



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP6 Ex-Post Evaluation in context

ESF Workshop, Vienna, 7 October 2008

Dr. Peter Fisch
European Commission
Directorate General Research A.3

17/10/2008





EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Roadmap

- Evaluation and Monitoring of FP6 and FP7
- Open Issues for organising evaluations



FP Evaluation System (1)

- Actors
 - Political level (Member States)
 - European Commission level
 - “Directorate General” level
 - Member States’ evaluation
- Rules
 - Framework Programme Decisions
 - European Commission Financial Regulations and related rules
 - European Commission Communications on Evaluation
 - Other types of internal European Commission Regulations

FP Evaluation System (2)

FP6	FP7
Annual Monitoring by independent experts	Internal monitoring of implementation -Indicators to track progress
	FP7 interim evaluation
Five Year Assessment by high-level independent experts	Ex post assessment of each FP, 2 years after its completion by high-level independent experts
Impact surveys at FP level	Strengthened programme of coordinated strategic-level evaluations
Evaluation studies at operational level	Evaluation studies at operational level (portfolio, programme)
National impact studies	Coordinated national impact studies
Ad-hoc research-related activities	FP research on evaluation tools and approaches



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP6 Ex-post Evaluation

- Actors: Expert group; Commission services
- Legal base: FP Decision
- Scope: All Community research activities
- Organisation: Coordinated approach between Commission services for FP activities
- Input: Reports from INFSO and JRC; evidence base of 30+ studies; Member States' studies; expert analyses; self assessments,...
- Output: Expert group report (findings and recommendations); Commission response
- Timing: Panel report by end 2008
- Dissemination: Policy makers and FP management

17/10/2008





EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP6 Ex-post Evaluation Expert Group

- Ernst Rietschel (Chair), Leibniz Association, D
- Aris Kaloudis (Rapporteur), NIFU-STEP, NO
- Antanas Cenys, Vilnius Technical University, LT
- Andrew Dearing, EIRMA, UK
- Irwin Feller, Penn State University, USA
- Sylvie Jaussaume, CNRS, F
- Lene Langer, Copenhagen University, DK
- Jerzy Langer, Academy of Sciences, PL
- Victoria Ley, ANEP, SP
- Riita Mustonen, Academy of Finland, FI
- Derek Pooley, UKAEA, UK
- Nicoletta Stame, Rome University, IT

17/10/2008





EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP6 Ex-post Evaluation Supporting Studies (Examples)

- Networking Patterns
- Behavioural Additionality
- FP6 New instruments
- Impact of FP6 on new Member States
- International Standing of FP
- Bibliometric analysis
- ...



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP7 Monitoring Implementation

- Move from external monitoring (FP6) towards internal monitoring (FP7)
- Move from an “ad-hoc” approach towards a continuous and systematic collection of information and indicators
- Monitoring primarily aimed to support management in implementing FP7
- Annual report to be presented to the Programme Committee and to be published on internet
- Possible information source for future FP7 evaluations
- Flexible system to develop as FP7 will become more “mature”
- First report envisaged for November 2008



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP7 Monitoring Issues at Stake

- Application numbers
- Proposal Evaluation
- Time to contract
- Success rates
- User Feedback
- ...

Evaluation of FP7

- **Roadmap**
 - Progress Report - 2009
 - Interim Evaluation - 2010
 - Ex-ante Evaluation – in time for new Commission proposal on “FP8”
 - Ex-post Evaluation – 2015

- **FP7 interim evaluation**
 - Independence
 - Comprehensive evidence base
 - Build on the ex-post evaluation of FP6



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

FP Evaluation Perspectives

- Growing EU Research budget also means: Increased need for accountability
- Efficiency of the European RTD system under scrutiny
- Timing of forthcoming evaluations in line with need to have an informed debate on future EU RTD policy
- Need to focus more on the “fundamental” aspects and less on minor implementation issues
- Need to develop evaluation capacities in Europe as part of the European Research Area

FP Evaluation Achievements and Challenges

- ☑ Individually robust evaluations
- ☑ Independence
- ☑ Assessment of impact on scientific knowledge
- ☑ Justification of interventions
- ☑ European network
- ☑ Some evolution of tools

- ↻ Coordination
- ↻ Assessment of longer-term impacts
- ↻ Assessment of socio-economic impact
- ↻ Use of results in implementation



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Open Issues Intervention Logic

- Specify a clear intervention logic in the basic legal acts
- Develop a hierarchy of (measurable) objectives throughout the different levels (programmes, projects)

FP evaluation:

- Difficult to achieve in a complex environment like the European Union
- Need to develop new types of indicators in order not to be blocked by just aiming at what you can measure ...





EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Open Issues

Overall Evaluation Strategy

- Clear evaluation strategy from the outset
- Complete coverage of all activities
- Right timing in view of revisions and development of new actions

FP evaluation:

- Concise long term-time planning
- Need to improve on overall coherence of the evaluation activities carried out in different fields of the FP



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Open Issues

Diversity and Coordination

- Calls for strong coordination and “harmonisation” clash with the need to use a wide spectrum of different evaluation approaches

FP evaluation:

- Diversity is one of the big assets of Europe
- Different traditions and schools across Member States
- Unique opportunity to bring together wide range of evaluation approaches
- Challenge to turn “constructive chaos” into operational structures



Open Issues

Control or Understanding

- Different views on what drives evaluation
 - Need to control activities and actors
 - Wish to understand what is going on
- Major implications on the organisation and focus of evaluations

FP evaluation:

- Focus on evaluation as a management task to gain a better understanding of the activities undertaken



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Open Issues Longer Term Impact

- Full impact of research activities can only be assessed after a long period of time, as full implementation can take several years

FP evaluation:

- In order to be on time (politically), evaluations are carried out very early ...
- Test-run planned for a study looking back at projects which were finished some 8 to 12 years ago
- Easier said than done ...



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Open Issues Concise Messages

- A too much detailed level of analysis prevents many evaluation reports from having a real impact in the wider political and societal context

FP evaluation:

- Meta-Evaluation through expert panels as a tool to “condense” otherwise too dispersed evaluation findings
- Further efforts are needed to focus on key messages for communication with the target audiences

Open Issues

Organise Mutual Learning

- There is no “ideal” evaluation
- All actors are trying out different approaches
- Need to organise more mutual learning

FP evaluation:

- European RTD Evaluation Network, involving experts from 30+ countries
- Interest in more active exchange at global level



EUROPEAN
COMMISSION

European
Research Area

Contact

Dr. Peter Fisch

Head of Unit

European Commission – DG RTD A.3

SDME 2/41

1049 Bruxelles

Belgium

peter.fisch@ec.europa.eu