



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 3.4**

**First report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels**

Due date of deliverable: 24, 2017

Actual submission date: 29<sup>th</sup> December, 2017

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

Start date of project: 1<sup>st</sup> 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 and Exploitation		
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

# INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION.....	3
2. ALIGNMENT .....	4
3. MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE ALIGNMENT PROCESS – CONCLUSIONS FROM THE MONITORING EXECUTED WITHIN TASK 3.1. ....	5
4. CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE EFFICIENCY OF THE KPIS SELECTED.....	6
5. GENERAL REMARKS – CONCLUSIONS.....	10

# 1. Introduction

The main objectives of the Work Package 3 (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 Deliverable D3.4 **“First report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels”** is the first 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”** (JPICH).

This task will assess the process of alignment performed both at JPICH and Member States level, by summarizing and analyzing results of the monitoring exercise performed through Task 3.1, under the responsibility of FCT (Portugal).

The evaluation will summarize and analyze all outputs of the monitoring exercise and will present a critical assessment of the KPIs applied to the period covered by the relevant period of the monitoring exercise (January 2015 - December 2016).

It will be 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 (Deliverable 3.2, July 2017) will be used to demonstrate impact of the alignment and joint programming process, provide meaningful input for the identification of **“gaps, barriers or bottlenecks”** to this process and feedback the JPICH with relevant elements to improve the on-going intervention.

This deliverable aims to critically evaluate the efficiency of the KPIs selected to monitor and evaluate the alignment process and evaluate the level of alignment on research activities at transnational level through the assessment of the results reported in D3.2 **First interim Evaluation of JPICH alignment process**.

## 2. Alignment

In D1.1 **Updated mapping on national research programmes**, 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. While in 2009 some countries mentioned not having a research strategy in the field of TCH (Germany, Iceland and UK), this was not the case for the countries participating in the questionnaire in 2016. For the 14 participating countries, 46 research programmes could be identified in which the thematic of CH is present, of which 70 % as the main focus while the remaining 30 % as part of a larger research programme. A further extending positive result was related to the aspect of alignment/influences: 7 of the 14 participating countries (50 %) mention an alignment to JPICH in at least one of their research programmes while 9 countries mention an alignment to H2020, further illustrating the global European context of them.

Similar results follow the answers related to indicator 15 (D3.2):

- 87% of the respondents to the monitoring survey agree or strongly agree that that JPICH contributed to an increase of strategic cooperation in Cultural Heritage area between EU Member States
- 80% agree or strongly agree on the fact that there is more interactions between institutional strategic agendas in Cultural Heritage area

In D1.2 Report on the best practices in alignment, 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. It was in that respect worth mentioning that the Netherlands took opportunity of their EU Presidency in 2016 to organize a conference on digital heritage. One parade showing off the JPI CH projects was successfully organized in February 2017 and one is planned for 2018.

JPI CH plans to organize a conference on Cultural Heritage Governance strategies and a workshop on alignment will be organized by JPI CH in 2018 – the European Year of Cultural Heritage.

Moreover, according to D3.2, indicators 2 to 4, collaborations are reported with organisations not yet represented in the JPI governing structure as well as joint activities with other JPI's. Although collaborations with non-ERA countries is quite low, more than 50% of countries reported collaborations with Advanced economies.

The JPI CH's Heritage Portal was considered a popular digital tool where the scientific community can share news, opportunities and research findings, participate in forum discussions, ask questions, connect with other experts in their field and explore new areas of interest. JPI CH member states use their websites, networks and reference groups to inform the scientific communities and other stakeholders about JPI CH calls and activities. They also organize information meetings about the calls.

Regarding recommendations on how to implement and promote alignment (D1.2), it was clear that JPI CH needs to strengthen the dialogue with the EU Commission, represented by the relevant DG's and

that through sharing of MS' experience and success stories, bottlenecks can be tackled.

There is however 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 (Deliverable 3.2, indicator 6).

