Co-funded by
the European Union

SYNERGIES

Innovating Preparedness by Leveraging SYNERGIES and Enhancing Results of DRM Projects

Grant Agreement No. 101121172
Starting date: 1st December 2023 – Duration: 36 months

Validation Workshop Report

Event key information

ID	**01**
Event title	Rotterdam Preparedness Case Validation Workshop
Date of the event	17 June 2026
Event responsible	Futurised Consultancy (FRD)

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Co-funded by the European Union

LIST OF PARTNERS

N.	Logo	Name	Short Name	Country
1		DEEP BLUE SRL	DBL	Italy
2		SINTEF AS	SINTEF	Norway
3		SAFETY INNOVATION CENTER GGMBH	SIC	Germany
4		RESILIENCE ADVISORS NETWORK	RAN	Ireland
5		STICHTING VU	VU	Netherlands
6		WEBGENESYS SPA	WG	Italy
7		ISTITUTO DI SOCIOLOGIA INTERNAZIONALE DI GORIZIA	ISIG	Italy
8		TARTU ULIKOOL	UTARTU	Estonia
9		UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION	UNESCO	France
10		SAVE THE CHILDREN ITALIA ETS	SAVETC	Italy
11		INTERNATIONAL SAFETY TRAINING COLLEGE LIMITED	ISTC	Malta
12		SCIENCES REUNION - CENTRE DE CULTURE SCIENTIFIQUE TECHNIQUE ET INDUSTRIELLE	SRUN	France
13		REGIONAL COUNCIL NORTHERN REGION	RT	Malta

14		HET NEDERLANDSE RODE KRUIS	RCNL	Netherlands
15		AGENCE OBSERVAT AMENAGE HABITAT REUNION	AGORAH	France
16		FUTURISED CONSULTANCY	FRD	Netherlands
17		FORUM EUROPÉEN POUR LA SÉCURITÉ URBAINE	EFUS	France

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction 4
2. Objectives 5
3. Results evaluated 5
4. Set up 7
   4.1. Preparation 7
   4.2. Event set up 7
5. Attendees 8
6. Data collection 9
   6.1. Atlas of Best Practices 9
      6.1.1. Methodology 10
      6.1.2. Key findings 10
   6.2. SAVIT Tabletop game 11
      6.2.1. Methodology 11
      6.2.2. Key findings 12
   6.3. Journey session 14
      6.3.1. Methodology 14
      6.3.2. Key findings 14
7. Validation Questionnaire Results 15
   7.1. Participant Demographics and Engagement 16
   7.2. Usefulness 17
   7.3. Usability 18
   7.4. Transferability 19
   7.5. Compatibility 20
8. Conclusions and next steps 21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – SYNERGIES results 6
Table 2 - Activities conducted 6
Table 3 - Validation activities attendes 8

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

1. Introduction

The SYNERGIES project - Innovating Preparedness by Leveraging SYNERGIES and Enhancing Results of DRM Projects - aims to strengthen disaster preparedness by improving the involvement, empowerment and collaboration of the different actors engaged in disaster risk management. These actors include first and second responders, citizens, communities, public authorities, civil society organisations, educational actors, business companies and practitioners.

SYNERGIES builds on the results of previous European and national disaster risk management projects and combines these with practitioners knowledge, stakeholder experience and real-life Preparedness Cases. Through this approach, the project seeks to increase the maturity, applicability and sustainability of practical tools, methods and guidance supporting disaster preparedness.

The Rotterdam Preparedness Case is one of the three real-life Preparedness Cases implemented within SYNERGIES. It focuses on the Dutch context, where flood-related risks, cascading effects and the integration of public and private emergency planning are particularly relevant. The case also addresses the role of organised and spontaneous volunteers and explores how preparedness planning can better support collaboration between formal actors, communities, volunteers and private-sector stakeholders.

The Validation Workshop for the Rotterdam Preparedness Case was held on 17 June 2026 at SS Rotterdam. The workshop formed part of the SYNERGIES Validation Phase, during which more mature versions of project results are tested with relevant stakeholders in practical settings. The event provided an opportunity to validate selected SYNERGIES results, collect structured feedback from participants, and identify recommendations for further refinement before the final release of the project outcomes.

