



PRO INNO EUROPE

**INNO
LEARNING PLATFORM**

Better innovation policy governance – a toolbox for innovation policy makers

Team 6: Recommendations on how to evaluate the impact of innovation support programmes, as well as the impact of new regulation on innovation in support of the ECs effort in promoting the design and application of better regulation tools at the EU level

Driver:	Mr Markus Koskenlinna
Expert:	Mr Jesus Maria de la Maza, CARSA (ES)
EC Policy Officer:	Mr Alberto Licciardello
ILP Expert:	Mr Babis Ipektsidis, Intrasoft International
ILSG Expert:	Mr Paolo Pispola, IPI (IT)

31 October 2007



**PRO INNO
EUROPE**

Content

Short introduction to the initiative.	2
1 Definition of the proposed action	2
1.1 Legitimization/rationale:	2
1.2 Existing guidance material	4
1.3 Objectives:	6
1.4 Description of the proposed tool:	7
1.5 Expected outcome:	8
1.6 Preconditions:	9
1.7 Risks:	10
2 Stakeholders of the proposed action	10
2.1 Stakeholders:	10
2.2 Potential partners:	11
2.3 Roles of the involved partners:	12
3 Expected impact of the proposed action	12
3.1 Utility of the tool:	12
3.2 Unique features:	13
3.3 Impact:	13
4 Implementation of the proposed action	14
4.1 Implementation modalities:	14
4.2 Planning:	15
4.3 Cost effectiveness:	16

Short introduction to the initiative.

Please provide a short introduction to the tool, identifying the needs for guidance, handbooks, information material in support of better innovation policy-making and implementation. (half a page)

Assessing the impact of programmes and regulations in support of innovation is a complex activity due to the multidimensional nature of the innovation processes which need a number of different indicators, methodologies and approaches to be measured. Although there is an acceptance among EU policy makers that impact assessment (IA) is relevant in every phase of the innovation policy cycle – from the initial design to the ex-post evaluation – the level of systematic application, commitment of public officers and enforcement in delivering and communicating innovation related IAs are different among EU countries and the national authorities upgrade their evaluation systems out of a common framework and strategy.

Despite the long experience in developing different evaluation approaches in different innovation related fields (i.e. deploying the structural funds or measuring the performances of Public Research), the EU policy makers do not take full advantage of the available materials, tools and knowledge, and there is a need for a stronger transnational cooperation among the Member States public institutions in charge of the innovation policies design and implementation. The cooperation in policy learning should take the form of a sustainable knowledge community of practitioners aiming to enhance a common culture for evaluation, improve skills and access to information and experiences.

A major lesson from existing cases is that, the whole system of evaluation has to be well thought through from an early stage. Decisions taken in the early stages of the designing cycle of innovation support programmes have consequences for the remainder of the stages. Thus, the first phase of identifying requirements is crucial, with the risk being that a not thorough investigation of alternatives on the first stage could potentially lead to an ex-post support and defence of an already adopted policy option.

1 Definition of the proposed action

1.1 Legitimization/rationale:

Please provide a description and analysis of the perceived problems and opportunities where the tool should provide an answer to.

The short introduction of the initiative has broadly highlighted the nature of the challenges faced by seeking to move forward on the theme of evaluation of innovation support programmes. Now, it is time to investigate these “problems” in detail and identify the potential opportunities for a European INNO Action if the focus will be mainly on the training and coaching aspect or an INNO Net regarding the possibility of developing an Evaluation Community.

