

# FP7 Evaluation Process



**IEA Expert Group on  
R&D Priority Setting and Evaluation  
Workshop « Evaluating R&D »  
9-10 November 2010 Brussels**

**European Commission  
Directorate General Research  
Martin Huemer**

# Content

- **Overview**
- **Organisation and cycle of FP evaluation**
- **Main evaluation criteria**
- **Examples**
  - ▶ FP7
  - ▶ NNE programme in FP5 and FP6
  - ▶ Project evaluation
- **Impact of evaluation results**

# Overview (1)

**RTD activities on European level are subject to many evaluations, impact assessments, reviews and related actions.**

**Evaluations differ according to**

- **Time:**
- **Scope**
- **Performers of/contributors to evaluations**
- **Subject**

# Overview (2)

- **Time:**
  - ▶ Ex ante impact assessment (e.g. for FP8)
  - ▶ In process (e.g. interim Evaluation FP7, mid term review of projects)
  - ▶ Ex post (5 years assessment of FP5)
- **Scope**
  - ▶ Project level
  - ▶ Theme (e.g. energy)
  - ▶ Framework Programme

# Overview (3)

- **Authors of/contributors to evaluations**
  - ▶ Internal (often in combination with monitoring)
  - ▶ Expert groups
    - ◆ institutionalised (e.g. Advisory Group on Energy)
    - ◆ Ad hoc (e.g. panel for evaluation of ERA-NETs)
  - ▶ Interest groups (ETPs)
  - ▶ Committees representing Member States
  - ▶ General public (e.g. public consultation as part of the interim evaluation of FP 7)

# Overview (4)

- **Subject**

- ▶ “general” performance
- ▶ Performance of/impact on specific groups (e.g. SME’s, gender aspects, New Member States)
- ▶ Instruments (ERA-Nets, PPPs, JTIs, Networks of Excellence)
- ▶ Processes (e.g. call evaluation procedure, time to contract)

# Organisation of evaluation in the EC

- **Decentralised system:**
  - ▶ Individual directorate generals and directorates are responsible for the evaluation of their activities
- **Coordination of evaluation activities**
  - ▶ Common standards
  - ▶ Internal Evaluation network
  - ▶ Evaluation Information Management System (EMIS)
- **Coordination with MS, AS and accession countries**
  - ▶ European RTD Evaluation Network (EUevalnet)

# History of FP evaluation

## Framework programmes are subject to a compulsory series of interlinked evaluations

- **1995 – 2006: Two major exercises**
  - ▶ annual monitoring of FP implementation
  - ▶ Five Year Assessment of the implementation and achievements of research carried out over the five preceding years.
- **FP7:**
  - ▶ indicator-based annual assessment of programme implementation (“annual monitoring”)
  - ▶ progress report on FP7 in 2009
  - ▶ Interim Evaluation of FP7 (2010)
  - ▶ Ex post evaluation



# Programme evaluation criteria

**Evaluation criteria depend on the specific evaluation demand. However, in most cases programme evaluations look at:**

## **Relevance:**

To what extent are the *objectives* of a programme appropriate regarding the *needs* and the *problems* the intervention is meant to solve?

## **Effectiveness**

Were the specific *objectives* attained and were the intended *results* achieved?

## **Efficiency**

How well have the *inputs* (resources) been converted into *outputs*, results and impacts? Were the effects obtained at *a reasonable cost*?

## **Utility**

Do the *impacts* achieved by an intervention correspond to the *existing needs* and the *problems* to be solved?

## **Sustainability**

Will the effects achieved last in the medium or long term, i.e. *after the funding has stopped*?

# Example: FP7 (1)

## a) Ex ante Impact Assessment:

- **Inputs:**

- ▶ stakeholder consultations
- ▶ Internal and external evaluation studies
- ▶ 5 year assessment of FP5

- **Main topics covered:**

- ▶ What challenges are tackled
- ▶ What would happen under a “no policy change” scenario
- ▶ Which S&T system actors will be affected
- ▶ Main objectives
- ▶ Expected impacts (R&D system, economic, social and environmental)
- ▶ Monitoring and evaluation procedure



## Example: FP7 (2)

### b) Interim Evaluation

- **Report drafted by group of 10 external experts**
- **Inputs:**
  - ▶ Self assessment by services responsible for different aspects of FP7
  - ▶ open stakeholder consultation (500 people)
  - ▶ Internal and external evaluation studies
  - ▶ Ex post evaluation of FP6
- **Some of the main questions addressed:**
  - ▶ Achievement of general objectives
  - ▶ Impact on ERA
  - ▶ Efficiency of novel measures (e.g. European Research Council, Joint Technology Initiatives, ERA-NET plus, Risk Sharing Finance Facility)
  - ▶ Effectiveness of simplification
  - ▶ Progress regarding follow up of FP6 evaluation report

