

Challenges, opportunities and way forward

12-13 October 2023

5th Meeting of the Expert Group on Public **Administration and Governance**







SI

Shared goals, different approaches

JRC (Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Lithuania, Netherlands)

- Standardised online survey to beneficiary organizations, selected line ministries, universities and relevant stakeholders
- Fact-finding missions (both in person and online)
- Combining JRC and national teams of experts

OECD (Belgium and Latvia)

- Open-question surveys to beneficiary organizations, selected line ministries, universities and relevant stakeholders
- Fact-finding missions (both in person and online)
- Internal management of the research

SHARED GOALS/LESSONS:

- Trust building and encouraging EIPM "champions" to act as such
- Value of combining analytical with policy change objectives
- Unique value of a systemic, cross-country approach about evidence-informed policymaking





JRC - OECD Analytical Framework for EIDM



What common challenges in the supply of evidence?

- Availability of skills inside ministries: not always sufficient to conduct systematic/ high quality analyses due to challenges with attracting these staffs
- Low incentives for academic researchers to produce policy-oriented research: professional recognition and funding
- Organisation of analytical capacities:
 - <u>inside government</u> > often spread across departments, with variable impact; few formal science advice networks, often lacking resources;
 - <u>outside government</u>: lack of intra-organisational support and inter-organisational coordination
- Access to data: challenges with GDPR; no mapping/overview of available data; interoperability; not enough valorisation of existing data, etc.





What opportunities in strengthening supply of evidence?

- Growing interest in competence building: growing interest among knowledge producers & training opportunities
- Mix of established and innovative organisational set-ups to learn from:
 - <u>Inside government:</u> Newly formed innovative units
 - Outside government: some well-established settings at arm's length of governments
- Innovations in cross-organisational collaboration:
 - <u>Inside government</u>: Networks of analytical units inside government
 - <u>Outside government</u>: newly formed consortia and participatory processes
- Policies favouring research for policy: EU funding programmes; new cocreation approaches to research funding; Knowledge valorisation policy







Good practices / innovations shaping the supply side

Lithuanian network of Research and Innovation Advisers

- <u>Aim</u>: strengthen EIPM in the country + coordinate and implement strategic R&D policy measures
- Approach: 15 positions of advisors foreseen (1/ ministry), centrally managed by the Research Council

Belgium's BELSPO Programming Committee

- <u>Aim</u>: Ensuring policy relevance of research programme
- Approach: Committee composed of staff from ministries and BELSPO co-creates research programme

Czech Republic's BETA2 Programme

- <u>Aim</u>: Allows Ministry to define and finance their own research interests
- Approach: Earmarked funds in each ministry for research purposes.
 Technology Agency helps ministries formulate funding calls.

Latvia's State Research Programme by the Ministry of Education and Science

- <u>Aim:</u> forward plan research needs of line ministries and to directly fund policy-relevant research
- Approach: Line ministries consult with the Latvian Academy of Sciences and the Latvian Council of Science & Programme approved by the Cabinet of Ministers





What common challenges in the demand for evidence?

- Ability to work with evidence: very heterogeneous across public administrations, few systematic approaches to evidence championing
- Political interest and incentive to use evidence: short-termism inherent to decision-making
- Understanding evidence needs at the organisational level: insufficient forward planning of evidence needs (role of foresight)
- Inter-organisation spaces for discussion: siloed approaches to evidence demand and thus supply, few systematic approaches to evidence championing





What opportunities in strengthening demand for evidence?

- Skills of policymakers to use evidence: skills are historically present in some policy fields (health, environment)
- Organisational level: actors with the role to champion S4P/ EIPM
- Efforts to adopt whole-of-government approaches to fostering demand: Initiatives to build capacity to support EIPM at the centre of government
- At the system level, greater demand for evidence than ever: COVID-19 has revealed the need for quality and trusted evidence/ advisory systems, tightening fiscal space, need to tackle long term challenges (green transition, etc.)





What common challenges at the interface?

- Heterogenous use of evidence along policy cycle: ex ante impact assessment are more developed than ex post evaluations, use of evidence in RIA is heterogenous across countries
- Limited trust between policymakers and scientists: due to lack of clear rules for commissioning and use of evidence
- Difficult to export some best practices occurring for EU funds: silos in evaluation of EU funds with respect to other evaluations





What opportunities at the interface?

- Growing understanding of the importance of connecting evidence to policymaking
- Increased systematisation of RIA in several countries: Including investment in new structures, supporting guidance, and formalisation
- Investment in foresight: New services established in several participating countries





Good practices / innovations strengthening the demand side and the interface

The Netherlands' Policy Compass

- Aim: System-wide policy framework asking policymakers to explore the evidence base for policies they design
- Approach: Guidelines and toolbox for impact assessment and policy evaluation

Greece's M.E.K.Y. expert unit in the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs

- <u>Aim</u>: Provide expertise on social impact of policy measures
- Approach: Expert team undertaking analysis of redistributive consequences of policy measures, often in the context of policy evaluation and impact assessment

Estonia's Foresight Centre

- Aim: Develops evidence-based scenarios of the future and presents them to parliament and the wider public
- Approach: Administratively tied to Government Office but hosted by Parliament





The "big picture"



Some shared roadblocks across countries...

- often innovations at early stage and still isolated
- very variable capacity and practices across government
- external supply organisations lack incentives and structures for systematic science for policy



.....But there is light at the end of the tunnel!

- Increasing awareness for EIPM
- Lots of innovations to learn from across seven countries





The way forward – some questions

- Who should be your EIPM champion? To mainstream isolated innovations and good practices across whole-of-government!
- How can you create a generation of EIPM pros? To make sure your staff and staff in EIPM organisations have the incentivises and support to develop EIPM competences!
- Who could be your bridge builder? To strengthen trust between knowledge producers and users!
- Which policies need change, which can be used better?
 So that EIPM is more deeply integrated in research and policymaking processes!





Thank you!

DG Reform Athina.MANTA@ec.europa.eu

Joint Research Centre (JRC)
Lorenzo.Melchor-Fernandez@ec.europa.eu
Kristian.Krieger@ec.europa.eu
Mara.SILVA-ALMEIDA@ec.europa.eu
Agnieszka.GADZINA@ec.europa.eu
David.Mair@ec.europa.eu

OECD

Stephane.Jacobzone@oecd.org
Claire.Salama@oecd.org
Silvia.Picalarga@oecd.org





