



H2020-Adhoc-2014-20-RTD-G.A. No. 699523 – JHEP2

Support to the implementation of the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) of the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI CH)

Instrument: Coordination and Support Action

Deliverable D3.2

First Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process

Due date of deliverable: *June, 2017*

Actual submission date: *July, 2017*

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable: FCT (Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia)

Start date of project: 1st January 2016

Duration: 4 years

Ministry of Cultural Heritage and Activities (Italy)

Project Coordinator: Antonia Pasqua RECCHIA

Coordination and Support Action within Horizon 2020 (2014-2020)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	X
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Methodology.....	4
2.1. Monitoring survey.....	4
2.2. Questionnaire	4
2.3. Template for Regular Reporting (TRR).....	4
3. Results and analysis of monitoring activities	7
A) Enabling framework.....	9
B) Research implementation.....	13
C) Research Added Value.....	15
C1) Annex to C category for Joint Calls Assessment.....	18
C2) Annex to C category for Joint Alignment Assessment.....	19
D) Transformational effect.....	21
4. Conclusion and Future Work	24
Annex I: JHEP2 - WP3 - D3.1 “Key Performance Indicators”	27
Annex II: JHEP2 – WP3 Monitoring Survey	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Annex III: JHEP2 - WP3 Questionnaire	40
Annex IV: JHEP2 – Template for Regular Reporting on JPICH Joint Activities	44

1. Introduction

The **Deliverable D3.2 “First interim evaluation of JPICH alignment process”** is the second document to be produced under the Task 3.1 “Monitoring the alignment process of joint research programming”, led by FCT (Portugal). This is part of the Work Package 3 “Monitoring and Evaluation (KPI)”, led by MCC (France) in the frame of JHEP2, the second Coordination and Support Action (CSA) for the Joint Programming Initiative “Cultural Heritage and Global Change: a new challenge for Europe” (JPICH).

The **main objectives of the Work Package (WP3)** are to monitor and assess JPICH alignment and implementation process, and to demonstrate and evaluate JPICH project’s impact by identifying and applying qualitative and quantitative Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). To accomplish these objectives, an already existing set of indicators identified by the first JPICH CSA (JHEP) has been upgraded and adapted to the JHEP2 goals and foreseen activities. Additional KPIs have been identified to monitor the alignment of national research programmes and research activities, and added to this initial set of indicators. This set of indicators is actually being applied to JPICH research activities performed within the alignment process (e.g. networking, calls for proposals, mobility, etc.).

The **Task 3.1 involves four main objectives:**

- 1) **Upgrade and adapt the JHEP monitoring and evaluation methodology** by selecting relevant KPIs for monitoring the alignment process;
- 2) Continue to **monitor the outcomes and results of activities launched through the first CSA JHEP**, as the alignment of national research programmes, and the outcomes of activities implemented through JHEP2 - WP2 and the different Task Forces applied in the frame of JHEP2;
- 3) Continue the **implementation of monitoring and evaluation tools identified in JHEP (D5.2) and provide solutions to ensure improved efficiency of monitoring activities and more effective implementation of indicators;**
- 4) **Produce interim evaluations** summarizing and analysing all outputs of the monitoring exercise in terms of joint programming - to be held in the context of D3.2 (June 2017) and D3.4 (December 2018).

The two first objectives were already achieved under the preparation of the D3.1 (submitted in June 2016). The third and the fourth objectives were to adapt JHEP monitoring and evaluation tools according to the newly defined KPIs. The present report aims to achieve a certain extent of the third and the fourth objectives, that will be get finalized with the D3.4, in December of 2018.

2. Methodology

Several tools had been proposed by the first JPICH CSA (JHEP) methodology for monitoring and assessment, namely in the D5.2 “Report on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation: Recommendation for future monitoring and evaluation activities”. In the second JPICH CSA (JHEP2), these tools were redrafted (questions were suppressed or added to the different documents: survey and questionnaire) in order to better fit the D3.1 set of indicators (Annex I). The template was kept as such, with only minor modifications. In sum, these three tools (a monitoring survey; a questionnaire; and a template), were created using the Online Survey Tool - **Survs** (<https://survs.com/>).

2.1. Monitoring survey

In May of 2017, in order to obtain the most current and broad idea of the existing data, a survey (Annex II) for regular monitoring of all activities performed within the JPICH, between January of 2015 and December of 2016, was addressed to Executive Board members with 39 questions, encompassing 16 indicators. The first deadline given to fulfill the required survey was June 20th, 2017. After that, two more reminders were made, with a last deadline for July 14th, 2017 (**Table 1**).

2.2. Questionnaire

Also in May of 2017, a questionnaire (19 questions, encompassing 3 indicators) referencing specific questions concerning governance, alignment and research policy, was addressed to Governing Board and Executive Board members (Annex III). The first deadline given to fulfill the required survey was June 20th, 2017. After that, two more reminders were made, with a last deadline in July 14th, 2017 (**Table 1**).

2.3. Template for Regular Reporting (TRR)

The Template for Regular Reporting (29 questions, encompassing 10 indicators) was also disseminated by the JPICH partners that have had specific activities performed within the framework of the JPICH, between January of 2015 and June of 2017 (Annex IV). The idea was also to gather information concerning activities attended or organized in the framework of the JPICH between the end of JHEP, and the beginning of JHEP2 monitoring activities. The first deadline given to fulfill the required survey was June 20th, 2017. After that, two more reminders were made, with a last deadline in July 14th, 2017 (**Table 1**).

The Template for Regular Reporting (TRR) concerns specific activities, namely workshops, training activities, conferences, etc., performed or attended in the frame of the JPICH.

Some of these activities are already foreseen by the action plan and follow a precise planning. This is mainly the case for a list of 13 activities that were identified under Work Package 2, Task 2.3 (Follow up

activities Action Programme and Cultural Heritage Governance strategies), and that are coordinated by JPICH Member States, namely:

1. Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage (Portugal);
2. The changing meaning and value of cultural heritage across Europe for 'old' and 'new' citizens as well as 'outside' visitors (Belgium);
3. Research on the role of cultural heritage in the reconstruction of (national) identity in post-conflict situations (Poland);
4. Development of preservation and accessibility of archeological monuments (Romania);
5. Changing (urban) landscapes & changing landscapes: landscape with its cultural heritage and natural environment (Netherlands);
6. Cultural heritage concepts and theories (Lithuania);
7. Enjoyment of cultural heritage by means of new and old media (Cyprus);
8. Re-use and continued use of buildings, historic urban centers and landscapes (United Kingdom);
9. Community as actor in heritage management & Sustainable development of local communities (France).
10. Migration and identity (Sweden);
11. Methodology development for assessing the cultural and socio-economic value(s) of digital cultural heritage (Spain);
12. Sharing knowledge of conservation measures for historical buildings in areas that are sensitive for earthquakes and landslides (Italy);
13. Creating environmental, cultural, social and economic assets on cultural heritage (Norway).

These 13 activities benefit from specific monitoring procedures that were defined in coordination between WP2 and WP3. Three regular reports on joint activities are scheduled (D2.7, D2.8 and D2.9), under the responsibility of WP2. These reports are already based on a questionnaire including a large range of questions from the TRR. The first of these reports has been published in June 2017: "D2.7 – Report on joint activities".

Of these 13 activities, only the first one "Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage", took place during the period of this report and it was organized by Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) in Beja, Portugal. As soon as more specific activities will take place, the TRR will be send to the partners in charge of the organisation of these activities and the final results will be presented in the D3.4, in December 2018, taking also into account results from the WP2 reports.

Some specific activities are not foreseen by the action plan. Specific activities from which was asked the support of the JPICH Coordination in filling in the TRR, were also identified, attended or organized in the

framework of the JPICH. These activities don't benefit from specific monitoring procedures. This is particularly the case for the following list of activities:

- JPICH Parade 2017 (20th -21st February 2017, Brussels)
- Joint Programming Conference (22nd – 23rd November 2016, Brussels)
- Copernicus for Cultural Heritage Workshop (24th April, Brussels)
- Workshop for the Participation of Non-EU Black Sea and EaP Countries in Thematic COFUND ERANETs & JPIs (13th – 14th October 2016, Baku)
- Cultural Heritage, disaster resilience and climate change: The contribution of EU research and innovation (7th December 2016, Brussels)

Table 1 – Information about the Online Instruments used to do the Monitoring and Evaluation of JPICH: Monitoring Survey, Questionnaire and Template for Regular Reporting.