Problems		Opportunities	
Problem Name	Description	Opportunity Name	Description

<p>Innovation as a complex and multidimensional matter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Innovation must be measured at different levels: enterprise (technological / non technological), overall economic system, socio-cultural environment. ▪ Innovation normally occurs through heterogeneous, iterative and not necessarily linear processes 	<p>IA Innovation-related methodology</p>	<p>Flexible and multi-criteria approach where a set of factors are also taken into consideration (risk, time, unpredictability, lack of homogeneity, intangible results)</p>
<p>Innovation is a cross-sectoral and horizontal matter</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although IAs on innovation support programmes are more likely to be carried out by specific national authorities, ministries or DGs impacts on innovation are a matter of concern for all other national authorities, ministries or DGs. ▪ Not all national authorities may be equipped with adequate expertise to carry out such a kind of evaluation. 	<p>Training on Innovation-related methodology</p>	<p>Provide training on the IA on innovation, presenting a selection of best practices, practical models and lessons learned. Training is tailored to different operational levels (middle management, staff etc.) and specific competences (EU and national policies.)</p>
<p>Difficult quantitative and qualitative data management</p>	<p>The identification, collection, processing and interpretation of relevant data are difficult due to the nature of innovation processes.</p>	<p>Improving the measurement of socio-economic processes</p>	<p>Valorisation of the international debate on the improvement of official statistics (for instance, at OECD level)</p>
<p>Lack of alignment in EU-National IA systems</p>	<p>MCs IA procedures on innovation are not aligned with reference to conventional indicators, processing rules, degree of legal constraint (mandatory or not mandatory)</p>	<p>Standardization and/or harmonization of IAs on innovation programmes</p>	<p>Several positive effects of the alignment can be considered: it makes national data available for EU purposes; allows a direct comparability among EU and national programmes and regulatory impacts; establish a common culture for IAs on innovation supporting emulation and valorising the best practice of some national experiences.</p>

Underestimation of ex-ante IA	Present IA experiences are mainly based on ex-post evaluation. This helps to understand the impact of a given programme but as is only gathered at the end, the findings only can be used as inputs and corrections in the following programme.	Enhance the IA in the early phase of the policy cycle	IA is used to develop policy options and to select the most appropriate policy instrument to achieve the objective
Proper timing of ex-ante IA	The IA risks to be perceived as a way to ex-post support and defend an already adopted policy option, which should not be the case.	Decision to streamline ex-ante IA	Timely ex-ante IA, with all decisions open
Lack of practical tools for ex-ante IA on innovation	Most guidance materials focus on the rationale and the overall approach to Innovation programmes evaluation	Database of actual evaluation exercises	Select a set of relevant evaluation exercise on different Innovation support programmes, grouped by category (ex-ante, ex-post etc.), industry, country and regional area. The evaluator can access to these examples to find the most adequate approach and technique.
Stakeholders' involvement in national IAs procedures	According to empirical analysis, the involvement of stakeholders may be more systematic and structured. The involvement is required to collect opinions and data.	Define standards for stakeholders' involvement	Define rules for consultations and for collecting data from stakeholders.

1.2 Existing guidance material

Identify which guidance material already exist and explore how it could be consolidated, validated and simplified at EU level.

The existing guidance material, suitable for further developments and customizations, can be grouped in two main categories:

- Material on impact assessment and the evaluation from a general cross-sectoral point of view
- Material concerning the evaluation of impacts on innovation, technology, research etc.

The former could provide a framework, i.e. a model or template, to prepare tools such as guidelines, IAs reports, training materials, while suggestions for new indicators to be used and technicalities to improve the assessments should come from the latter.

A possible approach to customize the available guidance material:

1. Screening of overall relevant material
2. Filtering and grouping with reference to subject (innovation) and phasing (ex-ante)
3. Identification of the best inputs to capitalize on.

