

URBAN-NET

Deliverable 5.7

Experience from the URBAN-net Pilot Call

Prepared by Formas (Leaders of work package 5)
Through Yvonne Rydin, Inger-Lise Saglie, Jacques Teller

March 2011

Project Title: Urban ERA-NET – Coordination of the funding of Urban Research in Europe
Instrument: ERA-NET (Coordination Action)
Contract no: 031342

Start date: 01 August 2006
Duration: 4 years

Dissemination Level		
PU	Public dissemination level	X
PP	Dissemination restricted to programme participants (including EC)	
RE	Dissemination restricted to groups specified by the consortium (including EC)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the Consortium	

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

_Toc289075282

1.	The URBAN-NET programme	5
2.	The evaluation methodology	6
3.	Review of programme implementation.....	7
4.	Assessment of the potential results of the funded research projects.....	8
5.	Recommendations regarding the future strategic direction for transnational funding of research on urban sustainability.....	10
6.	Comments on the evaluation process	11
7.	Conclusions	11

APPENDIX 1 – TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR EVALUATION THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

APPENDIX 2 - EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL – assessment of projects

APPENDIX 3 - EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL – questions to funding org.

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

EVALUATION PANEL

Yvonne Rydin (Chair)

Professor of Planning, Environment and Public Policy
Director of University College of London Environment Institute

Inger-Lise Saglie

Professor of Landscape architecture and spatial planning at Norwegian university for life sciences
Senior researcher at the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Planning

Jacques Teller

Professor of urban design and planning at the University of Liege
Director of Local Environment Management and Analysis

Final Version 28th March 2011

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

Summary of Key Points

- On the basis of the information provided and collected, the Panel consider that URBAN-NET rose to the challenge it posed itself.
- URBAN-NET made significant progress in terms of coordinating the dissemination of knowledge, practical experience and applications of research and in facilitating knowledge development in partner countries.
- URBAN-NET made some progress in terms of encouraging innovative, original and ground breaking research. It was more effective with regard to network projects as compared to full research projects.
- URBAN-NET represents considerable value added for the relatively small expenditure involved, funded projects that would not otherwise have been funded and enabled networking that would not otherwise have occurred.
- URBAN-NET has played an important role in raising the profile of urban sustainability research at European and national levels.
- The co-ordination of URBAN-NET has been excellent.

The following recommendations are made:

1. Provide as much information as possible on differential funding regimes in advance to allow for project partners to plan for any difficulties in advance.
2. Only fund full research projects of at least three years duration and require both a well developed common research framework and evidence of a well-balanced consortium with prior knowledge of each other; such projects should also seek to integrate all dimensions of urban sustainability (economic, social and environmental).
3. Be prepared to take more risks with network project applications, but expect at least an outline common framework to guide the work of all participants; consider the funding of participants' time also.
4. In all projects, plan for early face-to-face meetings to establish common understandings and approach.
5. More consideration should be given to risk management; for example, how to replace members within a consortium or add new expertise.
6. It is particularly good practice to involve MSc and PhD students and this should be encouraged.
7. Look to disseminate more from ERA-NETs such as URBAN-NET with regard to research practices and results.
8. In terms of areas to be considered for future funding, the Panel would encourage the development of capacity to apply for projects on:
 - Immigration, ageing societies and social issues of significance to the EU more broadly;
 - Shrinking cities and local economic decline;
 - Transport and associated carbon emissions;
 - Food supply and consumption chains and their sustainability impact;
 - Environmental/technological risks;
 - Adaptation to climate change;
 - Heritage of the built environment

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

1. The URBAN-NET programme

URBAN-NET is funded by the European Commission's 6th Framework Programme under the European Research Area Network (ERA-Net) initiative. Its aim is to increase cooperation between European Member and Associated States by networking and collaborating on joint research activities, with a focus on urban sustainability in Europe. It runs from August 2006 to the end of April 2011. The URBAN-NET consortium comprises 15 partners representing 13 countries plus a global partner. Of these, eight partner organisations have funded two rounds of transnational research projects.

