



Monitoring and Evaluation Framework for the European Innovation Partnership on Water

Edition 2

March 2014

EIP Water

Boosting opportunities - Innovating water



Table of Contents

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Approach	2
3.	Definition of Indicators	3
4.	Monitoring of Indicators	3
4.1.	Timing and frequency	3
4.2.	Information sources	3
4.3.	Aggregation of indicators	3
5.	Appraisal	3
6.	Evaluation	4
7.	Annex 1: Performance Indicators	4
8.	Annex 2: Impact indicators	6
9.	Annex 3: Information sources	7

1. Introduction

The European Innovation Partnership on Water aims to facilitate the development of innovative solutions to deal with our water challenges, boost market opportunities for these innovations and support the implementation of European water policy. As such, it constitutes an effort of the European Commission and stakeholders that contributes to the Europe 2020 Strategy to promote growth, increase efficiency and stimulate new, innovative solutions to critical societal challenges.

It is of key importance to monitor and evaluate both the **performance** and the **impact** of the EIP Water. The monitoring and evaluation must give evidence on the attainment of objectives AND on the progress towards the EIP Water's high-level and specific targets. Furthermore, it must provide the required information to manage the EIP's activities towards these targets. Furthermore, the monitoring and evaluation of the performance and impacts are the basis of the justification of the invested resources in the initiative and for its continuation.

The performance of the EIP Water will be assessed according to the indicators listed in Annex 1 of this document; and a preliminary assessment has already been developed for 2013.

The measurement of impacts of the EIP Water is of paramount importance to evaluate the added value of the initiative and form the basis for continued efforts. However, there are significant limitations to the possibility to assess impacts of the EIP Water. The EIP water operates in a medium to long term perspective. The development of innovations, their application and return on investments cannot realistically be expected on the short term. Furthermore, with often unclear cause-effect relationships it is extraordinarily complex^{1,2} to identify adequate indicators for measuring the (isolated) EIP Water's impact. However, given the importance a proposal has been developed in this monitoring and evaluation framework.

The need for Monitoring and Evaluation has been included in the EIP Water's 2012 Strategic Implementation Plan. Headline Targets (HLT) have been developed in 2013.

2. Approach

This Monitoring and Evaluation framework is based on four steps:

- Definition of indicators
- Monitoring of indicators
- Appraisal
- Evaluation

First, adequate indicators have to be defined. The monitoring observes the process and collects relevant indicator data as part of a regular program. The appraisal analyses and combines the collected data for a better and more complex understanding of the progress. Finally, the evaluation looks at collected data (over several monitoring periods or against established values and criteria) and interprets the findings with a view to present conclusions on the performance and impacts of the EIP Water.

¹ Frank Biermann, Philipp Pattberg, Sander Chan, and Aysem Mert. 2007. Partnerships for Sustainable Development: An Appraisal Framework. Global Governance Working Paper No 31. Amsterdam et al.: The Global Governance Project.

² Rea-Fani Papaioannou; personal communication and 'An ex ante assessment of the EIP on water successfulness'; Master thesis; to be submitted in Sept 2013

3. Definition of Indicators

There are numerous criteria and theoretical categorisations for ideal indicators. However, the balance between the effort to collect indicators and the information value of these need to be found and remains subject of expert judgement. In practice, a compromise must be made, not only between ideal and feasible indicators, but also for the necessary number and level of detail thereof.

A pragmatic and objective-focused approach has been adopted for the EIP Water, and its overall structure looks at performance and impact under two different perspectives at the EIP:

1. The **EIP Water as a whole**; providing an overview on outputs and general aspects for success and failure (indicators 1.x to 3.x in Tables 2 and 3)
2. The **components and organisational units** of the EIP Water (Action Groups, Market Place, Newsletter, annual conference, secretariat) (indicators 4.x to 7.x in Tables 2 and 3)

The indicators for performance monitoring have been listed in Annex 1, and the indicators for impact indicators in Annex 2 of this document. Currently it is assumed that the selected indicators deliver useful and appropriate information. However, if comparable or better information may be collected at later stages, these indicators may be replaced.

