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Background
The European Joint Programming Process was initiated in 2008 with a Communication of the European Commission and subsequent Conclusions of the European Council\(^1\). 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\(^2\) 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.

---


\(^2\) 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description/measurement</th>
<th>Methodology/data sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Alignment of national and European and/or international research and innovation programmes and resources** | Committed SRIAs | -Number and type of joint actions to implement SRIA  
-Regular updates of SRIA  
-Participation of external partners in actions (number and share of funding/resources) | -Data held by JPI (hubs, calls etc)  
-Procedures and changes  
-Data held by JPI |
| **Adaptation of national priorities towards JPI SRIA** | -Dedicated funding on national level  
-Integration of SRIA in national policies and strategies/programmes | -Budget data held by national funding agencies  
-Information gathered through interviews, narratives, qualitative data |
| **Shared or coordinated use of R&I infrastructures** | -Joint budgets/projects for shared or coordinated use of R&I infrastructures  
-Cost savings for shared or coordinated use of R&I infrastructures | -Project data, relative to type of infrastructure  
-Estimates by JPI/projects |
| **Engagement with countries beyond Europe** | -International expansion of JPI actions  
-Committed international partnerships (with allocated resources)  
-Third countries as full members of JPI | -Participation from countries outside Europe in JPI actions  
-Number and size of partnerships with other global initiatives  
-Number on non-EU/AC countries |
| **Influence on global agenda** | -Visible participation in global/international fora/events  
-Influence or uptake in global institutions | -Attendance with contribution  
-Reference of JPI in political statements/narratives |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enhanced knowledge production/sound knowledge base in JPI area</th>
<th>Productivity and quality of R&amp;I community</th>
<th>Size, structure and diversity of R&amp;I community</th>
<th>Integration with user sectors</th>
<th>Research and innovation management policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Number of publications in peer reviewed or highly ranked journals from JPI actions</td>
<td>-Number of publications in peer reviewed or highly ranked journals from JPI actions</td>
<td>-Number of participating countries, researchers and institutions/teams in JPI joint actions</td>
<td>-Number and share of JPI actions involving private sector</td>
<td>-Established Open Access policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Number and geographical scope of patent applications</td>
<td>-Number and type of other outputs</td>
<td>-Multidisciplinarity in projects</td>
<td>-Number and share of JPI actions involving public sector</td>
<td>-Established joint policy for Intellectual Property Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Productivity and quality of R&amp;I community</td>
<td>-Bibliometric data (including gender distribution), JPI data</td>
<td>-Gender balance</td>
<td>-Project data involving public sector</td>
<td>-Gender policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Patent data, e.g. European Patent Office, JPI data</td>
<td>-Number and size of networks</td>
<td>-Project data by JPI</td>
<td>-Documents by JPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-E.g. doctoral degrees, products, technologies. Quantitative data when possible, data from project reports</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Thematic coverage and relevance to challenge, data from JPI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Representative efficiency</td>
<td>-Commitment and resources from all partners</td>
<td>-Data on participation rates and modes in joint actions (relative to size and ability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Relevant engagement from JPI member countries</td>
<td>-Status and participation in Governing Boards with decision making power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Established coordination systems on national level</td>
<td>-Interviews, case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational efficiency</td>
<td>-Involvement of users or stakeholders</td>
<td>-Data collected through interviews, documents, JPI and project data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Joint actions or initiatives with other JPIs, PPPs, P2Ps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contribution to the area of the societal challenges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence on factors contributing to tackling the area of societal challenge</th>
<th>-Established intervention logics and identification of contributing factors</th>
<th>-Influence specific to individual JPIs, information from JPI documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Measured changes in identified factors</td>
<td>-Case studies, narratives, including information from stakeholders etc, awareness of attribution problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on policy relevant to the area of the societal challenge</td>
<td>-Uptake in national, European or international policy</td>
<td>-Revision or launch of new policies or strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Regulatory changes</td>
<td>-Revision or launch of new regulations or by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Dissemination activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 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.
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