The workshop agenda included an introduction to the SYNERGIES project and the Rotterdam Preparedness Case, a guided exploration of the ATLAS of Best Practices, a Table Top Game session, validation questionnaires and feedback moments, and a Journey session to reflect on the applicability and user experience of the tested results. The outcomes of this workshop contribute directly to the reporting of the Rotterdam Preparedness Case and provide input for the final project deliverable D1.4 Validation Case 3. The Rotterdam validation workshop built

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

on earlier evaluation and preparation activities conducted within the Rotterdam Preparedness Case, including the 2025 Evaluation Workshop and subsequent coordination with result owners and Dutch partners.

2. Objectives

The overall objective of the Rotterdam Preparedness Case Validation Workshop was to assess the practical usability, applicability and added value of selected SYNERGIES Results in a realistic preparedness context. The workshop was designed to move beyond conceptual review and to collect stakeholder feedback on the practical use of the results, their integration into preparedness activities, and their potential refinement before final release.

The specific objectives were to:

- validate selected SYNERGIES Results with stakeholders involved in or relevant to the Rotterdam Preparedness Case;
- assess whether the results address policy, coordination and preparedness needs connected to flooding, cascading effects, volunteer involvement and public-private emergency planning;
- collect feedback on usefulness, usability, transferability, compatibility, maturity and potential adoption;
- identify concrete recommendations for improvement from participants and facilitators;
- support Result owners in refining the final versions of the tools and guidance materials;
- provide evidence and input for D1.4 Validation Case 3 and for communication activities linked to the Validation Workshop.

3. Results evaluated

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Table 1 – SYNERGIES results

Project Result	Preparedness Case 3 Rotterdam	
Type of Validation	***Evaluation***	***Validation***
Atlas of Best Practices	☑	☑
PreCap Training	☑	
Training for Schools		
Early Warning Tool	☑	
SAVIT Catalogue	(☑)	(☑)
SAVIT Tabletop Game	☑	☑
Knowledge Base	☑	
PreCap Digital System	☑	

Table 2 - Activities conducted

Result / activity	Session in the workshop	Responsible partner(s)	Current status in this report
ATLAS of Best Practices	Guided Exploration of ATLAS, Part 1 and Part 2; validation questionnaire and feedback	ISIG	Questionnaire analysis and key findings integrated.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

SAVIT Tabletop game & Cataloque	Table Top Game session; validation questionnaire and feedback	SAVIT	Key findings, facilitator observations and participant feedback integrated. The Cataloque is included as supporting material under the Savit Tabletop game findings.
Journey session	Journey session after the Table Top Game validation	ISIG / FRD	Methodology and key findings integrated.
Rotterdam Preparedness Case context	Rotterdam Preparedness Case and video introduction	FRD	Case context, participant data and local observations integrated.

4. Set up

4.1. Preparation

Futurised Consultancy (FRD), as lead for D1.4 Validation Case 3 and coordinator of the Rotterdam Preparedness Case, coordinated the preparation of the validation workshop. This included alignment with the project coordinator, Dutch partners and result owners, as well as the practical organisation of the workshop setup, scenario framing, participant involvement and validation moments.

During the preparation phase, the workshop setup was refined into a one-day validation activity focused on policy-level preparedness reflection. The final setup combined a Rotterdam scenario introduction, guided exploration of ATLAS, the SAVIT Tabletop Game, validation questionnaires, facilitated feedback moments, a Journey session and a final plenary reflection.

4.2. Event set up

The Rotterdam Preparedness Case Validation Workshop took place on 17 June 2026 at SS Rotterdam. The workshop was organised as a one-day event, with registration from 08:30 and a formal programme running from 09:00 to 17:30, followed by a social dinner at SS Rotterdam.

The morning programme focused on the introduction of SYNERGIES, the Rotterdam Preparedness Case and the guided exploration of the ATLAS of Best Practices. The ATLAS

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

session was divided into two parts, allowing participants to first become familiar with the result and then provide structured feedback through a validation questionnaire and discussion.

The afternoon programme focused on the Table Top Game, followed by a dedicated validation questionnaire and feedback moment. The day concluded with a Journey session and a final wrap-up, enabling participants to reflect on their experience with the tested results and discuss applicability, improvement points and next steps.

5. Attendees

A total of 22 participants attended the Rotterdam Preparedness Case Validation Workshop on 17 June 2026 at SS Rotterdam. The participant group consisted of representatives from Safety Region Rotterdam-Rijnmond and the Netherlands Red Cross, as well as consortium partners, result owners, facilitators and the European Commission Project Officer.