The first or pilot call was in 2008. 24 eligible applications were received; seven for networks and 19 for full research projects. Seven were rated A; 12 were rated B; and 6 were considered non-fundable. The call resulted in eleven projects being funded. Of these, five were research networks with relatively modest funding:

- Democratic dilemmas of participatory planning
- Climate Change and Heat Stress: in buildings and structures across Europe
- RNCC: research network for climate neutral cities
- GDUS: gender diversity and urban sustainability
- CURE: cultural industries and urban resilience

The remaining six were full research projects, although four of these were also rather modestly funded:

- SUPERCITIES: sustainable land use policies for resilient cities
- DEGRA-CO: degradation of large, privatised housing estates
- REPLACIS: retail planning for sustainable cities
- SUPER: sustainable urban planning for ecosystem services and resilience
- Urban Tourism and Climate Change
- TOPEUM: optimisation of urban planning and architecture for energy use in Mediterranean cities

Deliverable 5.2 suggested a number of lessons from this pilot call: establish a Call Steering Committee at an early stage; sign a Memorandum of Understanding with funding organisations early in the process; discuss the evaluation process and criteria thoroughly; plan the funding process at an early stage; all partners to be involved in dissemination before the launch; put all national funding rules on a common website; improve the web-based submission process; and invite an open discussion on the second call.

The second call funded five further projects, two of which were follow-ups to networks and two to full projects funded under the first call. Two other applications following on from pilot call projects (one network; one full project) were refused funding under the second call.

The total sum for funding under URBAN-NET is reported to amount to some 8 million Euros. This funding is provided by the partner organisations, effectively leveraged in by the ERA-Net funding.

2. The evaluation methodology

The evaluation was commissioned from the Scientific Panel in November 2010. The Terms of Reference for the evaluation focus on the pilot call and are included in Appendix 1. The timing of the evaluation reflects the end date for URBAN-NET of April 2011.

The period to be covered by the evaluation is from March 2007 to October 2010. The eleven projects funded under the pilot call and listed above were assessed. It should be noted that not all these projects had completed by October 2010 and that publications from several of the funded projects could not be expected within this time period. Therefore, to some extent, it is project potential that was evaluated.

The Scientific Panel examined the following documentation:

- URBAN-NET research anthology
- URBAN-NET thematic research framework and supporting discussion paper
- D5.1 – Pilot call documents
- D5.2 – Experience form the pilot call
- D5.4 – Proceedings from Stakeholder Workshop 4
- Application forms from the first call for the funded projects
- Evaluation questionnaires completed by the funded researchers
- Publications from the funded projects where provided
- Application forms from the second call where relevant
- Information about the second call and the decisions about funding under that call

To assess the funded projects, the Scientific Panel used the proforma in Appendix 2. All three members of the Panel independently assessed the documentation on the eleven funded projects and discussed the results at a meeting on 11th February 2011 at University College London.

To assess the perspective of the funding organisations, the Scientific Panel interviewed representatives of the following funding organisations using the proforma in Appendix 3:

- ASDE, Bulgaria
- RPF, Cyprus
- PUCA, France
- Nicis, The Netherlands
- FCT, Portugal
- IPA, Romania
- FORMAS, Sweden
- TUBITAK, Turkey

In total eight interviews were undertaken. Due to the tight timescale, the results were discussed by the Panel by email as necessary.

The final report has been agreed by all members of the Scientific Panel.

3. Review of programme implementation

3.1 Did the call procedure lead to a satisfactory result in terms of the quality and relevance of the finally funded projects? If not, why?

By and large, the funding bodies declared themselves happy with the quality and relevance of the projects that were funded. However, FORMAS considered the competition for funds was less than might be expected and that the timetable left relatively little time to prepare submissions; this might have affected the quality of funded projects.

The Panel members independently assessed the funded projects and discussed these assessments at the London meeting. This assessment of the network strand of the URBAN-NET programme could be evaluated as producing good or very good results. The assessment of the full project strand suggested work of somewhat lower quality was being achieved, with the exception of the SUPER project which the Panel considered an excellent project. It should be noted that the funding for SUPER was considerably higher than for other projects (although it is difficult to compare funding across countries because of different accounting approaches). As indicated in S.6 below, the Panel considered they had rather limited information on which to evaluate these projects.