Online Instruments				
Instruments	Recipients	Description	Link	Deadline
Monitoring Survey	EB Members	39 questions organized in 4 main sections: (A) Enabling Framework Focus on activities that were performed or attended by your organisation within the context of the JPICH, between Jan 2015 and Dec 2016. (B) Research Implementation To monitor the implementation of necessary parameters for the construction of JPICH research capacity and excellence. (C) Research Added Value for Joint Alignment Assessment (D) Transformational Effect To complete indicators, examining how the JPICH generates a transformational power on the initial challenges having risen to intervention.	https://survs.com/survey/8rnd89r2z	July 14 th 2017
Questionnaire	GB & EB Members	19 questions organized in 4 main sections (General Information, Participation, SRA and Action Programme, Coordinated and Streamlined Research).	https://survs.com/survey/3z586oqbzu	July 14 th 2017
Template for Regular Reporting (TRR)	Any partner, each time they are organising an event or activity within the context of JPICH.	29 questions organized in 7 main sections (General Information, Participation, Stakeholders, Research Priorities and Topics, Publications, Specific Outputs, Dissemination).	https://survs.com/survey/lqe75iu3rj	July 14 th 2017

In addition to these instruments, specific questions were addressed to the JPICH Coordination, according with the necessary indicators to be measured. The questions were the following:

- Which were the precise dates when a country quitted or joint the JPICH? (To measure indicator 5);
- The Statistics of the Heritage Plus Call. (To measure indicator 8);
- The number of new and foreseen joint transnational calls for proposals? (To measure indicator 9);
- From the beginning of the JPICH, the increase in the amount of Cultural Heritage information available on JPICH website? (To measure indicator 30).

3. Results and analysis of monitoring activities

This part of the report is a full breakdown of the different monitoring instruments used to achieve the required objectives. The results obtained with the online instruments above mentioned are presented below, with specifications for each indicator, considering the period between January of 2015 and June of 2017.

The **JPICH partnership has 18 countries participating as members**: Italy, Belarus, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Ireland, Lithuania, Moldova, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, The Netherlands and United Kingdom. All of them are represented (sometimes by different delegates) in the Governing and Executive Boards.

From the **Executive Board members to whom the monitoring survey was addressed, 9 answers were obtained from 9 different countries**: Belarus, Cyprus, France, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Sweden, The Netherlands and United Kingdom.

Concerning to whom the **questionnaire was addressed from the Governing and Executive Board members 15 answers from 13 countries were obtained**: Belarus, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Italy, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, The Netherlands and United Kingdom. In the case of both Belarus and Slovakia, two answers were obtained.

The **results achieved through the TRR were not enough to get conclusions for this report**. There was a short gap in monitoring activities between the end of JHEP and the beginning of monitoring activities under JHEP2, resulting in a difficulty to collect precise informations to complete this TRR, in particular concerning activities attended or organized meanwhile. From the 13 specific activities foreseen in the action plan and following WP2 plans, only 1 occurred during the period of this report. Concerning the other specific activities, not foreseen in the action plan (JPICH Parade 2017, JP Conference, Copernicus Workshop, Workshop for the Participation of Non-EU Black Sea and EaP Countries, Event JPICH/EC on Climate Change), from the 29 questions referred, responses were given only to the first 12 questions, so no major conclusions can be achieved.

Following the assessment of the complete D3.2 set of 34 indicators, main topics and parameters regrouping these indicators will now be analysed through the results obtained.

A) Enabling framework

The category of indicators grouped under the denomination “Enabling framework” aims to monitor and evaluate five important topics (Governing structures, Extending cooperation and partnership, JPICH attractiveness, SRA and Action Programme, and Dissemination strategy) that are considered as enabling elements and essential prerequisite to the implementation of main JPICH coordinating structures and Work Packages.

- **Governing structures**

Indicator 1	Sustainability of the JPICH financial and administrative structures.
Indicator Definition	Capacity to secure financial resources from JPI members to fund the Secretariat and to execute the implementation plans.
Objective	Increase the performance of the financial and administrative management.

Results

About 62% of the organisations acknowledge the JPICH financial and administrative structures as good or very good, and about 38% as fair. It should be noticed that none of the agencies considers the structures excellent with the respect to the sustainability (**Figure 1**).

Q19: How do you evaluate the JPICH financial and administrative structures sustainability?

Excellent	0%		0
Very good	25%		2
Good	38%		3
Fair	38%		3
Poor	0%		0
Total respondents			8

Figure 1 – Question n° 19 of the Monitoring Survey, sent to EB Members.

- **Extending cooperation and partnership**

Indicator 2	Number of joint actions with organisations.
Indicator Definition	Formal collaborations through joint activities and actions with International organisations (including UN, UNESCO, NGOs, ICOMOS, ICOM...), NGOs, regional organisations, other...
Objective	To extend network and cooperation to external organisations.

Results

About one fifth of the answers (2 EB members) reported collaborations in 2015 and 2016, with organisations not already represented in the JPI governing structure, namely: UNESCO, ICOM, ICCROM, ICOMOS, IIC, INCCA, Council of Europe, European Heritage Heads Forum (EHHF), European Heritage Legal

forum (EHLF), ESPON 2020 Cooperation Programme, Europa Nostra, European Association of Archeologists (EAA), Europeae Archeologiae Consilium (EAC), European Council of Spatial Planners (ECTP-CEU), Europeana, European Heritage Label, HEREIN, IPERION CH.

RCE (the only respondent) reported to have cooperated with Japan, United States, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Russia, Sri Lanka, Surinam, South Africa and Australia in the areas of exchange of knowledge, awareness raising, training and consultancy. In the context of Maritime Archeology, RCE cooperated directly with many countries, among which: Iceland, Sweden, Finland, Italy, Estonia, Denmark, UK, Belgium, Surinam, Sri Lanka, Brazil, US, Australia, Indonesia, Japan, South Africa, Vietnam, Thailand, Cuba, Argentina, St Helena, Greece, Germany.

Indicator 3	Number of joint actions with other P2P networks.
Indicator Definition	P2P networks such as article 169/185, ERA-NETs, ERA-NETs cofunds... other JPIs (Urban Europe, Klik'EU, FACCE etc.). Joint actions including definition of common schemes for evaluation and monitoring, coordination or clustering, definition of common SRA, joint training activities, personnel exchange, mutual opening of facilities and infrastructures, of programmes, joint calls design and implementation, other...
Objective	To establish quality contacts with other P2P networks.

Results

About half of the EB members (4 in 9) have organized activities with other JPIs (OCEANS, FACCE, WATER and Urban Europe) in the areas of progress evaluation of projects, organization of workshops and information exchange, in 2015 and 2016.

About 67% of the respondents (6 EB members) participated in 2015 and 2016, in Joint Activities of other JPIs, namely: Joint Transnational Calls and Joint Alignment Activities. All the 10 JPIs were referred (JPND, FACCE, HDHL, Cultural Heritage, Urban Europe, CLIMATE, MYBL, AMR, WATER and OCEANS), but the most mentioned were the Urban Europe, FACCE and JPND.

Indicator 4	List of joint actions involving non-European countries.
Indicator Definition	Joint actions involving non-European countries, particularly advanced economies (Japan, USA...), neighbourhood Mediterranean countries, BRICs...
Objective	To cooperate with non European countries.

Results

Most of countries (about 70%) didn't have collaborations with non-ERA countries (not members of the EU or not associated to H2020), in 2015 and 2016. About half the countries (56%) reported collaborations with Advanced economies (ERA countries excluded: Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand,

Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and United States) or BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China), in 2015 and 2016.

The collaborations with Advanced economies, non-ERA & BRIC countries indicated were: Canada - Joint Call - AAL 2016 & JPI Water 2016 & EUROSTARS 2015&2016; Israel - Joint Call - AAL 2015 & JPI Water 2015 & JPI FACCE & M-ERANET 2016 & EUROSTARS 2015&2016; Norway - Joint Call - AAL 2015 & AAL 2016 & JPI Water 2015 & JPI Water 2016 & JPI FACCE & M-ERANET 2016 & EUROSTARS 2015&2016; Turkey - Joint Call - JPI Urban Europe 2015 & JPI Water 2016 & JPI FACCE & SOLAR-ERANET 2016 & M-ERANET 2016 & EUROSTARS 2015&2016; Moldavia - Joint Call - JPI Water 2015 & JPI Water 2016; Egypt - Joint Call - JPI Water 2016; South Africa - Joint Call - JPI Water 2016 & M-ERANET 2016 & EUROSTARS 2015&2016; Tunisia - Joint Call - JPI Water 2016; Taiwan - Joint Call - JPI Water 2016 & M-ERANET 2016; Brazil - Joint Call - M-ERANET 2016; Russia - Joint Call - M-ERANET 2016; Iceland - Joint Call - M-ERANET 2016; South Korea - Joint Call - EUROSTARS 2015&2016; New Zeland - Joint Call - JPI FACCE; Brazil, China and India - Newton Fund.

- **JPICH attractiveness**

Indicator 5	Evolution of the number of countries participating to the JPICH.
Indicator Definition	Cumulated number of countries that joined the project and that were not present at the beginning of the project, countries that opted out (no longer partners or observers), and information about the number of countries that participated to the JPICH per year.
Objective	JPICH is attracting new countries.

