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Defining evaluation

• **Evaluation** is systematic determination of merit, worth, and significance of something or someone using criteria against a set of standards

• **Evaluation** is the systematic acquisition and assessment of information to provide useful feedback about some object
  – data collection
  – judgement about the validity of data and of the inferences we make about it
  – useful feedback to various audiences
Motivation

• **Acceleration**
  – Technology development needed to address the three Es, more than ever!

• **Accountability**
  – Who can call for an account and who owes a duty of an explanation:
    • Political
    • Administrative
    • Professional
Ex-ante (Swedish case; IEA acceleration project)

– Transformation of the energy system and the strategic role of ERD&D, bringing down Cost of Energy for new technologies

– **Trade off** between
  
  • Risk taking vs demonstrating success in RD&D, especially having the uncertainty in RD&D in mind
  
  • Intended and unintended behavioural consequences (Ph.D’s, innovations etc.)
  
  • National focus vs. opportunities for international cooperation
  
  • RD&D (push) vs. other market support mechanisms (pull), also in terms of expenditure.

– Strategic holistic approach needed to transform energy systems

– Diverse roles, perspectives and stakeholders when building consensus on new priorities and design programmes

– Input and *inspiration from other sectors* (health, agriculture etc.)

– RD&D is long term, relevant for energy systems and global markets; it may have huge impact, but it takes time and requires patience.
In progress: keeping pace in the race (EU and US cases)

- **Development and implementation of monitoring systems and tools**
  - Step-wise roll-out (pilot, learning or cautious process?)
  - Tailor made data and tools - transparency
  - Methodological challenges when measuring impact of public strategic plans on overall policy goals, impact on policies, R&D investments, action progress/performance
  - Requirements for both qualitative and quantitative data and analysis
  - Standardising performance measurements, data collection and use of performance information (feedback)
  - The powerful tool of **scoreboards** for decision-makers whereas practitioners more interested in using performance information
  - Information sharing is about stable monitoring architecture
  - Systematic linkages in the process from mission to performance

- Technology development and tracking that **progress not restricted to one country (or company)** – good case for international cooperation!
Ex-post: Back to the future (Nordic scoreboard, US case and international case)

- The methodological *challenges in developing cross-country indicators* covering the value chain in its context
- Need for improvements on individual indicators as well as composed indicators, incl. better data on industrial activities, investments, tech transfer, policy framework conditions etc.
- Retrospective and prospective evaluations
  - R&D takes time and requires long term impact assessment
  - Defining and measuring benefits and costs (3 Es) analytically demanding
  - Adapting retrospective methodologies to prospective construct
  - Always uncertainties to take into consideration – complex technologies, dynamic markets, changing society
- Systemic evaluations and impact assessment frameworks
  - narrative, indicator, self evaluation and context sensitive approaches
The role of evaluation in priority setting and policy making: Technopolis

- Need for more effective and ambitious energy R&D policy & Need for better information

- How to come from evaluation to priority setting.
  - Evaluation is an essential component, but in combination with road mapping, needs assessments, market survey etc.
  - Levels of priority setting: strategy, programme creation, programme design
  - Have the courage to give unpopular messages (fuel cells): cut budget or redirect programmes. (freight) but it’s a policy decision by the end of the day (and competes with other priorities).
  - How to faze out technologies.
Priority setting and policy making 2

- Ensure objectives can be met (define market barriers and deal with them)
- Evaluation often within programme, and not between programmes
- Evaluation results go through layers of governance
- Effective use of conclusions: right moment, involve stakeholders (from the start), high level evaluation committee. Formal reviewing of follow-up evaluation, action plan based.
- Social research evaluation: possible, but more complex
FP 7 evaluation

- Ex ante FP8, In process FP7, Ex Post FP5 (compulsory)
- Broad evaluation: Internal, Experts, Interest groups, Committees, General Public.
- Scope: General, specific impact, Instruments (networks of excellence etc.), Processes (time to contract)
- Interim evaluation: Report drafted by external experts with open stakeholder evaluation
- Interim evaluation FP7 is input for FP8
- Data collection: Partly on line input (part of the full participatory policy.)
FP 7 evaluation

• Evaluate projects:
  – list of *all* topics: look “across the border”
  – Interim evaluation of projects (somewhat) weak.

• Impact of evaluation results depends on:
  – Real demand for improvement
  – Openness to accept negative statements
  – Involvement stakeholders: scope, questionnaire
  – Resisting attempt to “smoothen” the outcome.

• Budget: not available, research is funded
Round Table

• Italy:
  – ex ante. Based on ministerial nucleus. Long-term industrial evaluation show little innovation. Since 1998 no energy strategy, as such a lack of evaluation base.
  – Transition to gas non governmental.
  – On research level good examples are available.
  – Geothermal energy is overlooked.
  – Little coordination between pull and push.
Round Table

• UK:
  – Produce evaluations that are used!
  – Evidence based policy is gaining importance.

• Austria
  – It has a cultural element: is evaluation to punish or to learn.
  – Change due to EU regulations
  – Project manager now have to look at the original plan.
  – Beware of the the translation from evaluation to message... and ask for written reaction
Round Table

• Denmark
  – Add sociology to hard core technology.
  – Good exchange off exchange between evaluators.

• Netherlands:
  – Programmes start to soon after evaluation: no time to adjust.
  – Evaluations in governmental programmes in-process are “part of the process”
  – Focus of evaluation sometimes Policy driven: more emphasis on industry
Round Table

• New Zealand
  – On the moment no official national evaluation
  – Evaluation in research centres: policy influenced.
  – No ex-post at all. Strongly influenced by lack of capacity

• Norway
  – 8 Large scale programmes with good evaluations. Partly done by the research council.
  – Also overall evaluation over all programmes.
  – Evaluation used as important input.
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Round Table

• Germany
  – Ministry based
  – Environment: large study +1000 pages.
  – Economy 2 low cost studies. Good evaluation on fuel cells, studying part of the programme.
  – E-mobility is an upcoming priority.

• Belgium
  – Federal country, R&D regional responsibility, with the exception of nuclear.
  – PV is the most important topic.
  – Not a good allocation of time/money to evaluation
  – Don’t loose opportunities
Round Tabel

• US
  – Death by evaluation
  – 2000: 34 advisory boards (independed, external)
  – Congressional hearings (budget cuts)

• Internal evaluations
  – Unpopular: we only want to hear success stories
  – Gaps analyses tend to be not to critical / sustainable
  – Beware of stovepipes and sponsors
General remarks

• Matrix
So let’s give good advice!