



Evaluation of the streamSAVE+ outcomes

Deliverable D6.2

Version N°1

Authors: Ils Moorkens (*VITO*)
Jan Verheyden (*VITO*)
Petya Pakovska (*EnEffect*)



@streamSAVEplus



<https://streamsavenplus.eu>



contact@streamsavenplus.eu



Co-funded by the
European Union

Disclaimer

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the CINEA. Neither the European Union nor the CINEA can be held responsible for them.

Keywords

Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), Stakeholder survey, Bottom-up methodologies, Priority Action Tools, Policy Analysis Hub, Quality assessment, Policy implementation, Articles 4 and 8, Replicability, Stakeholder engagement



**Co-funded by the
European Union**

This project has received funding from the European Union's LIFE programme.
Project No. 101167618 — LIFE23-CET-streamSAVEplus

Project coordinator:

SEVEn, The Energy Efficiency Center z.ú.
Americká 17, 120 00, Praha 2, Czech Republic
+420 224 252 115 <https://streamsaveplus.eu>



Co-funded by the
European Union

Document Information

Grant agreement	101167618
Project title	Streamlining Energy Savings Calculations in the EU Member States +
Project acronym	streamSAVE+
Project coordinator	Jiří Karásek, SEVEn
Project duration	1 July 2024 – 30 June 2027 (36 months)
Related work package	WP 6 – Sustainability, replication and exploitation
Related task(s)	Task 6.2 – Assessment of streamSAVE+ outcomes
Lead organisation	VITO
Contributing partner(s)	EnEffect, CRES
Lead authors	Ils Moorkens (VITO)
Contributing author(s)	Petya Pakovska (EnEffect) - Jan Verheyen (VITO)
Reviewer(s)	Christos Tourkolias (CRES), Jiří Karásek (SEVEn)
Due date	30 June 2026
Publication date	18 July 2026
Dissemination level	Public



Content

List of figures	5
List of tables.....	5
Summary	6
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Organisation of the survey	7
3. Analysis of survey results	9
3.1. Number of responses	9
3.2. Respondents profile	9
3.3. Familiarity with project outputs.....	11
3.4. Quality assessment of project outputs.....	13
3.5. Support for EED implementation and recommendation potential	16
Conclusion	18
Annex I Survey questionnaire.....	19
Annex II Calculating the scores.....	20
Methodology	20
WP2 reports	20
WP2 Priority Action Tools	21
WP3 Dialogues and materials.....	21
WP5 Report	22
Overview of the scoring of all materials.....	23
Total and percentage per criterion	23
Ranking per criterion	23
Overall score	23



List of figures

Figure 1 Respondents by country.....	9
Figure 2 Respondents by type of organization	10
Figure 3 Respondents' responsibility concerning EED implementation.....	10
Figure 4 Familiarity with project outputs	12
Figure 5 Quality assessment of project outputs.....	15
Figure 6 Assessment of support for EED implementation.....	16
Figure 7 Assessment of recommendation potential	16

List of tables

Table 1 Survey structure	8
--------------------------------	---

Summary

This report presents the results of the stakeholder survey conducted within the streamSAVE+ project to assess the main exploitable outputs developed under WP2, WP3, and WP5, namely the guidance reports and Priority Action calculation tools supporting energy savings calculations under the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), the materials produced for the stakeholder dialogues, and the report on methodologies, indicators, and projections for assessing impacts of EED policies. The survey aimed to evaluate stakeholder familiarity with the project outcomes, assess their quality and applicability, and examine their contribution to the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), particularly with regard to energy savings calculations under Articles 4 and 8.

The survey was distributed between May and June 2026 through the streamSAVE+ consortium network, the project website, and the project newsletter. A total of 15 responses were received from stakeholders representing eight EU Member States. Respondents were predominantly public authorities and organisations directly involved in the implementation, administration, and support of EED measures. The respondents were generally well acquainted with the project and its outputs. Most had reviewed or used the WP2 reports and the WP5 report, while substantial proportions were also familiar with the WP2 Priority Action Tools and the WP3 dialogue materials. This high level of familiarity means that the survey results are based on informed assessments by stakeholders with direct knowledge of the evaluated outputs.

