



- ▲ A few words from Peter Fisch who sends apologies (and ideas)
 - European Commission
Research Directorate General
Head of Unit RTD.A.3: 'Evaluation and Monitoring of Programmes'
- ▲ The goal we want to stick to in this Forum is having the Commission always aware of our steps and progress
 - On one side to make sure work is not duplicated
 - On the other to see whether at a much different granularity (MOs vs Countries or EU bodies) things might look differently
- ▲ Peter refers to two recent studies
 - "*Drivers of international collaboration in research*", prepared by Technopolis and Manchester Institute of Innovation Research
 - "*Tools and indicators for community research evaluation and monitoring*", prepared by a consortium led by Proneos (DE)



- ▲ For the second one we have one of the authors in the room ...
 - Emanuela would you like to comment? ...
- ▲ For the first one, chapter 6 deals with indicators and metrics
 - *The use and sophistication to understand one's own STI systems varies considerably in the countries of the review*
 - *Improved efforts to understand the starting point for internationalisation activities amidst a generally low level of evidence gathering*
 - *The general finding remains: indicator use to underpin internationalisation policies shows room for improvement – and policy makers are increasingly aware of that*
 - *The linking of internationalisation targets to existing goals of broader STI strategies is limited and targets are set on the level of measures rather than on effects*
 - *The success of internationalisation policies is measured by the increase in scale and scope of international activities, rather than by their effects on scientific and innovation performance*



✦ **Two issues raised by Peter Fisch**

- ✦ *Work on indicators is sometimes dominated by the "supply" side, digging very deep into all possible statistical options to produce new analytical tools. Unfortunately, in my experience the "demand" side is less organised, formulating clearly what the indicators should be used for and what the real essentials to be covered are. Against this background I am in a sense an advocat for an approach to get the basics right, rather than to aim at perfection. This requires the courage to admit that the data lack ultimate precision, but at least they provide a rough orientation where otherwise one would be in the complete dark*
- ✦ *A closely related issue is the availability of data over time: while some data are of great analytical value in a long term perspective (like bibliometric data for example), their use in a more pragmatic political context is often very limited due to their inherent timelag. In case of doubt it might be advisable to prefer even less "solid" indicators which become quickly available over potentially more "solid" indicators which will be lagging behind.*