A first review highlighted some major available contributions:

Title	Author (year)	Contents and possible developments
<i>Guidance material on evaluation and impact assessment</i>		
Impact Assessment Guidelines	EC Secretariat General – Impact Assessment http://ec.europa.eu/governance/impact/index_en.htm	The guidelines could be developed into a practical handbook on innovation policy, with indications on specific methodologies, available data, and existing stakeholders at European, National and regional level.
Evaluation of the Commission's Impact Assessment System	Evaluation Partnership Limited, a study for the EC Secretariat General	Analysis of the Commission's IA system with a set of suggestions and options to improve the procedures. Each finding and conclusion should be tailored to the Innovation programmes
The evaluation of socio-economic development (EVALSED Guide)	Tavistock Institute, GHK, IRS (2003) http://www.evalsed.info/downloads.aspx	Particular focus on Structural Funds and ex-post evaluation
The evaluation of socio-economic development (EVALSED Guide - Sourcebook 1)	http://www.evalsed.info/downloads.aspx	Focus on ex-post evaluation. Suggestions to reduce risks and improve effectiveness of the evaluation process.
Study on Indicators for monitoring Transnational and Interregional Cooperation Programmes	INTERACT Programme (Austrian Federal Chancellery c/o Austrian Institute for Regional Studies and Spatial Planning, 2006)	Output, results and impact indicators
Guidance and toolkit on IA	Department for Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (http://www.berr.gov.uk/) Better Regulation Executive (http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/regulation/ria/)	The Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) is planned in three phases: initial, partial and final RIA. Scope, objectives and templates of the initial RIA could be analysed.
A comparative analysis of Regulatory Impact Assessment in ten EU countries	Formez (Italian Training Institution supervised by the Italian Government) for the EU Directors of Better Regulation (May 2004)	Overview of the Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA) in countries with a different commitment to the procedures. Distinction between a "start-up phase" and a "stabilisation phase" in the RIA implementation. Since many countries have been upgrading their administrative procedures, the situation may be consistently changed during the last four years.

<i>Guidance material on evaluation of impacts on innovation, technology, research</i>	
Supporting the monitoring and evaluation of innovation programmes	<p>Louis Lengrand & Associés (France) PREST (University of Manchester, United Kingdom) ANRT (France) REIDEVLtd (study for DG Enterprise and Industry, coordinated by Louis Lengrand & Associés, 2006)</p> <p>The study includes three documents: 1) <i>SMART INNOVATION: A Practical Guide to Evaluating Innovation Programmes</i>. Scope, rationale for the different types of evaluation (ex-ante, in itinere and ex-post), overview of methodologies and techniques, bibliographies. Several issues are investigated but it cannot be considered a “practical guide” on carrying out an evaluation. Some inputs could be further developed: complete examples of an evaluation exercise with a detailed process flow, actual indicators, processing tools, findings etc. A new guide could contain only the part related to ex ante evaluation.</p> <p>2) <i>Draft Terms of Reference for an EC Pilot Initiative</i>. Activities to promote policy learning and policy development.</p> <p>3) <i>Final Report</i>. Database of examples of innovation programme evaluations, country comparisons.</p>

Concerning the focus on “ex-ante”, “in itinere” and “ex-post” evaluation, here it can be stated that at the moment the subject of ex-ante impact assessment is attracting more and more importance, something that gives more timeliness to our exercise. As an example the OECD Istanbul declaration focuses on how indicators and statistics should be developed in order to give feedback to good governance. Additionally, there are other national activities that try to tackle impact assessment of new regulations to industry, to national economy, to society, as caused by regulative developments. In this sense it covers also innovations, as these can be the content of the new regulation.

1.3 Objectives:

What are the objectives of the proposed tool, who should benefit from it?

As already presented in section 1.1 the initiative described has both horizontal elements, meaning our proposal to create an evaluation community, but also elements of an INNO Action focussing more on the coaching and training elements. In the table below the various objectives and beneficiaries are presented.

Objective	Beneficiary
Improve the quality of innovation programmes proposals and regulatory actions	Different National Authorities (Ministries, Regions) EU innovation community
Standardized methods for impact assessment	Different National Authorities (Ministries, Regions) EU innovation community Regional development associations Economic development associations R&D community

Creation of an online platform of the evaluation-impact assessment community	Different National Authorities (Ministries, Regions) EU innovation community
Make an effective use of the relevant stakeholders' networks to collect reliable data of initiatives undergone	Regional development associations Economic development associations R&D community
Provide training on the Impact assessment on innovation, presenting a selection of best practices, practical models and lessons learned	

1.4 Description of the proposed tool:

Identify the main tool to be developed to meet this objective with a clear mandate and task description.

