as to reflect the views of the consortium on its progress, including any suggestions for changes and improvements.

In order to collect quantitative and qualitative data, each partner's project representative was asked to rate the project in a questionnaire made using an online digital survey tool that allowed respondents to remain anonymous. Finally, the assessment was done by analysing the responses from each partner to these questions.

If, after processing the results, the Quality Manager finds that one or more are below the expected performance, he notifies the Project Coordinator in order to set forth problem-solving procedures.

The delivery of the questionnaires and the collection of results of this internal evaluation was done using Google Forms. Elaboration of results was done using MS Excel.

### 2.1 Project Evaluation

The "*Project Evaluation*" survey contained five parts:

- Part 1: Project Management.
- Part 2: Internal Communication.
- Part 3: External Communication.
- Part 4: Overall Project Progress.
- Part 5: Personal info.

Parts 1 to 4 contained closed questions (5-point Likert scale), in which respondents had to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). The possibility to provide comments at the end was provided.

In Part 5, respondents were asked regarding their personal data, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation. Some of this information was optional for the participants in order to preserve their anonymity.

Partners were allowed to submit their answers during the period from May 7th, 2022 to June 13th, 2022.

Out of 14 participants in the survey 14 responses were received, coming from all partners (100% participation in the survey). This is illustrated in Figure 1. The responses given by the participants are analysed below.




Figure 1. Number of surveys submitted (N=14).

### 2.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions

In Part 1, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the project management.

RESULTS (M12. Project Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
Project Management									
1	I know what the project aims to achieve	0	0	1	1	12	96%	100%	14
		0%	0%	7%	7%	86%			100%
2	The responsibilities for each partner are stated clearly	1	0	1	5	7	84%	93%	14
		7%	0%	7%	36%	50%			100%
3	I am aware what tasks my organisation has to do in the coming months	0	0	1	4	9	91%	100%	14
		0%	0%	7%	29%	64%			100%
4	Feedback from the lead partner is received when a query is raised from a partner	0	1	0	6	7	87%	93%	14
		0%	7%	0%	43%	50%			100%
5	Issues are resolved quickly and effectively	0	0	1	7	6	87%	100%	14
		0%	0%	7%	50%	43%			100%
6	We receive instructions about meetings well in advance	0	2	0	4	8	86%	86%	14
		0%	14%	0%	29%	57%			100%

Table 1. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Project Management”).




Figure 2. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Project Management”).

In Part 2, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the internal communication.

RESULTS (M12. Project Evaluation)								
	1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
Internal Communication								
7	I'm satisfied with the file-sharing tool used and the method that is used for Project internal communications					90%	100%	14
	0	0	0	7	7			100%
8	Response from partners on raised issues is satisfactory					81%	93%	14
	0	1	2	6	5			100%
9	All partners provide regular updates on their work package activities					76%	93%	14
	0	1	3	8	2			100%
10	There is a good level of communication with the lead partner					89%	100%	14
	0	0	0	8	6			100%
11	There is a good level of communication among all partners					77%	86%	14
	0	2	1	8	3			100%

Table 2. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Internal Communication”).




Figure 3. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Internal Communication”).

In Part 3, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the external communication.

RESULTS (M12. Project Evaluation)								
	1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
External Communication								
12	The materials prepared and used (logo, banner, website) have been appropriate and effective for the promotion of the project objectives and results					90%	100%	14
	0	0	1	5	8			100%
13	The project activities so far promote the exploitation of the project findings					90%	100%	14
	0	0	1	5	8			100%
14	The dissemination activities so far are in line with the strategy described in the dissemination plan					89%	100%	14
	0	0	2	4	8			100%
15	The dissemination strategy depicted in the dissemination plan has been feasible and effectively facilitated the promotion of the project results and objectives					86%	100%	14
	0	0	2	6	6			100%
16	The project partners have addressed and effectively engaged the relevant stakeholders (* only for partners that have hosted/participated in activities in contact with stakeholders)					78%	86%	12
	0	0	3	7	2			86%

Table 3. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“External Communication”).




