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 D 3.6**

**Final evaluation of JPICH alignment process and critical assessment of KPIs applied to the period covered by**

**the project**

Due date of deliverable: December, 2019

Actual submission date: 21 December, 2019

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable:  BELSPO, KIK-IRPA (Koninklijk Intituut voor het Kunstpatrimonium)

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) | |

## INDEX

# Introduction

The main objectives of the Work Package 3 (WP3) are to monitor and assess JPI CH alignment and implementation process, and to demonstrate and evaluate JPI CH 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 JPI CH CSA (JHEP) has been upgraded and adapted to the JHEP2 goals. Additional KPIs have been identified to monitor the alignment of national research programmes and research activities, and added to the initial set of indicators (D3.1 "Key Performance Indicators to monitor alignment at national research programmes level and at JPI CH research activities level").

The Deliverable D3.6 "Final evaluation of JPICH alignment process and critical assessment of KPIs applied to the period covered by the project " is the final document to be produced under Task 3.2 "Assessment of the alignment process", led by BELSPO (Belgium). 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" (JPI CH).

Task 3.2 assesses the process of alignment performed both at JPI CH and Member States level, by summarizing and analyzing results of the monitoring exercise performed through Task 3.1.

The evaluation summarizes and analyzes all outputs of the monitoring exercise and presents a critical assessment of the KPIs applied to the period covered by the project.

It is performed through two main evaluation steps:

1) critically evaluate the efficiency of the KPIs selected;

2) evaluate the level of alignment on research activities at transnational level.

Reports produced by Task 3.1 are used to demonstrate the impact of the alignment and the joint programming process, provide meaningful input for the identification of "gaps, barriers or bottlenecks" to this process and feedback the JPI CH with relevant elements to improve the on-going intervention.

The first report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels, D3.4, covered the first 18 months and concluded that quite some KPI's were interpreted differently by partners and needed to be reformulated or clarified. Besides, recommendations were addressed to adapt indicators, or even suppress some of them, to improve their overall understanding without influencing the monitoring process as such. Compared to the first monitoring report, D3.2, it was recommended to reduce the number of indicators from 34 to 29 in the second reporting period. The recommendations reported in D3.4 have been included in the second monitoring campaign, covering the period January 2017-December 2018, as reported in D3.3.

The second report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes, D3.5, aimed to critically re-evaluate the efficiency of the selected and adapted KPIs enabling to monitor and evaluate the alignment process and the level of alignment on research activities at transnational level. It was concluded that the interpretation of questions by member states could differ considerably, implying the need to revise monitoring surveys and other tools in a way that member states are able to respond concisely and comprehensively.

On the other hand, although clearly stated in the related questions, answers from Member States remained quite global and with a lack of clear link with the JPI CH activities.

This deliverable 3.6 aims to evaluate the JPICH alignment process and critical assess the KPIs applied to the period covered by the project.

# Alignment

In D1.1, presenting the results of the questionnaire related to mapping of regional and national research programmes within the field of CH and the alignment process, it was concluded that remarkable progresses were achieved the last 6 years related to the research strategy dedicated to Cultural Heritage. A further extending positive result was related to the aspect of alignment/influences: the number of programmes that were aligned to H2020 on one hand and JPI CH, potentially via the SRA, on the other hand was remarkable.

In D1.2, alignment was defined according to the definition that is used by the High Level Group for Joint Programming (GPC):

"*Alignment is the strategic approach taken by Member States to modify their national programmes, priorities or activities as a consequence of the adaptation of joint research priorities in the context of Joint Programming, with a view to implement changes to improve the efficiency of investment in research at the level of Member States and the European Research Area*."

According to D1.2, several of the member states have promoted the JPI CH in national and international conferences and meetings on the subject of CH or related topics. Two parades showing off the JPI CH projects were successfully organized in 2017 and in 2018.

JPI CH organized a conference on Cultural Heritage Governance strategies and a workshop on alignment in 2018 – the European Year of Cultural Heritage. The 9th September 2019, The JPI CH and the Time Machine Initiative have signed a joint statement in view to join forces for a research and innovation partnership promoting the future of our Cultural Heritage. The Arts and Humanities Research Council (UK) have been leading on the review of the JPI CH Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda (SRiA) since May 2019. Over the summer, they have been coordinating the consultation of the SRA which was published in 2014. The first stage of the consultation has involved gathering feedback directly from the JPI CH Scientific Group and the JPI CH Partners through National Consultation Panels as to align with national research agenda. They have provided comments on advances in the cultural heritage research environment, identified new priorities and gaps and suggested revisions to the existing research strategy and agenda.

In addition, within the framework of the Action Programme implementation, a set of different events has been organized by the 13 activities coordinated by JPI CH partners. Between 2017 and 2019, 15 seminars, workshops or conferences were organized, integrating JPI CH-funded research results, alongside national or regional research projects and case studies.