The primary end-user group consisted of representatives from Safety Region Rotterdam-Rijnmond and the Netherlands Red Cross, who participated from a policy and preparedness perspective. In addition, Netherlands Red Cross consortium members contributed as project partners, bringing humanitarian and volunteer-management expertise to the workshop.

The broader participant group included FRD as case lead, Deep Blue as project coordinator, ISIG and SINTEF as result owners, VU Amsterdam as Dutch academic partner, and other consortium participants. This composition allowed the workshop to combine end-user feedback with observations from project partners and result owners. It also supported shared learning on usability, applicability, facilitation needs and future uptake of the SYNERGIES results.

Table 3 - Validation activities attendes

Organisation stakeholder group	Role in the validation workshop	Number of participants
Deep Blue (DBL)	Project coordination and SYNERGIES introduction	2
ISIG	ATLAS facilitation and Journey session support	2

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Netherlands Red Cross – consortium members	Consortium partner, facilitation and humanitarian/volunteer-management expertise	2
Trimmension	Participating organisation / technical or project perspective	1
Resilience Advisors Network (RAN)	Consortium participant / resilience expertise	1
SINTEF	SAVIT Tabletop Game facilitation	1
Project Officer	Observer	1
Futurised Consultancy (FRD)	Case lead, organisation, scenario introduction and wrap-up facilitation	3
Netherlands Red Cross – participants	Primary end-user group / humanitarian and volunteer-management perspective	4
Safety Region Rotterdam-Rijnmond (VRR)	Primary end-user group / policy-maker perspective	3
Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (VU)	Dutch partner, facilitation and academic/stakeholder perspective	2
Total		22

6. Data collection

Data collection for the Rotterdam Validation Workshop combined quantitative questionnaire data, qualitative facilitator observations, group discussions and plenary reflections. ATLAS was assessed through an anonymised questionnaire dataset analysed by ISIG. The SAVIT Tabletop Game was assessed through facilitator observation notes, participant feedback, debriefing and available questionnaire input. The Journey session and final wrap-up provided additional qualitative insights into long-term use, sustainability and the integration of SYNERGIES results into preparedness practice.

6.1. Atlas of Best Practices

The ATLAS of Best Practices was explored during the morning programme through a guided validation session facilitated by ISIG. The session was divided into two parts and combined

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

hands-on exploration of the platform with facilitated discussion and a structured validation exercise. Participants assessed both the technical functionalities and the potential value of the platform within preparedness and disaster risk management contexts. The session was followed by a dedicated validation questionnaire and feedback moment.

6.1.1. Methodology

The validation session was designed as a guided exploration rather than a conventional software demonstration, encouraging participants to interact directly with the platform while reflecting on its practical applicability.

Following a short introduction to the objectives and workflow of ATLAS, participants worked individually or in small groups, supported by ISIG researchers throughout the session. The exploration followed the intended user journey within the platform, beginning with familiarisation with the interface and repository of practices, continuing with completion of the Self-Assessment Tool (SAT), and progressing to the Strategy Builder and Contribution modules available through the user profile.

Participants were encouraged to discuss their observations, compare experiences and relate the platform to their own organisational contexts. The session concluded with the completion of an individual validation questionnaire collecting both quantitative assessments and qualitative feedback on the platform's usefulness, usability, transferability, compatibility with existing practices, perceived maturity and priorities for further development.

6.1.2. Key findings

The validation confirmed a generally positive perception of ATLAS as a structured platform supporting preparedness reflection, learning and strategic discussion. The ATLAS validation was supported by 15 completed questionnaire responses, including responses from 10 stakeholders and 5 project partners. The ATLAS analysis included 15 completed questionnaire records: 10 from stakeholders and 5 from project partners. Thirteen respondents provided a valid overall experience score, resulting in an average of 7.00 out of 10.

Participants particularly appreciated the combination of self-assessment, access to good practices and strategy-building functions. They recognised the platform’s potential to stimulate organisational reflection, identify preparedness gaps and facilitate discussion among stakeholders.

This project has received funding from the European Union’s research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author’s view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

The Self-Assessment Tool (SAT) emerged as the strongest and most accessible entry point to the platform, successfully guiding participants towards a more structured understanding of their preparedness context. The Strategy Builder was also positively received, although participants highlighted the need for additional guidance to better connect assessment results with concrete strategic actions.

