



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 3.5

Second report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member

States and Associated Country levels

Due date of deliverable: April, 2019

Actual submission date: July, 2019

Lead beneficiary for this Deliverable: BELSPO, KIK-IRPA (Koninklijk Instituut 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 | 3 |
| Alignment..... | 3 |
| Monitoring and evaluation of the alignment process – conclusions from the monitoring executed within task 3.1 | 4 |
| Critical evaluation of the efficiency of the KPIs selected | 6 |
| General remarks | 10 |
| Abbreviations | 10 |

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 D3.5 "**Second report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels**" is the second 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 and hence are not sufficiently clear. Besides, recommendations were addressed to adapt indicators, or even skip. It has to be noticed here, that the adaption of the KPI's does not influence the monitoring process as such as they only enable to improve their understanding. 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, aims 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.

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. 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. 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 JPI CH's Heritage Portal is 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.

JPI CH promotes, via its member states, a Partnership for European Cultural Heritage to scale up the impact and value of the JPI CH. 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. It will enable to advance the research field through the SRiA in the form of boundary-crossing, inter-disciplinary and cutting-edge research collaborations .

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". Input was received via the updated 3 Online Survey Tools - Survs (<https://survs.com/>): a monitoring survey, a questionnaire and a template.

D3.2 and D3.3 aimed at providing recommendations for future evaluation activities as well as an evaluation of activities performed so far by the JPI CH. D3.3 took into account the recommendations for adaption of the indicators as suggested in D3.4 "First report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels".

In D3.2, it turned out that many indicators have given very poor or rather deceiving results, as many elements of outcomes were still impossible to assess. It was expected that the 2nd Interim Evaluation report (D3.3) would provide 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 JPI CH 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 JPI CH SRA priorities and increased the national budgets or the financing prioritization in order to participate in more international activities/programmes.

13 of 18 countries participated to the second monitoring and evaluation campaign, described in D3.3, which did not obtain the necessary data to assess a certain number of indicators, which raises the necessity to update or adapt the monitoring methodology for more efficiency. As described in D3.4, some indicators/associated questions are not clear enough for partners, rendering the monitoring tool not efficient enough. Further, the unavailability of data on time received by the WP3 monitoring team hinders a correct consideration of certain indicators.

Following points were concluded in D3.3:

- since the last monitoring exercise (D3.2 - submitted in July 2017) the agencies were less optimistic concerning *the sustainability of the JPI CH financial and administrative structures*. The solutions in order to increase partner's confidence may consist in guaranteeing the long term continuity of the direct support of the European Commission as well as increase the support and commitment of the Member States to the JPI CH through the implementation of fees from JPI CH partners, the change of the Coordinator, etc.
- With respect to *extending cooperation and partnership*, only few members of JPI CH reported collaborations with organisations not represented in the JPI governing structure, collaborations with advanced economies or BRIC countries, and have organized activities and/or participated in Joint Activities with other JPIs. Collaborations with non-ERA countries were reported by more than half of the members.
- From January 2010 to December 2018, *the number of participating countries* increased from 16 to 18. However, D3.2 reported 19 countries of which Slovakia withdrew in December 2018. Hence, efforts are needed to attract new partners.
- Compared to the first monitoring campaign, the % of the agencies that considers that *the gaps identified in the SRA* are completely covered by JPI CH activities increased from 20 to 33. Two thirds reported that the *funding instruments for the implementation of SRA* are identified (completely or partly) and are globally satisfied with the Action Programme. In this sense, the SRA should be revised and developed, including the innovation aspect, and efforts should be made to implement it more clearly.
- The launch of *calls for proposals* remains one of the main elements for the implementation of research through JPI CH joint activities. Since its start in 2010, the JPI CH launched 4 Joint Transnational Calls for proposals (2013, 2014 and two in 2017). The roadmap schedules two more calls for proposals (2019 and 2020) reflecting, despite the gap between 2014 and 2017, a quite good frequency of Calls during the lifetime of the JPI CH.
- With respect to *capacity building and enabling activities* the answers remain less promising as only 1 out of 10 organisations implemented new training instruments and 20% conducted collaborations and/or joint activities with the private sector. A positive evolution is obtained within the aspect of associated with new research infrastructures: 40% answered positively whereas D3.2 reports 20%. Anyway, efforts should be made to improve the capacity building.
- Most of the agencies (69%) consider that JPI CH successfully developed mechanisms to reduce fragmentation and unnecessary duplication through Joint Transnational Calls, the SRA, Alignment actions, Networking and Communication through Heritage Portal. With respect to the rationalization of the research agendas, 92% of the agencies (12 out of 13 respondents) already have national strategies, research agendas, programmes and priorities that take into account the JPI CH SRA while the other respondent has the intention to align these national documents with the JPI CH SRA.
- In the Heritage Plus WP4 no patent applications, license agreements and invention disclosures are reported. Nevertheless, more than 105 different kinds of outputs were produced, that are included in this indicator definition. A total of 665 publications were reported and 856 scientifically *relevant outputs* identified. Dissemination activities and knowledge transfer reached more than 2.2 Million people, however

