

Consolidated Evaluation report

Proposal number: 498896

Acronym: ESHP

Title: European Summit on Hospital Pharmacy

Criteria Block A: Content of the proposal	Note	Comments
(1) Relevance of the content and expected results of the event in relation to the objectives and priorities described in the second program of Community action in the field of health and its annual work plan	15/15	The proposed conference is organized by the European Association of Hospital Pharmacists (EAHP) and has as objective to improve qualifications and establish better standards thus increasing patient safety and security. The proposal displays a good knowledge of state-of-art and relates to the priorities of the Health Programme and the Europe 2020 Strategy.
(2) Participation	13/15	The conference targets 120 participants from 25 Member States. Sixty will represent EAHP members; thirty will represent medical professionals (doctors and nurses); and thirty patient associations. The size and type of participants matches well the conference's objectives. The list of major patients and health professionals organisations to be invited could have been added.
(3) European dimension	15/15	The organizers expect participation from 24 (25) EU countries. Therefore it has a wide European dimension with many more than 10 countries participating.
(4) Follow-up and evaluation methodology	7/15	The conference aims at tangible results, namely, the elaboration and adoption of new standards for hospital pharmacists. Preparatory work will be carried out by working groups. Two of these will be assigned evaluation tasks, namely, the task of monitoring implementation of the standards in the post-conference phase and the task of measuring the Summit's success. The evaluation methodology has not yet been properly designed. The proposal would benefit from inclusion of some process and output evaluation during and immediately after the conference. Moreover no scientific committee has been established to ensure higher quality of event and produced outputs.
Total criteria block A:	50/60	
Criteria Block B: Management Quality	Note	Comments
(1) Planning of the event	9/15	The planning of the event is professional and deliverables match the conference objectives and dissemination plan. The conference programme is available in outline form whereby this corresponds to the nature of the event. The steering committee is multinational and includes high-level experts. There is, however, no scientific committee. The risk analysis and contingency analysis are conventional. A major risk is to get no post event results and actions adding value to the objectives stated and this potential problem has not been fully addressed.
(2) Organisation capacity	8/10	The organizer is a professional organization with many years of expertise. The organization of the conference will rest with its staff, no funds for staff costs are being requested. There are no biographical notes on the key staff members. There is little information on decision-making, monitoring and supervision mechanisms.
(3) Overall and detailed budget	10/15	The budget is sufficient and in general appropriate. Staff costs are not mentioned. For clarity sake, the staff costs even if entirely covered by the beneficiary should be mentioned in the budget. Travel costs represent the biggest cost items: 111,600 Euros. These require full justification considering that the 'travel' budget item should be used for 'own staff' travels whereas the 'other costs' budget item is the one where participants' travel costs should be reported (refer to guide for applicants). Overheads are higher than 7%, which is not allowed (refer to guide for applicants).
Total criteria block B:	27/40	
Overall appreciation - Total:	77/100	
Conclusion and suggestions		This is a good proposal on a relevant subject. Its strength lies in its intention to produce new standards for European hospital pharmacists. Improvements are possible regarding the budget and the evaluation methodology. In view of the available budget the evaluation committee decided to not recommend for funding any proposal which scores below 82 points.

Consolidated Evaluation report

Recommended for funding:	No	
--------------------------	----	--