

# Summary report: ESFRI Workshop on the Future of Research Infrastructures in the European Research Area

6-8 November 2019, Los Cancajos, La Palma, Canary Islands

## Session 4. ESFRI Framework for monitoring of Research Infrastructure performance

Session Chair: Peter Wenzel-Constabel

### Session Objectives

*(As formulated in the program)*

*ESFRI Working Group has been established to propose a methodology to monitor the performance of RIs based on KPIs, taking into account the diversity of RIs and the aim that they will be adopted widely and effectively. This session will present the methodology for a final discussion and will explore the ways to foster its uptake by RIs, funding authorities and stakeholders.*

### Session Presentations

- **Introduction**, Peter Wenzel-Constabel, Chair ESFRI WG Monitoring ([download the presentation](#))

“The session is dedicated to the feedback to the structure of the monitoring approach, not to the specifics of the KPIs.”

- **The ESFRI RI monitoring framework**, Jana Kolar, Member of ESFRI WG on Monitoring ([download the presentation](#))

“The KPIs were developed after intensive involvement of stakeholders along the RACER criteria and follow the nine most common objectives of the RIs. The KPIs are not carved in stone, but shall be adjusted in dialogue with the RIs and reviewed throughout the monitoring process. Possible timeline: implementation starting 2020, KPI collection in 2021.”

- **RI perspective on performance monitoring**, Werner Kutsch, Director General, ICOS ERIC ([download the presentation](#))

“Describes the ongoing process of ICOS Impact Assessment. Some of the indicators used by ICOS directly refer to KPIs proposed by the WG. Suggests that the timing of the future ESFRI assessment processes should be coordinated with the schedule of assessments of ICOS (5-year period).”

- **RI perspective on performance monitoring**, Ute Gunsenheimer, Head of External Relations and EU Projects, European Spallation Source ERIC ([download the presentation](#))

“Emphasizes the good cooperation between the ERIC Forum and the ESFRI WG Monitoring. Offers to continue this cooperation throughout the implementation process. Suggests to hold a joint workshop (ESFRI + ERIC-Forum) with stakeholders in June 2020.”

### Round-tables discussion

Participants were asked to engage in round table discussions focussed on the following 3 questions:

- 1) What roles do you see for the ESFRI RIs, national funders and ESFRI (Strategic Working Groups, EB, Forum) in the dialogue process on the definition of specific objectives and indicators and in the further process of implementation and "monitoring the monitoring system"?**
- 2) What do you regard as the main obstacles in implementing such an approach, are there major obstacles for the acceptance of such an approach by the RIs?**
- 3) Are there any recommendations missing that would increase usefulness and acceptance of such an approach; taking into account the diversity of RIs?**

The stakeholders generally well received the monitoring approach.

### Define (more) clearly:

- What is the purpose of the ESFRI monitoring?
- Who are the drivers and actors of the KPI development?
- Confidentiality of the monitoring procedures, results and of the data, but
- Transparency is the key to accepted and successful monitoring.

### Emphasize:

- KPIs are not fit to benchmark RIs – no “misuse” for funding competition.
- Any monitoring must not be based solely on KPIs, KPIs must be set in a context.
- KPIs should stay stable over a given time, but it is essential that they are adapted in cooperation with the individual RI.
- KPIs must not lead or direct science, they should rather help the RIs in their development.

### Procedural remarks:

- ESFRI should endeavour to clearly communicate the approach to the RIs.
- The SWGs / IG must be involved in the specific adaption of the KPIs and in the further development of the monitoring approach.
- ESFRI should coordinate monitoring with other evaluation activities, and minimize additional burden to the RIs.
- ESFRI should not intervene in established procedures.
- ESFRI should participate in regular evaluations of RIs and involve the RIs scientific advisory boards.
- Costs and resources for the monitoring?
- After the first rounds, the system should be evaluated and if necessary adapted.
- ESFRI should offer / promote workshops and other formats for exchange of experience, development of appropriate tools etc.

### Next steps:

1. Revision of the WG report, taking into account the main messages above.
2. ESFRI should discuss the future steps for the implementation and the process of the monitoring.
3. ESFRI should define responsibilities.
4. During the implementation, ESFRI shall keep close contact with the stakeholders (e.g. another Workshop, in cooperation with ESFRI Forum?).
5. Some basic rules (e.g. how to store / how to handle the KPI data) need further definition.

#### For future consideration

- Consider the connection between performance monitoring and impact assessment – adjust for a smooth interface between the two (summer 2020: RI-PATHs framework to be finalized)
- Consider to make adaptations for assessing also projects on the roadmap at reasonable intervals.