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Mandate of the WG

• Develop a harmonised impact evaluation template
  – *core set* of evaluation *questions*
  – *common* evaluation *methodologies*
  – *common indicators*
  – available *common datasets* and available EU and national *databases* to assess the socio-economic impacts of EU Framework Programmes at national level
Expectations on the WG

• Distinct expectations on contribution of WG
  – WG should go beyond basic templates which most countries have been already applying
  – Challenge of addressing wider impact of participation in FPs

• Template as guidance to different impacts
  – Template modules according to objectives/questions
  – Comparability at each module should be promoted
  – Going beyond minimum common practices and hence contributing to respond to most challenging questions on impact

• Feasibility – appropriate implementation
  – National objectives that underlie assessment differ for different MS
  – Size of participation is also distinct – with implications on related assessment practices and costs
  – Need to consider MS objectives regarding the impact of participation in FPs
Development of the Work

• WG Members
  – 24 Members

• 1st Meeting
  – 12 April 2016

• 2nd Meeting
  – 6 June 2016

• 3rd Meeting
  – 26 September 2016

• 4th Meeting
  – Delayed to early 2017

• Deliverable (initially expected end 2016)
  – Report including an evaluation template
  – Template - questions / methodologies / indicators / data sets
‘Impact’ of Participation

- Assessment of the **impact of science on society at large**, including ‘any effect on, change, benefit or limitation’, to the research and innovation system, economy, society, culture, public policy or services, health, the environment or quality of life.

- Impact which results primarily from participation in Framework Programmes, either because of the direct funding, the collaborative structure, the international dimension, or other **opportunities (or barriers) provided by such participation**.
Work developed

• Initial discussion on objectives of WG
• Review of national experiences/studies on assessment of national participation in FPs
• Identification of national objectives – participation vs impact
• Understanding dimensions of analysis, methodologies, data – challenges/barriers of quantitative analysis (standardisation)
• Follow-up of ongoing relevant work promoted by the Commission

• Ongoing
  – Specification of template according to distinct dimensions
National objectives

Questions

• Understanding role of national strategies and support instruments in motivating participation and improving impact
  — How do national strategies and support instruments contribute to participation decisions/promote impact?

• Understanding organizational motivations to participate
  — What are organisations’ and individuals’ main motives to apply for FP funding?

• Identifying financial return of national participation in FPs
  — Are there significant differences in success of participation across instruments/orgs?

• Improving internationalization of research and innovation communities
  • Do European networks build on existing links? Do they build new international links?

• Improving research quality and promoting research careers
  — How do research results compare with other similar programmes?

• Achieving economic/innovative impact
  — What was the impact in terms of innovation in participating firms?

• Upgrading of technological/innovative capabilities
  — Has participation in FPs contributed to strengthen technological/innovative capabilities?

• Improving innovation capabilities in specific emerging fields
  — Has participation in FPs contributed to develop new technological/innovative capabilities in emerging fields?

• Creating economic spillovers at national/sectoral level
  — Does national participation cluster in specific sectors?

• Promoting societal impact of research
  — What wider societal impacts can be identified?
  — Has the third-sector organisations participation led to new lines of action/collaboration?
Challenges

• Identification of impacts
  – Long term and structural effects
  – Tracing impacts
  – Identifying counterfactuals

• Diverse methodology vs standard template

• Data
  – Comparable data sets across countries
  – Favouring existing data / reducing burden on performers
  – Quality of existing participation data

• Differences between instruments/areas

• Template which embraces standardization/comparability with flexibility/national needs
Structure of WG Report

• Executive Summary
• Introduction and objectives
• Policy context of ‘impact’ and methodological issues
• Recommendations for MS and EC
  – MS national objectives and participation
  – EC role in data harmonization and distribution
• Template dimensions
  – Participation Structure
  – Structuring Impacts
  – Scientific Impacts
  – Innovation Impacts
  – Economic Impacts
  – Societal Impacts
• Distinct impacts / sections
  – Evaluation methodologies
  – Data and indicators
  – Examples
Proposal to extend mandate

- Mandate scheduled to deliver by end of 2016
- Work is currently delayed
- Challenge of defining specifications across templates
  - Balancing existing data/indicators with dedicated objectives/needs
  - Reflecting current discussions/challenges on the ‘impact policy agenda’
  - Benefitting of ongoing parallel work by the EC

- Proposal to extend mandate by further 6 months (Spring/Summer ERAC Plenary)
  - Earlier presentation of draft
  - Considering eventual national timelines (ultimate objective)