Results

JPICH attractiveness has been assessed through two different criteria: new countries attracted by the JPICH, and commitment of Member Countries and countries that withdrew from the project.

Despite the three withdrawals (Turkey in December 2011, Slovenia in March 2013 and Israel in November 2015), the number of participating countries in JPICH increase since the project beginning in January 2010, going from 16 participating countries (Italy, UK, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Spain, Turkey, Slovenia, Austria, Slovakia, Poland, Romania, Ireland and Lithuania) to 19 in June 2017 (Italy, UK, France, Belgium, The Netherlands, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Spain, Slovakia, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Norway, Ireland, Lithuania, Sweden, Moldova, Denmark and Belarus).

Besides the withdrawals, more changes were made. Austria changed from participant into observer, in July 2010, and Sweden and Portugal changed from observer into participant in May of 2011 and November of 2014, respectively. Also Moldova and Belarus joined the JPICH in February of 2013 and November of 2016, respectively.

- **SRA and Action Programme**

Indicator 6	Adequacy of research needs in SRA and Action Programme.
Indicator Definition	The SRA is reflected by the Action Programme that identifies the most useful funding instruments and pooling capacities for implementation of selected research topics in SRA.
Objective	Action Programme funding quantity and type matches SRA needs.

Results

Only 20% of the respondents consider that the gaps identified in the SRA are completely covered by activities of the JPICH Action Programme, and about half (53%) envisages that this coverage is only partially achieved. About one third of the respondents acknowledge that the funding instruments for the implementation of the SRA are well identified and are globally satisfied with the Action Programme, and about half of the respondents (47%) assumes that this objective is only partially accomplished. There is not a consensus with respect to the effectiveness of the pooling capacities for the implementation of the SRA (Figure 2).

Q10 - Please indicate if you agree or not with the following statements:	Yes, completely	Yes, partly	Only partially	Not at all
The gaps identified in SRA are sufficiently covered by JPICH activities as described in the Action Programme?	3 - 20% 	8 - 53% 	4 - 27% 	0 - 0%
Funding instruments for implementation of the SRA are well identified in the Action Programme?	5 - 33% 	7 - 47% 	3 - 20% 	0 - 0%
Pooling capacities for implementation of the SRA are well identified in the Action programme?	6 - 40% 	4 - 27% 	5 - 33% 	0 - 0%
You are globally satisfied with the Action Programme?	5 - 33% 	8 - 53% 	2 - 13% 	0 - 0%

Figure 2 – Question n° 10 of the questionnaire, sent to GB & EB Members.

Concerning the comments about the SRA and the Action Programme, these are mainly referring to the necessity to revise and develop further the SRA, to include the innovation theme and also to the necessity to implement more clearly the SRA.

- **Dissemination strategy**

Indicator 7	List of new stakeholders and types of stakeholders reached by the dissemination strategy within EU and across the EU.
Indicator Definition	One list for stakeholders reached by JPICH dissemination strategy in the EU, one list for stakeholders reached outside the EU, with description of categories of stakeholders reached. They include the four categories used in the JHEP Dissemination Plan: Policy makers and influencers; Cultural Heritage research community; Parallel projects and organisations; Industry, SMEs and civil society.
Objective	To identify and contact key stakeholders across and within the EU.

Results

For the specific activity “Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage” the type of stakeholders reached by the dissemination strategy within EU and across the EU were “Policy makers and influencers” and “Cultural Heritage research community” with very relevance, and with relevance “Parallel projects and organisations” and “Industry, SMEs and Civil Society”. However, there is the perception by the agency that “Policy makers and influencers” and “Parallel projects and organisations” were not properly reached by the activity (**Figure 3**).

















Q17 – Which kind of stakeholders was the joint activity relevant for?	very relevant	relevant	not relevant	absolutely not relevant
Policy makers and influencers	1 - 100% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 
Cultural Heritage research community	1 - 100% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 
Parallel projects and organisations	0 - 0% 	1 - 100% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 
Industry, SMEs and Civil Society	0 - 0% 	1 - 100% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0% 

Figure 3 - Question nº 17 of the TRR, concerning the specific activity “Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage”.

The stakeholders that participated in the activity were:

- Member States and NGO’s/IGO’s: Portugal (FCT); UK (AHRC) and Poland (NIMOZ);
- Responsible JPICH partner/coordinating organization: Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) and Laboratório Nacional de Engenharia Civil (LNEC);
- Other participating organization: Câmara Municipal de Beja.

No more information could be obtained at this stage, since only 1 out of the 13 specific activities took place. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

B) Research implementation

The category of indicators grouped under the denomination “Research implementation” aim to assess the implementation of necessary parameters for the construction of JPICH research capacity and excellence, by evaluating 3 important topics (Joint transnational calls for proposals, Capacity building and Enabling activities and Collaboration with private sector).

- **Joint transnational calls for proposals**

Indicator 8	Evolution in the number of applications granted and average funding allocated per application through calls for proposal.
Indicator Definition	For each call, total amount of allocated funding related to the number of applications finally granted and average funding allocated to each granted project, compared to preceding call.
Objective	To increase the amount of allocated funding through transnational calls for proposals.

Results

The launch of calls for proposals is one of the main elements for the implementation of research through JPICH joint activities. The monitoring and evaluation framework planned to assess the launch of Calls for Proposals is through the three following aspects: the number of calls launched and planned for the future; the amount of allocated funding; and the final number of granted projects.

For each of these aspects, WP3 could analyse important improvements: the 2nd Heritage Plus Joint Call gathered more countries in its consortium, more proposals submitted after the Call launch, and more funding, in comparison with the 1st Pilot Call (**Table 2**).

Table 2 – Results of the two Joint Calls for proposals launched on behalf of the JPICH: 1st Pilot Call and 2nd Heritage Plus Joint Call.

1 st Pilot Call	2 nd Heritage Plus Joint Call
13 countries participates	15 countries participates
89 full proposals submitted (one stage)	352 pré-proposals submitted (two stages)
	58 full proposals submitted (from the 61 that pass to the 2 nd stage)
68 of full proposals submitted for evaluation (after the national eligibility check)	54 of full proposals submitted for evaluation (after 2 nd national eligibility check)
10 projects funded in a total of 4.785.527,18 €	16 projects funded in a total of 8.668.128,00 €

Indicator 9	Number of new and foreseen joint transnational calls for proposals.
Indicator Definition	Number of new joint transnational calls for proposals published by the JPICH, and calls foreseen or planned for future of JPICH.
Objective	To launch joint transnational calls for proposals.

Results

Recently was launched the JPICH – Digital Heritage Call, with a deadline for submission of proposals in June of 2017. In the next future, 3 calls for proposals will be provided, namely on:

- “Changing Environments” - to be launched in September 2017;
- “Conservation and Protection” - to be launched in 2019 (co-fund call);
- “Identity and Perception” - to be launched in 2019.

- **Capacity building and Enabling activities**

Indicator 10	Number and diversity of training instruments implemented.
Indicator Definition	Inform the number of seminars, conferences, thematic workshops, e-learning platforms developed for Cultural Heritage researchers and professional training purposes.
Objective	Development of advanced training.

Results

About one third of the organisations implemented new training instruments in 2015 and 2016, namely workshops on the connection between landscape and heritage and contribution to graduate studies in archaeology.

Indicator 11	Share of digital and built infrastructures compared to total number of infrastructures participating in the JPICH.
Indicator Definition	Number of new or pre-existing infrastructures participating in JPICH activities. Physical (CHARISMA...) and digital (DARIAH...) infrastructures. Open laboratories, networks (HERA...)
Objective	Development of a Cultural-Heritage-dedicated network of infrastructures.

Results

About 22% of the countries mentioned to have participated in preliminary meetings and groups with new research infrastructures: E-RIHS and the Cultural Heritage service for the COPERNICUS satellite infrastructure (not yet implemented), that are not direct products of the JPICH, but could lead to fruitful collaborations between JPICH and the those infrastructures in the near future.

- **Collaboration with private sector**

Indicator 12	Number of research collaborations and partnerships with private sector.
Indicator Definition	Participation of industry and SMEs through calls for proposals, access to research infrastructures, training programmes, informal collaborations, and commercial projects. Projects co-financed by private sector, access to private infrastructures.
Objective	Private sector participation in the research process.

Results

Only 33% of the respondents (3 EB members from 9) have conducted collaborations and/or joint activities with the private sector in the years of the 2015 and 2016.

C) Research added value

The category of indicators grouped under the denomination “Research added value” aims to monitor and evaluate eight important topics (Publications, Training, Aligned research, Calls outputs, and Alignment at

strategic, funding, operational and scientific level). This part of the report assesses how the JPICH intervention produces effects and added value, affecting the primary beneficiaries of the intervention by producing meaningful results and developing knowledge transfers between the research community, Cultural Heritage professionals, various stakeholders and all close collaborators.