In this section we aim to describe our ideas about the proposed tool that has 3 modules. The first module is:

1. Build an Innovation Evaluation Community

This Evaluation Community should entail the following aspects

1. Identification of available tools, methodologies, evaluation exercises
2. Identification of actors and players in defining and launching innovation programmes
3. Build a knowledge-exchange platform for the Community by creating an online platform
4. Active dissemination of objectives and challenges of the innovation evaluation activities

Here it must be mentioned that when building the evaluation community, it must be acknowledged that already some form of cooperation among evaluators exist in initiatives undertaken by DG Research and thus this community could benefit from synergies being developed.

The second module we propose is in terms of:

2. Pilot training on evaluation of innovation programmes

1. Identification of focal points in Public Administrations at National/Regional levels
2. Design of training modules
3. Delivery of training sessions to focal points
4. Evaluation of the pilot program

Finally, the last module we propose focuses on:

3. Transnational actions to improve the practice of evaluation on innovation

1. Training programs for specific end-users' needs
 - ✓ Technology / industry focused
 - ✓ Technological / non technological innovation processes
 - ✓ SMEs oriented programmes...
2. Create transnational evaluation teams to support the evaluation process of EU funded programmes and projects

3. Launch a set of specialized workshops on specific innovation evaluation practices at a transnational level
4. Select 10 best practices on evaluation programmes through EU

1.5 Expected outcome:

What are the expected outcomes from the proposed action? What would be the main deliverables?

Expected outcome	Short description	Estimated success rate*	Explanation/main deliverable
A database of focal points in Public Administrations at National/Regional levels	A consolidated group of practitioners (public officers) involved in evaluation of innovation programmes should be visible and reachable by national and regional policy makers. This group is the first base to build the Knowledge Community.	High	An innovation focal point for each policy area, in each Member States involved, at National/Regional levels
A list of evaluation exercises	List of exercises concerning different typologies of innovation related evaluations, to be a reference for policy makers	Average	Database of relevant evaluation exercises
Database of specialists involved in innovation related evaluation process in EU	This group involves not only public officers but also researchers and consultants, with an expertise on delivering evaluation of programmes and regulatory actions for innovation. These experts could be proposed by the public institutions involved in the platform.	High	Repository – online platform
Dissemination and promotion materials	Promotion materials that increase awareness on evaluation processes	High	Training material on paper and digital format
Repository of available tools and methodologies	Increase the quality of the evaluation processes	Average	Repository

Delivery of training sessions to focal points	Facilitate the definition and launching of new innovation programmes	Average	Delivered training sessions, training material.
Specialized workshops	Valorisation of practices through EU Administrations	Average	Workshop hosted by the public institutions involved in the platform.
Awareness raising on evaluation and impact assessment	Getting and keeping it on the political agenda	Average	Communication

* Please provide category: high, average, low

1.6 Preconditions:

Describe the crucial factors for success, including proposals on how to further leverage transnational cooperation into better regional and national innovation policies

Factor for success	Short description why
Management of the community	For the development of the community it is important that an experienced network manages it, that will have both the experience and the knowledge/visibility to promote it
Stakeholder involvement (evaluators, assessors, policy makers)	Involvement of evaluators, stakeholders and policy makers enables to have access to relevant data and an added value
Commitment	Commitment from all sides to implement activities towards evaluation and Impact Assessment. These activities should ideally become part of regional innovation policy in order to be closer to the citizen, who could be the final beneficiary
Communication	Communication is an important precondition. First of all due to the fact that our aim is to build a community. Additionally, since some actions are applying to more authorities than one, there should be communication and collaboration for the evaluation and Impact Assessment so that if possible lessons learned are widely disseminated
Training -Coaching Including practical models and studies of best practices. This training should have two main directions. The first would be to identify an innovation focal point for each policy area. The second direction where training is needed is to provide tailored training to Member States' officers on methodology tools in specific policy areas.	Training is a crucial element since it is acknowledged that impact assessment is a complex issue which at the moment acquires timeliness

--	--

1.7 Risks:

Please describe possible risks such as opposition, duplication, too early, too late (timing), bureaucracy.