### **3. 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 D3.1 **Key Performance Indicators to monitor alignment at national research programmes level and at JPI CH research activities level**, which was based on one proposed by the first JPICH CSA (JHEP), namely in the D5.2 "Report on the implementation of monitoring and evaluation: Recommendation for future monitoring and evaluation activities". Several tools had been designed by JHEP WP5 to allow monitoring and evaluation of activities performed in the framework of the JPI-CH: A monitoring survey to be applied on a regular 6-months base, a questionnaire addressed to the management framework members, and specific templates for targeted monitoring on activities. In the second JPICH CSA (JHEP2), these tools were redrafted (questions were suppressed or added to the different documents: survey, questionnaire and templates) in order to better fit the D3.1 updated set of indicators. Input was received via 3 Online Survey Tools - Survs (<https://survs.com/>): a monitoring survey, a questionnaire and a template.

D3.2 (name of deliverable) aimed at providing recommendations for future evaluation activities as well as an evaluation of activities performed so far by the JPICH, in 2015 and 2016.

It turned out that many indicators have given rather poor results, as many elements of outcomes were still impossible to assess. This is due to multiple factors: The transition between JHEP and JHEP2 created a large period of time uncovered by the monitoring exercise, making the feedback on past activities more difficult for partners. Another reason is, that for many of these indicators, it is still hard or too early to give constructive answers. It is expected that the 2nd Interim Evaluation report (D3.3), in December of 2018, will provide more appropriate answers.

Through the results, important positive conclusions were drawn, with respect to *extending cooperation and partnership*, quite a satisfied perception of the *funding instruments for the implementation of SRA* as well as that JPICH is recognized as being capable to successfully reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication. 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 terms of *joint alignment at strategic and funding level*, 78 % of agencies 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.

From 2010 to 2017 the number of participating countries increased from 13 to 19. However a negative issue, concerns the fact that 4 of the member countries withdrew during the same period (Turkey, Slovenia... i don't see the 2 others. See in D3.2), what shows a significant turnover. As already mentioned, there is further 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. The launch of *calls for proposals* is still one of the main elements for the implementation of research through JPICH joint activities. Compared to the 1<sup>st</sup> pilot call, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Heritage Plus Joint Call gathered more countries in the consortium, more proposals submitted and more funding. The launched Digital Heritage Call and the roadmap of future calls are good signs in terms of sustainability. 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.

#### 4. Critical evaluation of the efficiency of the KPIs selected

The critical evaluation of the efficiency of KPI's selected is based on D3.1 and D3.2. In the following, the KPI's selected in D3.1 and evaluated in D3.2 will be critically addressed.

Despite the huge work already done, and as the purpose should be to use a same set of KPI's during the whole lifetime of a project, quite some aspects are still unclear and/or subject to different interpretations. The last is reflecting from the relatively few answers received at the questions/surveys lowering the global approach/effect of the monitoring activities.

Therefore, within this D3.4, each indicator was addressed critically.

**Indicator 1:** Sustainability of the JPICH financial and administrative structures.

The indicator definition should be updated, as the success of indicator 1 does not only rely on finding funding for the secretariat and for the execution of implementation plans, but also on the capacity of the coordination unit in order to be capable to "increase the performance on the level of *management* (= objective)".

It is suggested to adapt accordingly:

Indicator definition: Capacity to secure and manage financial resources from JPICH partners at the long term.

Objective: long term confidence and financial commitment from JPI CH partners

**Indicator 2:** Number of joint actions with organisations.

One is expecting a "number" of actions for this indicator, while the answer is reduced to a listing of all types of organisations active in the field of CH, for which the meaning or level of "collaboration" is unclear.

It is suggested to adapt: list and type of joint actions with organisations active in the field of CH

**Indicator 3:** similar remarks as indicator 2 with respect to "number".

**Indicator 4:** indicators should be SMART, and hence specific. It is in that sense unclear how indicator 4 should be interpreted (on a global scale related to all types of JPI's? or focused on the joint activities between JPI CH and non-European countries). According to the answers, indicator 4 is approached on a global scale (f.e. what is the meaning of a joint call with Taiwan – JPI Water) while it should be focused

on JPI CH and hence be aligned to the framework of JPI-CH action programme and activities (WP2 of JHEP2).

**Indicator 7:** list of new stakeholders and types of stakeholders reached by the dissemination strategy within EU and across the EU.