3.2 What have funding organisations learnt from participation in the various procedures of the call? How could they have learnt more?

The funding organisations were generally seeking to make links with other national teams and to exchange knowledge and best practice on developing and implementing urban sustainability research programmes. They hoped to learn how other national funding organisations worked, including pragmatic issues such as approaches to writing a call and the impact of different funding rules. Some, particularly in recent accession countries, were looking to build capacity among national researchers to engage in European funding opportunities, to understand the European research 'frame' and take on coordinator roles within projects. In general the funding organisations were very appreciative of the learning opportunities that URBAN-NET offered on these topics.

There was a general welcoming of the role that URBAN-NET played in raising the urban sustainability agenda within national research funding debates. It was felt that there was a need to strengthen urban research in general as a research area, both within some countries and across Europe as a whole. Several funding bodies considered that the economic and social scientific aspects of urban sustainability research were under-emphasised currently (as compared to technical and natural scientific research) and that URBAN-NET played a useful role in redressing this imbalance.

The breadth of the URBAN-NET call was considered a particularly positive feature. It provided funding for studies that would not otherwise have been funded. In some countries, this meant research on urban sustainability, in others it meant social scientific research on urban sustainability, and in most it covered comparative international studies.

The low-bureaucracy approach to submitting applications was appreciated and the coordination by FORMAS was universally praised. While most considered the level of core funding for URBAN-NET to be about right, it should be recognised that coordination was a resource-intensive activity. Funding for staff exchanges between national funding organisations was suggested by one body as a possible additional use of funds. The other request was that there could have been more emphasis on dissemination of research results. The possibility of a research digest was mentioned but some

additional funding may be needed for such activities. Wider dissemination of the lessons learnt from engaging in the pilot call to those not directly involved would also have been helpful.

3.3 What have the researchers learnt from each other with respect to theories and methods? What problems did the researchers meet in cooperation and coordination of the projects? Which were the benefits?

Members of both the network and full research projects reported considerable sharing of research, knowledge and experiences and mutual learning. They clearly appreciated the opportunities for cooperation offered by the network funding. This was supported where there was a clear conceptual framework for collaboration. For full research projects, having a clear and detailed common framework was essential to the ability to complete the research on time and deliver the benefits of collaboration. For the networks, such a framework could be developed through the network activities but some outline framework in common at the outset was an advantage. Early discussion on common definitions and approach seemed to reap dividends in all cases. This may require more face-to-face meetings in the early stages of projects. In particular, in the absence of a common framework, there seemed to be a danger of the coordinator dominating the activities and outputs.

The main problems that the networks and projects encountered concerned funding. Where different funding regimes and bureaucratic requirements led to a different start date for the involvement of the different members of a network, the effectiveness of collaboration was reduced. The Turkish funding agency also reported visa difficulties. It is clearly important to start the clock ticking on a network only once all members are able to participate. Different funding regimes also meant there was not a common playing field for participation across countries and this caused some difficulties. Finally, the funding itself was rather limited under URBAN-NET and this caused difficulties for some participating organisations; in particular funding for participants' time would have enhanced collaboration as already reported in D5.2.

4. Assessment of the potential results of the funded research projects

4.1 How do the projects compare with the European/international research on urban sustainable development with respect to quality and relevance?

The Panel struggled with the limited evidence available to them in making judgements comparing the projects to the European/International state-of-the-art.

However, they considered that the network projects compared well with other such initiatives. They are typical of EU and international research networks and largely successful in their own terms. They were not high cost measures, rather operating with a tight budget.

The projects were rated less highly by the Panel and those with higher funding achieved higher scores from the Panel. In general, the funding (although difficult to interpret because of difference in national funding rules) seemed rather low for international projects and this must have limited their activities. It would be difficult to meet the standard of the best international projects with such funding.

