

# **Task Force on Monitoring & Evaluation of the JPIs**

**Final report  
on**

**Key indicators**

**31.8.2018**

## Task Force on Monitoring & Evaluation of the JPIs

### **Background**

The European Joint Programming Process was initiated in 2008 with a Communication of the European Commission and subsequent Conclusions of the European Council<sup>1</sup>. The attractiveness of Joint Programming lies in its structured and strategic process, whereby Member States voluntarily agree to work in partnership towards common visions, encapsulated in Strategic Research and Innovation Agendas (SRIAs) and implemented through joint actions. Ten Joint Programming Initiatives (JPIs) were established with the aims to:

**(1) Respond to societal challenges through joint and targeted research and innovation strategies, programmes and activities on a transnational level**

JPIs ensure a more effective approach to make significant impact on the identified grand societal challenges, directly or indirectly, through strategic cooperation and resource allocation. The value added to national level activities lies in particular in greater critical mass and less fragmentation in Europe's efforts to tackle these challenges.

**(2) Better coordinate and integrate national research and innovation planning, policies, strategies and programmes for selected challenges**

JPIs were part of a larger move to ensure a more concerted and coordinated European Research Area (ERA) which was supposed to contribute to better alignment of the strategies and instruments between Member States and Associated Countries to overcome structural and systemic problems in European research and innovation.

Several initiatives<sup>2</sup> have been undertaken to provide monitoring and evaluation frameworks for strategic guidance and as a tool for learning. In addition, the individual JPIs have been developing their own, specific, monitoring and evaluation frameworks to ensure steering and decision making in each case.

### **Aim of the Task Force**

In January 2017, the Chairs of the decision making bodies from the 10 JPIs established a Task Force (TF) on Monitoring and Evaluation of the JPIs with an aim to define a framework of common dimensions and indicators relevant and applicable for all the JPIs. A key reason for this was a growing awareness of a need for harmonisation of the emerging monitoring and evaluation efforts among the JPIs and the wish to better cover the various dimensions of JPIs and their implementation efforts in such monitoring activities. **A recommendation for common dimensions and indicators of impact** reflecting the role and "modus operandi" of the JPIs, their mandate and role in the ERA, and their progress, was seen as necessary.

---

<sup>1</sup> CEU, Council conclusions concerning joint programming of research in Europe in response to major societal challenges, 16775/08, Brussels, 3 December 2008, <[https://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/programming\\_st16775\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/research/era/pdf/programming_st16775_en.pdf)>.

<sup>2</sup> These are initiatives such as JPIs to Co-Work, ERA-LEARN, The Commission's Hernani-report, GPCs IG3-report, and GPCs Framework conditions.

The focus of the TF was therefore to identify a **small set of important dimensions of JPIs with their associated indicators that is robust and is supported by all JPIs as a basis for the assessment of the JPIs as a whole**. The TF has had several meetings through 2017 and 2018 to discuss and refine a proposed framework.

The process of developing the framework has shown that while a joint set of indicators is useful to better assess the progress and performance of JPIs, strict comparisons between them may prove less fruitful, or even counterproductive, as the mandates, activities and impacts of the JPIs differ significantly.

### ***A proposed common approach to monitoring and evaluation of JPIs***

The approach to monitoring and evaluation of JPIs should enable decision makers to acquire a broad understanding of the JPIs' role and development, to identify key issues that are common to all JPIs, and provide a guide to the JPIs for their own monitoring and evaluation frameworks.

Two specific concerns have guided the work of the TF:

- The long term impacts on the societal challenges are very difficult to measure, not least due to significant attribution problems.
- The JPIs, as intergovernmental partnerships, need to be monitored and evaluated using indicators that are qualitative as well as quantitative.

Table 1 below summarises the TF's work and attempts to reflect this dual concern. The left column of the table represents the agreed dimensions reflecting the objectives of the JPIs, and the second column includes the proposed indicators. The third column of the table includes the key measurements of the selected indicators, while the last column includes some additional comments. It should be noted that information and data needed to measure progress against the indicators may be quantitative or qualitative, the latter requiring specific data collection procedures such as interviews, narratives, and success stories.

The mandate of the TF was to advise the JPI Chairs on a small set of common dimensions and impact indicators. However, the TF has included a broader set of dimensions and indicators that reflect the concerns stated above. Therefore, the common set of impact indicators that the TF suggests should be adopted by all JPIs are highlighted in the table with bold/kursive. Those that are not highlighted may be adopted and used more freely.

A final note of caution is needed: In order to address the chosen societal challenges, all JPIs need to go beyond state-of-the-art activities and instruments. Monitoring and evaluation can help to highlight such efforts, successes and impacts, to identify good practice and support mutual learning among the JPIs, reflecting the diversity between them.

The actions to implement the SRIAs of JPIs are diverse. For these and other reasons it is not to be expected that the individual JPIs report comparable progress against these indicators. In fact, using this framework may serve to illustrate the diversity between the JPIs and demonstrate their different priorities and contexts. This is also the added value of the common set of dimensions and indicators developed here: It allows for a greater understanding of the roles that the individual JPIs play in their respective fields.