advancements in knowledge and knowledge transfer are very difficult to quantify.

- In terms of *joint alignment at strategic level*, the results remain optimistic: about 70% of the agencies have aligned their research priorities to the JPI CH SRA and actions, while 40% established common rules and procedures in order to be able to participate in international programmes and calls. At funding level, 70% of the agencies mentioned an increase of the national budgets or the financing prioritization in order to participate in more international activities/programmes. In terms of joint alignment at operational level, the low numbers indicate the need for a broader reflection of the topic “alignment”, being transversal to and hence covering all JPI’s.
- More than half of the respondents indicated to have participated in actions to bring the JPI CH at the political level, namely by the participation in political advisory group meetings, through the contribution to national groups covering all 10 JPIs to achieve visibility and getting minister support to the JPI CH.

Critical evaluation of the efficiency of the KPIs selected

Under the Task 3.2 “Assessment of the alignment process”, led by BELSPO (Belgium) was produced the Deliverable D3.4 “First report on the implementation of the alignment of common research programmes at single Member States and Associated Country levels”, that aimed 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.

This deliverable D3.5 aims a critical evaluation of the efficiency of KPI’s selected, based on D3.1, D3.2 and D3.3 and builds on D3.4.

A. Enabling framework

Five important topics are included in the category of “enabling framework”: governing structure, extending cooperation and partnerships, JPI CH attractiveness, SRA and Action Programme and Dissemination strategy.

A sixth and hence further category within enabling framework is missing with respect to the role and activities of the Scientific and Advisory Board and Executive Board besides the commitment of Member States as such. Recent progresses of the JPI CH demonstrate partners’ intention to implement sustainable structures for the JPI CH management structure: implementation of yearly fees, upgrade of the Terms of References, set up and implementation of Task Forces to be used as a basis for JPI CH activities. These new forms of commitment should be reflected, in one way or another, by relevant indicators. The JPI Water has implemented some indicators that could serve as an inspiration to the JPI CH monitoring and evaluation framework, in order to reflect varying commitments between partners of the same initiative: “JPI partners participation to Task Forces”; “JPI partners commitment to activities (WPs, Tasks, Calls coordination...)”; “JPIs partners contribution to fees (in cash and in-kind)”...

Extending cooperation and partnership

The related indicators 2 to 4 are global, and refer to initiatives/networks/actions in the field of CH, for which the role, the added value, the influence of the JPI CH nor a commitment or outcome is clear, although stated in the related survey/questionnaire.

None of the indicators are relevant for the monitoring, unless the survey/questionnaire specifically stresses on the role, the added value and the influence from the JPI CH. These three indicators should be merged in one single indicator, aiming to monitor activities directly relevant to the JPI CH.

Dissemination strategy

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

As JHEP2 does not include a “dissemination strategy”, although it was integrated in the original JHEP2 proposal, the relevance of this indicator is poor. Further, it is unclear how the indicator 7 should be “measured” and followed up. Should we opt for “an increasing number of stakeholders” or “an increasing number of new stakeholders” or “an increasing variety of stakeholders”?

Recently, a Task Force within the pillar “Communication” has been setup within JPI CH that will address a dissemination strategy including the aspect of stakeholders while respecting the privacy policy.

B. Research implementation

Transnational calls for proposals

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

The indicator as such is irrelevant.

Suggestion to adapt: total yearly budget allocated to transnational calls launched within JPI CH.

Following indicators are missing:

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 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 committed 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 9: Roadmap of joint transnational calls for proposals

The relevance of this indicator is poor, as this should be part of an action programme.