The Panel also considered that two years was too short for a full research project working on comparative themes and would recommend three years instead; several of the project members made this point strongly in the evaluation questionnaires. The result seemed to be a lack of synthesis or even straight-forward comparison of results in many cases at time ran out. Some

projects also struggled with inter-disciplinarity and the Panel questioned whether it was wise to combine both international comparison and inter-disciplinarity within one short project. Overall the Panel queried whether fewer larger full research projects should not have been funded.

In some cases, it was clear that the consortium was not strong enough in terms of inter-relationships and common understanding to deliver all the desired results. The Panel considered that a two-stage process of funding a network project prior to a full research project with the same consortium might be fruitful. In such cases the network would give the opportunity for project members to develop a common approach and good working relationships before embarking on actual research. In this context it will be interesting to see the impact of giving follow-up funding to the Participatory Planning and Heat Stress consortia under the second call.

If a two-stage approach was adopted in future, the Panel would recommend differential paperwork for responding to the call for networks and full projects. While the network application form could be slim-line, the full project form should demonstrate clearly that the consortium had prior knowledge of each other and an agreement to a common conceptual framework.

4.2 Have the projects followed the plans made in the applications? If not, why?

It appears that the networks, by and large, did follow through on the plans made in applications. This was less demanding than in the case of full projects as the plans mainly involved holding meetings, workshops, etc. and submitting follow-up grant applications.

The full projects often struggled more. In part this was because of the demands of trans-national research and the inherent difficulties in getting research in multiple countries to follow a single time-line. But it was also clear that severe problems arose from the different funding regimes in different countries, the associated difficulties in starting on time and the need to meet the bureaucratic requirements imposed by funding agencies in the different countries. Funders of trans-European research need to recognise this. One possible solution mentioned was the use of a common pot that all funding organisations put their contributions into for common administration.

4.3 Are the project results (likely to be) applicable and to contribute to urban sustainable development?

The limited evidence available to the Panel made this a particularly difficult aspect to evaluate.

In the case of the network projects, the Panel did not consider it reasonable to expect too much in terms of impact. The main benefits should be stronger connections between research teams; a further funding application could be expected (and was often delivered). Any further output such as publications should be considered a bonus. The Panel did consider that such network projects could deliver useful outputs in terms of literature and research reviews, establishing the current state-of-the-art in a specific area. Given this, network projects are ideal candidates for taking a few more risks with funding and being more experimental in terms of focus. This could be of significant value in terms of European research more widely.

When considering the full projects, the Panel identified very different kinds of research being undertaken and were of the view that these needed to be assessed rather differently. The following four types of project were identified:

1. Projects researching the impact of different policy frameworks: such projects need a solid theoretical foundation to be able to make a rigorous cross-national comparison. Given this, such projects can make a substantial contribution to the research literature.
2. Projects researching specific urban sustainability processes in different national contexts; such projects need to develop comparative datasets on a sound, common basis, a resource intensive task. If this is developed and analysed carefully, then again the contribution to the research literature in terms of empirical material can be considerable.
3. Projects based on modelling exercises; here there is a danger of the modelling remaining divorced from connections with practice with modellers talking only to modellers. Such projects need to build in mechanisms for making modelling outcomes relevant to practitioners.
4. Projects based around networks of researchers and practitioners in different locations; such projects need to devote specific resources to synthesising across detailed case studies in specific locations. There is considerable potential here to deliver research results and to influence policy but there needs to be explicit consideration given to the follow-up and legacy of the project to ensure impact.

The Panel consider that greater clarity about the specific aim of a project would make it easy to evaluate its impact. Application procedures should not encourage projects to promise too much in terms of outcomes and too many different kinds of outcomes.

There was some debate within the Panel as to whether all the projects were sufficiently focussed on the theme of urban sustainability. In the case of some projects, the links seemed rather tenuous and forced. The Panel took the view that for networks, it was appropriate to be flexible about the definition of urban sustainability to allow for experimentation.