**Table 1: Proposed set of indicators for the evaluation and monitoring of JPIs**

Dimension	Indicator	Description/measurement	Methodology/data sources
<b>Alignment of national and European and/or international research and innovation programmes and resources</b>	Committed SRIAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number and type of joint actions to implement SRIA</li> <li>-Regular updates of SRIA</li> <li>-Participation of external partners in actions (number and share of funding/resources)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Data held by JPI (hubs, calls etc)</li> <li>-Procedures and changes</li> <li>-Data held by JPI</li> </ul>
	<b>Adaptation of national priorities towards JPI SRIA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Dedicated funding on national level</li> <li>-Integration of SRIA in national policies and strategies/programmes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Budget data held by national funding agencies</li> <li>-Information gathered through interviews, narratives, qualitative data</li> </ul>
	Shared or coordinated use of R&I infrastructures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Joint budgets/projects for shared or coordinated use of R&amp;I infrastructures</li> <li>-Cost savings for shared or coordinated use of R&amp;I infrastructures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Project data, relative to type of infrastructure</li> <li>-Estimates by JPI/projects</li> </ul>
<b>International cooperation or activities</b>	Engagement with countries beyond Europe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-International expansion of JPI actions</li> <li>-Committed international partnerships (with allocated resources)</li> <li>-Third countries as full members of JPI</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Participation from countries outside Europe in JPI actions</li> <li>-Number and size of partnerships with other global initiatives</li> <li>-Number on non-EU/AC countries</li> </ul>
	<b>Influence on global agenda</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Visible participation in global/international fora /events</li> <li>-Influence or uptake in global institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Attendance with contribution</li> <li>-Reference of JPI in political statements /narratives</li> </ul>

Enhanced knowledge production/sound knowledge base in JPI area	Productivity and quality of R&I community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number of publications in peer reviewed or highly ranked journals from JPI actions</li> <li>-Number and geographical scope of patent applications</li> <li>-Number and type of other outputs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bibliometric data (including gender distribution), JPI data</li> <li>-Patent data, e.g. European Patent Office, JPI data</li> <li>-E.g. doctoral degrees, products, technologies. Quantitative data when possible, data from project reports</li> </ul>
	Size, structure and diversity of R&I community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number of participating countries, researchers and institutions/teams in JPI joint actions</li> <li>-Multidisciplinarity in projects</li> <li>-Gender balance</li> <li>-Number and size of networks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Data collected by JPI</li> <li>-Project data from JPI</li> <li>-Project data from JPI</li> <li>-Thematic coverage and relevance to challenge, data from JPI</li> </ul>
	Integration with user sectors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Number and share of JPI actions involving private sector</li> <li>-Number and share of JPI actions involving public sector</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Project data by JPI</li> <li>-Project data by JPI</li> <li>Comment: Can also be co-producers</li> </ul>
	Research and innovation management policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Established Open Access policy</li> <li>-Established joint policy for Intellectual Property Rights</li> <li>-Gender policy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Documents by JPI</li> <li>-Documents by JPI</li> <li>-Documents by JPI</li> </ul>

Governance	Administrative efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Effective implementation of SRIA</li> <li>-Harmonised timing, peer-reviews, reporting for joint actions</li> <li>-Transparent and effective governance structures</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Timely execution of joint actions through implementation or operational plans</li> <li>-Interviews, document reviews</li> <li>-Interviews, narratives, governance documents</li> </ul>
	Representative efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Commitment and resources from all partners</li> <li>-Relevant engagement from JPI member countries</li> <li>-Established coordination systems on national level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Data on participation rates and modes in joint actions (relative to size and ability)</li> <li>-Status and participation in Governing Boards with decision making power</li> <li>-Interviews, case studies</li> </ul>
	Relational efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Involvement of users or stakeholders</li> <li>-Joint actions or initiatives with other JPIs, PPPs, P2Ps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Data collected through interviews, documents, JPI and project data</li> </ul>
<b>Contribution to the area of the societal challenges</b>	<b><i>Influence on factors contributing to tackling the area of societal challenge<sup>3</sup></i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Established intervention logics and identification of contributing factors</li> <li>-Measured changes in identified factors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Influence specific to individual JPIs, information from JPI documents</li> <li>-Case studies, narratives, including information from stakeholders etc, awareness of attribution problems</li> </ul>
	Impact on policy relevant to the area of the societal challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Uptake in national, European or international policy</li> <li>-Regulatory changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Revision or launch of new policies or strategies</li> <li>-Revision or launch of new regulations or by-laws</li> <li>-Dissemination activities</li> </ul>

<sup>3</sup> Several types of impacts can be foreseen, many are specific to each individual JPI. In most cases there are significant attribution problems, so that JPIs have to define specific outcomes as proxies for impact. Hence, specification of intervention logics is necessary by which to define these factors/outcomes.

## Annex: Participants in the Task Force

The following persons have been participating in the Task Force during 2017-2018:

Richard Tavares, JPI Water  
Abida Durrani, JPND  
Martine Batoux, JPI HDHL  
Denice Moi Thuk Shung, JPI MYBL  
Susanne Meyer, JPI Urban Europe  
Alexandre Causse, JPI Cultural Heritage  
Carlos Segovia Perez, JPI AMR  
Kata-Riina Valosaari, JPI Water  
Michael Dinges, JPI Urban Europe  
Shawon Lahiri, JPI AMR  
Miguel Àngel Gilarranz Redondo, JPI Water  
Stefanie Margraf, FACCE-JPI  
Pier Francisco Moretti, JPI Oceans  
Rebecca Griggs, JPI MYBL  
Alexandre Fernandes, JPI Climate (chair January 2017-January 2018)  
Svend Otto Remøe, JPI Oceans (chair February 2018-end 2018)

The work of the Task Force has also been kindly supported by ERA-LEARN 2020, with valuable contributions from Effie Amanatidou.