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• 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
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## FP Evaluation System (2)

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

- Ernst Rietschel (Chair), Leibniz Association, DE
- 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
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
- …
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
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
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
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 …
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
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
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 …
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
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