Risk	Description
Duplication or interference	The risk is duplicating or interfering with national activities when Member States are autonomously developing their IA procedures on innovation
Time to change national procedures	National IA procedures need time to be changed or improved or standardized
Too many administrative levels	Different administrative levels have to be involved (national and regional) and this requires time and coordination
Not sufficient exchange of information, lack of communication	If these two do not exist then there is risk of failing
Low acceptance of the tool due to different culture in evaluation	The beneficiaries might find low interest in accessing the tool, since their evaluation culture is different

2 Stakeholders of the proposed action

2.1 Stakeholders:

Who are the main actors to be involved and what are their interests?

Stakeholder Name	Type*	Importance**	Interests
Central Administrations	National public authority	National policy maker	Balancing effectiveness and costs of IA procedures
Regional/Local Administrations	Sub-national public authority	Regional/Local policy maker	Balancing effectiveness and costs of IA procedures
EU Commission	Public authority	EU player affecting national policy makers	Promote transnational cooperation to enhance the culture for evaluation
Regional development associations	Private associations	Sectoral player	Influencing design of programmes and regulatory actions
Economic development associations	Private associations		Influencing design of programmes and regulatory actions
National Schools of Public Administration	Public authority	National public body influencing public administrations	They aim to improve skills of public officers
A not exclusive list of	Firm	Evaluation experts	

private consulting companies specialized in evaluation where all the interested ones can subscribe			

* Please categorize the type of stakeholder e.g. public authority, local government, chamber of commerce, intermediary organization, investment fund, venture capitalist, labour organization, firm...

** Please give some characteristics of the stakeholder organization: e.g. local player, national player, international player, large stakeholder with much power, small stakeholder organization...

2.2 Potential partners:

Verify interest and willingness of identified stakeholders to take part to this action and propose possible partners prepared to launch such action.

The potential partners are at this moment only identified and have not been contacted, since the list has not been finalized.

Institution Name	Contact person	Contact details	Already informed yes/no	Estimation of willingness to join
EU Commission Different Dgs				
Regional/Local Administrations				
Regional development associations				
Economic development associations				
R&D community				
National Schools of Public Administration				
A not exclusive list of private consulting companies specialized in evaluation where all the interested ones can subscribe				

2.3 Roles of the involved partners:

What roles are the partners expected to fulfil?

Partner	Desired Role	Value judgement on role
Commission	Driver/supervisor	
National / Regional Authorities	main target of actions	
Regional development associations	Participants in the Community	
Economic development associations	Participants in the Community	
R&D community		
Innovation Policy makers	Facilitate and share experiences at national and regional levels	Key community for this initiative
National schools of Public Administration and other public agencies in charge of delivering training to central and local Administrations	Training	They deliver training to public managers and other public officers

3 Expected impact of the proposed action

3.1 Utility of the tool:

Describe the added value for the (different) target group(s) and describe the main difference with the existing context (systems and structures).

Target group	Added value for the group	Difference from existing context (system name + description)
National / Regional Authorities	Increase the knowledge level of existing evaluation responsables	
National / Regional Authorities	Increase the number of trained peopled in evaluation of innovation programmes	
Innovation Policy makers, All	Strengthen the knowledge exchange on evaluation	
Innovation Policy makers, All	Increase the culture for evaluation on innovation impact assessment	
Innovation Policy makers, All	increase awareness on evaluation processes	
All	Increase the quality of the evaluation processes	
All	Facilitate the definition and launching of new innovation programmes	

All	Support the sustainability of the knowledge sharing	
All	Valorisation of practices through EU Administrations	

3.2 Unique features:

Why is the tool better than alternatives?