Figure 4. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“External Communication”).



In Part 4, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the overall project progress.

RESULTS (M12. Project Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
Overall Project Progress									
17	The project is keeping up with the planned objectives	0	0	1	6	6	88%	93%	13
		0%	0%	7%	43%	43%			93%
18	The workplan of the project is being followed	0	0	1	5	7	89%	93%	13
		0%	0%	7%	36%	50%			93%
19	Any deviations from the workplan have been well considered and agreed by all	0	0	0	5	8	92%	93%	13
		0%	0%	0%	36%	57%			93%
20	Partners have committed the required time and resources to achieve the objectives	0	0	0	11	2	83%	93%	13
		0%	0%	0%	79%	14%			93%
21	I'm satisfied with the deliverables delivered during the first year of the project	0	0	1	5	7	89%	93%	13
		0%	0%	7%	36%	50%			93%
22	My expectations regarding my involvement in the project (effort, time, commitments, etc) were met	0	0	1	5	7	89%	93%	13
		0%	0%	7%	36%	50%			93%

Table 4. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Overall Project Progress”).




Figure 5. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Project Evaluation (“Overall Project Progress”).

### 2.1.2 Additional comments

The comments and suggestions collected in the surveys are presented below literally transcribed (without spelling or grammatical corrections) and corresponding to one per person surveyed.

#### Internal Communication, additional comments:

- NA.
- At least in cluster 2, my emails as a cluster coordinator are often not answered. Furthermore, I would appreciate, if you could send calendar invites for regular meetings well in advance and include the meeting link in the invitation. Schedule changes on short notice are sometimes hard to realize.
- I think that scheduling salaries payments for the people who did a lot of work and will continue to do the work is important.
- Good.
- Many times the responses from partner delay for a long time, it could be good to establish interO1 rule to respond for any email within 3 days.

#### External Communication, additional comments:

- It would be better if each partner can communicate with its own network.
- Good.

#### Overall Project Progress, additional comments:

- NA.
- Good.

### 2.1.3 Overall Conclusions

The value of the weighted average of all items is more than 70% so it is not considered necessary to establish any improvement plan with respect to the results.

86,36% of the items (19 of 22) have obtained a weighted average within the range 80% - 100%.

The highest result came for the question “I know what the project aims to achieve” with weighted average 96%.

The lowest rated question was “All the partners provide regular updates on their work package activities” (weighted average: 76%).

### 3. POST MEETINGS' EVALUATIONS

Post-meetings evaluations among project partners aim to ensure the quality of the Eco-Car project key project processes (such as the management meetings' effectiveness), as well as to assess the organisational issues of the meeting and the value of the received information to the project progress.

After each meeting, an evaluation survey was conducted, asking each partner's project representative to rate the meeting in a questionnaire made using an online digital survey tool that allowed respondents to remain anonymous.

The Quality Manager collected all the answers from the partners, which reflected the views of the consortium on its progress, and the assessment was done by analysing the responses from each partner to these questions.

It is worth mentioning that the meeting is considered approved if the average percentage of weighted answers is more than 70%. Scores less than this require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

The delivery of the questionnaires and the collection of results of this internal evaluation were done using Google Forms. Elaboration of results was done using MS Excel.

#### 3.1 Meetings' Evaluation

"*Meeting Evaluation*" surveys contained 15 items that covered all activities included during the meeting, separated into the three following parts:

- Part 1: The Meeting.
- Part 2: The Project.
- Part 3: Personal info.

Parts 1 and 2 of the survey contained closed questions (5-point Likert scale), in which respondents had to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). The possibility to provide comments at the end was provided.

In Part 3, respondents were asked regarding their personal data, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation. Some of this information was optional for the participants in order to preserve their anonymity.