## Example: FP7 (3)

**Interim Evaluation report will include recommendations for the rest of FP7 and FP8**

**Recommendations might address**

- **Balance between different parts of FP7**
- **Coordination and coherence between activities in different specific programmes**
- **Gender aspects**
- **Ways to promote international cooperation in FP7**

**The Interim Evaluation of FP7 is a key input for the design of FP8**

**The EC will publish a communication responding to the report**

**c) Ex post evaluation of FP7 after 2013**



# Example: non nuclear energy programme(1)

## *Evaluation and Impact Assessment of the European Non Nuclear Energy RTD Programme (FP5 and FP6)*

- Performed by external contractor (Technopolis)

### Issues addressed:

- achievements in light of the objectives defined in the EU energy / climate change and competitiveness policies
- scientific outputs and results
- Relevance of instruments
- support to science-industry relationships:
- Coordination of national research policies
- International cooperation
- Economic and social impacts

## Example: non nuclear energy programme(2)

### External inputs:

- On line survey for NNE project participants
- Field interviews and thematic workshops

### 8 recommendations on

- budget allocation and the respective decision process
- Size of instruments (projects)
- Management and monitoring of projects
- Coordination of projects within an area or under different themes

### Results feed into

- Work of advisory boards, programme committees
- Mid term evaluation of FP7

# Example: evaluation on project level (1)

## a) Calls for proposals:

- **project selection by teams of independent experts**
  - ▶ Single step or two step procedure
  - ▶ Each step starts with individual assessment reports
  - ▶ Followed by discussion of evaluation panel leading to a common “consensus report”
  - ▶ Experts check in/out of scope and assess
    - ◆ scientific and/or technological excellence;
    - ◆ the potential impact
    - ◆ the quality and efficiency of the implementation and management.
  - ▶ An extended panel ensures harmonized application of criteria across different consensus groups
- **Result: ranked list of proposals above the threshold**



## **Example: evaluation on project level (2)**

**Consensus panels are moderated by Commission officials.**

**Participants may file a complaint against the evaluation of their proposal (redress procedure)**

**The evaluation and selection process itself is monitored and evaluated by “independent observers”. Many of their recommendations are taken into account in the evaluation of the next call**





## Example: evaluation on project level (3)

### **b) Interim evaluations of projects (mid term review)**

- **Only in some themes and only in the case of big projects**
- **Made by external experts**
- **Could in principle result in project stop (happens very rarely)**
- **Problem: experts sometimes tend to be too “friendly” (fear that EC could stop to support the own research field)**

### **c) Ex post evaluation of projects or group of projects**



## Impact of evaluation results (1)

**The legal basis of FP7 requires the Commission to *communicate the conclusions of the interim evaluation accompanied by its observations and, where appropriate, proposals for the adaptation of this Framework Programme, to the European Parliament, the Council, .....***

**Such a direct legal obligation does not exist on other levels. But the evaluation standards demand the services concerned to**

- **Examine results and outline the actions they propose to take**
- **make results publicly available**
- **Communicate them effectively to all relevant decision makers and other interested stakeholders/parties**

## Impact of evaluation results (2)

**The degree to which evaluation results are taken into account varies considerably among different evaluation exercises.**

**Factors, which seem to increase relevance and impact of evaluations:**

- **A real demand for improvement, acknowledged by the service in charge of implementation**
- **The openness to accept also negative evaluation statements and the willingness to respond to the recommendations**
- **The substantial participation of external experts**

# Impact of evaluation results (3)

## Factors (cont.):

- **The people launching the evaluation and those in charge of implementing changes (if different) must cooperate closely**
- **People affected by the evaluation (e.g. coordinators) could be involved in the preparatory phase of the evaluation (TOR design)**
- **Timing**
- **Quality of evaluation study**

# links

## **EU Framework Programme Evaluation and Monitoring**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=home](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=home)

## **Archive of FP Programme Evaluation and Monitoring Documents**

[http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index\\_en.cfm?pg=archive](http://ec.europa.eu/research/evaluations/index_en.cfm?pg=archive)

## **Study on Role and Impact of Small and Medium Size Enterprises in Energy Research Framework Programme Projects**

[http://www.partnersforinnovation.com/PDF\\_web/publicaties/091203%20PfI\\_final\\_report\\_Role\\_impact\\_SMEs.pdf](http://www.partnersforinnovation.com/PDF_web/publicaties/091203%20PfI_final_report_Role_impact_SMEs.pdf)