For full projects though, the Panel considered that there was sometimes insufficient attention paid to the full scope of the urban sustainability agenda, leading to an over-emphasis on just economic, social or environmental dimensions. Taking the URBAN-NET programme as a whole, there was a good balance between the different dimensions of urban sustainability (although the connection between sustainability and resilience was not always clear). However, the Panel considered that it should be a priority for full projects to integrate these different dimensions within each project also. This is important if the full projects are to deliver in terms of the urban sustainability agenda.

To have an impact, it is also important for connections to be forged between research and practice. The Panel considered that this was not always a strong aspect of the projects; SUPER is an outstanding exception here. It should not be necessary to deliver practice relevance in every single project; otherwise there is a tendency to promise 'tool-kit add-ons' which are largely spurious. However, where practice relevance is promised, then this should be given fuller attention within the project; prior connections with practitioners are clearly helpful here and should be given due weight in funding applications.

5. Recommendations regarding the future strategic direction for transnational funding of research on urban sustainability

It was reported that an early attempt within URBAN-NET to map existing urban research programmes in progress across Europe proved unsuccessful. However, the early discussion among URBAN-NET participants on what should be covered under the umbrella of urban sustainability research was generally welcomed. The URBAN-NET Strategic Research Framework was considered a

useful document and has proved its value in discussions with national government departments funding research. However, looking across the projects funded under URBAN-NET, the Panel identified some possible gaps:

- Immigration; ageing societies; and social issues of significance to the EU more broadly
- Shrinking cities and local economic decline
- Transport and associated carbon emissions
- Food supply and consumption chains and their sustainability impact
- Environmental/technological risks
- Adaptation to climate change
- Heritage of the built environment

Consideration could be given to means of attracting high quality applications in these areas in the future. To achieve this, it may be necessary to issue guidance and provide training for applications from countries with less experience of and capacity for comparative research but where these problems are highly relevant.

6. Comments on the evaluation process

The Panel appreciated the support to the evaluation process provided by FORMAS in terms of timely provision of documentation and ready responses to additional queries. However, there were difficulties in providing an evaluation on the basis of evidence provided. In particular the Panel noted the following:

- The evaluation forms were often not fully completed; some questions were left unanswered even by the coordinator; not all project members contributed to the answers.
- It was not helpful just to paste elements of the project application into the evaluation form; this should have been an opportunity to reflect on the actual progress of the project.
- There was a lack of outputs from the projects to evaluate; the Panel would have welcomed more publications, reports, workshop papers, etc. to assess.
- Projects could have been asked to pinpoint the three most useful outcomes of their activities clearly.
- It was particularly difficult to evaluate the networks and to assess whether the meetings between partners had turned into actual collaboration.
- A little more clarity on the overall structure of the URBAN-NET programme would have been helpful, including timelines and summary charts relating the first and second call projects.
- The projects covered a wide range of areas, including some rather technical aspects; the Panel felt they did not have the expertise to fully assess some of these more technical areas.
- It might have been useful to see the application forms for the establishment of this particular ERA-Net, i.e. for URBAN-NET itself.

7. Conclusions

The **aims** of URBAN-NET were to:

1. coordinate the dissemination of knowledge, practical experience and applications of research;
2. to encourage innovative, original and ground breaking research; and
3. to facilitate knowledge development in partner countries.

On the basis of the information provided and collected, the Panel consider that URBAN-NET made significant progress on the first and third aims; it made some progress on the second aim. The Panel consider that URBAN-NET rose to the challenge it posed itself. URBAN-NET represents considerable value added for the relatively small expenditure involved and funded projects that would not otherwise have been funded. Furthermore the Panel are of the view that this kind of European-funded project plays an important role in facilitating the network of national funding and research organisations and that this networking would not occur otherwise.

The co-ordination of URBAN-NET has been excellent. More attention could have been (and still could be) devoted to dissemination, both of research results from funded projects and lessons learnt about research funding processes. Because feedback from projects has only been back to national funding organisations (and often only from the partners they directly funded), trans-national learning has been limited. This needed to be addressed through some form of feedback across the entire URBAN-NET network. This may require some additional funding.