The results in this report summarize the information collected in the surveys that were delivered after the meetings listed in Table 5.

Meeting	Date	No of participants	No of answers	Participation (%)
4 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	26.05.2021	23	23	100%
Steering Committee Meeting and workshop for Local Partners	24.06.2021	30	15	50,00%
5 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	26.07.2021	22	3	13,64%
6 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	08.09.2021	27	12	44,44%
7 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	04.10.2021	29	7	24,14%
8 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	09.11.2021	23	3	13,04%
9 <sup>th</sup> Management Meeting Evaluation	15.12.2021	28	9	32,14%
<b>Total</b>		<b>182</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>39,56%</b>

Table 5. Meetings that were evaluated during the first year of the project.

Out of a total of 182 participants in the meetings (according to the Attendance List), 72 responses were received, coming from all partners (39,56% participation in the surveys). This is illustrated in Figure 6. The responses given by the participants are analysed below.




Figure 6. Number of surveys submitted (N=72).

### 3.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions

In Part 1, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the overall meeting.

RESULTS (M12. Management Meetings Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
A- The meeting									
1	The meeting was well planned and organised.	6	0	1	22	43	87%	92%	72
		8%	0%	1%	31%	60%			100%
2	The agenda was balanced, focusing on all key aspects of the project.	5	1	2	22	42	86%	92%	72
		7%	1%	3%	31%	58%			100%
3	The participants received all information about the meeting on time.	5	2	3	24	37	84%	90%	71
		7%	3%	4%	34%	52%			100%
4	The presentations by the partners were clear and understandable.	5	1	4	30	32	83%	92%	72
		7%	1%	6%	42%	44%			100%
5	Partners were able to interact with the other project's partners.	4	1	4	22	41	86%	93%	72
		6%	1%	6%	31%	57%			100%
6	The timetable was respected.	3	3	3	22	41	86%	92%	72
		4%	4%	4%	31%	57%			100%
7	The conference room and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting.	4	2	7	25	31	82%	91%	69
		6%	3%	10%	36%	45%			100%

Table 6. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Meetings Evaluation.




Figure 7. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Meetings Evaluation.

In Part 2, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the project.

RESULTS (M12. Management Meetings Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
B. The Project - After the meeting...									
8	The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible.	4	1	4	31	32	84%	93%	72
		6%	1%	6%	43%	44%			100%
9	The meeting contributed positively to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps.	5	1	1	26	39	86%	92%	72
		7%	1%	1%	36%	54%			100%
10	The communication between the partners was effective and clear.	4	2	2	29	34	85%	92%	71
		6%	3%	3%	41%	48%			100%
11	The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.	4	2	1	25	40	86%	92%	72
		6%	3%	1%	35%	56%			100%

Table 7. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Meetings Evaluation.




Figure 8. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Meetings Evaluation.

### 3.1.2 Additional comments

The comments and suggestions collected in the surveys are presented below literally transcribed (without spelling or grammatical corrections) and corresponding to one per person surveyed.

#### 4<sup>th</sup> Management Meeting, additional comments:

- Keep the monthly meeting.
- All are fine.
- Everything is clear.

- I would prefer a calendar invite for the meeting instead of an email containing the date, time and the meeting link.

#### Steering Committee Meeting and workshop for Local Partners, additional comments:

- This was the first onsite meeting and it was needed.

#### 6<sup>th</sup> Management Meeting, additional comments:

- More meetings are needed.

#### 7<sup>th</sup> Management Meeting, additional comments:

- My best wishes always.
- Things are fine.

#### 9<sup>th</sup> Management Meeting, additional comments:

- Many thanks for your valuable efforts. It would be helpful in the next meetings to focus the meeting on the most important points to discuss them in more detail.

### 3.1.3 Overall Conclusions

The value of the weighted average of all items is more than 70% so it is not considered necessary to establish any improvement plan with respect to the results.

All of the items have obtained a weighted average within the range 80% - 90%.