Feedback also identified several opportunities for further refinement. Participants emphasised the importance of clearer navigation, simplified terminology, stronger onboarding support and increased localisation of examples and good practices to facilitate transferability across different organisational and territorial contexts. Language accessibility and interface consistency also require attention, including the removal or translation of remaining non-English interface elements where these appear. One or more open-text responses suggested exploring AI-supported search and filtering functions. This suggestion was not tested during the workshop. Rather than technical reliability issues, the main challenges concerned usability, contextualisation and demonstrating the added value of ATLAS within existing preparedness workflows.

Overall, the Rotterdam findings indicate that ATLAS is sufficiently developed for further facilitated piloting in preparedness reflection, organisational learning and strategic discussion. Further work is needed on usability, contextual adaptation and integration into existing preparedness processes.

6.2. SAVIT Tabletop game

The SAVIT Tabletop Game was conducted during the afternoon programme and led by SINTEF, with facilitation support from the Netherlands Red Cross, VU Amsterdam and RAN.

6.2.1. Methodology

The SAVIT Tabletop Game is a facilitated serious game designed to help stakeholders explore how spontaneous and informal helpers can be better integrated into disaster management.

Participants worked in small multidisciplinary teams and analysed the scenario in three rounds: before the event or during the warning phase, during the first half-day of the event, and several days after the event. They collaboratively identified challenges and opportunities related to informal help, needs (in the form of key functions at the moment of the event) and potential approaches. Rather than role-playing, participants contributed from their own

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

professional perspectives and experiences, as if they were tasked with providing recommendations for local authorities and practitioners. The purpose was not to manage the emergency itself, but rather to stimulate discussion, learning, and reflection on what tools, approaches, and organisational arrangements could improve the integration of informal volunteers before, during, and after crises.

The game session was led by SINTEF, with facilitation support from the Netherlands Red Cross, VU Amsterdam and RAN as group facilitators. In each round, teams reviewed a scenario update, identified the key actors involved in the event, determined the most critical functions for integrating informal help, selected relevant solution cards, and discussed the local conditions that could enable or hinder implementation. Participants could consult the SAVIT Catalogue to obtain additional information on potential solutions, such as more detailed descriptions or, where available, lessons learned from implementation. At the end of each round, teams presented pitches for their chosen solutions, voted on the most relevant proposal, and collectively discussed the results.

The session concluded with a short debriefing, allowing participants to provide qualitative feedback on their experience playing the game. They also filled out a validation questionnaire. Nine questionnaires were included in the Rotterdam SAVIT analysis. Most questions used a five-point scale. Responses marked “Not applicable” were excluded from the calculation of averages. As a result, the number of responses included in each score ranged from seven to nine. The data were also complemented by structured observation notes collected by the facilitators during the game.

6.2.2. Key findings

The workshop participants generally found the Tabletop Game easy to use and engaging, highlighting the importance of the facilitation in the process. However, participants frequently noted that there were too many materials (paper elements) on the table, some confusion around specific game phases and board sections, and a strong need for facilitation, especially during the first round.

The questionnaire results support the positive feedback from the observations and group discussions. Respondents gave the Game an average score of 3.89 out of 5 for ease of use and 3.89 for willingness to recommend it to similar organisations. They also considered the

This project has received funding from the European Union’s research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author’s view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Game adaptable to other hazards and contexts, both scoring 3.56, and to other user groups, scoring 3.44. The scores were lower for use without support. The possibility of using the Game without additional assistance received 3.11 out of 5. The statement that no training, supervision or other resources would be needed received 2.78. Willingness to invest organisational resources received 2.89. These results show that clear facilitation, preparation and follow-up are important for effective use. The maturity scores were generally positive. Readiness for further pilot use received 3.62 out of 5, perceived reliability during the workshop received 3.88, and the possibility of further developing the Game for practical use received 4.00. These results support further testing and improvement in facilitated settings. They do not show that the Game is ready for use without guidance.

In terms of usefulness, the game was valued primarily as a discussion, learning, and collaborative tool rather than a strategic planning instrument. The game successfully stimulated discussion, encouraged participation from all group members, and provided a structured way to explore challenges and solutions related to informal help. The solution cards and functions were seen as particularly helpful for identifying and selecting relevant solutions, while the game encouraged participants to consider perspectives and options they might not otherwise explore. More experienced professionals sometimes found the content too high-level and suggested adding more detailed or specialised scenarios.
The Catalogue was used only sparingly. Most groups relied on the solution cards during gameplay and felt there was insufficient time to explore the Catalogue. Where it was used, the catalogue helped deepen understanding of solutions, suggesting that it may be more useful as a follow-up resource after the game rather than an integral gameplay component.