Feature	Description	Argumentation why/how it is better than alternatives
It enhances IAs quality building on skills	It creates competences and builds skills in assessing innovation in different policy areas	Because it structures the training for each operational level
Evaluation Community	Community of evaluators	Does not exist until now
Repository of existing evaluation exercises		One of the main problems is that until now evaluations are not public and thus not accessible in order to learn from past experiences
Training	Training of several target groups	

3.3 Impact:

What will be the long term impact(s) of developing and implementing the tool? Please name different kinds of impacts and provide a short description (1 page in total)

The long term impacts of developing these proposals should be seen in different levels. The main impact foresee will be the improvement of the effectiveness and quality of the innovation programmes and the provision to the European administrations of an additional capability to design new ones , based in the results and analysis of the data gathered from the evaluation activities. The approach we designed could lead us to define a sequenced analysis which is reasonable, as it is possible to make appraisals of what is expected to happen at each phase.

Creation of a transnational evaluation community: Current evaluation activities are only local and even in the local language, which makes it very hard for others to learn from experience already undertaken in different countries, regions than his own on

Dissemination of studies and practices: In the existing databases there are a limited number of published studies.

Intensification of the practice of evaluation and impact assessment: Currently There is no intensity of the practice

Building an evaluation culture in the innovation support activities: Evaluation is most frequently seen as something external although it should be seen as an integral part of the Design of a programme

Creation of a systematic approach towards evaluation and impact assessment on innovation: There is no widely accepted systematic approach

Dissemination of the use of Indicators identified

The tool we propose will be an enlarged and well populated evaluation community, which is well trained and prepared to use the existing set of tools and moreover is well connected through information and dissemination actions to be launched. We aim to build an evaluation community which will enable the wider dissemination of ideas and activities already undertaken. We aspire that this community via the portal we propose will exchange experience and good policy practices. With the good practices the portal will provide an environment for the exchange of ideas and a tool to help policy analysts:

- Analysing whether the intervention logic is suitable and if the priorities stated are appropriate in order to engage in the socio-economic problems identified. As already stated specifically in ex-ante impact assessment an important consideration is if action is needed or not.
- Reviewing the internal coherence of the strategy and of individual priorities
- Reviewing the external coherence of the overall strategy and of individual priorities with the EU, national and regional policy frameworks. This is important in order that the general policies are successfully implemented
- Ensuring that the horizontal themes (as innovation is not monothematic) are adequately taken into consideration in the impact assessment. This of course presupposes that there will be communication between the various authorities of different policy areas

Another important element this toolbox aims to is coaching and training of how to evaluate. This together with the portal will enable evaluators to create a systematic approach.

4 Implementation of the proposed action

4.1 Implementation modalities:

Reflect on how to maximise the impact of such a tool and examine specifically the different possible value-added additional services that should be considered to make an optimal use of the tool.

To achieve the objectives required and the impact planned, we propose launching the actions described below:

Nr	Option	Short description
1	Build an Innovation Evaluation Community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of available tools, methodologies, evaluation exercises ▪ Identification of actors and players in defining and launching innovation programmes ▪ Build a knowledge-exchange platform for the Community

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Active dissemination of objectives and challenges of the innovation evaluation activities
2	Pilot training on evaluation of innovation programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identification of focal points in Public Administrations at National/Regional levels ▪ Design of training modules ▪ Delivery of training sessions to focal points ▪ Evaluation of the pilot program
3	Transnational actions to improve the practice of evaluation on innovation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Training programs for specific end-users' needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Technology / industry focused b. Technological / non technological innovation processes c. SMEs oriented programmes ▪ Create transnational evaluation teams to support the evaluation process of EU funded programmes and projects ▪ Launch a set of specialized workshops on specific innovation evaluation practices at a transnational level ▪ Select 10 best practices on evaluation programmes through EU
4		

The packages of the three modules will be the base for financing and promoting a new INNO-Action.