- **Publications**

Indicator 13	Number of publications resulting from JPICH research activities.
Indicator Definition	Number of publications resulting from JPICH research activities. Publications in specialized, academic and high-impact journals (those considered highly influential in the field of Cultural Heritage and in specialized professional fields), and publications on JPICH research activities (collective works, conference proceedings, monographs, etc.).
Objective	Available publications to enhance visibility of JPICH activities.

Results

Following the International Networking Event on the topic “Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage” (1 out of 13 specific activities), one publication has been issued by FCT. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

- **Training**

Indicator 14	Number of degrees achieved and thesis presented by students collaborating in JPICH during the life time of the project.
Indicator Definition	Students having achieved important degrees (master, doctoral) or presented their thesis during JPICH lifetime and having participated in JPICH research activities in one way or another, through research projects, workshops or training programmes.
Objective	To include students and professionals still in training in JPICH research activities.

Results

Concerning the International Networking Event on the topic “Social, cultural, political and economic value of Cultural Heritage” (1 out of 13 specific activities), 8 young students or professionals still in training participated in this specific activity. No references were made to the number of degrees achieved and thesis presented. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

- **Aligned research**

Is needed to align research programmes to increase their impact and effectiveness, reduce duplications and fragmentation in European research, avoid overlaps and exploit synergies in order to improve the efficiency of scarce financial resources.

Indicator 15	New mechanisms for alignment with regional, federal, national and European research agendas.
Indicator Definition	Innovative mechanisms implemented for alignment, coordination and interactions between institutional strategic agendas in the Cultural Heritage area: common research agendas, forums, subsidiarity principle... as innovative funding concepts likely to influence national, regional, institutional funding policies.
Objectives	Increased coordination of JPI and European scientific strategic agendas.
	High coordination of JPI and National/Federal scientific strategic agendas.

Results

There is a widespread feeling that JPICH contributed to an increase of strategic cooperation in Cultural Heritage area between EU Member States (60% of the respondents agree, or 27% strongly agree) and more interactions between institutional strategic agendas in Cultural Heritage area (40% of the respondents agree, or 40% strongly agree) (**Figure 4**).

Q12: Do you agree with the following statements:	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
Thanks to JPICH, there is an increase of strategic cooperation in Cultural Heritage area between EU Member States?	4 - 27% 	9 - 60% 	2 - 13% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0%
Thanks to JPICH, there are more interactions between institutional strategic agendas in the Cultural Heritage area?	6 - 40% 	6 - 40% 	3 - 20% 	0 - 0% 	0 - 0%

Figure 4 – Question n° 12 of the questionnaire, sent to GB & EB Members.

About 50% of the respondents feel that JPICH has the instrument to measure the gains in efficiency in national funding by reducing fragmentation (20% completely and 33% partly), and about 60% by reducing unnecessary duplication in the relevant research fields (20% completely and 40% partly).

About 73% of the respondents (11 GB/EB members from 15) feel that JPICH developed mechanisms to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication. The most reported instruments to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication were the Joint Transnational Calls, the SRA and the Alignment Actions, specifically the shift of national resources to the international level.

Regarding the coordination and rationalizing agendas and research, the most relevant comments are related to the long term planning for predictability, and the use of the portal to the coordination and dissemination.

Indicator 16	Number of institutions sharing JPICH Strategic Research Agenda.
Indicator Definition	Number of International organisations, national ministries or departments, agencies, councils, regional organisations, public research organisations and others... sharing JPICH research agenda or for which the SRA of the JPICH is explicitly mentioned as a cornerstone.
Objective	To share common research agendas.

Results

About 60% of the respondents have national strategies, research agendas, programmes and priorities that take into account the JPI SRA (completely: 19% and partly: 38%), and 50% of the respondents are discussing opportunities to further develop these tools.

C1) Annex to C category for Joint Calls Assessment

Several parameters are supposed to be evaluated here, all depending of Joint Calls for Proposals and its corresponding results.

For the moment, the only existing source of information that we can use to measure the indicators evaluated here, is the Heritage Plus WP4 reports: “D4.1 - 1st Annual progress Report of funded projects and explanation on the use of the EC funding” and “D4.2 - 2nd Annual progress Report of funded projects and explanation on the use of the EC funding”, which contain very useful information concerning the 16 ongoing transnational research projects granted within the Heritage Plus Call.

- **Calls outputs**

Indicator 17	Number of patent applications, license agreements, invention disclosures, studies underway, technology demonstrators, new specific frameworks and methodologies dedicated to Cultural Heritage conservation.
Indicator Definition	Development through JPICH research activities of cross disciplinary tools and methodologies for repair, treatment and maintenance... of Cultural Heritage, including new or improved products, technologies (advanced hybrid technologies, diagnostic tools, nanotechnology), processes (single early warning intelligent system crossing chemical, biological or physical sensors, climatic-security- behaviour interdisciplinary model, mapping earth observation with the help of spatial technologies) and equipments. New frameworks, methodologies and dedicated to risk assessment & prevention, Cultural Heritage conservation, natural and man-made disasters, specific management and risk assessment protocols.
Objective	Development of innovative Cultural-Heritage-dedicated tools, technologies, frameworks and methodologies for conservation and risk assessment.

Results

In the Heritage Plus WP4 reports there is no mention to patent applications, license agreements and invention disclosures. Two projects have as objectives to develop IT technology demonstrators, however these tools are not yet fully developed. Major conclusions could only be achieved with the final reports of the transnational research projects granted within the Heritage Plus Call.

Indicator 18	Number of publications resulting from research activities.
Indicator Definition	Number of publications resulting from research activities. Publications in specialized, academic and high-impact journals (those considered highly influential in the field of Cultural Heritage and in specialized professional fields), and publications on JPICH research activities (collective works, conference proceedings, monographs, etc.).
Objective	Available publications to enhance visibility of JPICH activities.

Results

Since the start of the projects, a total of 274 publications and other outputs were realized, 81% of which during the 2nd Annual Progress Report (D4.2). Also, the number of peer reviewed publications is about the same as the other scientific publications and outputs. In the other scientific outputs are included the training and educational instruments/modules, social media communication, new databases, exhibitions, presentations and degrees achieved.

Indicator 19	Share of research project addressing improvement in accessibility of materials and data.
Indicator Definition	Share of research projects concerned with improving accessibility of materials and data, by using data mining, database, infrastructures... compared to total number of research projects during the period in question.
Objective	Improved accessibility of materials and data.

Results

There were 13 new or updated databases, and dissemination tools developed in order to improve data fusion and availability.

C2) Annex to C category for Joint Alignment Assessment

Some parameters were evaluated in order to assess the alignment of national strategies and research programmes with the Strategic Research Agenda (SRA) of the JPICH, namely: alignment at strategic level, at funding level, at operational level, and at scientific level.

- **Alignment at strategic level**

Indicator 20	Alignment of national agendas.
Indicator Definition	Changes in research priorities of the agencies, and in national research priorities, towards a demand for harmonization between partners.
Objective	Level of the strategic leverage effects.

Results

78% of the agencies (corresponding to 7 members of the EB) referred to have harmonized the national research agenda with the JPICHR SRA priorities. The topic Cultural Heritage was the main one to induce changes in the national agendas (with 5 in 7 answers).

- **Alignment at funding level**

Indicator 21	Changes in national budgets re international activities / programmes.
Indicator Definition	Changes in national budgets, in order to increase the participation of agencies in international activities / programmes.
Objective	Level of the funding leverage effects.

Results

78% of the agencies are increasing the national budgets or the financing prioritization, in order to participate in more international activities/programmes. With the calls 'Digital Heritage' and 'Changing Environments' being the most mentioned (3 and 2 times, respectively, out of 7).

Indicator 22	Changes in legislation to allow payments to foreign researchers.
Indicator Definition	Legal and regulatory changes that enhance the internationalization factor, namely by permission of payment to foreign researchers.
Objective	Level of the funding leverage effects.

Results

None of the agencies made any change in legislation to allow payments to foreign researchers.

- **Alignment at operational level**

Indicator 23	Leverage effect.
Indicator Definition	Efforts at financial and operational level in order to increase the return of partners investment (leverage effect).
Objective	Level of the financial and operational leverage effects.

Results

The agencies efforts to leverage the partner's investment were mainly by the use of websites (70% of agencies), newsletters (43% of agencies), consultation, information and networking meetings (43%), and also with targeted and mass emails. There was no mention at financial level.

Indicator 24	Coordination of timing in funding & programme implementation.
Indicator Definition	Adjustment of timelines with regard to the funding schemes and to the implementation of the programmes.
Objective	Level of the operational leverage effects.

