



## **FP7-SCIENCE-IN-SOCIETY-2013-1**

***Grant Agreement Number 612345***

**Supporting Action**

**MAPPING**

**WP8 Evaluation**

**WP leader: CNR IRPPS**

### **D8.1 Evaluation and Monitoring Plan**

Version 0.1	Originated by:	Lucio Pisacane	on 10/08/2014
Version 0.2	Revised by:	Lucio Pisacane	on 16/08/2014
Version 0.3	Revised by:	Sveva Avveduto	on 25/08/2014
Version 0.4	Revised by:	Daniela Luzi	on 26/08/2014
Version 0.5	Revised by:	Sveva Avveduto, Daniela Luzi	on 27/08/2014
Version 0.6	Revised by:	Aukje Snijders	on 01/09/2014
Version 0.7	Reviewed by:	Joe Cannataci	on 01/02/2016



---

## Table of Contents

<b>Table of Contents .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>1. Acronyms .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Evaluation and Monitoring plan rationale .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1. MAPPING Objectives .....	4
2.2. Objectives of the evaluation .....	5
<b>3. Coherence of the project purpose and objectives.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Questionnaires; timing and targets .....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1. Steering Committee Meeting/General Assembly Evaluation Questionnaire - (IQ1 ) .....	10
4.2. Annual Intermediate/Final Evaluation Questionnaire – IQ2.....	12
<b>5. Evaluation and Monitoring Plan; timing and deliverables .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6. Bibliography .....</b>	<b>16</b>

## 1. Acronyms

DCS	Dissemination and Community Strategy	Dissemination and Communication Document for the project
FQ	Final questionnaire	Set of questions to be answered by the project leader and partners responsible for WPs
HR	Human Resources	Personnel participating in the project
IQ1	Meeting and Steering Committee Questionnaires	Set of questions to be submitted to MAPPING meeting participants
IQ2	Annual Interim Evaluation Questionnaires	Set of questions at annual intervals of the MAPPING project cycle
IQ3	Final Evaluation Report	Set of questions at the end of MAPPING project cycle
PCM	Project Cycle Management	Analytical Evaluation Model for project management
TA	Technical Annex	Technical Annex of the project

## 2. Evaluation and Monitoring plan rationale

### 2.1. MAPPING Objectives

The goal of MAPPING (Managing Alternatives for Privacy, Property and Internet Governance), is to create an all-round and “joined-up” understanding of the many and varied economic, social, legal and ethical aspects of the recent developments on the Internet, and their consequences for the individual and society at large. MAPPING specifically investigates and debates the existing innovation policies, business models and legal framework related to the implementation of the Digital Agenda for Europe and the changes needed to set up an improved governance structure for the EU innovation ecosystem. The key to MAPPING’s success would be its planned mobilisation of a wide spectrum of ICT-related stakeholders and social actors from both EU Member States and associated countries, including academics, law and policy makers, ISPs (Internet Service Provider), international and EU Internet governance bodies, NGOs and civil society organisations. The project intends to provide these actors with a forum for informed discussion of issues related to the digital transition, such as problems of personal data and IPR (Intellectual Property Rights) protection online, business models and e-government applications based on the use of personal data, economic exploitation of IPRs and open innovation. MAPPING will then move to create an Action Plan and put forward workable policy guidelines based on a multidisciplinary perspective on the latest and foreseeable developments in ICTs taking into account conflicting interests, perceptions and practices of different societal actors that shape the EU’s technological future. MAPPING will thus significantly contribute to creating an enabling framework for completing the digital transition and improving the innovation climate in the EU.

MAPPING objectives:

- Provide fora for the stakeholders where research meets practice for better coordination and utilisation of knowledge;
- Foster and contribute to the debate in the 3 focus areas: Internet governance, privacy and intellectual property rights;
- Map Internet governance: describing status quo and offering a platform for discussions, including desirable developments from a EU perspective;
- Chart right to privacy considerations in the development of business models using personal data;

- Refresh intellectual property rights debate: balancing exclusive rights with the interests of growth and innovation;
- Ensure public engagement: bringing science closer to society;
- Determine a Road Map for further engagement and learning;

## 2.2. Objectives of the evaluation

The Evaluation team aims at fostering the maintenance of high levels of quality in the implementation of MAPPING activities throughout the duration of the project. The team will carry out the devising and implementation of a permanent multi-level evaluation and monitoring system using a participatory approach. Since MAPPING is a coordination and support action project, the evaluation activity will involve not only project partners, but also external stakeholders and actors participating in public events. Moreover the Evaluation strategy encompasses the involvement of external participants to the evaluation activities along with project partners.