The highest result came for the question “The meeting was well planned and organised” (weighted average: 87%).

The lowest rated question was “The conference room and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting” (weighted average: 82%).

## 4. POST- WORKSHOPS' EVALUATIONS

Post-Workshop evaluations among participants aim to assess the organisational issues of the workshops and their effectiveness.

After each Workshop an evaluation survey was conducted, asking those who attended the Workshops to rate the event in a questionnaire made using an online digital survey tool that allowed respondents to remain anonymous.

The Quality Manager collected all the answers from the participants and the assessment was done by analysing the responses from each participant to these questions.

It is worth mentioning that the workshop is considered approved if the average percentage of weighted answers is more than 70%. Scores less than this require corrective actions by the partnership, led by the Project Coordinator.

The delivery of the questionnaires and the collection of results of this internal evaluation were done using Google Forms. Elaboration of results was done using MS Excel.

### 4.1 Workshops' Evaluation

“*Workshop Evaluation*” surveys contained four parts:

- Part 1: The Meeting.
- Part 2: The Project.
- Part 3: Personal info.

Parts 1 and 2 of the survey contained closed questions (5-point Likert scale), in which respondents had to give a grade between 1 and 5, with 5 being the highest (fully agree) and 1 the lowest (fully disagree). The possibility to provide comments at the end was provided.

In Part 3, respondents were asked regarding their personal data, for the purpose of ascertaining partner participation. Some of this information was optional for the participants in order to preserve their anonymity.

The results in this report summarize the information collected in the surveys that were delivered after the workshops listed in Table 8.



Workshop	Date	No of participants	No of answers	Participation %
Introduction to Batteries	23.06.2021	55	48	87,28%
Stakeholders Networking Workshop	02.09.2021	65	24	36,92%
Introduction on Internal Combustion Engines in Hybrid Vehicles and Well to Wheel LCA Calculation Workshop by UNIVAQ	13.09.2021	165	61	36,97%
Dynamics of Vehicle, active and passive safety Workshop by NTUA	05.11.2021	150	49	32,67%
Internal Combustion Engines in Hybrid Drivetrain Systems Workshop by BME	17.11.2021	138	49	35,51%
Vibroacoustic Comfort in Road Vehicles by UD	02.12.2021	128	32	25,00%
Charge Transport in Batteries and Hydrogen Vehicles Workshop by TH-OWL	20.12.2021	102	34	33,33%
<b>Total</b>		<b>803</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>36,99%</b>

Table 8. Workshops that were evaluated during the first year of the project.

Out of a total of 803 participants in the meeting (according to the Attendance List), 297 responses were received, coming from all partners (36,99% participation in the survey). The responses given by the participants are analysed below.

#### 4.1.1 Analysis of scaled questions

In Part 1, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the overall meeting.

RESULTS (M12. Workshops Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
A- The meeting									
1	The meeting was well planned and organised.	12	3	14	92	176	88%	95%	297
		4%	1%	5%	31%	59%			100%
2	The agenda was balanced, focusing on all key aspects of the project.	11	5	18	118	145	86%	95%	297
		4%	2%	6%	40%	49%			100%
3	The participants received all information about the meeting on time.	11	3	18	100	165	87%	95%	297
		4%	1%	6%	34%	56%			100%
4	The presentations by the partners were clear and understandable.	14	1	27	117	138	85%	95%	297
		5%	0%	9%	39%	46%			100%
5	Partners were able to interact with the other project's partners.	11	6	26	130	123	84%	94%	296
		4%	2%	9%	44%	42%			100%
6	The timetable was respected.	13	6	20	113	143	85%	94%	295
		4%	2%	7%	38%	48%			100%
7	The conference room and its facilities facilitated the work during the meeting.	11	9	24	105	146	85%	93%	295
		4%	3%	8%	36%	49%			100%

Table 9. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Workshops Evaluation.