4. Monitoring of Indicators

4.1. Timing and frequency

The indicators as listed in Annexes 1 and 2 will be collected by the EIP Water Secretariat for the corresponding reporting periods, which are yearly (January-December). Note that the indicators will be collected at different intervals or frequencies; some need to be collected only once (output parameters e.g. 1.1), on a yearly basis, or in larger intervals (e.g. biennial 2.1-2.8), and others are observed permanently (e.g. 6.x, 7.x).

4.2. Information sources

Reliable and available information sources are of crucial importance to create a data set for indicators that will allow for drawing meaningful conclusions and support further decision making. In addition to publicly available information, Annex 3 provides an overview of the information sources that have been established and that will be consulted.

4.3. Aggregation of indicators

Some of the indicators can only be collected at a detailed level but might be aggregated at higher levels (e.g. 4.7-4.9, 1.2, 1.6,). Aggregation may be needed to ensure that information is conveyed efficiently and at the most appropriate level of detail or aggregation is required to ensure privacy and confidentiality of participants and participating entities.

5. Appraisal

The appraisal will be performed by the EIP Water Secretariat, and combines the collected data for a better and more complex understanding of progress, and is reflected in a text that describes:

- The performance of the EIP Water as a whole and of its different components and organisational units
- The impact of the EIP Water, and of the Action Groups in particular.

The impact appraisal refers to the EIP's High-Level Targets and the specific targets. The appraisal step extracts and combines the desired monitoring information from all available

sources for each reporting period. The attribution of indicators to the different high level and specific targets is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Attribution of indicators to EIP (High Level) targets

(High level) target		indicators
1	Resolving water challenges with sustainable innovations	1.3, 1.4, 1.7, 3.3, 3.4
2	Creating market opportunities and removing barriers for global water solutions	1.7, 4.8, 3.1-3.3, 3.4
3	Increasing competitiveness of the European water sector through fostering partnerships	6.4, 5.4, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1-4.2, 4.5, 4.7, 4.8, 4.9
4	Supporting the green economy through blue innovation	3.4
Specific targets for priority areas		Indicators
1	Wastewater is a fully accepted and safe resource	1.4, 3.1-3.3, 4.8, 3.4, 4.10-4.12
2	Smart and innovative water and wastewater treatment is widely established	
3	The full sustainable water-energy synergy potential is realized	
4	Increased resilience reduces loss and damage from floods and droughts	
5	Eco-system services are recognised as an essential tool to solve water challenges	
6	Efficient, effective and legitimate governance for sustainable water management is in place	
7	Decision support systems and monitoring facilitate transparent and cost effective water management	
8	Effective finance mechanisms are supporting water innovations and export of technologies	

The appraisal step has not entirely been formalised in the EIP Water reporting 2013, but will be developed for subsequent reports (2014 onwards).

6. Evaluation

Evaluation looks at different monitoring periods or against targets and assesses the progress, introducing values and criteria. The evaluation will be undertaken by the Steering Group of the EIP Water, based on the Monitoring and Appraisal, and with supportive input from the EIP Water Task Force and the European Commission.

Evaluation should be undertaken for both, performance and impact of the EIP Water.

A specifically difficult task concerns the evaluation of the achievement of the EIP's specific targets (see Table 1). These targets describe the desired impact of the partnership by 2020. Their wording describes a state that should be reached by the actions of the EIP Water. As mentioned previously, the evaluation has to consider the general restrictions for impact monitoring.