Results

33% of the agencies adjusted the timeline of the funding schemes and the implementation of national funding programmes, in order to enable the participation on the JPI calls.

Indicator 25	Harmonised rules and procedures for participation.
Indicator Definition	Harmonization of the regulation and procedures for participation in programmes and calls.
Objective	Level of the operational leverage effects.

Results

About half of the agencies (44% of the respondents) made harmonization efforts regarding the regulations and procedures in order to participate in national/international programmes and calls. RPF made a specific programme for the period 2016-2020 in order to be able to participate in all the European Initiatives.

- **Alignment at scientific level**

Indicator 26	Standardisation of research practices.
Indicator Definition	Establishment of common rules and procedures for the joint transnational calls, programme clustering and changes in national research programmes' themes.
Objective	Level of the scientific leverage effects.

Results

About half of the agencies establish common rules and procedures in order to be able to participate in international programmes and calls, namely with specific programmes or with the implementation of internal groups to manage European Initiatives.

D) Transformational effect

This last category of indicators grouped under the denomination “Transformational effect” aims to monitor and evaluate three important topics (Connecting people with heritage, Creating knowledge and Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource).

- **Connecting people with heritage**

Indicator 27	Increased access to Cultural Heritage information through database development, and share of open access databases.
Indicator Definition	Number of multidisciplinary databases created, updated and pooled through JPICH activities, and share of open access sources compared to total.
Objectives	To improve Cultural Heritage accessibility.

Results

Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”, as no answers were obtained.

Indicator 28	To improve Cultural Heritage accessibility.
Indicator Definition	Number and type of actions developed by the JPICH to promote knowledge, tools and policy making instruments developed through its activities at political regional/federal/national/European/transnational levels: lobbying, political advisory groups, advocacy groups, transnational forums.
Objectives	To help leaders in their use of Cultural Heritage (policy making) and to improve Cultural Heritage inclusion in research and sectoral policies.

Results

About half the organisations that answered to the questionnaire, indicated to have participated in actions to bring the JPICH at the political level, namely by the participation in political advisory group meetings, through the contribution to national processes related to the H2020, and getting minister support to the JPICH.

- **Creating knowledge**

Indicator 29	JPICH ability to attract and increase investments for existing and new Cultural Heritage educational programmes.
Indicator Definition	JPICH participations in creation of new Cultural Heritage curricula, in enforcement of the existing one, and its expenditure on pre-existing and new educational programmes.
Objectives	To move the field towards truly interdisciplinary studies.

Results

Since the beginning of the monitoring period no additional financial investments for Cultural Heritage specialized educational programmes were made by the responding agencies.

Indicator 30	Increase in the amount of Cultural Heritage information available on Heritage Portal and on JPICH website.
Indicator Definition	From the beginning of the JPICH, increase in the amount of information available on the Heritage Portal (http://www.heritageportal.eu/) and on the JPICH website (http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/).
Objectives	To generate knowledge.

Results

There is no precise data about the increase in the amount of Cultural Heritage information available on JPICH website.

- **Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource**

Indicator 31	JPICH potential contribution in reduction in energy demand and use.
Indicator Definition	Potential impact on energy demand and use (in %), of results achieved through JPICH-related projects addressing or trying to tackle the challenge of renewable energy in the Cultural Heritage domain with reference to Europe 2020 goals.
Objectives	Adaptation to and mitigation of climate change effects.

Results

None of the agencies identified results with potential impact on H2020 objectives of reducing the energy demand and use.

Indicator 32	Share of collaborative projects addressing and investigating the issue of climate change.
Indicator Definition	Share of total projects and activities developed through JPICH addressing and investigating the issue of climate change effect on Cultural Heritage.
Objectives	Adaptation to and mitigation of climate change effects.

Results

The respondent indicated that the topics addressed through the joint activity “Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage” were: “Digital cultural heritage”; “Improvement in accessibility of materials and data”; “Multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalization of artefacts, buildings and landscapes”; “Renewal and restoration of historic areas” and “Climate change”. The only topic not addressed was “The potential impact in terms of reductions in energy demand and use”. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

- **Transversal Indicators**

Indicator 33	Proportion of priorities identified in the SRA addressed by JPICH activities, and number of research projects working on each priority.
Indicator Definition	Among the priorities identified in the SRA: Developing a reflective society, identity and perception, values, ethics; connecting people with heritage, protection through use, sustainability, security, heritage information; creating knowledge, linking information, change, methods and measurements, integrating risk; safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource, conservation, adaptation and mitigation.
Objectives	JPICH ability to address research priorities identified in the SRA.

Results

The respondent acknowledge that all the following research priorities were addressed through the joint activity “Social, cultural, political and economic value of cultural heritage” were: “Developing a reflective society”; “Connecting people with heritage”; “Creating knowledge”; and “Safeguarding our cultural heritage resource”. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

Indicator 34	Number of transversal jobs directly or indirectly created through JPICH joint actions and their sustainability.
Indicator Definition	Through activities and joint actions developed by JPICH, number of jobs directly or indirectly created, and their sustainability rate one year later.
Objectives	To help Europe’s economical growth and jobs.

Results

Concerning the International Networking Event on the topic “Social, cultural, political and economic value of Cultural Heritage” (1 out of 13 specific activities), no references were made to the number of transversal jobs directly or indirectly created through JPICH joint actions and their sustainability. Major conclusions could only be achieved in the D3.4 “Second Interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process”.

4. Conclusions and Future Work

The present Deliverable (D3.2) aims to summarize and analyse the outputs of the monitoring exercise in terms of joint programming, in 2015 and 2016.

The results were still incomplete for some indicators, and didn't gave all the expected results, as it was still too soon to gather enough elements of outcomes for a proper assessment. Appropriate answers should be addressed in the 2nd Interim Evaluation report (D3.4), in December of 2018.

Through the results discussed, the main conclusions are the following:

- It should be noticed that none of the agencies considers the JPICH financial and administrative structures excellent, with the respect to the sustainability. However, a large percentage considers it good or very good;
- With respect to extending cooperation and partnership, more than half of the members of JPICH have organized activities and/or participated in Joint Activities with other JPIs, or reported collaborations with countries from advanced economies or the BRICs;
- From 2010 to 2017 the number of participating countries increased from 16 to 19, however a negative aspect stands out, concerning the fact that 4 of the countries withdrew in this period, what shows a significant turnover;
- There is a concern with respect to the SRA and its implementation, since only one fifth of the agencies consider that the gaps identified in the SRA are sufficiently covered by JPICH activities, and only one third reported that the funding instruments for the implementation of SRA are well identified and are globally satisfied with the programme;
- The launch of calls for proposals is one of the main elements for the implementation of research through JPICH joint activities. The 2nd Heritage Plus Joint Call gathered more countries in the consortium, more proposals submitted and more funding, when comparing with the 1st Pilot Call. The recently launched Digital Heritage Call and the launching in the next future of 3 more calls are more good signs;
- With respect to capacity building and enabling activities the answers do not seem promising, only one third of the organizations implemented new training instruments and conducted collaborations and/or joint activities with the private sector, and only one fifth participated or associated with new research infrastructures;
- While it was not possible to obtain conclusions relatively to the publications and training due to lack of TRR answers, most of the agencies (73%) consider that JPICH successfully developed mechanisms to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication, through Joint Transnational Calls, the SRA and the Alignment Actions. With respect to the rationalization of the agendas and research, more than half of the agencies already have national strategies, research agendas, programmes and

priorities that take into account the JPI SRA and about half have the intention to align these national documents with the JPI SRA;

- In the Heritage Plus WP4 reports there were no mention to patent applications, license agreements and invention disclosures, yet. Some projects are developing IT technology demonstrators. A total of 274 publications were already realized, and 13 new or updated databases and dissemination tools developed;
- In terms of joint alignment at strategic and funding levels, the numbers shows overall good results, with 78 % of agencies referring to have harmonized the national research agendas with the JPICH SRA priorities and increased the national budgets or the financing prioritization in order to participate in more international activities/programmes;

In the future, it should be done an in depth work on trying to improve the implementation of the SRA, with respect to covering the gaps identified in the strategy and in identifying adequate funding instruments. The JPICH attractiveness, the contry turnover and the stakeholders outreach should also be a point of concern deserving some debate.