The results indicate a high level of familiarity with the streamSAVE+ outputs, particularly the WP2 reports and the WP5 report. Respondents evaluated the project outcomes against a comprehensive set of quality criteria, including usefulness, usability, relevance to the EED, technical adequacy, and replicability. Overall, the project outcomes received consistently positive evaluations. Across all evaluated outputs, the highest ratings were generally observed for relevance to the EED and usefulness for accomplishing the intended work. Technical adequacy, replicability, and usability were also assessed favourably, with very few low ratings recorded.

Among the evaluated outputs, the WP2 reports received the strongest overall assessment, while the WP2 Priority Action Tools, WP3 dialogue materials, and the WP5 report were likewise rated highly across all quality criteria. The results demonstrate that stakeholders consider the streamSAVE+ outputs technically robust, relevant to policy implementation, and suitable for application in a range of contexts.

The survey also highlights the perceived policy value of the project outcomes. More than 90% of respondents indicated that the streamSAVE+ outputs support improvements in frameworks and approaches for energy savings calculations under EED Articles 4 and 8 to a large or very large extent. Similarly, more than 90% would recommend the project outcomes to policy officers and other stakeholders working on the implementation of these EED provisions.

Overall, the findings confirm that the streamSAVE+ outputs are regarded as valuable resources for supporting the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive. The positive stakeholder assessment provides strong evidence for their continued dissemination, exploitation, and use beyond the duration of the project.

1. Introduction

The streamSAVE+ project (Streamlining Energy Savings Calculations in the EU Member States Plus) is a three-year LIFE programme project (2024–2027) that supports the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED) by improving the consistency, transparency, and comparability of energy savings calculations across EU Member States. Building on previous work, the project develops harmonised bottom-up calculation methodologies, Priority Action calculation tools, stakeholder dialogue activities, and analytical resources to support the implementation of Articles 4 and 8 of the recast EED. By strengthening methodological guidance and facilitating the exchange of good practices, streamSAVE+ aims to improve the quality of reported energy savings and promote a more consistent application of EED requirements throughout the European Union.

As part of the project's sustainability, replication and exploitation activities, it is important to assess how the developed outputs are perceived by their intended users. The stakeholder survey was therefore conducted to evaluate stakeholders' familiarity with the project outputs, their perceived quality and practical applicability, and their potential to support policy implementation and continued use beyond the lifetime of the project. The results provide evidence for the effectiveness of the project's main exploitable outcomes and help identify their value for future dissemination and uptake.

This report presents the results of the stakeholder survey conducted to assess the materials developed under WP2, including the priority actions and reports, WP3 dialogue meetings and materials, and the first WP5 report on the Policy Analysis Hub.

The survey covered the materials available at the time of its preparation in May 2026. Its objective was to identify the most meaningful outcomes developed to date and assess their potential to support policymakers and other target stakeholders, while contributing to the institutional and technical capacity needed to facilitate the implementation of energy efficiency policies beyond the streamSAVE+ project.

The survey aims to:

- Assess stakeholder awareness and use of streamSAVE+ outputs.
- Evaluate the perceived quality and applicability of project deliverables.
- Measure the contribution of the project to EED implementation and energy savings methodologies.
- Gather evidence for project evaluation, replication, exploitation, and sustainability activities after project completion.

The stakeholder survey was intentionally designed to be concise and straightforward in order to minimise the burden on respondents and maximise participation. The questionnaire focused on a limited set of key questions covering the use, quality, and policy relevance of the streamSAVE+ outputs.

2. Organisation of the survey

The survey was first distributed on 18 May 2026 via email to the main national contacts of the designated contact persons within the streamSAVE+ consortium and through the streamSAVE+ website and the streamSAVE+ LinkedIn page. A first reminder was sent on 11 June, followed by a final reminder on 19 June 2026. The survey was also promoted through the second streamSAVE+ newsletter, published in June 2026.

The survey is designed to evaluate the usefulness, quality, and policy relevance of outputs developed within the streamSAVE+ project. The survey specifically examines how project results support the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), particularly energy savings calculations under

Articles 4 and 8. Respondents are stakeholders involved in EED implementation, energy efficiency policy, research, consultancy, industry, or related activities.

An overview of the survey structure is provided in Table 1. The complete survey questionnaire is included in Annex I.