7. Annex 1: Performance Indicators

Table 2: List of proposed performance indicators, structured according to the different components of the EIP Water

	Indicator	Source	Information
General EIP indicators			
1	EIP Water output indicators		
1.1	Creation of authoritative texts		Evidence on operational milestones (SIP/OP, call text, etc)

1.2	Compliance with the operational plan (milestones, timeplan, quality)	Publicly or internally available	Percentage of fulfilment of tasks and qualitative description
1.3	Number of Action groups, Expert Groups		Response of the sector to this project form
1.4	Covered topics of Action groups		Balance of priority areas/specific targets
1.5	Number of submitted AG proposals		Interest of the sector, visibility and feedback from the sector, rigour of evaluation
1.6	Number of and participation in meetings		Level of activity of SG/TF members
1.8	Number of complementary, individual, unique and irregular EIP Water activities		Coverage of unaccounted activities (trade missions, calls, programme cooperations, conference contributions, etc.)
2 General success factors / enabling conditions of transnational public-private partnerships³			
2.1	Trust/Trustworthiness	Interviews ⁴ EIP Water	Trust is/is not a bottleneck for efficient cooperation
2.2	Shared narrative		Is there a consensus on problem, goal, mission and means of the partnership? Does it develop a clear 'identity'?
2.3	Flexibility		Enabling factor for consensus in developing a common strategy, management and implementation priorities.
2.4	Involvement of powerful actors		Does the EIP Water involve a critical mass of influential actors to facilitate tangible changes
2.5	Involvement of key actors		Is there an added value for participating entities; balance between input and output of participants
2.6	Mutual benefit for participants		Enabling factor in the sense of avoiding obstructive competition
2.7	Diversity of interests		Are all parties, sectors and regions represented in a balanced way?
2.8	Balanced power, participation, inclusiveness		
Specific indicators for organisational units and components			
4. Compliance / success / failure of EIP Water Action Groups			
4.1	Number of participating entities	AG lead or relevant AG partner	Size and relevance of the project
4.4	Pros and Cons		Advantages and disadvantages
4.6	Market characterisation		Where do AGs see the main market for the project results?
4.9	Fulfilment of workplan. Uptake of innovation by launching costumers or administrations		Compliance with submitted workplan. Delivery of results/impact
5 EIP Water Annual Conference			
5.1	Number of registrations	Sec	Visibility / attraction of the forum, appropriateness of venue
5.2	Sector participation	Questionnaire ⁵	Target group analysis, participation of priority stakeholders
5.3	Rating of speakers & presentations		Feedback on the selection of lecturers
5.4	Networking value (see indicator 6.4)		Facilitation of new links between actors and sectors (rated: high medium low)
5.5	Organisation quality		Feedback for upcoming conferences
6 EIP Water Marketplace and webspace			

³ The baseline assessment of these indicators has been done in the frame of a master thesis. In order to keep the workload at a reasonable level, subsequent assessments shall be done every second year and address changes only.

⁴ In 2013: Average values of Rea-Fani Papaioannou's interviews (percentages of half-quantitative marks (+, -, +/-))

⁵ In order to allow for an integration of the conference monitoring in the monitoring report, it is proposed to set the deadline in mid January.

6.1	Number of personal profiles	Log files	Size of the community (over time)
6.2	Number of logins and analysis of last logins		Level of activity of the community
6.3	Characterisation of participants (innovation value chain)		Balance between participants (demanders/suppliers etc.)
6.4	Networking value (see indicator 5.4)	Questionnaire	Number (and quality) of facilitated contacts, impact of matchmaking facilities
6.5	Number and type of document views and downloads on Slideshare and YouTube accounts	Log files / LinkedIn Statistics	General parameter for interest and visibility
6.6	Page Impressions (PIs) over time incl. statistic of top content	Google Analytics	Page Impressions (PIs) are the most used indicator of website traffic
6.7	Statistic on geographical coverage of MP visitors	Google Analytics	Statistic on geographical coverage of MP visitors on country level.
7 EIP Water newsletter			
7.1	Total number of subscribers	Stats of newsletter program mailchimp (online) questionnaire	Visibility / Size of target group
7.2	Percentage of opening/reading articles (click-through-rate)		Level of interest / relevance
7.3	Trend of participation		Growth dimension / causes
7.4	Rating of content		'Customer satisfaction'
7.5	Reserve indicator		n.a.
8 EIP Water Secretariat			
8.1	Intensity of interaction*	Questionnaire	Intensity and quality of communication between secretariat and AG, TF,SG
8.2	Rating of services		
8.3	Ranking of desired ,new, obsolete services		Input for modifications, redesign of secretariat services (tick list)
8.4	Workload of secretariat	Monthly reports	Number of workdays spent
8.5	Secretariat output		Number of documents/reports drafted
8.6	Rating of Marketplace services	as 7.4	Quality of Secretariat's services provided to Marketplace users