The participating organisations – both researchers and funding organisations – all welcomed the opportunities for learning from each other with regard to funding approaches, project management and research practices. URBAN-NET has clearly been successful with regard to exchange of best practice and research experiences and has built capacity within individual organisations. URBAN-NET has also contributed to the higher visibility of the funding organisations at the European level through their involvement in various inter-governmental groups such as EUKN and the Urban Development Group.

URBAN-NET has played an important role in raising the profile of urban sustainability research at European and national levels. It has also promoted such research as both distinctively urban and integrative across different dimensions of sustainability. More could be done though to operationalise the integration of economic, social and environmental themes within the individual research projects.

The call procedures were more effective in generating satisfactory outcomes in terms of network projects. The networks met the standards for European best practice. Not too much should be expected of such networks beyond useful literature reviews, establishing contacts and developing further applications. In the case of URBAN-NET, these expectations were generally fully met although some partners struggled with the lack of funding of their time for participation.

The call procedures were somewhat less effective in producing relevant and quality outcomes in the case of fully funded research projects. This was largely due to the limitations of funding and the lack of time. Funding was clearly a problem in the case of many projects due to differential funding rules across countries and funding organisations. In some cases the absence of a common research framework and high ambitions with regard to inter-disciplinary (alongside trans-national) work meant that project objectives were not fully met.

Our **recommendations** regarding the future strategic direction for transnational funding of research on urban sustainability are as follows:

1. Provide as much information as possible on differential funding regimes in advance to allow for project partners to plan for any difficulties in advance.
2. Only fund full research projects of at least three years duration and require both a well developed common research framework and evidence of a well-balanced consortium with prior knowledge of each other; such projects should also seek to integrate all dimensions of urban sustainability (economic, social and environmental).
3. Be prepared to take more risks with network project applications, but expect at least an outline common framework to guide the work of all participants; consider the funding of participants' time also.
4. In all projects, plan for early face-to-face meetings to establish common understandings and approach.
5. More consideration should be given to risk management; for example, how to replace members within a consortium or add new expertise.
6. It is particularly good practice to involve MSc and PhD students and this should be encouraged.
7. Look to disseminate more from ERA-NETs such as URBAN-NET with regard to research practices and results.
8. In terms of areas to be particularly considered for future funding, the Panel would encourage the development of capacity to apply for projects on:
 - Immigration; ageing societies; and social issues of significance to the EU more broadly
 - Shrinking cities and local economic decline
 - Transport and associated carbon emissions
 - Food supply and consumption chains and their sustainability impact
 - Environmental/technological risks
 - Adaptation to climate change
 - Heritage of the built environment

TERMS OF REFERENCE

EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN NET CALL

1. Aim and scope of the evaluation

An evaluation of the first call, also called the pilot call, was announced in the Call text and in the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the funding organisations: “The URBAN-NET research programme will be evaluated by a European scientific panel including experts designated by the funding organisations. The scientific panel will review the programme implementation, assess the outcomes, and improve the URBAN-NET thematic framework of urban sustainability research.”

The URBAN-NET Steering Group, (who will approve these terms of reference), has underlined the added value of transnational cooperation as an important object of the evaluation in addition to the results of the funded projects.

The main target groups for the evaluation report are the URBAN-NET partners and especially the call partners, the funded researchers, other ERA-NETs, European urban associations and transnational programmes for urban research, such as the Joint Programming Initiative and the European Framework Programme.

The programme evaluation will cover the period from the preparations starting in March 2007 up to October 2010. Some of the projects will not have finished by October 2010. Published and refereed articles are normally not to be expected until a year or two after project end and it will therefore to some extent be the project potential that is evaluated. The reason for the early evaluation is that URBAN-NET ends by April 2011.