The Evaluation and Monitoring activities will be developed on the basis of three types of function:

- The first is a function of in-depth independent evaluation of the methodology and implementation of MAPPING, throughout the duration of the project, which will be carried out by an evaluation committee composed of at least three external experts (which corresponds with the External Advisory and Evaluation Group). The names of these experts, after consultation, will be proposed at the first Steering Committee and they will be contacted immediately after the start of the activities.
- The second function is that of an "internal observatory" that will promote and facilitate a reflexive analysis of the implementation process, to ensure an adequate exchange between the different WPs and support all partners in a shared vision of the project activities, its problems and its results. In order to avoid conflict of interest, the partner responsible for WP8 will not be participating in any other Work Package in the MAPPING project. Likewise, none of the other Partners will take part in the tasks of WP8.
- A third function, exercised by the WP8 leader, will be the coordination of all evaluation activities, and a quantitative and qualitative monitoring of the project activities, which will

produce useful information for the evaluation, to be shared with the External Advisory and Evaluation Group mentioned above, as well as with all the partners.

Through the exercise of these three functions, information and points of view will be collected that will be used to continuously fine tune the approaches and the on-going activities, and to provide elements to ensure the project's sustainability. The WP leader of WP8 will inform the Project Coordinator and the Steering Committee of the evaluation results on a regular basis.

Following the above-mentioned functions, the MAPPING Evaluation Team will address the following issues to set up the evaluation activities and get the relative results:

- Effectiveness, intended as the capacity to implement the activities according to the objectives outlined in the MAPPING Technical Annex and Project Plan (D.1.1).
- Efficiency, intended as the capacity to make the best use of available resources, complying with the timeframes and procedures contemplated for expenses, in the context of a good managerial capacity.
- Impact, involving two main dimensions:
  - - subjective impact, concerning the satisfaction of the multitude of involved actors at any level, as well as the capacity to promote consensus among the other beneficiaries;
  - - objective impact, referring to the effects obtained in terms of real change within the different contexts, which may be expressed in numerical terms, but may also be of a cultural, organisational or political character, resulting in qualitative terms;
- Relevance, concerning the adequacy of the initiatives foreseen to the situation of the contexts in which they are conducted, as well as to the wider social, cultural and economic contexts of reference for "ICT and society" in the different countries involved.
- Sustainability, which refers to the capacity of the actions implemented through MAPPING to continue producing effects even beyond the end of the programme.

In order to achieve these targets the evaluation team will monitor and contribute to enhance:

- The communication exchanges between partners and interactions at the meetings;
- Project partners involvement in all project stages;
- Dissemination process of project results;

Moreover the evaluation activities aim at helping and easing the Project coordination by providing analyses and information to the Project Coordinator and Steering Committee on a regular basis.

These monitoring activities will be carried out developing:

- A questionnaire to be answered by project partners after all common exchange interactions (Steering Committee Meetings)
- A questionnaire to be answered by participants to Extraordinary and General Assemblies and other public events (such as Round Tables and information meetings).
- A set of questions to be answered annually by the WPs leaders (Intermediate annual questionnaire), and a Final questionnaire at the end of the Project
- Participation to all meetings as well as to teleconferences, managed by MAPPING coordinator and WP leaders, involving all the partners for the analysis and group monitoring of the activities, organised both in connection with and independently from virtual Steering Committee Meetings.

The construction of questionnaires will be further improved during the project life cycle in relation to the intermediate results, its changes and developments. The evaluation team will describe its results in Evaluation Reports issued every year (respectively in month 12, 24 and 36) and in a summative Evaluation Report at the end of the project (in month 48).

### 3. Coherence of the project purpose and objectives

The evaluation of coherence of the project purpose and objectives is a complex activity, which will be carried out within the collaboration between the evaluation team, the project leader and WP leaders in order to contribute to the success of the project in terms of the partners' collaboration and goal achievement. The partner responsible for the evaluation of the MAPPING project (WP8) will not take part in any scientific research carried out as part of the other work packages to ensure scientific autonomy and independent oversight.