4.2 Planning:

What is the timeframe that is necessary for the development and implementation of the tool?

A network type initiative as suggested requires between 2-3 years. Given the probability that we are moving towards an INNO Action style project the period of two and a half years seems logical and appropriate. Furthermore this longer timeframe seems indispensable given the nature of the targeted community and of the initiative. As we aim to involve the community of evaluators, and also National schools of Public Administration and other public agencies in charge of delivering training to central and local Administrations. Moreover, the organisation of handbooks and delivering training, manuals and courses would benefit from the longer timeframe.

The new INNO-ACTION should start early, even before any other action in order to gather the requirements and specifications of the previous experiences and to match it with the planned objectives. It would be advisable, that the action covers all the steps of the new INNO programme, providing the necessary ex-ante, in-itinere and ex-post activities. Therefore, it is proposed that the action may be between two to four years in order to tune the use of the assigned resources to the speed and duration of the EU innovation programme.

The planning of this tool is a function that can be calculated only once the aspired partners confirm their participation. Since, we aim for the creation of an evaluation community an important element next to the platform that should be built to facilitate the action; are also the people that will be part of this community and will bring in their ideas and experiences. An additional element is the identification and selection of available tools, methodologies, evaluation exercises. Only the combination of tools and actors and players can lead to the knowledge-exchange platform envisaged.

A further crucial element of this toolbox is the pilot training and coaching on evaluation of innovation programmes which is also a factor of first indentifying the focal points in Public

Administrations at National/Regional levels, of the designing of training modules, delivering the training and of evaluating the pilot programme in order to identify potential elements and changes.

4.3 Cost effectiveness:

What are the expected costs as regards the development, validation, promotion, training and maintenance of the proposed tool?

Considering the time and the size of the existing innovation programmes, the range of the proposed tool could be around 1.200.000 €. The distribution of the money available between the modules and specific actions should be better organized and decided after a more in depth analysis.

- Development costs: (please provide text, ¼ page)

The development costs of such a portal, platform is a function of the profiles of the people who will do the job, for example there will be certainly web designers and web developers needed as also trainers for the designing of training elements, of the actual training and coaching, of the infrastructure that will be needed.

- Validation costs: (please provide text, ¼ page)

The validation costs should be seen as days of testing times by the fees of the people needed. As here we suggest a portal but also training elements we will have to identify the days of training, the profile of the trainer, the location etc...

- Promotion costs: (please provide text, ¼ page)

It all depends on the type of promotion and the available budget. A combination of online and printed-events promotion is a good mix. We need to make sure that the platform is adequately advertised and described in relevant conferences/events, meetings and in all relevant websites as the added value of this tool is the involvement of the experts of evaluation.

- Training costs: (please provide text, ¼ page)

The cost of training-coaching is an important element of this proposal, as one of the pillars it is based on is the training of policy officials in evaluation-impact assessment. In order to estimate the costs we need to determine the number of trainings, the number of the participants and the profile of the trainer.

In addition to these we will need also to calculate the costs of infrastructure (Projectors, machines, portables), the preparation- designing of the training needs (training needs analysis, definition of training curricula, identification of trainees-trainers, invitations, welcome and preparation of material – power-points, copies).

Finally since we aim to evaluate the pilot phase and we aim with this tool on promoting the evaluation mentality we need to implement also post-training sessions that will include minutes, satisfaction surveys, emails, CD-DVDs and website sections.

- Maintenance costs: (please provide text, ¼ page)

In addition to the maintenance costs that are based on the maintenance of the system and the time frame this will be done we should also account for the fact that the platforms aim is to include also an online helpdesk