



Board of Funders
Brussels 15 May 2017

Interim Evaluation of FET Flagships Panel Recommendations

Aymard de Touzalin
Flagships Unit
DG Connect
European Commission

Flagships Interim Evaluation

■ **Mandate:**

- evaluation of the FET-Flagship instrument, and its implementation through the HBP and Graphene Flagships
- provide recommendations on implementation and governance model

Name	Position
Maria Carrozza (Chair)	Member of the Italian Parliament; Professor at Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna, Italy
Charlotte Brogren	Director General VINNOVA, Sweden
Ruth McKernan	Chief Executive Director of Innovate UK, United Kingdom
Matthias Kleiner	President of the Leibniz Association, Germany
Michal Kleiber	Vice-President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts, President of the European Materials Forum, Poland

- **One year of investigation (data collection and KPIs, interviews with stakeholders, comparison with other initiatives, ...)**
- **Part of the Horizon 2020 mid-term evaluation**



Five Evaluation Criteria

1. Relevance / Contribution to EU policies

The relationship between the needs and problems in the European economy and society and the objectives of the intervention

2. Effectiveness

How successful was the intervention in progressing towards the objectives ?

3. Efficiency

The relationship between the resources used by an intervention and the changes generated by the intervention

4. Coherence

How well or not different actions work together ?

5. EU "added-value" of the intervention

Why the intervention is justified at EU level ?

Flagships Interim Evaluation Findings

C1 Relevance: ... Both Flagships are demonstrating that they are contributing towards excellent science, although there are differences between the two...
...important contribution towards the Europe 2020 goals of delivering smart, sustainable and inclusive growth.
... There is a strong justification therefore to continue funding the instrument at EU level.

C2 Effectiveness: While the Flagships demonstrate their effectiveness in delivering excellent science, their future effectiveness in supporting innovation still needs to be demonstrated.
...further improvements are desirable to both the strategic and operational management of the Flagships.
...need to be more positioned within an international context...
...more can be done to reduce the burden associated with a two-year funding cycle... and enable the Flagships to better respond to opportunities..

C3 Efficiency: ... share of management costs in the Graphene Flagship has been kept at a low level, and it is by 1.5% below the share of FP7 management costs...

...it is still too early in the history of the Flagships to be assessing efficiency in detail.

C4-5 Coherence and EU added-value:...need for improved interaction across the H2020 programme...

...Linking research investments made through private and public funding across Europe with the two current Flagships is proving to be more difficult than expected.

...ensure commitment and buy-in from national authorities from the start.

...quest to find the simplest and most effective means of cooperation and coordination between the Flagships and national level activities

Flagships

Interim Evaluation Recommendations



FET FLAGSHIPS Interim Evaluation

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Markus Claus Giermes (Chair)
David Bellamy
Michael Gahleitner
Nikolaus Glensk
Markus Högl
Paul T. Padoa-Schioppa

Senior Advisors

Julian Lindberg
Georgios Loupasakis
Wolfgang Reinhardt
Georgios H. Sideris

Final Report
February 2017

- ✓ Strategic Relevance of the Flagship Instrument in Setting and Implementing the European Strategy for Research and Innovation
- ✓ Increase Clarity of Purpose and Differentiation between the Flagships and other Research Instruments
- ✓ Establish a Standard Means of Assessing the Flagships based on Key Performance Indicators that Fully Reflect Purpose
- ✓ Improve Operational Management to Enhance the Budget Flexibility and Reduce Administrative Overhead

Flagships

Interim Evaluation Recommendations



FET FLAGSHIPS Interim Evaluation

Members of the Evaluation Panel

Marie Claire Gomez (Chair)
David de Graaf
Michael Gilman
Niklaus Kuster
Mark McLaren
Neil Tople (Secretary)

Senior Advisors

Julian Lindberg
Georgios Loupas
Wanggang Huo

Final Report
February 2017

Logo of the European Commission

- ✓ Improve Strategic Management to Enhance Openness of the Flagships towards Adopting New Directions
- ✓ Improve Coherence with other Horizon 2020 Activities
- ✓ Improve the Process of Selecting Flagships
- ✓ Improve Engagement with National Initiatives

What do we take from the report

- ✓ **Short term take away:**
 - ✓ **Improve set of KPIs in running flagships**
 - ✓ **Providing flexibility & reducing overhead by adopting 2 years reporting cycle & moving to a 3 years SGA in WP2018-2020**
 - ✓ **New directions adopted by the flagships as they progress**
 - ✓ **Further stimulate awareness raising and communication across H2020 initiatives**
- ✓ **Longer term**
 - ✓ **Endorsement for jointly preparing new flagships with Member States & with the community**
 - ✓ **Reflecting on model for flagships in FP9**

Some questions for discussion



What is the model for flagship for the next Framework Programme?

- How to combine progress towards a shared goal and flexibility over time in implementing a Flagship initiative ?
- What is the role of national initiatives? What should be the partnering model?
 - Core project / partnering projects; Joint initiative: Public/Public partnership; EC only initiative...

How to select flagship for FP9?

- Jointly selected by EC & MS: e.g. embedded in FP9/SP text; Expert selection/ Competitive call; Other?



THANK YOU!