Participants considered the game transferable to a range of contexts, including municipalities, safety regions, volunteer organisations, training settings, and multi-stakeholder collaborations. They also saw potential for using it as an icebreaker or awareness-raising tool. At the same time, different participants questioned how game outcomes could be integrated into existing operational processes, indicating that further development would be needed to strengthen compatibility with established preparedness and crisis-management practices.

Overall, the game was viewed positively as an innovative and accessible way to stimulate dialogue about informal help. The main recommendations were to:

- Simplify the materials,

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

- Pay special attention to facilitator guidance,
- Provide more specific scenarios,
- Better convey the purpose and outputs of the exercise, and
- Better integrate the session's outcomes into real-world practice.

6.3. Journey session

The Journey session was held after the Tabletop Game and before the final workshop wrap-up. It was intended to support reflection on the user experience, practical applicability and possible integration of the tested SYNERGIES Results into preparedness workflows.

6.3.1. Methodology

The session followed a participatory back casting approach based on the SYNERGIES Journey Framework. After a short presentation of the complete portfolio of SYNERGIES Results by the project coordinators, participants were divided into four facilitated discussion groups.

Each group worked through a common four-step process:

- identification of a current preparedness priority;
- development of a future vision (2036) in which this priority had been successfully addressed;
- identification of the key transformations required across five preparedness dimensions (preparedness gaps, participation, volunteers, communication and capacity);
- discussion of the actions and combinations of SYNERGIES Results capable of supporting these transformations.

Compared with the La Réunion workshop, the Rotterdam implementation introduced several methodological refinements, including dedicated facilitators for each discussion table, structured recording templates and a more systematic mapping of preparedness actions to the complete portfolio of SYNERGIES Results. Following the group discussions, each facilitator presented the key outcomes during a plenary debriefing.

6.3.2. Key findings

The Journey Exercise generated four complementary preparedness pathways, each reflecting different preparedness priorities while converging towards common long-term preparedness

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

objectives.

Across the discussions, participants consistently described preparedness as a continuous societal process requiring sustained investment in education, communication, governance, stakeholder participation, volunteer engagement and capacity building rather than a set of isolated emergency management activities. Although the discussion groups approached preparedness from different perspectives, ranging from risk awareness and household preparedness to community engagement and institutional governance, they collectively demonstrated that preparedness operates across individual, community and organisational levels.

Another important finding concerned the perceived value of the SYNERGIES toolkit. Rather than considering individual project results in isolation, participants naturally identified complementary combinations of solutions addressing different preparedness dimensions. This confirmed the added value of presenting SYNERGIES as an integrated preparedness ecosystem, where different Results contribute to different stages of preparedness planning and implementation.

The workshop also confirmed the robustness and applicability of the Journey Framework itself. Unlike the first validation in La Réunion, participants proposed very limited methodological modifications, instead demonstrating the flexibility of the framework by successfully applying it to different preparedness priorities and operational contexts. The exercise therefore validated not only the Journey methodology but also its potential as a practical strategic planning and stakeholder engagement instrument supporting future preparedness planning activities.

The final wrap-up, facilitated by FRD, reinforced several cross-cutting conditions for the future uptake of SYNERGIES results. Participants highlighted the importance of continued cooperation, stronger communication and visibility, recurring knowledge exchange, end-user involvement, interoperability, standardisation and community building. These reflections confirmed the need to connect SYNERGIES tools to existing organisational processes and to maintain collaboration beyond the project period.

7. Validation Questionnaire Results

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

The questionnaire was designed to gather comprehensive feedback from participants regarding the relevance, usability, and potential impact of the SYNERGIES Results. It aimed to capture the perspectives of key stakeholders, focusing on their roles, assessments of applicability, and willingness to adopt the presented outcomes.