Q17: The aspect « relevance » is here a qualitative statement, so automatically subjective, made by the person who is filling in the template.

In order to be capable to measure indicator 7 it is suggested to opt for “an increasing number of stakeholders”, “an increasing number of new stakeholders” as well as for “an increasing variety of stakeholders”.

A satisfaction form attached to an action to be filled in by the stakeholders might be appropriate to reach the objective of this indicator.

**Indicator 8:** evolution of the number of applications granted and average funding allocated per application through calls for proposal.

Indicators related to calls Proposal statistics are missing, consisting of:

Indicator 8/2: evaluation of the committed budget/country vs used budget though allocation to partners. (for some JPI's, Flanders had committed 1Meuro, but there were no Flemish partners in the top ranked projects, so the 1Meur was finally not used).

Indicator 8/3: evaluation of committed budget per country vs number of applications / partners participating to calls for projects. Reason: is the budget committed by a country influencing the interest of partners to apply?

Indicator 8/4: evaluation of the committed budget vs total budget of proposals per country that might reflect the interest rate of research potential of national/regional partners.

Indicator 8/5: evaluation of committed/allocated budget per country vs number of partners of that country participating in granted projects. Reason: is the budget committed/country affecting the global distribution of their participation in projects? Fe a country with 2Meuro vs one of 0,1 Meuro: how is this reflected in the overall research landscape?

The research landscape might be a trigger/attraction for decision makers to stimulate for a higher commitment.

Indicator 8/6: landscape of the success rate of applications

**Indicator 9:** number of new and foreseen joint transnational calls for proposals

It is suggested to adapt it to: Roadmap of joint transnational calls for proposals

A “number” as such is irrelevant is not reflecting the aspect of “continuity” (a silent period without calls is not good for the sustainability of a JPI). Roadmap also reflects the aspect of “frequency” of calls”. In that aspect, table 2 should also mention the year of the call.

The output of this indicator will not change during the lifetime of JHEP2.

**Indicator 11:** Share of digital and built infrastructures compared to total number of infrastructures participating in CH.

Unclear indicator.

Proposal for adaptation: number of collaborations with digital and built infrastructures participating in CH.

Reason: one cannot “share an infrastructure and compare a shared infrastructure to a number”. In order to be able to answer indicator 11 as it was defined, one should start from a complete list of the infrastructures active in the field of CH prior to mapping the collaborations.

Charisma should be replaced by Iperion CH.

Objective: too challenging. Is the objective to stimulate maximally the participation with infrastructures or to stimulate a network between infrastructures (which is quite challenging and not the purpose of JPI). As a JPI cannot “develop” a network of infrastructures (which act as enabling framework), it should stimulate or participate in the development of a CH dedicated network of infrastructures.

**Indicator 16:** Number of institutions sharing JPICH SRA

Indicator definition is listing institutions/organisations/agencies which are not acting on an INSTITUTIONAL level. As it is defined and answered now, indicator 16 is highly overlapping with indicator 20.

Proposals for adaptation: make it more specific to the “institutional aspect”, and hence relevant within “research added value”.

Indicator definition: number of institutions sharing the JPICH SRA or for which the JPICH is explicitly mentioned as a cornerstone.

Objective: to align institutional research agenda to JPICH SRA.

**Indicator 17:** Number of patent applications, license agreements, invention disclosures, studies underway, technology demonstrators, new specific frameworks and methodologies dedicated to Cultural Heritage conservation

The relevance of this indicator for a JPI focused on CH is low as many applications are related to humanities and social sciences and hence the outcome defined in indicator 17 will be low.

**Indicator 18:** Number of publications resulting from research activities

objective unclear

Proposal for adaptation: increase of the valorization of outputs and outcomes from research activities to contribute to an increased visibility of JPICH activities.

**Indicator 19:** share of research project addressing improvement in accessibility of materials and data.

Proposal for adaptation: Open access of outputs (tools and data) of research projects

Objective: Improved accessibility of tools and data (instead of materials and data)

**Indicator 20:** alignment of national agendas

Proposal for adaptation: alignment of national and regional agendas

Indicator definition: changes in research priorities of the agencies, and in national/regional research priorities, towards a demand for harmonization between partners



Proposal for adaptation: adapting research priorities of agencies and programme owners in alignment with the JPI CH SRA and actions

Proposal for adaptation of objective: increase of the level of the strategic leverage effects.