Table 1 Survey structure

Survey section	Content
Respondent profile	Email address, country, organisation type, and role in EED implementation.
Familiarity with project outputs	Extent to which respondents reviewed or used WP2 reports, WP2 priority action tools, WP3 dialogue materials, and the WP5 report.
Quality assessment of project outputs	Evaluation of WP2 reports, WP2 tools, WP3 materials, and the WP5 report against five criteria: usefulness, usability, relevance to the EED, technical adequacy, and replicability.
Support for EED implementation	Assessment of the extent to which project outcomes support energy savings calculation frameworks and approaches under EED Articles 4 and 8.
Recommendation potential	Assessment of the likelihood of recommending the project outcomes to policy officers working on EED Articles 4 and 8.

1. Respondent profile

The survey first collects background information to characterize respondents:

- Email address.
- Country of organisation (EU Member State).
- Organisation type (public authority, NGO, research organisation, consultancy, industry, other).
- Role in EED implementation (implementing authority, participating party, entrusted party, obligated party, technology provider, research/technical expert, other).

2. Familiarity with project outputs

Respondents are asked how extensively they have reviewed or used four categories of streamSAVE+ outputs:

- WP2 reports on bottom-up methodologies and standardised savings methodologies.
- WP2 Priority Action Tools (online calculators and Excel tools).
- WP3 dialogue materials (dialogues, workshops, meeting outputs).
- WP5 report on methodologies, indicators, and projections for assessing impacts of EED policies.

3. Quality assessment of project outputs

For each of the four output categories (WP2 reports, WP2 tools, WP3 materials, WP5 report), respondents assess performance against five quality criteria using a six-point scale ranging from Very low to Very high, with a Not able to assess option. The criteria are:

- Usefulness for accomplishing intended work.
- Usability/User-friendliness.
- Relevance to the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED).
- Technical adequacy and appropriate complexity.
- Replicability in other contexts or settings.

4. Contribution to EED implementation

The survey concludes with two overarching impact questions:

- To what extent the project outcomes support improvements in frameworks and approaches for energy savings calculations under EED Articles 4 and 8.
- To what extent respondents would recommend the project outcomes to policy officers working on EED Articles 4 and 8.

Responses range from Not at all to To a very large extent, with a Not able to assess option.

3. Analysis of survey results

3.1. Number of responses

A total of 15 responses were received. Following the initial distribution, 6 responses were collected. The first reminder increased the number of responses to 11, while the final reminder resulted in a total of 15 completed responses.


3.2. Respondents profile

The survey received responses from stakeholders in eight EU Member States. Lithuania and Croatia were the most represented countries, each accounting for three responses (20%). Austria, Greece, and Slovenia each contributed two responses (13.3%), while Germany, Luxembourg, and Portugal were each represented by one respondent (6.7%). This distribution provided input from a geographically diverse group of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive across Europe.

Figure 1 Respondents by country

In which country is your organization located? (Please write down one of the 27 EU member states).

15 responses




Public authorities formed the largest respondent group, accounting for 66.7% of all responses (10 respondents). Consultancy and technical expert organisations represented 13.3% of respondents (2 respondents). Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), research organisations or academia, and industry/commercial organisations were each represented by one respondent, corresponding to 6.7% of the total sample. The respondent profile therefore reflects a strong representation of public-sector stakeholders, complemented by contributions from consultancy, research, industry, and civil society organisations.

Figure 2 Respondents by type of organization

Which type of organization do you work for? (Please select the option that best describes your organization.)

15 responses




Almost half of the respondents (46.7%, 7 respondents) identified themselves as representatives of public authorities responsible for implementing, enforcing, or overseeing EED measures. Entrusted parties, obligated parties, and organisations providing research or technical expertise each accounted for 13.3% of responses (2 respondents each). Participating parties represented 6.7% of respondents (1 respondent), while one respondent (6.7%) indicated another role related to public authority inspection activities. Overall, the respondent profile was strongly oriented towards organisations directly involved in the implementation and administration of the Energy Efficiency Directive.

Figure 3 Respondents' responsibility concerning EED implementation

What is your responsibility concerning EED implementation? (Please select the option that best describes your responsibility.)

