



Workshop Summary and Outcomes

EGRD - 10 November – 2010

Session Leader

Rob Kool



Workshops Outcome

- Wrap up slides 3-7: Birte Holst Jørgensen



Defining evaluation

- **Evaluation** is systematic determination of merit, worth, and significance of something or someone using criteria against a set of standards
- **Evaluation** is the systematic acquisition and assessment of information to provide useful feedback about some object
 - data collection
 - judgement about the validity of data and of the inferences we make about it
 - useful feedback to various audiences



Motivation

- **Acceleration**
 - Technology development needed to address the three Es, more than ever!
- **Accountability**
 - Who can call for an account and who owes a duty of an explanation:
 - Political
 - Administrative
 - Professional

Ex-ante (Swedish case; IEA acceleration project)

- Transformation of the energy system and the strategic role of ER bringing down Cost of Energy for new technologies
- **Trade off** between
 - Risk taking vs demonstrating success in RD&D, especially having the uncertainty in RD&D in mind
 - Intended and unintended behavioural consequences (Ph.D's, innovations etc.)
 - National focus vs. opportunities for international cooperation
 - RD&D (push) vs. other market support mechanisms (pull), also in terms of expenditure.
- Strategic holistic approach needed to transform energy systems
- Diverse roles, perspectives and stakeholders when building consensus on new priorities and design programmes
- Input and **inspiration from other sectors** (health, agriculture etc.)
- RD&D is long term, relevant for energy systems and global markets; it may have huge impact, but it takes time and requires patience.





In progress: keeping pace in the race (EU and US cases)

- **Development and implementation of monitoring systems and tools**
 - Step-wise roll-out (pilot, learning or cautious process?)
 - Tailor made data and tools - transparency
 - Methodological challenges when measuring impact of public strategic plans on overall policy goals, impact on policies, R&D investments, action progress/performance
 - Requirements for both qualitative and quantitative data and analysis
 - Standardising performance measurements, data collection and use of performance information (feedback)
 - The powerful tool of **scoreboards** for decision-makers whereas practitioners more interested in using performance information
 - Information sharing is about stable monitoring architecture
 - Systematic linkages in the process from mission to performance
- Technology development and tracking that **progress not restricted to one country (or company)** – good case for international cooperation!

Ex-post: Back to the future (Nordic scoreboard, US case and international case)

- The methodological *challenges in developing cross-country indicators* covering the value chain in its context
- Need for improvements on individual indicators as well as composed indicators, incl. better data on industrial activities, investments, tech transfer, policy framework conditions etc.
- Retrospective and prospective evaluations
 - R&D takes time and requires long term impact assessment
 - Defining and measuring benefits and costs (3 Es) analytically demanding
 - Adapting retrospective methodologies to prospective construct
 - Always uncertainties to take into consideration – complex technologies, dynamic markets, changing society
- Systemic evaluations and impact assessment frameworks
 - narrative, indicator, self evaluation and context sensitive approaches



The role of evaluation in priority setting and policy making: Technopolis

- Need for more effective and ambitious energy R&D policy & Need for better information
- How to come from evaluation to priority setting.
 - Evaluation is an essential component, but in combination with road mapping, needs assessments, market survey etc.
 - Levels of priority setting: strategy, programme creation, programme design
 - Have the courage to give unpopular messages (fuel cells): cut budget or redirect programmes. (freight) but it's a ***policy decision*** by the end of the day (and competes with other priorities).
 - How to faze out technologies.



Priority setting and policy making 2

- Ensure objectives can be met (define market barriers and deal with them)
- Evaluation often within programme, and not between programmes
- Evaluation results go through layers of governance
- Effective use of conclusions: right moment, involve stakeholders (from the start), high level evaluation committee. Formal reviewing of follow-up evaluation, action plan based.
- Social research evaluation: possible, but more complex



FP 7 evaluation

- Ex ante FP8, In process FP7, Ex Post FP5 (compulsory)
- Broad evaluation: Internal, Experts, Interest groups, Committees, General Public.
- Scope: General, specific impact, Instruments (networks of excellence etc.), Processes (time to contract)
- Interim evaluation: Report drafted by external experts with open stakeholder evaluation
- Interim evaluation FP7 is input for FP8
- Data collection: Partly on line input (part of the full participatory policy.)



FP 7 evaluation

- Evaluate projects:
 - list of **all** topics: look “across the border”
 - Interim evaluation of projects (somewhat) weak.
- Impact of evaluation results depends on:
 - Real demand for improvement
 - Openness to accept negative statements
 - Involvement stakeholders: scope, questionnaire
 - Resisting attempt to “smoothen” the outcome.
- Budget: not available, research is funded



Round Table

- Italy:
 - ex ante. Based on ministerial nucleus. Long-term industrial evaluation show little innovation. Since 1998 no energy strategy, as such a lack of evaluation base.
 - Transition to gas non governmental.
 - On research level good examples are available.
 - Geothermal energy is overlooked.
 - Little coordination between pull and push.



Round Table

- UK:
 - Produce evaluations that are used!
 - Evidence based policy is gaining importance.
- Austria
 - It has a cultural element: is evaluation to punish or to learn.
 - Change due to EU regulations
 - Project manager now have to look at the original plan.
 - Beware of the the translation from evaluation to message... and ask for written reaction



Round Table

- Denmark
 - Add sociology to hard core technology.
 - Good exchange off exchange between evaluators.
- Netherlands:
 - Programmes start to soon after evaluation: no time to adjust.
 - Evaluations in governmental programmes in-process are “part of the process”
 - Focus of evaluation sometimes Policy driven: more emphasis on industry



Round Table

- New Zealand
 - On the moment no official national evaluation
 - Evaluation in research centres: policy influenced.
 - No ex-post at all. Strongly influenced by lack of capacity
- Norway
 - 8 Large scale programmes with good evaluations . Partly done by the research council.
 - Also overall evaluation over all programmes.
 - Evaluation used as important input.



Round Table

- New Zealand
 - On the moment no official national evaluation
 - Evaluation in research centres: policy influenced.
 - No ex-post at all. Strongly influenced by lack of capacity
- Norway
 - 8 Large scale programmes with good evaluations . Partly done by the research council.
 - Also overall evaluation over all programmes.



Round Table

- Germany
 - Ministry based
 - Environment: large study +1000 pages.
 - Economy 2 low cost studies. Good evaluation on fuel cells, studying part of the programme.
 - E-mobility is an upcoming priority.
- Belgium
 - Federal country, R&D regional responsibility, with the exception of nuclear.
 - PV is the most important topic.
 - Not a good allocation of time/money to evaluation
 - Don't loose opportunities



Round Table

- US
 - Death by evaluation
 - 2000: 34 advisory boards (independent, external)
 - Congressional hearings (budget cuts)
- Internal evaluations
 - Unpopular: we only want to hear success stories
 - Gaps analyses tend to be not too critical / sustainable
 - Beware of stovepipes and sponsors



General remarks

- Matrix

So let's give good advice!