The questionnaire included questions covering the following areas:

- **Participant Demographics:** questions identifying the actor type and participant capacity at the workshop, establishing the respondent profile.
- **Result Selection:** a question asking participants to specify the SYNERGIES Result they were evaluating, ensuring focused feedback.
- **Perceived Usefulness and Applicability:** questions gauging whether the result addressed participant needs and its potential for recommendation to colleagues in similar organizations.
- **Resource Implications and Adoption Potential:** questions assessing participant willingness to invest resources (time, funds, personnel) and evaluating the ease of integration into existing workflows.
- **Usability and Adaptability:** questions exploring the tool's intuitiveness and its adaptability across various hazards, contexts, and communities.
- **Transferability and Compatibility:** questions determining the result's compatibility with existing systems and operational practices.
- **Economic viability and Maturity**: questions to evaluate the long-term benefits and operational readiness of the results.
- **Open-Ended Feedback:** a section for general observations, suggestions, and any additional comments from participants.

The questionnaire also included a consent statement, ensuring participants were informed of the voluntary nature of their participation and their right to withdraw at any time. The analysis of the responses to these questions provides valuable insights into the reception and potential impact of the SYNERGIES Results.

7.1. Participant Demographics and Engagement

The validation workshop involved 22 participants, including external stakeholders, SYNERGIES project partners, result owners, facilitators and the European Commission

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Project Officer. For the ATLAS validation questionnaire, 15 completed responses were available: 10 from stakeholders and 5 from project partners.

The ATLAS respondent group included participants with different levels of professional experience and different levels of experience with preparedness or risk-management digital tools. Most respondents had not participated in the earlier evaluation workshop, meaning that the Rotterdam validation included a substantial first-exposure component.

Engagement with ATLAS focused mainly on the Self-Assessment Tool and the Strategy Builder. These were the most frequently tested components and formed the core of the guided exploration.

For the SAVIT Tabletop Game, nine completed questionnaires were included in the analysis. Respondents represented first and second responders, civil-society organisations, a public authority, education, research, humanitarian aid and business. The questionnaire data were complemented by structured facilitator observations, table debriefings and plenary feedback. The Journey session was assessed through facilitated group work, recorded table outputs and plenary reflection.

7.2. Usefulness

ATLAS was perceived as useful mainly as a structured support tool for preparedness reflection, discussion and gap identification. Participants valued the combination of the Self-Assessment Tool, access to good practices and the Strategy Builder. The questionnaire results show that respondents were moderately positive about the usefulness of ATLAS, especially for supporting discussion with others, reflecting on current practices and identifying relevant cases, ideas or possible measures.

The Self-Assessment Tool was the most useful entry point, as it helped participants structure their thinking about preparedness strengths, gaps and priorities. The Strategy Builder was also considered relevant, but participants indicated that more guidance is needed to translate assessment results into concrete strategic actions.

The SAVIT Tabletop Game was perceived as a useful tool for stimulating discussion on the integration of organised, informal and spontaneous help. Participants found the game engaging and recognised its value in addressing this topic in a creative and structured way.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

The game encouraged participants to discuss relevant actors, functions, possible solutions and implementation conditions. The questionnaire results support this finding. Respondents gave the Game an average score of 3.33 out of 5 for supporting their work and addressing their needs. Willingness to recommend the Game to similar organisations received 3.89 out of 5.

Willingness to invest organisational resources was lower, with an average score of 2.89 out of 5. This suggests that participants recognised the value of the Game, but were more cautious about committing time, staff or funding to its use.

The observations and questionnaire results indicate that the SAVIT Tabletop Game is most useful as a discussion, learning and awareness-raising tool. It helped participants exchange perspectives and consider solutions they might not otherwise explore. However, observations also showed that the game was sometimes perceived as too general by more experienced professionals. For these participants, a more detailed or specialised scenario, or a stronger focus on a specific phase of the crisis, could increase the added value.

The SAVIT Catalogue was used only to a limited extent during the game. Where it was used, it helped deepen the discussion and provided additional information on possible solutions. However, the Catalogue seems most useful as a supporting or follow-up resource rather than as a central element during time-limited gameplay.

7.3. Usability

ATLAS was generally considered usable and technically reliable, but not yet fully self-explanatory. Participants were able to work with the platform during the guided session, especially when supported by facilitators and group discussion. The Self-Assessment Tool was the easiest component to use, while the Strategy Builder required more explanation and guidance.

The main usability challenges for ATLAS concerned navigation, terminology, user guidance and the amount of text presented to users. Several participants indicated that it was not always clear where to go next, how different platform components were connected, or how assessment results should be interpreted. The platform also requires users to process a relatively large amount of written information, which can slow down first-time use. ATLAS

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

would therefore benefit from clearer onboarding, simplified terminology, shorter explanatory texts, step-by-step guidance and more consistent language use across the interface.