**Indicator 21:** changes in national budgets re international activities/programmes

Unclear indicator.

Proposal for adaptation: Adaption of funding landscape to align with JPICH activities

Indicator definition: The definition is unclear: is the purpose of indicator 21 to increase the number of agencies participating, or to increase their budget, or, is the purpose to leverage the funding (model) and hence harmonise the funding landscape?

Objective: unclear.

Proposal for adaptation: leverage of the funding landscape.

**Indicator 22:** Changes in legislation to allow payments to foreign researchers

Seems more fitted in the point “alignment at operational level”

Objective: unclear

Proposal for adaptation: harmonize eligibility criteria

**Indicator 22** should be merged into **indicator 25**.

**Indicator 23:** leverage effect

Unclear indicator (leverage effect of what?)

What is the purpose of indicator 23?

Objective: unclear

It is proposed to remove this indicator

**Indicator 25:** Harmonised rules and procedures for participation

should be merged with indicator 22.

Title: Alignment at scientific level

Proposal to adapt to: Alignment at thematic level

Indicator 26: standardization of research practices

Unclear

The way it is described, it fits more within “alignment at strategic level” rather than “scientific” level.

Proposal for adaptation: to align research themes

Indicator definition, proposal for adaptation: Establishing a methodology enabling programme clustering and adaptations in national/regional research programme themes

Objective: unclear (what is a scientific leverage effect?)

**Indicator 27:** Increased access to Cultural Heritage information through database development, and share of open access databases

What is the difference with indicator 19 (to improve cultural heritage accessibility)?

Proposal for adaptation: to contribute to the improvement of CH as connection tool for people

**Indicator 29:** JPICH ability to attract and increase investments for existing and new Cultural Heritage educational programmes

Proposal for adaptation: JPICH ability to adapt and create new CH educational programmes

Objective: proposal for adaptation: to integrate JPICH research research outputs in educational programmes

**Indicator 30:**

Objective proposal for adaptation: To disseminate knowledge

**Indicator 31:** JPICH potential contribution in reduction in energy demand and use.

The relevance of this indicator is very poor, as this is strongly related to the roadmap of calls till 2019 and the action programme. So the question is as to whether this indicator, as well as indicator 32, is useful to monitor and evaluate a JPI, based on a commitment of MS.

Proposal for adaptation: JPICH potential contribution to the mitigation of climate change effects. In that sense, it should be merged in indicator 32.

Anyway, in case of a SMART, and hence measurable indicator, this implies that projects should have a clear business plan and Environmental Impact assessment.

**Indicator 32:** share of collaborative projects addressing and investigating the issue of climate change.

This indicator is restricted to “events or activities within the context of JPICH”

**Indicator 34:**

The relevance of this indicator is very poor for JPICH, as measuring the impact of CH initiatives in terms of economic and job growth is challenging.

## 5. General remarks – conclusions

This D3.4 is focused on a critical evaluation of each indicator that might form the basis of the adaptation of the global monitoring and evaluation tool to assess the aspect of alignment of common research programmes.

Firstly, it is noticed that some of the indicators are beyond the aspect of “alignment of research programmes” and are considered at a more global level.

A further remark is related to whether the questions/indicators are interpreted differently by partners. It is recommended to first try to come to a common language prior to the global launching of a survey/questionnaire to be sure of reaching a common meaning.

Finally, quite some indicators miss the aspect of being specific, measurable and time-dependent, rendering them difficult to assess. What in case for example the number of indicator 27 has increased but the one of number 28 has decreased? Further, without a clear statement “What do we aim to reach within the lifetime of JHEP2 and within JPI CH after 10 years?” the aspect of “monitoring and evaluation” is very challenging. Targets enabling to evaluate indicators and hence “what should be achieved”, might be added to address this point.

**Abbreviations**

JPI = Joint Programming Initiative

SRA= Strategic Research Agenda

CH= Cultural Heritage