With respect to transnational calls for proposals and research projects funded by JPI CH, the JPI CH monitoring framework should be aligned to ERALEARN monitoring indicators. The relevant data upstream should be according to a standardized methodology and pre-defined template(s) setup during the preparation of the call. The data are related to the grant projects (summary of results, names, contacts, websites, budgets, other sources of funding...), as well as to the Call (number of proposals received at each stage, details about the selection procedures, total investment planned and actual investment, research fields covered, groups targeted...).

Capacity building

It is unclear whether the output of indicator 10 “Number and diversity of training instruments implemented” and indicator 11 “Number of collaborations with digital and built infrastructures participating in Cultural Heritage” relate generally to Cultural Heritage as such, or are related to “in the framework of JPI CH” as requested in the questions. Future monitoring should focus on outputs directly relevant to the JPI CH, and mainly resulting from JPI CH activities.

Indicator 11: Number of collaborations with digital and built infrastructures compared to total number of infrastructures participating in the JPI CH.

Proposal for adaptation: Share of infrastructures active in the field of CH, compared to the total number,

participating in the JPI 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). If yes, JPI CH cannot “develop” a network of infrastructures (which act as enabling framework), but should stimulate the participation within the entire network.

It is suggested to adapt the indicator reflecting the strategy towards a structural and mutual collaboration between JPI CH, through the SRiA, and infrastructures in the form of common statements, alignment of implementation of the vision,...

C) Research added value

Publications

Indicator 13: number of publications resulting from JPI CH research activities

Poor relevance; might merge into indicator 18.

Training

Adapt: training and education

Indicator 14: number of degrees achieved and thesis presented by students collaborating in JPI CH during the life time of the project

Suggestion to adapt: yearly number of degrees achieved and finalized thesis projects for which the JPI CH is an enabling framework

Indicator definition: is different and more general compared to the original title. The answers are restricted to the aspect of “participation of students to workshops/research projects” taken up by indicator 7.

Aligned research

Indicator 15: New mechanisms for alignment with regional, federal, national and European research agendas,

Indicator 16: Number of institutions sharing JPI CH SRA and Indicator 20: Alignment of agendas

can be merged.

C1 Annex to C category for Joint Calls Assessment

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 Cultural Heritage is low, even if the monitoring and evaluation framework should make sure that the relevant data is collected by the Joint Calls secretariats.

Indicator 18: number of publications resulting from research activities

Suggestion: merge into Indicator 13

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

Proposal for adaptation:

Open access of outputs (tools and data) of research projects

However, this indicator has a poor relevance and is difficult to measure, it is suggested to skip this indicator.

Indicator 21: align research themes

The answers are not related to the subject of the indicator. It is suggested to skip indicator 21.

C. Transformational effect

Connection people with heritage

Indicator 24: to improve cultural heritage accessibility

Proposal for adaptation: to foster the social relevance of cultural heritage as connection tool for people. However, as the accessibility to CH is difficult to measure, it is suggested to skip this indicator.

Creating knowledge

Indicator 25: JPICH ability to adapt and create new Cultural Heritage educational programmes.

Since the beginning of JPI CH no additional financial investments for cultural heritage specialized educational programme were made. It is suggested to skip this indicator.

Indicator 26: Increase in the amount of Cultural Heritage information available on Heritage Portal and on JPICH website.

From the results of the monitoring, the relevance of the indicator is poor. It is suggested to skip this indicator.

Both indicators are more linked to “dissemination” than to creating knowledge. It is suggested to address them in the dissemination strategy that will be setup in the related taskforce.

Indicator 27: JPI CH potential contribution to the mitigation of climate change effects.

The relevance of this indicator is poor. It is suggested to skip this indicator or merge it into indicator 28.

Indicator 28: Share of collaborative projects addressing and investigating the issue of climate change.

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

General remarks

From the answers received from the questions of the survey/questionnaire launched, it is noticed that the interpretation of questions by member states might differ considerably. This implies for the need to revise monitoring surveys in a way that member states are able to respond concisely and comprehensively.

Compared to the first monitoring report, D3.2, the number of indicators was reduced from 34 to 29 in the second reporting period (D3.3). The last deliverable includes conclusions related to the second monitoring campaign January 2017-December 2018.

On the other hand, answers from Member States remain very global, out of which the link with the JPI CH is missing although clearly stated in the related questions, rendering them difficult to address or interpret in terms of monitoring item.

This deliverable 3.5 will be 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 .

Abbreviations

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