The SAVIT Tabletop Game was generally understandable and easy to use once participants had completed the first round. The game encouraged active participation and discussion, but the first round required clear facilitation to explain the sequence of steps, the purpose of the game elements and the use of the board, cards and supporting materials.

The questionnaire results were positive about the basic usability of the Game. Ease and intuitiveness received an average score of 3.89 out of 5. Use without additional assistance received 3.11, while the statement that no training, supervision or other resources would be needed received 2.78.

These results show that participants could understand and use the Game, but that clear facilitation and preparation remain important, particularly for first-time users.

The main usability challenge for the SAVIT Tabletop Game was the amount of material on the table. Several observations indicated that the number of printed elements, boards, cards and sheets could feel overwhelming. A more visual process, simplified materials and clearer facilitator guidance would improve usability.

Overall, ATLAS and the SAVIT Tabletop Game were usable in a facilitated workshop setting. Both require a clear introduction, guidance and contextual explanation for first-time users.

7.4. Transferability

ATLAS was considered transferable to other hazards, contexts and user groups. Participants saw potential for using ATLAS beyond the Rotterdam case, especially in preparedness workshops, training settings, stakeholder discussions and strategic planning processes. The self-assessment approach, preparedness concepts, examples and good practices were seen as the most transferable elements.

At the same time, participants indicated that ATLAS would need to be adapted to the local context before it can be applied in practice. More local examples, comparable cases, language adaptation and better alignment with institutional procedures would strengthen transferability. The examples and good practices are therefore useful as inspiration, but need to be adapted to the local context before they can be used in practice.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

The SAVIT Tabletop Game was also considered transferable to other organisational and disaster-management contexts. Observers noted potential use with municipalities, safety regions, volunteer organisations, training settings and multi-stakeholder collaborations. The game was also considered useful as an icebreaker or awareness-raising tool, especially for organisations or partners that are less familiar with the topic of informal help.

The questionnaire results also indicate that the Game can be adapted to different settings. Adaptability to other hazards and other contexts both received an average score of 3.56 out of 5. Adaptability to other communities or user groups received 3.44.

For the SAVIT Tabletop Game, transferability depends strongly on the availability of a clear and contextualised scenario. The game would become more useful if scenarios could be adapted to the specific hazard type, local context, target group or preparedness challenge. A shorter or modular version could also make the game easier to use in training settings or workshops with limited time.

7.5. Compatibility

ATLAS was considered partly compatible with existing preparedness and organisational work processes. Participants saw potential for using the platform in specific activities such as preparedness workshops, gap analysis, stakeholder discussions and strategic planning. However, direct integration into existing systems, platforms or routine workflows was considered less straightforward.

For ATLAS, compatibility depends mainly on whether organisations can clearly define when and how the platform should be used. The validation suggests that ATLAS is most compatible with periodic reflection and planning processes, rather than with daily operational use. A clearer connection to existing organisational procedures and internal knowledge systems would strengthen its practical adoption.

The SAVIT Tabletop Game also showed potential compatibility with existing preparedness practice, particularly as a facilitated exercise, training activity or awareness-raising tool. Participants recognised its value for discussing informal help, stakeholder roles and possible solutions.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

Questionnaire respondents gave the Game an average score of 3.56 out of 5 for ease of integration into existing systems or processes. Compatibility with existing working practices received 3.50 out of 5, based on eight valid responses.

These scores indicate potential for organisational use, but they do not show that the Game can be introduced without adaptation. Clear use cases, defined outputs and follow-up actions remain necessary.

However, the observations showed that the link between game outcomes and organisational follow-up still needs to be strengthened. The added value would become clearer if the game produced outputs that can be translated into lessons learned, follow-up actions or input for preparedness planning.

Overall, both tools fit best within facilitated preparedness, learning and planning activities. Their integration into existing organisational workflows will depend on clear use cases, defined outputs and follow-up processes.

Compatibility also relates to the maturity and potential economic viability of the tested results. For ATLAS, the validation indicates sufficient technical maturity for further piloting and facilitated use, but not yet for unsupported organisational adoption in all contexts. Practical uptake will depend on clear use cases, ownership, maintenance, content updating and the resources required for implementation.