The MAPPING "Description of Work" at page 31 describes the objectives in terms of:

- Relevance to Theme: Mobilisation and Mutual Learning (MML) Action Plans: mainstreaming Science in Society actions in research
- Methodology for measurement
- Main milestones

This will be "benchmarked" during the evaluation activities taking into account particularly the coherence of project results with the foreseen objectives. Data collection procedures will be devised to establish if:

- the project achieved its purpose and objectives,
- the project outcomes assisted policymakers and other stakeholders,
- the contribution of the individual partners to the project.

The data will be analysed and relayed to the Project Coordinator at appropriate intervals as an additional audit function. It will also be integrated in a final summative report for the full project. The Evaluation reports could be used as a support document for the Project Coordinator to use in the presentation of intermediate and final results to the European Commission.

The identified main milestones are:

1. MAPPING Steering Committees
2. MAPPING Extraordinary General Assembly (MS4)
3. MAPPING General Assemblies (MS8, MS9)

4. Evaluation Reports at months 12-24-36-48 (MS16)
5. Final Conference (MS10)

For each of the foreseen milestones, the evaluation team has identified a set of activities depending on the type of milestone as well as on the source of information. In particular, concerning point 1, 2, 3 and 5 the evaluation team carries out the following activities:

- Observation of interactions
- Preparation and submission of a set of questions to be submitted to participants of the meetings aiming to a self-evaluation of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the single event.

Concerning point 5, the evaluation team carries out following activities:

- Preparation and submission of a set of questions to Project Work Package leaders aiming to a self-evaluation of strength points and weakness, collaboration with other partners, coherence with the foreseen objective throughout the project life cycle.

## 4. Questionnaires; timing and targets

Hereafter, a set of questions for the different kind of milestones as listed above is presented. The questions proposed will be reviewed and updated during the evaluation activity, depending on the progress of the project as well as on main milestones. Questionnaires will be available on the online platform Limesurvey for all WP's leaders, project partners and for external stakeholders when required.

Different questionnaires will be sent out;

- **IQ1** for the evaluation of project meetings and public events (such as Mapping Steering Committees and General Assemblies) and
- **IQ2** for the annual Intermediate and Final self evaluation.

### 4.1. Steering Committee Meeting/General Assembly Evaluation Questionnaire - IQ1

Steering Committee Meetings as well General Assemblies are important occasions to self-evaluate the state of the project and to monitor the progresses.

The first questionnaire (IQ1) will be submitted both to the MAPPING partners participating in Steering Committee Meetings and also to the stakeholders participating in the Extraordinary General Meeting and General Assemblies, starting from the first Extraordinary General Assembly held in month 3 (May 2014). This will include the following set of questions<sup>1</sup>:

- *How and to what extent did the supporting documentation for the meeting help your proactive participation?*
- *The fact that there were stakeholders and experts from different backgrounds present added value to the discussion in the Steering Committee/Assembly. Please state the level of agreement with this statement.*
- *How did the time foreseen for discussion allow for participation in the debate?*
- *The Steering Committee Meeting / General Assembly offered the opportunity of meeting colleagues and experts that might lead to future collaboration. Please state the level of agreement with this statement.*
- *Which were the strong points of the meeting?*

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondents are asked to provide, depending from the single question, both a descriptive and a quantitative evaluation (Likert like scale)

- *Which were the weak points of the meeting?*
- *To what extent were the topics discussed during the meeting relevant to your research interests?*
- *Please give suggestions to improve future meetings.*

Different set of questions could be added in addition to the above mentioned ones, if we intend to address different audiences, i.e. stakeholders, policy makers etc. depending on the topic of the General Assembly, or on the role of various participating stakeholders and policy makers.

## 4.2. Annual Intermediate/Final Evaluation Questionnaire – IQ2

On an annual basis and before the project conclusion the Evaluation team will launch the annual intermediate/final evaluation questionnaire (IQ2). The questionnaire will be submitted only to project Work Packages Leaders and will be divided into four sections:

### 1. RELEVANCE

**1.1** To what extent are the specific objectives of the project still valid?

**1.2** Are the activities and outputs of the project (still) consistent with the overall goal and the attainment of its objectives?