15 responses




3.3. Familiarity with project outputs

The introductory questions indicate a generally high level of familiarity with the streamSAVE+ outputs among respondents. For the WP2 reports, two-thirds of respondents (66.7%) had reviewed most or all reports, while only one respondent (6.7%) had not reviewed any of them. Familiarity with the WP2 Priority Action Tools was also substantial, with 46.7% reporting that they had used or explored most or all tools. For the WP3 dialogue materials, 40.0% of respondents had reviewed only a few dialogues, while another 40.0% had reviewed most or all dialogue materials. The WP5 report showed the highest level of engagement, with 80.0% of respondents indicating that they had reviewed the report.

Overall, the results demonstrate that the majority of respondents were familiar with the project outputs and therefore well positioned to assess their quality, relevance, and usefulness. Familiarity was strongest for the WP5 report and WP2 reports, while engagement with the dialogue materials was somewhat more varied across respondents.

Figure 4 Familiarity with project outputs



3.4. Quality assessment of project outputs

Respondents assessed the streamSAVE+ outputs against five quality criteria: (1) usefulness for accomplishing the intended work, (2) usability and user-friendliness, (3) relevance to the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), (4) technical adequacy and appropriate complexity, and (5) replicability. Across all outputs, ratings were predominantly positive, with particularly strong assessments for relevance to the EED, usefulness, and technical adequacy.

Overall assessment

The overall picture is very positive. Across all four outcome categories, the vast majority of ratings are High or Very high, while Low and Very low ratings are virtually absent. The criterion that consistently receives the strongest ratings is Relevance to the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), followed closely by Technical adequacy, Replicability and Usefulness. Usability/User-friendliness receives positive ratings overall but is comparatively the weakest criterion.

A notable observation is that the number of "Not able to assess" responses is highest for the WP3 Dialogues & Materials and the WP5 Report, where two respondents selected this option across most criteria. The WP2 Reports and WP2 Priority Action Tools show only one "Not able to assess" response per criterion.

WP2 Reports

The WP2 Reports received the strongest overall evaluation of all assessed outputs. For four of the five criteria, a large majority of respondents selected Very high, with particularly strong ratings for Replicability, Relevance to the EED, and Usefulness. Although Usability/User-friendliness received slightly fewer Very high ratings than the other criteria, it was still assessed positively by nearly all respondents.

WP2 Priority Action Tools

The WP2 Priority Action Tools were also assessed very positively. Technical adequacy and appropriate complexity received the highest ratings, followed by Relevance to the EED, Usefulness, and Replicability. Compared with the WP2 Reports, respondents provided slightly more Moderate ratings for usability and usefulness, indicating somewhat greater variation in user experience, but the overall assessment remained highly favourable.

WP3 Dialogues & Materials


The WP3 Dialogues & Materials received strong evaluations, particularly for Relevance to the EED, Usefulness, and Usability/User-friendliness, where Very high ratings clearly dominated. However, compared with the WP2 outputs, respondents gave relatively more High ratings and fewer Very high ratings for Technical adequacy and Replicability.

WP5 Report

The WP5 Report received positive ratings across all criteria but showed a somewhat different pattern from the other outputs. Relevance to the EED was clearly the strongest-performing criterion, receiving predominantly Very high ratings. Technical adequacy and Replicability were also evaluated favourably. However, Usefulness showed more variance in responses and Usability/User-friendliness stood out as the only criterion where High ratings exceeded Very high ratings, suggesting that respondents viewed

the report as valuable and relevant but somewhat less directly useful and user-friendly than the other assessed outputs.

Figure 5 Quality assessment of project outputs




3.5. Support for EED implementation and recommendation potential

The survey results indicate a very positive assessment of the contribution of streamSAVE+ outcomes to the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED). When asked to what extent the project outcomes support improvements in frameworks and approaches for energy savings calculations under EED Articles 4 and 8, 60.0% of respondents indicated that the outcomes provide support to a very large extent, while a further 33.3% reported support to a large extent. Only one respondent (6.7%) considered the support to be moderate, and no respondents selected the limited support or no support options.

Figure 6 Assessment of support for EED implementation

To what extent do the project outcomes support you in improving frameworks and approaches for energy savings calculations under EED Articles 4 and 8?

15 responses



The recommendation potential of the project outcomes was assessed even more positively. Two-thirds of respondents (66.7%) indicated that they would recommend the outcomes to policy officers working on EED Articles 4 and 8 to a very large extent, while 26.7% would recommend them to a large extent. Only one respondent (6.7%) selected a moderate level of recommendation, and no respondents expressed reservations strong enough to select the lower response categories.