Over the past ten years, the Joint Programming Initiative on Cultural Heritage and Global Change (JPI CH), launched in January 2010, has proved to be an effective strategic Member State driven partnership, that has significantly contributed to the European Research Area. In this partnership Member States and Associated Countries jointly address areas where public research Programmes can respond to major societal challenges.

# Monitoring and evaluation of the alignment process – conclusions from the monitoring executed within task 3.1.

The methodology for monitoring and assessment has been described in D3.2 "First interim Evaluation of JPI CH alignment process" and D3.3 'Second interim Evaluation of JPI CH alignment process", which was based on one proposed by the first JPI CH CSA (JHEP), namely in the D5.2 "Report on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation: Recommendation for future monitoring and evaluation activities". In the second JPI CH CSA (JHEP2), these tools were redrafted (questions were suppressed or added to the different documents: survey and questionnaire) in order to better fit the set of indicators presented in D3.1 "Key Performance indicators to monitor alignment at international research programmes level and at JPI CH research activities level". In

D3.1, the proposed methodology was to keep the methodological framework for monitoring and evaluation, composed by four different levels of objectives: (A) Enabling Framework – (B) Research Implementation – (C) Research Added Value – (D) Transformational Effect, and to add two annexes to the (C) category of indicators, namely C1 and C2, in order to allow assessment of Calls for proposals and of the alignment process. Starting from a total of 60 indicators proposed in the JHEP methodology, a final number of 34 indicators was reached after the refinement process.

In D3.2, it turned out that many indicators had given very poor or rather deceiving results, as it was too soon for many elements of outcomes to assess. Moreover, as described in D3.4, the number of indicators was further reduced from 34 to 29 in the second reporting period. It was expected that the 2nd Interim Evaluation report (D3.3) would provide appropriate answers. Through the results, important positive conclusions were drawn, as well as drawbacks and bottlenecks, as described in D3.5 from which is was concluded that the interpretation of questions by member states might differ considerably. Answers from Member States remain global, quite often missing the link with the JPI CH, rendering them difficult to address or interpret in terms of monitoring item. This implied for the need to revise monitoring surveys in a way that member states are able to respond concisely and comprehensively.

The deliverable 3.5 would act as the basis for a broader reflection on a set of adapted KPI's for the JPI CH, which will be the subject of D3.6 Final evaluation of JPICH alignment process and critical assessment of KPIs applied to the period covered by the project .

## Obstacles, challenges and recommendations

Although JHEP2 has quite successfully managed to develop a full set of Monitoring and Evaluation indicators early on in its lifecycle, it had overcome a number of challenges to do so. These are described in detail below:

- **Keeping the framework simple.** One of the main challenges in the process of indicator development was to ensure that the framework was simple and does not include too many indicators. This is critical in order to keep the activities related to data collection viable and to not overburden JPI CH members with data gathering. Time-consuming overall process and tedious data collection, and the issue of non-response causing considerable delay and extra time work, is considered an important obstacle. An effortless and simple Monitoring and Evaluation framework is more sustainable in the long-term. This D3.6 proposes to rationalize through re-formulating or removing indicators. In that respect, emphasis on feasibility, through establishing the right balance between an ambitious evaluation framework and providing practical information for a maturing JPI, emphasizing the need to keep data collection simple.

- **Added value by involving actors who can create (policy) impact.** By defining part of the evaluation, national delegates might redefine their self-perceived role as active contributors to (national) alignment activities in the joint programming context which can result in activities that drive strategic and structural alignment. JPI's as highly complex system innovation platforms are developing in an evolutionary manner which implies a continuous "collective searching and learning". The Monitoring and Evaluation procedures develop incrementally. Through the yet performed Monitoring and Evaluation processes, it seems crucial to integrate besides policy makers also stakeholders/beneficiaries in the process of impact assessment to a larger extent. Research influences how policy makers and policies act. It can provide evidence that influences decisions and can enhance citizens' participation in scientific and technological decisions Research also affects welfare, behavior, practices and activities of people and groups, including their well-being and quality of life. Through trans disciplinary and international research actions, increased capacities and skills are developed contributing to increased quality of research and hence increased chances of solving societal challenges.

- The **monitoring of data related to the grant projects** (summary of results, names, contacts, websites, budgets, other sources of funding...), as well as to the Calls (number of proposals received at each

stage, details about the selection procedures, total investment planned and actual investment, research fields covered, groups targeted...) needs optimisation. This is shown by the initial difficulty encountered when answering the ERALEARN surveys for data collection. A better harmonization of reporting and evaluation procedures between national research agencies and organisations would be recommended for more efficiency. Reporting templates, that were setup for the JPI CH Heritage Plus Call, were not reused in the subsequent calls, raising the question on the way new data will be collected in the coming years, and of their efficient dissemination. It is recommended to standardize methodologies and agree on pre-defined template(s) setup during the preparation of the calls.