Figure 9. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Workshops Evaluation.

In Part 2, partners were asked to rate some questions characterizing the project.

RESULTS (M12. Workshops Evaluation)									
		1 Fully Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral	4 Agree	5 Fully Agree	Weighted Average	Combined %	Total
B. The Project - After the meeting...									
8	The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible.	13	5	23	129	126	84%	94%	296
		4%	2%	8%	44%	43%			100%
9	The meeting contributed positively to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps.	12	4	20	134	125	84%	95%	295
		4%	1%	7%	45%	42%			100%
10	The communication between the partners was effective and clear.	10	8	30	118	130	84%	94%	296
		3%	3%	10%	40%	44%			100%
11	The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.	14	7	21	113	141	84%	93%	296
		5%	2%	7%	38%	48%			100%

Table 10. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Workshops Evaluation.




Figure 10. Analysis of responses on 1-5 scale for the Workshops Evaluation.

#### 4.1.2 Additional comments

The comments and suggestions collected in the surveys are presented below literally transcribed (without spelling or grammatical corrections) and corresponding to one per person surveyed.

Introduction to Batteries, additional comments:

- Video how battery its work in car systems.
- Really Happy about the workshop, and interested to learn more and more.
- Video of how battery life is going.

- Please provide us with the scientific material (أرجو تزويدنا بالمادة العلمية).
- Thank you for your invitation.
- Please contact me on this Email ashraf2278@gmail.com to hand over the certificate of attendance and thank you.
- How temperatures actually affect.
- I hope to consider Hydrogen cars in the project.
- Thanks a lot.
- Thank you for the valuable information.
- Please share the recording and presentation with us.
- Thank you very much for the valuable information.
- Thank you.

#### Stakeholders Networking Workshop, additional comments:

- Thank you.
- More workshops are needed.
- More workshops are needed.
- The necessary attention was not shown to the participants, and the attention was only on some members of the project team and not the stakeholders, institutions and companies (لم يتم إظهار الاهتمام اللازم بالمشاركين و كان الاهتمام فقط على بعض أعضاء فريق ) (المشروع و ليس اصحاب المصالح و المؤسسات و الشركات).
- Attention was focused on the members of the project and not on the participants who are the basis of the project. Unfortunately, I will not complete the project as a member organization (الاهتمام كان منصبا على أعضاء المشروع و ليس على المشاركين الذين هم ) (أساس المشروع . لسوء الحظ لن اكمل المشروع كمؤسسة عضو).
- Participants were not treated appropriately. The attention was focused on the members of the project, not us. It was agreed with some friends to withdraw from the project (لم يتم معاملة المشاركين بما يليق. و كان الاهتمام منصبا على أعضاء المشروع و ليس نحن . ) (وتم الاتفاق مع بعض الأصدقاء بالانسحاب من المشروع).
- It is better for the successful high school graduates to complete the scientific and industrial branch, as well as the graduates of colleges and universities for the project partners and the unsuccessful students or the lower grades who were unable to complete the study academically. In hybrid and electric cars, other cars did not mention gasoline and diesel, knowing that they are available and work in a large way... God bless you and your family and thank you (الأفضل أن يتم قبول الناجحين ) بالثانوية العامة الفرع العلمي والصناعي وكذلك خريجي الكليات والجامعات للشركاء بالمشروع والطلبة الغير ناجحين أو الصفوف الأقل ولم يستطيعوا تكملة الدراسة اكاديميا يتم تدريبهم في الأكاديميات أو مراكز التدريب الغير مشتركه في المشروع.... والملاحظه الهامه الأخرى أن المشروع اهتم فقط بالسيارات الهجينه والكهربائيه ولم ( يتطرق للسيارات الأخرى البنزين والديزل علما أنها متوفره وتعمل بشكل كبير... وفقكم الله ورعاكم وشكرا لكم).
- I hope to coordinate with the Vocational Training Corporation and not to marginalize its role because it has a large and extensive experience in this field, as well as the needs of the job classification that will be approved for licensing (أرجو التنسيق مع مؤسسة التدريب المهني وعدم تهميش دورها لما لها خبرة كبيرة واسعة بهذا المجال وكذلك ) (احتياجات التصنيف الوظيفي الذي سيعتمد للترخيص).