*detailed assessment would be possible (but maybe to laborious) via the process track wiki

8. Annex 2: Impact indicators

Table 3: List of proposed impact indicators, structured according to the different components of the EIP Water

	Indicator	Source	Information
General EIP indicators			
1	EIP Water output indicators		
1.7	Identified, addressed and removed innovation barriers		Number, type (descr.) of barriers (and expected impact of removing). Monitored are: AG view and any other type of EIP Water activity)***
3 Impact monitoring			
3.1	Number of 'innovations' (patents/trademarks/ proprietary methods) rooted in EIP related actions	AG lead	EIP contribution / facilitation**
3.2	Number of (full scale and pilot) 'implementations' of innovations mentioned under indicator 3.1		Dissemination and practical impact of EIP Water related innovations**
3.3.	AG view regarding general high-level target		Complements a subjective view to impact monitoring
3.4.	Progress towards the 4 general and 8 specific headline targets	Questionnaire	Qualitative valuation by EIP Water partners and other EIP Water stakeholders/participants
Specific indicators for organisational units and components			

4. Compliance / success / failure of EIP Water Action Groups			
4.2	New or established project team?		Did the EIP Water trigger the formation of a completely new team or the establishment of a new project?
4.3.	New members in the project team		'Networking effect' and visibility of the EIP Water AG concept
4.5	New sources of cash/in kind contributions (internal/external)?		Did the EIP Water provide access to new/additional resources/financing?
4.7	Estimated implementation effect (e.g. employment)		Type and relevance of innovation's impact
4.8	Estimated market (size)		Economic dimension
4.10	Commitments for market/implementation		Commitments by innovation demanders to implement solutions
4.11	Number of end users		Increase/decrease of end users being involved in the Action Group and/or applying its innovation
4.12	Barriers & Bottlenecks Analysis and Policy recommendations	Sec. Meeting minutes	Uptake of analysis of barriers and bottlenecks or policy recommendations by TF and SG

** including an attribution to the EIP Water's priority areas

*** For this purpose, the form for expressions of commitment need to mention "barriers and bottlenecks" in one way or another. The industry expert group's activity needs to be harmonised with this requirement.

9. Annex 3: Information sources

The following information sources will be used:

- (Biennial) Interviews for (changes in) indicators 2.1-2.8 with
 - TF members
 - AG leads
 - Secretariat lead
- Annual (online) Questionnaires for
 - TF members and SG members (indicator 3.4)
 - Action Group leads (indicators 1.4, 1.6, 1.8, 3.1-3.4, 4.1.-4.12, 8.1-8.3)
 - Approach: all indicators only for newly established AGs; already established AGs report on changes in indicator values only
 - Timing: end of each year
 - EIP Water conference (indicators 5.1-5.5)
 - Timing: distributed AND collected at the conference venue
 - MP participants for indicator 6.4, 8.6
 - Timing: end of each year / OP update
 - Newsletter subscribers/readers for indicator 3.4, 7.4-7.5
- Weblog files (Google analytics) for
 - EIP online Market Place (indicators 6.1-6.3 & 6.5-6.7)
 - Timing: quarterly standard evaluation
 - EIP newsletter (indicators 7.1-7.3)
 - Timing: quarterly standard evaluation