- Maximally use the opportunity of an **update of the JPI CH website** (Heritage Portal and institutional website) to create an online platform, with databases for research projects and research institutions facilitating the monitoring of JPI CH activities, and of JPI CH funded projects results, i.e. "Researchfish, the Research Impact Assessment Platform". This further enables to ensure sustainability of results and outcomes and hence long-term impact of JPI CH activities and funded research;

- Need to define a clear "**communication and dissemination strategy and plan**" to ease monitoring and evaluation, and this in close collaboration with the newly formed Pillars and task Forces in the JPI CH structure, in particular the one "Pillar impact and communication". This will contribute to the monitoring of the processes and activities with relevant and more targeted indicators.

# Proposal for set of key indicators for Monitoring and Evaluation of the JPI CH

Following set of 14 key indicators aim to overcome the challenges and bottlenecks described above and are grouped in 5 categories: Governance, alignment issues, international collaboration, knowledge production and contribution to societal challenges. This set of indicators is broadly aligned with the recommendations for key indicators in the Final Report of Task Force on Monitoring & Evaluation of the JPIs, published in August 2018, and to which several JPI CH representatives contributed. The data collected through the coordination office/JPI CH website as platform facilitating the monitoring of JPI CH activities, are marked in grey.

| Category | Indicator | Description | Method/data sources |
|---|---|---|---|
| Governance | Representative efficiency | Relevant engagement from JPI member countries through a business plan | Status and participation in Governing Boards with decision making power |
| | | | Dropout of countries |
| | | Commitment and resources from all partners | Data on participation rates and modes in joint actions (Joint Calls, Task forces, in-kind...) |
| | Administrative efficiency | Effective implementation of SRIA Develop research performing long-term activities | Roadmap of actions Harmonized operational plans and procedures Timely execution of Joint actions that address the priorities identified in SRIA |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Relational efficiency | Involvement of users and stakeholders | Data collected through interviews, documents, JPI and project data |
| Alignment of national and European and/or international research and innovation programmes and resources | Extent of MS indicating a commitment towards SRIAs | Regular update of SRIA | Procedures and plan for an updated SRIA |
| | | Number and type of joint actions to implement SRIAs | Data held by JPI CH (JPICH website, calls, project outcomes, …) |
| | | Participation of MS in actions and share of funding/resources | |
| | Extent of MS indicating that national research programmes and funding is adapted to match the JPI CH SRIA | Dedicated funding on national level specifically to each joint activity | |
| | | Integration of SRIA in national policies and strategies/programmes | Information gathered through surveys/interviews |
| | Structural collaboration of Research infrastructures collaborating in the field of CH | Number and type of joint initiatives/actions with RIs (E-RIHS, DARIAH, …) | Data held by JPI CH (JPICH website, calls, project outcomes, …) |
| | Synergies with EU funding and financing instruments | Number and type of joint initiatives/actions with EU funding and financing instruments (ESF, PPPs, P2Ps, Horizon Europe,…) | |
| International cooperation and activities | Engagement with countries beyond Europe | Committed international partnerships (with allocated resources) | |
| | | Third countries as full members of JPI CH | |
| | Influence on global agenda | Visible participation in global/international events | |
| | | Influence or uptake in global institutions (ICCROM, ICOMOS, ICOM, IIC, …) | Reference to JPI CH in political statements/narratives |
| Enhanced knowledge production in CH area | Productivity and quality of R&I community | Number of publications and other types of outputs | Data held by JPI CH website |
| | Integration with user community | Number of training and capacity building activities | |
| | | Number and share of JPI CH actions involving private sector | |
| | | Number and share of JPI CH actions involving public sector | |

| | Research and innovation management policy | Established Open Access policy | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Contribution to the area of the societal challenges | Investment in European R&D in the field of CH research as share of total investment in R&D | The total European investments in R&D in the field of CH | Mapping exercise |
| | Societal impact on the challenge of identification and preservation of CH | Uptake in national, European or international policy | Examples of changed thinking amongst policy makers, data on influences on policy issues and increased awareness in the policy world due to JPI CH activities |

# Abbreviations

JPI = Joint Programming Initiative
SRA= Strategic Research Agenda
CH= Cultural Heritage

# References

Task force on Monitoring & Evaluation of the JPIs, Final report on Key Indicators, 31.8.2018

A.Köngeter, Good Practice Case Studies within ERA-LEARN 2020, Practices of Evaluation and Impact Assessment, D2.3, 9 May 2017

A.Durrani, Recalibrated Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the EU JPND, June 2016

B. Mostert, E. Beem, P.J. Visser, Monitoring and Evaluation of EU JPND, 13 April 2012

ERAC-GPC 1304/17, 7 June 2017

S.O. Remoe, Report on Operational Models and Procedures for Evaluation of Policy and structuring actions, D2.3 OCEANS2, 7.7.2017

S.S. Hansen et al, FACCE-JPI Evaluation framework, D3.5, FACCEJPI, september 2013