Annex I: JHEP2 - WP3 - D3.1 “Key Performance Indicators”

A) Enabling Framework

Topics	Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Governing structures	Increase the performance of the financial and administrative management	Members States / EC satisfaction	1	Sustainability of the JPICH financial and administrative structures	Capacity to secure financial resources from JPI members to fund the Secretariat and to execute the implementation plans	Survey C19
Extending cooperation and partnership	To extend network and cooperation to external organisations	At least one annual joint action with an international organisation	2	Number of joint actions with organisations	Formal collaborations through joint activities and actions with International organisations (including UN, UNESCO, NGOs, ICOMOS, ICOM...), NGOs, regional organisations, other...	Survey A11 & A12
Extending cooperation and partnership	To establish quality contacts with other P2P networks	Organise at least one annual joint action with another P2P networks	3	Number of joint actions with other P2P networks	P2P networks such as article 169/185, ERA-NETs, ERA-NETs cofunds... other JPIs (Urban Europe, CliK'EU, FACCE etc.). Joint actions including definition of common schemes for evaluation and monitoring, coordination or clustering, definition of common SRA, joint training activities, personnel exchange, mutual opening of facilities and infrastructures, of programmes, joint calls design and implementation, other...	Survey A7, A8, A9 & A10
Extending cooperation and partnership	To cooperate with non European countries	Organise at least one annual joint action with a non-European country	4	List of joint actions involving non-European countries	Joint actions involving non-European countries, particularly advanced economies (Japan, USA...), neighbourhood Mediterranean countries, BRICs...	Survey A4, A5 & A6
JPICH attractiveness	JPICH is attracting new countries	Initial countries' membership enlarged to include at least one new country and doesn't decrease from one year to the next	5	Evolution of the number of countries participating to the JPICH	Cumulated number of countries that joined the project and that were not present at the beginning of the project, countries that opted out (no longer partners or observers), and information about the number of countries that participated to the JPICH per year	Coordinator
SRA and Action Programme	Action Programme funding quantity and type matches SRA needs	-	6	Adequacy of research needs in SRA and Action Programme	The SRA is reflected by the Action Programme that identifies the most useful funding instruments and pooling capacities for implementation of selected research topics in SRA	Questionnaire Q10 & Q11
Dissemination strategy	To identify and contact key stakeholders across and within the EU	4 categories of key stakeholders identified, by WP6 contacted and involved in JPICH activities	7	List of new stakeholders and types of stakeholders reached by the dissemination strategy within EU and across the EU	One list for stakeholders reached by JPICH dissemination strategy in the EU, one list for stakeholders reached outside the EU, with description of categories of stakeholders reached. They include the four categories used in the JHEP Dissemination Plan: Policy makers and influencers ; Cultural Heritage research community ; Parallel projects and organisations ; Industry, SMEs and civil society	Template Q17 & Q18

B) Research Implementation

Topics	Goals, Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Joint transnational calls for proposals	To increase the amount of allocated funding through transnational calls for proposals	Number of applications granted and average funding allocated per application increase from one call to the next	8	Evolution in the number of applications granted and average funding allocated per application through calls for proposal	For each call, total amount of allocated funding related to the number of applications finally granted and average funding allocated to each granted project, compared to preceding call	Coordinator
Joint transnational calls for proposals	To launch joint transnational calls for proposals	Launch at least 2 joint transnational calls for proposals	9	Number of new and foreseen joint transnational calls for proposals	Number of new joint transnational calls for proposals published by the JPICH, and calls foreseen or planned for future of JPICH	Coordinator
Capacity building and Enabling activities	Development of advanced training	At least one training instrument implemented annually	10	Number and diversity of training instruments implemented	Inform as to number of seminars, conferences, thematic workshops, e-learning platforms developed for Cultural Heritage researchers and professional training purposes.	Survey B17 & B18
Capacity building and Enabling activities	Development of a Cultural-Heritage-dedicated network of infrastructures	Develop and pool digital infrastructures for Cultural Heritage	11	Share of digital and built infrastructures compared to total number of infrastructures participating in the JPICH	Number of new or pre-existing infrastructures participating in JPICH activities. Physical (CHARISMA...) and digital (DARIAH...) infrastructures. Open laboratories, networks (HERA...)	Survey B15 & B16
		Develop and pool research facilities, laboratories, infrastructures				
Collaboration with private sector	Private sector participation in the research process	At least one collaboration implemented with the private sector	12	Number of research collaborations and partnerships with private sector	Participation of industry and SMEs through calls for proposals, access to research infrastructures, training programmes, informal collaborations, and commercial projects. Projects co-financed by private sector, access to private infrastructures	Survey B13 & B14

C) Research Added Value

Topics	Goals, Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Publications	Available publications to enhance visibility of JPICH activities	–	13	Number of publications resulting from JPICH research activities	Number of publications resulting from JPICH research activities. Publications in specialized, academic and high-impact journals (those considered highly influential in the field of Cultural Heritage and in specialized professional fields), and publications on JPICH research activities (collective works, conference proceedings, monographs, etc.).	Template Q21, Q22
Training	To include students and professionals still in training in JPICH research activities	–	14	Number of degrees achieved and thesis presented by students collaborating in JPICH during the life time of the project	Students having achieved important degrees (master, doctoral) or presented their thesis during JPICH lifetime and having participated in JPICH research activities in one way or another, through research projects, workshops or training programmes.	Template Q14, Q15, Q23 & Q24
Aligned research	Increased coordination of JPI and European scientific strategic agendas	Development of an European agenda mirroring the JPICH agenda	15	New mechanisms for alignment with regional, federal, national and European research agendas	Innovative mechanisms implemented for alignment, coordination and interactions between institutional strategic agendas in the Cultural Heritage area: common research agendas, forums, subsidiarity principle... as innovative funding concepts likely to influence national, regional, institutional funding policies	Questionnaire Q12, Q13, Q14, Q15, Q16 & Q17
Aligned research	High coordination of JPI and National/Federal scientific strategic agendas	Participating States align their scientific strategy to the JPICH agenda				
Aligned research	To share common research agendas	Share the JPICH research agenda with at least one institution	16	Number of institutions sharing JPICH Strategic Research Agenda	Number of International organisations, national ministries or departments, agencies, councils, regional organisations, public research organisations and others... sharing JPICH research agenda or for which the SRA of the JPICH is explicitly mentioned as a cornerstone	Questionnaire Q18 & Q19

C1) Annex to C category for Joint Calls Assessment

Topics	Goals, Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Calls outputs	Development of innovative Cultural-Heritage-dedicated tools, technologies, frameworks and methodologies for conservation and risk assessment	–	17	Number of patent applications, license agreements, invention disclosures, studies underway, technology demonstrators, new specific frameworks and methodologies dedicated to Cultural Heritage conservation	Development through JPICH research activities of cross disciplinary tools and methodologies for repair, treatment and maintenance... of Cultural Heritage, including new or improved products, technologies (advanced hybrid technologies, diagnostic tools, nanotechnology), processes (single early warning intelligent system crossing chemical, biological or physical sensors, climatic-security- behaviour interdisciplinary model, mapping earth observation with the help of spatial technologies) and equipments. New frameworks, methodologies and dedicated to risk assessment & prevention, Cultural Heritage conservation, natural and man-made disasters, specific management and risk assessment protocols.	Heritage Plus WP4 reports: D4.1 and D4.2
Calls outputs	Available publications to enhance visibility of JPICH activities	–	18	Number of publications resulting from research activities	Number of publications resulting from JPICH research activities. Publications in specialized, academic and high-impact journals (those considered highly influential in the field of Cultural Heritage and in specialized professional fields), and publications on JPICH research activities (collective works, conference proceedings, monographs, etc.).	Heritage Plus WP4 reports: D4.1 and D4.2
Calls outputs	Improved accessibility of materials and data	–	19	Share of research project addressing improvement in accessibility of materials and data	Share of research projects concerned with improving accessibility of materials and data, by using data mining, database, infrastructures... compared to total number of research projects during the period in question.	Heritage Plus WP4 reports: D4.1 and D4.2

C2) Annex to C category for Joint Alignment Assessment

Topics	Goals, Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Alignment at strategic level	Level of the strategic leverage effects	–	20	Alignment of national agendas	Changes in research priorities of the agencies, and in national research priorities, towards a demand for harmonization between partners.	Survey C20 & C21
Alignment at funding level	Level of the funding leverage effects	–	21	Changes in national budgets re international activities / programmes	Changes in national budgets, in order to increase the participation of agencies in international activities / programmes	Survey C22 & C23
Alignment at funding level	Level of the funding leverage effects	–	22	Changes in legislation to allow payments to foreign researchers	Legal and regulatory changes that enhance the internationalization factor, namely by permission of payment to foreign researchers	Survey C24 & C25
Alignment at operational level	Level of the financial and operational leverage effects	–	23	Leverage effect	Efforts at financial and operational level in order to increase the return of partners investment (leverage effect)	Survey C26
Alignment at operational level	Level of the operational leverage effects	–	24	Coordination of timing in funding & programme implementation	Adjustment of timelines with regard to the funding schemes and to the implementation of the programmes	Survey C27 & C28
Alignment at operational level	Level of the operational leverage effects	–	25	Harmonised rules and procedures for participation	Harmonization of the regulation and procedures for participation in programmes and calls	Survey C29 & C30
Alignment at scientific level	Level of the scientific leverage effects	–	26	Standardisation of research practices	Establishment of common rules and procedures for the joint transnational calls, programme clustering and changes in national research programmes' themes	Survey C31 & C32