### Introduction on Internal Combustion Engines in Hybrid Vehicles and Well to Wheel LCA Calculation Workshop by UNIVAQ, additional comments:

- Everything was very nice and clear.
- The presentation was clear and understandable, very well organized, thank you for all.
- Test the mic beforehand.
- Thank you very much.
- Thanx.
- Just if we can make it virtual.
- No, thank you everyone.
- Thank you very much!
- We hope in the future to receive the note or agenda earlier before one week at least please.
- If it possible you can provide me with the materials of the workshop? I will be pleased. Thanks.
- Truly its usefully to get attend this session I hope that's to invite me to all sessions you are plan to prepare . Thanks a lot.
- ITS GOOD.
- God bless you.
- Please reschedule the presentation for ICE.
- Thank you.
- Send us the materials of the presentations.
- If possible, to translate the power points and distribute on the local participants.

### Dynamics of Vehicle, active and passive safety Workshop by NTUA, additional comments:

- Share books and pdf with students.
- Many thanks to Dr Ahmad and Eng. Sara for your efforts.
- YES.
- No thanks.
- Thank you.
- Thanks for your efforts.
- Conducting face-to-face vehicle technology courses.
- I have a suggestion for a vehicle suspension system. Why don't we add a piezo-electrical in the system?
- The workshop is very interested and presented in a very and clear language and method.
- The record??

### Internal Combustion Engines in Hybrid Drivetrain Systems Workshop by BME, additional comments:

- Thanks for ever.
- Please give the attendees a pdf copy of the materials presented so that they can reach the benefit in an excellent manner, and the topic will be reviewed at a later time. Thank you.

- Thanks.
- Many thanks for your efforts.
- Thanks.
- No thank you.
- Please provide us with the presentations slides and /or with the recording.
- Could you please provide us the slides and the recording of the workshop, it is very important to review the information after the session.
- Good knowledge and interesting. I suggest to add simulation and animation next time.
- Thanks for all.
- Thanks for all ☐.
- Many thanks!!
- The purpose of these workshops as you said is to qualify engineers and technicians in the Jordanian field, so I'd love to see some workshops on the maintenance of the automotive (EV/ hybrid or gasoline) like how to interact with vehicle live data or how to analyse the CANBUS system.

#### Vibroacoustic Comfort in Road Vehicles by UD, additional comments:

- Thanks.
- Thank you.
- Thank you.
- Truly I have an invitation to Eco cars team to visit our academy technical and vocational training Academy in Amman Almanarah we have the biggest workshop for hybrid and electric vehicles in Jordan , also we have many training materials for the both eco cars, regards Majed Alsweiti 0787409195.

#### Charge Transport in Batteries and Hydrogen Vehicles Workshop by TH-OWL, additional comments:

- Thank you.
- Keep up the good efforts Thank you all.
- If it's possible, to induct some videos with the presentation to make some ideas more clear for attendants.
- Many thanks.

#### 4.1.3 Overall Conclusions

The value of the weighted average of all items is more than 70% so it is not considered necessary to establish any improvement plan with respect to the results.

All of the items have obtained a weighted average within the range 80% - 90%.

The highest result came for the question “The meeting was well planned and organised” (weighted average: 88%).

With a weighted average of 84%, the lowest rated questions were the following:

- Partners were able to interact with the other project's partners.
- The timescales proposed are realistic and feasible.
- The meeting contributed positively to the progress of the project and the scheduling of the next steps.
- The communication between the partners was effective and clear.
- The meeting helped with the development of trust and positive attitudes among partners.