For the SAVIT Tabletop Game, the main resource requirements are facilitator availability, preparation time, suitable game materials and the development of a context-specific scenario. The game appears mature enough for facilitated workshop and training use, but its long-term value depends on clearer outputs and a stronger link to organisational follow-up. The SAVIT Catalogue showed potential as a supporting reference resource, but was used too selectively during the workshop to assess its standalone maturity or economic viability in detail.

8. Conclusions and next steps

The Rotterdam Preparedness Case Validation Workshop provided useful evidence on the practical applicability, usability and added value of the selected SYNERGIES results in a realistic preparedness setting. The workshop provided evidence that ATLAS, the SAVIT Tabletop Game and the Journey session can support structured reflection and discussion on

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

preparedness challenges. The SAVIT Catalogue showed potential as a supporting reference resource, but was used too selectively for a comprehensive assessment.

Overall, the tested results were positively received and appear sufficiently mature for use in facilitated workshop, learning and reflection settings. Their strongest value lies in supporting dialogue, stakeholder engagement, preparedness reflection, gap identification and the exploration of possible improvement measures. The validation also showed that the results are most effective when they are introduced clearly, connected to a concrete scenario and linked to the organisational context of participants.

The ATLAS session confirmed the potential of the platform to support preparedness reflection, self-assessment and strategic discussion. The ATLAS validation was supported by 15 completed questionnaire records and showed a positive overall experience score of 7.00 out of 10. Participants recognised the value of combining good practices, assessment functionalities and strategy-building elements in one platform. The Self-Assessment Tool emerged as the strongest entry point, while the Strategy Builder was considered relevant but in need of clearer guidance. Further development should focus on navigation, terminology, onboarding, localisation, clearer value proposition, reduced text density, interface consistency, and stronger connection with existing preparedness workflows.

The SAVIT Tabletop Game was positively received as an accessible and engaging tool for discussing the integration of organised, informal and spontaneous help. The game stimulated discussion and helped participants consider possible solutions from different perspectives. Its strongest value lies in awareness-raising, learning and facilitated discussion. Further development should focus on simplifying materials, strengthening facilitator guidance, developing more specific or contextualised scenarios, and clarifying how game outcomes can be translated into organisational follow-up actions.

The SAVIT Catalogue was useful as supporting material, but its role during the workshop was limited. In several groups, the Catalogue was not used or was only used briefly because participants first needed time to understand the game. Where it was used, it provided more detailed information on solutions. This suggests that the Catalogue may be most valuable as a follow-up or reference resource after the game, rather than as a central element during time-limited gameplay.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.

The questionnaire results support these findings. Respondents were positive about the Game's ease of use, recommendation value, adaptability and potential for further development. Lower scores for use without support and organisational investment indicate that facilitation, preparation and a clear organisational purpose remain necessary.

The Journey session helped participants look beyond individual tools and reflect on the wider use of SYNERGIES results. It supported discussion on long-term preparedness pathways, stakeholder participation, communication, volunteer engagement, capacity building and sustainability. The session confirmed the value of presenting SYNERGIES as an integrated preparedness ecosystem rather than as a set of isolated results.

Several cross-cutting lessons emerged from the workshop. First, clear facilitation and onboarding are essential, especially for participants who are not familiar with the SYNERGIES project or with the specific tool being tested. Second, contextualisation is necessary: scenarios, examples and outputs need to connect to the organisational reality of users. Third, long-term uptake depends on whether the results can be embedded in existing preparedness processes, training settings, organisational workflows and multi-stakeholder cooperation structures.

The next steps are to use the validation findings to support further refinement, dissemination and exploitation of the SYNERGIES results. For ATLAS, this includes improving user guidance, terminology, localisation, content accessibility, Strategy Builder support and the practical connection to organisational workflows. Further development could also explore AI- or LLM-supported functionalities to help users search, filter and connect relevant practices and strategies. For the SAVIT Tabletop Game, this includes simplifying materials, improving facilitator guidance, developing more specific scenarios and clarifying the outputs of the exercise. For the SAVIT Catalogue, further work should clarify its role as a follow-up and reference resource.

Future uptake should also clarify ownership, maintenance requirements, facilitation capacity and resource implications for each result, as these factors will influence maturity, sustainability and economic viability in practice.

The outcomes of this validation workshop will feed into D1.4 Validation Case 3 and support the further refinement and practical uptake of SYNERGIES results.

This project has received funding from the European Union's research and innovation programme Horizon Europe under the grant agreement No. 101121172. This document reflects only the author's view, and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.