Figure 7 Assessment of recommendation potential

To what extent would you recommend these outcomes to policy officers for use in relation to EED Articles 4 and 8?

15 responses



Overall, the results demonstrate that stakeholders perceive the streamSAVE+ outputs as highly valuable for supporting the implementation of EED Articles 4 and 8 and consider them suitable for wider use by policymakers and other relevant stakeholders.

Conclusion

This report presented the results of the stakeholder survey conducted to assess the streamSAVE+ outputs available in May 2026, including the WP2 reports, WP2 Priority Action Tools, WP3 dialogue materials, and the first WP5 report on the Policy Analysis Hub.

The survey results demonstrate a high level of stakeholder engagement with the project outputs, particularly the WP2 reports and the WP2 Priority Action Tools. Respondents represented a diverse range of stakeholders involved in the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED), with a strong representation of public authorities and organisations directly involved in EED implementation.

Overall, the streamSAVE+ outcomes were assessed very positively across all quality criteria. Respondents considered the outputs highly relevant to the EED and useful for supporting their work. Technical adequacy, replicability, and usability also received favourable evaluations, indicating that the developed methodologies, tools, reports, and dialogue materials are perceived as practical, robust, and applicable beyond the specific contexts in which they were developed.

Among the assessed outputs, the WP2 reports received the strongest overall evaluation, closely followed by the WP2 Priority Action Tools. While also the WP3 dialogue materials, and WP5 report were likewise rated highly across all criteria. The limited number of “Not able to assess” responses suggests that most respondents were sufficiently familiar with the outputs to provide informed feedback.

The survey further demonstrates the perceived policy value of the project outcomes. More than 90% of respondents indicated that the streamSAVE+ outputs support improvements in frameworks and approaches for energy savings calculations under EED Articles 4 and 8 to a large or very large extent. Similarly, more than 90% would recommend the project outcomes to policy officers working on these provisions of the EED.

Overall, the findings confirm that the streamSAVE+ outputs are regarded by stakeholders as valuable resources for supporting the implementation of the Energy Efficiency Directive. The positive assessment of their quality, relevance, and applicability provides strong evidence for their continued dissemination, exploitation, and use beyond the lifetime of the project.

The findings reflect the views of stakeholders who had reviewed or used the evaluated streamSAVE+ outputs to varying degrees. Consequently, the assessments are based on the experience of respondents with the outputs they were familiar with, while allowing respondents to refrain from evaluating outputs they could not sufficiently assess. During the remainder of the project, ongoing dissemination activities may create further opportunities to reach additional stakeholders and obtain complementary feedback on the uptake and practical application of the project outputs.

Annex I Survey questionnaire

Questionnaire



survey_questionnaire.
pdf

[survey_questionnaire.pdf](#)

Annex II Calculating the scores

To support the conclusions, weighted scores were calculated for each outcome and criterion using the following approach.

Methodology


Using the weighting:

- Very low = ×1
- Low = ×2
- Moderate = ×3
- High = ×4
- Very high = ×5
- Not able to assess = ×0

With 15 responses the maximum score is 75. This maximum score is used to calculate the percentage per criterion in the summarizing table.

WP2 reports


Please rate the WP2 Reports on each criteria:



Criterion	Calculation	Weighted score
Usefulness	$(2 \times 4) + (12 \times 5) + (1 \times 0)$	68
Usability / User-friendliness	$(5 \times 4) + (9 \times 5) + (1 \times 0)$	65
Relevance to the Energy Efficiency Directive (EED)	$(2 \times 4) + (12 \times 5) + (1 \times 0)$	68
Technical adequacy and appropriate complexity	$(3 \times 4) + (11 \times 5) + (1 \times 0)$	67
Replicability	$(1 \times 4) + (13 \times 5) + (1 \times 0)$	69

WP2 Priority Action Tools


Please rate the WP2 Priority action tools on each criteria:



Criterion	Calculation	Weighted score
Usefulness	$(1 \times 3) + (3 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (1 \times 0) = 3 + 12 + 50$	65
Usability / User-friendliness	$(2 \times 3) + (3 \times 4) + (9 \times 5) + (1 \times 0) = 6 + 12 + 45$	63
Relevance to the EED	$(4 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (1 \times 0) = 16 + 50$	66
Technical adequacy	$(2 \times 4) + (12 \times 5) + (1 \times 0) = 8 + 60$	68
Replicability	$(1 \times 3) + (3 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (1 \times 0) = 3 + 12 + 50$	65

WP3 Dialogues and materials

Please rate the WP3 Dialogues & Materials (meeting minutes, slidedecks) on each criteria:




Criterion	Calculation	Weighted score
Usefulness	$(3 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 12 + 50$	62
Usability / User-friendliness	$(1 \times 3) + (2 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 3 + 8 + 50$	61
Relevance to the EED	$(2 \times 4) + (11 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 8 + 55$	63
Technical adequacy	$(4 \times 4) + (9 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 16 + 45$	61

Replicability	$(1 \times 3) + (4 \times 4) + (8 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 3 + 16 + 40$	59
---------------	---	-----------

WP5 Report

Please rate the WP5 Report on each criteria:



Criterion	Calculation	Weighted score
Usefulness	$(2 \times 3) + (4 \times 4) + (7 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 6 + 16 + 35$	57
Usability / User-friendliness	$(7 \times 4) + (6 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 28 + 30$	58
Relevance to the EED	$(3 \times 4) + (10 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 12 + 50$	62
Technical adequacy	$(1 \times 3) + (4 \times 4) + (8 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 3 + 16 + 40$	59
Replicability	$(4 \times 4) + (9 \times 5) + (2 \times 0) = 16 + 45$	61

Overview of the scoring of all materials

Total and percentage per criterion

Outcome	Usefulness	% (of 75)	Usability / User-friendliness	% (of 75)	Relevance to the EED	% (of 75)	Technical adequacy	% (of 75)	Replicability	% (of 75)
WP2 Reports	68	90.7%	65	86.7%	68	90.7%	67	89.3%	69	92.0%
WP2 Priority action tools	65	86.7%	63	84.0%	66	88.0%	68	90.7%	65	86.7%
WP3 Dialogues & Materials	62	82.7%	61	81.3%	63	84.0%	61	81.3%	59	78.7%
WP5 Report	57	76.0%	58	77.3%	62	82.7%	59	78.7%	61	81.3%

Ranking per criterion

Criterion	1st	2nd	3rd	4th
Usefulness	WP2 Reports (68)	WP2 Priority action tools (65)	WP3 Dialogues & Materials (62)	WP5 Report (57)
Usability / User-friendliness	WP2 Reports (65)	WP2 Priority action tools (63)	WP3 Dialogues & Materials (61)	WP5 Report (58)
Relevance to the EED	WP2 Reports (68)	WP2 Priority action tools (66)	WP3 Dialogues & Materials (63)	WP5 Report (62)
Technical adequacy	WP2 Priority action tools (68)	WP2 Reports (67)	WP3 Dialogues & Materials (61)	WP5 Report (59)
Replicability	WP2 Reports (69)	WP2 Priority action tools (65)	WP5 Report (61)	WP3 Dialogues & Materials (59)

Overall score

Outcome	Usefulness	% (of 75)	Usability / User-friendliness	% (of 75)	Relevance to the EED	% (of 75)	Technical adequacy	% (of 75)	Replicability	% (of 75)	Total score	% (of 375)	Rank
WP2 Reports	68	90.7%	65	86.7%	68	90.7%	67	89.3%	69	92.0%	337	89.9%	1
WP2 Priority action tools	65	86.7%	63	84.0%	66	88.0%	68	90.7%	65	86.7%	327	87.2%	2
WP3 Dialogues & Materials	62	82.7%	61	81.3%	63	84.0%	61	81.3%	59	78.7%	306	81.6%	3
WP5 Report	57	76.0%	58	77.3%	62	82.7%	59	78.7%	61	81.3%	297	79.2%	4
Total (all outcomes)	252	84.0% (of 300)	247	82.3% (of 300)	259	86.3% (of 300)	255	85.0% (of 300)	254	84.7% (of 300)	1267	84.5% (of 1500)	–



CONTACT THE PROJECT



@streamSAVEplus



<https://streamsveplus.eu>



contact@streamsveplus.eu



Co-funded by the
European Union