1.1 Questions to answer or comment on

- Review of the programme implementation
 - Did the call procedures lead to a satisfactory result in terms of the quality and relevance of the finally funded project applications? If not – why?
 - What have funding organisations learnt from participation in the various procedures of the call? How could they have learnt more?
 - What have researchers of the funded projects learnt from each other with respect to theories and methods? What problems did they meet in cooperation and coordination of the projects? Which were the benefits?
- Assessment of the (potential) results of the funded research projects
 - How do the projects compare with the European/international research on urban sustainable development with respect to quality and relevance?
 - Have the projects followed the plans made in the applications? If not – why?
 - Are the project results (likely to be) applicable and to contribute to urban sustainable development?
- Recommendations regarding the future strategic direction for transnational funding of research on urban sustainability

2. Scientific panel

- Formas will appoint the scientific panel – three experts including a chair who is responsible for reporting – and provide them with appropriate information. The results of the funded projects will be evaluated as far as this is possible.
- The scientific panel will develop the methodology for the evaluation including a mailed questionnaire/telephone interview with the partners funding the call.
- The scientific panel will draw up a timeframe for the review to meet the given target date for the evaluation report.

3. Basic information

- Documents, se Annex
 - Deliverables and printed material made by URBAN-NET
 - Applications to the call
 - Reports, articles etc. produced by funded research projects
- Information from funding partners direct to scientific panel
 - Mailed questionnaires and/or
 - Telephone calls

4. Deliverables

- The scientific panel will be required to provide:
 - An oral presentation at the SW5 (Final Stakeholder workshop) of URBAN-NET, 17th-18th of February 2011;
 - A final report in mid February. The report should include the following:
 - ✓ an executive summary;
 - ✓ background;
 - ✓ questions addressed;
 - ✓ approach and methodology;
 - ✓ key findings;
 - ✓ conclusions and recommendations;
 - ✓ appendices containing e.g. terms of reference, lists of acronyms.
- The final report, *D5.7 – Evaluation of the first URBAN-NET call*, will be placed on the URBAN-NET website.

5. Time frame

The review will take place November 2010 – February 2011 with one intermediate meeting decided by the scientific panel.

6. Management

Formas, leader of URBAN-NET WP5 and organiser of the call, will provide the following services:

- plan the evaluation, including a budget;
- appoint evaluator

- supply the evaluator with necessary documents, mail addresses to funding partners, and other basic information and services
- disseminate the findings to the above mentioned target groups.

7. Budget

The budget will be negotiated and made available by Formas. The budget will include expenses for one panel meeting and oral presentation at a conference in Malmö by the chair of the panel.

The terms of reference may be amended should the need arise

APPENDIX 2 - EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

To be used for assessing the 11 funded projects; for completion by 9/2/11

PROJECT TITLE:
EVALUATOR:
1. What have the researchers learnt from each other with respect to theories and methods? What problems did they meet in cooperation and coordination of the projects? Which were the benefits?
2. How do the projects compare with the European/international research on urban sustainable development with respect to quality and relevance?
3. Have the projects followed the plans made in the applications? If not, why?
4. Are the project results (likely to be) applicable and to contribute to urban sustainable development?

APPENDIX 3 - EVALUATION OF THE FIRST URBAN-NET CALL

To be used for interviewing the funding organisation contacts: to be completed and returned to YR by 25th February 2011

FUNDING ORGANISATION
EVALUATOR:
5. What is the main interest of your organisation in the URBAN-NET programme ?
6. Did it offer something that cannot be done with national funding?
7. Did the call procedure lead to a satisfactory result in terms of the quality and relevance of the finally funded projects? If not, why not?
8. What have funding organisations learnt from participation in the various procedures of the call?
9. How could they have learnt more?
10. How would you assess your knowledge of the funded projects; including those not funded by your own organisation?
11. What have the researchers learnt from each other with respect to theories and methods?
12. What problems did the researchers meet in cooperation and coordination of the projects?
13. What were the benefits?
14. How do you think the projects compare with the European/international research on urban sustainable development with respect to quality and relevance?
15. Have the projects followed the plans made in the applications? If not, why
16. Are the project results (likely to be) applicable and to contribute to urban sustainable development?
17. Would you want a follow up to URBAN-NET? Why?
18. How effective was the co-ordination of the programme?
19. Was the EU funding sufficient to run the programme?
20. Do you agree with the definition of urban sustainable implied by the programme?
21. What are your views on the desirable future strategic direction for transnational funding?