**1.3** Are the activities and outputs of the project (still) consistent with the intended impacts and effects?

### 2. EFFICIENCY

#### 2.1 Financial management

- In carrying out the activities did you meet any difficulty to follow the instructions concerning payments, money expenditures and costs reporting? If this is the case, please describe them and eventually adopted solutions.
- Globally, how satisfactory do you evaluate financial management was in the 1<sup>st</sup> period?

#### 2.2 Communication between participating organizations

- Did you observe noticeable conflicts between partners caused by poor communication?
- Do you evaluate as adequate the number of partners' meetings?
- Do you evaluate as adequate the number of e-mail/phone interactions with other partners?
- There is a general feeling of cooperation among partners?
- Can you easily communicate with lead partner every time you need?

#### 2.3 Quality of management of deliverables / outputs

- Do you judge that an acknowledged repository for final versions of deliverables satisfactorily serves the project?
- Do you judge that the quality assurance of project outputs is satisfactory?

## **2.4 Areas where lack of efficiency challenged project results**

- Would you point out any areas or project activity that lack efficiency? If yes, how serious / critical do you evaluate this problem is?

## **3. EFFECTIVENESS**

### **3.1 Planned activities / implemented activities**

Referring to the activities you have been carrying out in 1<sup>st</sup> period/2<sup>nd</sup> period of the project, you are kindly requested to specify if some of those formerly scheduled have not been implemented. If that is the case, please explain the reasons.

### **3.2 MAPPING of the deadlines set in the work plan**

Referring to the activities you have been carrying out during the last 12 months, you are kindly requested to specify if the deadlines set in the work plan have been always respected. If not, please explain the reason why.

### **3.3 Presence of hindering / facilitating factors**

- 3.3.1 During the implementation of your activities, did you meet any obstacles? If this is the case, please explain which obstacles were met for each activity, whether they had consequences on the fulfilment of the objectives and which was the way out.

3.3.2 Did you find any facilitating factors in performing your tasks? If yes, please describe them. If possible, refer each facilitating factor to a corresponding activity, specifying if such factors were crucial in order to meet the activity goals.

## **4. PARTNERSHIP**

Please express your agreement to the following sentences. (*from 1 min. to 5 max.*)

	1	2	3	4	5	don't know
The work plan pertaining your activities						
How the work of your team progressed						
The assistance you received from the coordinator and the WP/Task leaders						
The assistance you received from the coordinator on administrative issues						
The assistance you received from the coordinator on logistics and organisation (Steering Committees or other coordination interactions in person and at distance)						
Quality of the communication tools produced: newsletters and web site						
Effectiveness of cooperation among partners in project development						
Scientific quality of the project outputs (deliverables and others)						
The collaboration of other partners in project development						
Overall satisfaction compared with your initial expectations						

#### 4.1 LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

- Please express your appreciation towards the MAPPING project, by indicating in particular your degree of satisfaction concerning the following aspects;
- Would you like to continue your collaboration with the same partners in future project?

## 5. Evaluation and Monitoring Plan; timing and deliverables

The table below describes the timing of the evaluation process and the different project stages where evaluation is carried out. The table reports also the different deliverables and their timing.

Deliverable Number <sup>61</sup>	Deliverable Title	Lead beneficiary number	Estimated indicative person-months	Nature <sup>62</sup>	Dissemination level <sup>63</sup>	Delivery date <sup>64</sup>
D8.1	Evaluation and monitoring plan	7	3.00	R	PU	6
D8.2	Evaluation report No.1	7	3.00	R	RE	12
D8.3	Evaluation report No.2 (Mid-term evaluation report)	7	3.00	R	RE	24
D8.4	Evaluation report No.3	7	3.00	R	RE	36
D8.5	Final Evaluation Report	7	3.00	R	RE	48
			Total	15.00		

### Description of deliverables

D8.1) Evaluation and monitoring plan: [month 6]  
 D8.2) Evaluation report No.1: [month 12]  
 D8.3) Evaluation report No.2 (Mid-term evaluation report): [month 24]  
 D8.4) Evaluation report No.3: [month 36]  
 D8.5) Final Evaluation Report: [month 48]

## 6. Bibliography

- MAPPING Technical Annex
- MAPPING Dissemination and Communication strategy
- European Commission Guidelines: Aid Delivery Methods. Vol. 1 Project Cycle Guidelines, EU, March 2004