D) Transformational Effect

Topics	Goals, Objectives	Success criteria /Target	Indicator		Indicator Definition	How to measure (multiple sources)
Connecting people with heritage	To improve Cultural Heritage accessibility	50% of total created, updated and pooled multidisciplinary databases are in open access	27	Increased access to Cultural Heritage information through database development, and share of open access databases	Number of multidisciplinary databases created, updated and pooled through JPICH activities, and share of open access sources compared to total.	Template Q23 & Q24
Connecting people with heritage	To help leaders in their use of Cultural Heritage (policy making) and to improve Cultural Heritage inclusion in research and sectoral policies	–	28	Increased and diversified actions to bring knowledge developed in the JPICH to political level	Number and type of actions developed by the JPICH to promote knowledge, tools and policy making instruments developed through its activities at political regional/federal/national/European/transnational levels: lobbying, political advisory groups, advocacy groups, transnational forums	Survey D33 & D34
Creating knowledge	To move the field towards truly interdisciplinary studies	–	29	JPICH ability to attract and increase investments for existing and new Cultural Heritage educational programmes	JPICH participations in creation of new Cultural Heritage curricula, in enforcement of the existing one, and its expenditure on pre-existing and new educational programmes	Survey D37 & D38
Creating knowledge	To generate knowledge	Available information on the Heritage Portal and on the JPICH website increased from the beginning of the JPICH	30	Increase in the amount of Cultural Heritage information available on Heritage Portal and on JPICH website	From the beginning of the JPICH, increase in the amount of information available on the Heritage Portal (http://www.heritageportal.eu/) and on the JPICH website (http://www.jpi-culturalheritage.eu/)	Coordinator
Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource	Adaptation to and mitigation of climate change effects	Contribute to H2020 goals to reduce energy demand by factor of 5 to 20%, or more	31	JPICH potential contribution in reduction in energy demand and use	Potential impact on energy demand and use (in %), of results achieved through JPICH-related projects addressing or trying to tackle the challenge of renewable energy in the Cultural Heritage domain with reference to Europe 2020 goals	Survey D35 & D36
Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource	Adaptation to and mitigation of climate change effects	–	32	Share of collaborative projects addressing and investigating the issue of climate change	Share of total projects and activities developed through JPICH addressing and investigating the issue of climate change effect on Cultural Heritage	Template Q20, Q25 & Q26
Transversal indicators	JPICH ability to address research priorities identified in the SRA	80% of research priorities identified in the SRA were addressed by JPICH activities	33	Proportion of priorities identified in the SRA addressed by JPICH activities, and number of research projects working on each priority	Among the priorities identified in the SRA: Developing a reflective society, identity and perception, values, ethics; connecting people with heritage, protection through use, sustainability, security, heritage information; creating knowledge, linking information, change, methods and measurements, integrating risk; safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource, conservation, adaptation and mitigation	Template Q19
Transversal indicators	To help Europe's economical growth and jobs	–	34	Number of transversal jobs directly or indirectly created through JPICH joint actions and their sustainability	Through activities and joint actions developed by JPICH, number of jobs directly or indirectly created, and their sustainability rate one year later.	Template Q23 & Q24

Annex II: JHEP2 – WP3 Monitoring Survey



JHEP2 - Monitoring Survey for JPICH EB members

This survey will help WP3 of JHEP2 to implement its Monitoring and Evaluation framework for the JPICH. In order to maximise the usefulness of the exercise, please try to answer as much questions as possible.

General Information

1. Name and Surname *

2. Which country do you represent in the JPICH? *

3. Name of your Institution *

(A) Enabling Framework

These questions mainly focus on activities that were performed or attended by your organisation within the context of the JPICH, in order to draw, as complete as possible, a picture of diverse activities and collaborations developed in the framework of the JPICH between January of 2015 and December of 2016.

4. Has your organisation been collaborating(*) with non-ERA countries(**) between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Formal and informal collaborations, joint activities and informal contacts.

(**) Non-ERA countries: Countries which are not member of the EU or countries that weren't associated to H2020.

- YES
 NO

5. Has your organisation been collaborating with Advanced economies(*) or BRIC countries(**) between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Advanced economies (ERA countries excluded): Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and United States.

(**) BRIC countries: Brazil, Russia, India and China.

- YES
 NO

6. Please, list all collaborations with advanced economies, non-ERA & BRIC countries. Precise the name of the Country, the kind of collaboration, and if possible, the date and the duration.

7. Has your organisation been organising activities(*) with another JPI between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Joint Activities including definition of common schemes, coordination, clustering, training activities, exchanges, mutual opening of facilities and infrastructures, programmes, joint calls design or implementation and mapping.

- YES
 NO

8. If yes, list these activities below. Please precise the name of the other JPI, the type of activity, the date, the duration and the location (if applicable).

9. Has your organisation been participating to another JPI Joint Activities between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

- YES
 NO

10. If yes, list these activities below. Please precise the name of the other JPI, the type of activity, the date, the duration and the location (if applicable).

11. Have other organisations(*) been collaborating(**) with your organisation between January of 2015 and December of 2016, in another way than being represented in the JPI governing structure?

(*) Organisations: International and regional organisations, NGOs (Council of Europe, European Heritage Legal Forum, ICOM, UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS, Europa Nostra...).

(**) Collaborations: including formal and informal collaborations, joint activities and informal contacts.

- YES
 NO

12. If yes, list these collaborations below. Please precise the organisation's name, the country (if applicable), the type of collaboration, the date and duration (please precise especially collaborations that did last more than 3 months).

(B) Research Implementation

The following questions will help to monitor the implementation of necessary parameters for the construction of JPICH research capacity and excellence. They assess some important outputs for research capacity enabled by the pooling of financial, human and material resources, such as infrastructures, through JPICH activities.

Please try to answer the following questions by using outputs of activities performed by your specific organisation in the framework of the JPICH.

13. Has your organisation been conducting collaborations(*) and/or joint research activities(**) with the Private sector between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Collaborations: including formal and informal collaborations, joint activities, and informal contacts.

(**) Activities such as participation of the private sector through calls to research projects, access to research infrastructures, access to private infrastructures, training programmes, informal collaborations, commercial partnership, co-financing, access to diverse facilities.

- YES
 NO

14. If yes, list these collaborations below. Please precise the company or institution name, the country, the type of collaboration, the date and duration.

15. In the framework of the JPICH, has your organisation been participating or associated to development of new research infrastructures(*) or the upgrade(**) of existing ones, between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Research infrastructures: facilities, resources and services that are used by the research communities to conduct research and foster innovation in their fields. They include: major scientific equipment's (or sets of instruments); knowledge-based resources such as collections, archives or scientific data; e-infrastructures, such as data and computing systems and communication networks; and any other infrastructure of a unique nature essential to achieve excellence in research and innovation. Such infrastructures may be 'single-sited', 'virtual' or 'distributed'.

(**) Upgrades such as providing support for open-access, assuring harmonisation or interoperability between infrastructures, ensure optimal use, facilitate installation into virtual facilities, providing innovative solutions for data collection.

- YES
 NO

16. If yes, please precise below the infrastructure's name, the type of participation and if it is 'single-sited', 'virtual' or 'distributed' infrastructure.

17. Has your organisation been implementing or participating to the implementation of new training instruments(*) between January of 2015 and December of 2016?

(*) Training instruments: thematic workshops, e-learning platforms, teaching modules, educational programmes developed for Cultural Heritage researchers and professional training purposes.

- YES
 NO

18. If yes, list these instruments below. Please precise the type of instrument, date (if applicable), subject (if applicable) and if possible, a short description.

(C) Research Added Value for Joint Alignment Assessment

19. How do you evaluate the JPICH financial and administrative structures' sustainability?

20. Did your agency make any change in research priorities, towards a demand for harmonization between partners of JPICH?

- YES
 NO

21. If yes, please list these changes below.

22. Did your agency make any change in national budgets, in order to increase the participation in international activities/programmes?

- YES
 NO

23. If yes, please list these changes below.

24. Did your agency make any change in legislation to allow payments to foreign researchers?

- YES
 NO

25. If yes, please list these changes below.

26. Please describe the efforts made, if any, at national and operational level (e.g. dissemination of the initiative and the call, support to the scientific community), in order to increase the return of partners' investment (leverage effect)?

27. Did your agency make any adjustment of timeline with regard to the funding schemes and the implementation of the national funding programmes?

- YES
 NO

28. If yes, please list these adjustments below.

29. Did your agency make any harmonization efforts regarding the regulations and procedures for participation in national/international programmes and calls?

- YES
 NO

30. If yes, please list these harmonization's below.

31. Did your agency established common rules and procedures for the joint transnational calls, programme clustering and changes in national research programmes' themes?

- YES
 NO

32. If yes, please list these common rules and procedures below.

(D) Transformational Effect

The following questions will allow completing indicators, examining how the JPICH generates a transformational power on the initial challenges having risen to intervention. It also assesses JPICH responsiveness to initial research objectives, as stated in the SRA.

33. From the beginning of the JPICH, have representatives of your Work Packages been taking or participating to actions(*) to bring the JPICH at the political level?

(*) Actions: lobbying, political advisory groups, advocacy groups and transnational forums.

- YES
 NO

34. If yes, list most important of these actions below.

35. From the beginning of the JPICH, were any results with potential impact on H2020 objectives of reduction in energy demand and use(*) issued through JPICH activities?

(*) Safeguarding Cultural Heritage resource by contributing to H2020 goals to reduce energy demand by factor of 5 to 20%, or more.

- YES
 NO

36. If yes, list these results below. Please precise through which activity the results were issued and if possible their estimated impact.

37. From the beginning of the project, have new or additional financial investments been made for Cultural Heritage specialised educational programmes?

- YES
 NO

38. If yes, list these investments below. Please precise the type of investment the funding source and the amount.

39. Please list below any fact, event or output between January of 2015 and December of 2016 that you think that would be relevant for the monitoring team and which has not been covered by the previous questions in this survey.

Annex III: JHEP2 - WP3 Questionnaire



JHEP2 - WP3 Questionnaire for JPICH GB and EB members

This questionnaire will help WP3 of JHEP2 to implement its Monitoring and Evaluation framework for the JPICH.

Please provide only one answer per Country, per Board. In order to maximise the usefulness of the exercise, please try to answer as much questions as possible.

I - General Information

1. Name and Surname *

2. Which country do you represent in the JPICH? *

3. Name of your Institution. *

4. When did your country join the Joint Programming Initiative? *

5. Are you a member of the JPICH Governing Board (GB)? *

- YES
 NO

6. Are you a member of the JPICH Executive Board (EB)? *

- YES
 NO

II - Participation

7. Does your institution benefit from the JHEP2 Coordination and Support Action (CSA)?

- YES
 NO

8. Is your institution contributing to the HERITAGE PLUS call for proposals?

- YES
 NO

9. If yes, please indicate the amount of your contribution.

III - SRA and Action Programme

10. Please indicate if you agree or not with the following statements:

	Yes, completely	Yes, partly	Only partially	Not at all
The gaps identified in SRA are sufficiently covered by JPICH activities as described in the Action Programme?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Funding instruments for implementation of the SRA are well identified in the Action Programme?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pooling capacities for implementation of the SRA are well identified in the Action programme?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
You are globally satisfied with the Action Programme?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. Please, feel free to add any relevant comment regarding the SRA and the Action Programme.

IV - Coordinated and streamlined research

12. Do you agree with the following statements:

	strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree
Thanks to JPICH, there is an increase of strategic cooperation in Cultural Heritage area between EU Member States?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Thanks to JPICH, there are more interactions between institutional strategic agendas in the Cultural Heritage area?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

13. Do you feel that the JPICH has the instrument to measure the gains in efficiency in national funding by reducing fragmentation in the relevant research fields?

14. Do you feel that the JPICH has the instrument to measure the gains in efficiency in national funding by reducing unnecessary duplication in the relevant research fields?

15. Did the JPICH develop or set-up mechanisms to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication in existing or new programmes for countries participating in the JPICH?

- YES
- NO

16. Could you please quote some of these instruments?

17. Please, feel free to add any relevant comments regarding coordinating and rationalizing agendas and research, through the JPICH.

18. Please indicate if your country:

	Yes, completely	Yes, partly	Only partially	Not at all
Already has national strategies, research agendas, programmes, priorities taking into account the JPI SRA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is demonstrably in the process of developing national strategies, research agendas, programmes, priorities taking into account the JPI SRA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is discussing opportunities to develop national strategies, research agendas, programmes, priorities taking into account the JPI SRA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does not have plans to develop national strategies, research agendas, programmes, priorities taking into account the JPI SRA?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Please list these initiatives or strategies.

Annex IV: JHEP2 – Template for Regular Reporting on JPICH Joint Activities



JHEP2 - Template for Regular Reporting on JPICH Joint Activities

This template will help WP3 of JHEP2 to implement its Monitoring and Evaluation framework for the JPICH.
In order to maximise the usefulness of the exercise, please try to answer as much questions as possible.

I - General Information

1. Please precise the type of joint activity:

- Conference
- Seminar
- Workshop
- Symposium
- Meeting
- Information day
- Lecture fair
- Exhibition
- Forum
- Public presentation
- Training activity

Networking event

Other, please specify

2. Please indicate the title of the joint activity.

3. Precise the activity duration and location.

4. Precise the role of the JPICH in this activity:

Institutional framework

Organiser

Co-organiser

Financing structure

Co-financing structure

Participant

Partner

5. Please describe in few words the role of the JPICH in this activity.

6. If possible, indicate the total budget mobilised for this Joint Activity, in Euros.

7. If the JPICH participated to the financing of this joint activity, please indicate the amount of its participation, in Euros.

8. Was this activity included in/part of an existing educational programme?

YES

NO

9. If yes, please name the programme.

10. Please list and precise in few words the research or professional areas covered by this activity.

II - Participation

11. Please precise who were the organisers and financing structures for this joint activity:

(Please precise the Institution's country, name and type: JPI, NGO, Foundation, Governmental Agency, Ministry, Private company, Public research institution, Museum, etc.)

12. Please indicate the number of participants (invited or taking part directly in the joint activity or event, not the public and the audience) to this joint activity.

13. Please precise which countries were represented by participants.

14. Did young students or professionals still in training participated to the activity?

- YES
 NO

15. If yes, how many?

16. Could you give an approximate estimation of the number of persons reached by the joint activity (including organisers, participants, general public and audience)?

III - Stakeholders

17. Which kind of stakeholders was the joint activity relevant for?

	very relevant	relevant	not relevant	absolutely not relevant
Policy makers and influencers	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cultural Heritage research community	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parallel projects and organisations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Industry, SMEs and Civil Society	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18. Give an estimation of the kind of stakeholders that were finally reached by the activity?

	0 %	10 %	20 %	30 %	40 %	50 %	60 %	70 %	80 %	90 %	100 %
Policy makers and influencers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cultural Heritage research community	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Parallel projects and organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Industry, SMEs and Civil Society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IV - Research priorities and topics

19. Which of the following JPICH SRA research priorities were addressed through this joint activity:

- Developing a reflective society
- Connecting people with heritage
- Creating knowledge
- Safeguarding our Cultural Heritage resource

20. Which of the following specific topics were addressed through this joint activity:

- Digital cultural heritage
- Improvement in accessibility of materials and data
- Multidisciplinary frameworks for integrated revitalisation of artefacts, buildings and landscapes
- Renewal and restoration of historic areas
- Potential impact in terms of reductions in energy demand and use
- Climate change

V – Publications

21. Did the joint activity result in the issue of one or many of the following written outputs?

- Minutes
- Briefing paper
- Final conclusion, findings
- Working paper
- Report
- Collective work
- Monograph
- Proceedings
- Publication in academic/specialized journal
- Peer reviewed paper
- Other, please specify

22. Please join a table with the publications description, exact references, etc.

Explorar... Nenhum ficheiro selecionado.

VI - Specific outputs

23. Did the joint activity result in the issue of any of the following outputs for the JPICH?

- New technology
- New product, equipment, device
- Patent, license agreement, invention disclosure
- Technology demonstrator
- New process
- New framework
- New protocol for research, for conservation...
- New coordination mechanism
- Training or educational instrument
- Teaching module
- Adoption or enforcement of declaration
- Adoption/enforcement of chart
- Adoption/enforcement of standard, ethical code
- New network of infrastructures
- New infrastructure
- New, updated or pooled open-access database
- New, updated or pooled restricted-access database
- Action to bring the JPICH at the political level
- Decision support tool
- Software
- Toolbox

- Job, position, vacancy
- Degree achieved, thesis defended

Other, please specify

24. Please join a table with a list of specific outputs.

Explorar... Nenhum ficheiro selecionado.

25. Do some results of this activity have potential impact in reduction in energy demand and use, as on climate change?

- YES
- NO

26. If yes, please list these results below and precise their estimated impact (if possible).

Dissemination

27. Did the joint activity necessitated or resulted in the issue of one or many of the following communication and dissemination tools?

- Printed promotional material
- Logo

- Website, web page
- Specific newsletter
- Offline mass media presentation
- Online mass media presentation
- Other, please specify

28. Please indicate the outputs applied and the number of each below.

29. Please list below the dissemination tools .