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Our Mandate & Objective

Objective

“Assess the current state of the Knowledge Programme (KP) activities and propose recommendations for the way forward.” (ToR)

Components

- Describing activities under the KP and their general patterns
- Identifying strengths & weaknesses of the KP with respect to the three criteria
- Proposing recommendations for improving the KP in the future

Criteria

- Visibility
- Functionality
- Value-added
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## Our Three Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visibility</th>
<th>Awareness of the Knowledge Programme and its components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information channels used by stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accessibility of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>Practicability of the administrative processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity and transparency of grant application procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adequacy of resources and duration of the activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value-added</td>
<td>Effectiveness: Extent to which intended outcomes are achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relevance: Alignment of activities with stakeholders’ interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainability: Long-lasting effects and triggering further activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Evaluation Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1 (Oct 2015 ~ Jan 2016)</th>
<th>Phase 2 (Jan ~ Feb 2016)</th>
<th>Phase 3 (Feb 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desk Research</strong></td>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stock-taking</td>
<td>- Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Descriptive statistics</td>
<td>- Weaknesses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 4 exploratory &amp; 15 in-depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- EIB Group staff &amp; external</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- beneficiaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Semi-structured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 604 respondents (60% EIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Group, 40% non-EIB Group)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Success factors for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Knowledge Sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Case Studies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The World Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The Asian Development Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking Stock of the Knowledge Programme
Overview of the Knowledge Programme

Objectives

- Support higher education and academic research in Europe
- Recognise and stimulate excellence in economic and social research
- Manage internal knowledge-based activities (internal capacity building)
- Extend the EIB Group’s professional network
- Promote the EIB Group’s reputation within the academic sector in Europe

Activities

- EIBURS (EIB University Research Sponsorship) (launched in 2006)
- STAREBEI (STAges de REcherche BEI) (launched in 2006)
- Events
  - Cooperation with universities
  - EIB Prize in Economics
  - EIB-European Regional Science Association (ERSA) Prize
EIBURS: Trend of Numbers of Projects and Proposals

- 25 projects
- 297 proposals
- 21 main universities
- 20 partner institutions
- 199 researchers supported through EIBURS

**Number of Funded Projects and Proposals**

- **beneficiaries (left-hand)**
- **proposals (right-hand)**
- **average proposals (right-hand)**

![Graph showing the trend of numbers of funded projects and proposals from 2006 to 2014.](graph.png)
EIBURS: Main Topics and Participating Countries

### Main Topics

- Infrastructure (5 projects)
- Financial Markets (3)
- Innovation (3)
- Urban Development (3)
- Social Cohesion (3)
- Environment (3)

### Most Projects from Italy

- IT: 70
- DE: 18
- UK: 33
- NL: 20
- ES: 37
- BE: 7
- FR: 24
- IR: 1
- LU: 2
- PT: 9

**Beneficiaries (left-hand):**

**Proposals (right-hand):**

(Beneficiaries and proposals are plotted on a bar chart, with country codes representing Italy, Germany, UK, Netherlands, Spain, Belgium, France, Ireland, Luxembourg, and Portugal.)
STAREBEI: Trend of Numbers of Projects

35 projects

27 universities

11 European countries

Number of Sponsored Projects (2006-2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAREBEI: Main Topics and Participating Countries

- Infrastructure (10 projects)
- Financial Markets (6)
- ICT (4)
- Urban Development (3)
- Energy (3)
- SME & Entrepreneurship (3)
Events: Trend of Number of Events (by Category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>in-house</th>
<th>external</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- in-house: independently
- external: jointly

Total events: 46 in-house, 37 external
Events: Main Topics

Main Topics

- Macro-Economy*
- Financial Markets
- Social Cohesion
- Others
- Urban Development
- ICT
- EU Integration
- Infrastructure
- SME & Entrepreneurship
- Public Admin. & Governance
- Culture
- Environment

* Macro-economy: (e.g.) investment, market, employment, growth, tax

60% and 40%
Strengths and Weaknesses
Identified from the Survey and Interviews
Strengths and Weaknesses

Overall, participants are satisfied with the Knowledge Programme.

Visibility of grants is low.

Main challenges for EIB staff participation: Low relevance to their work, lack of time and information.

Mismatch between expectations of EIB and Non-EIB Stakeholders.
Participants of Grants Agree that Cooperation between Academia and the EIB Group is a Tremendous Asset

"Working with academia is a prominent incentive for EIB Group staff. Links with academia facilitate normal operations of the EIB Group."
EIB Group Interviewee

"The KP is able to pick up interesting topics. In this sense, academics receive an intellectual stimulus from the EIB Group Staff."
EIBURS Beneficiary
Motives to Participate in Knowledge Programme’s Activities are Diverse

Grants

n=54

- 90%: interest in topic
- 70%: networking
- 65%: professional & personal improvement

- 100%: interest in topic
- 100%: reputational benefits
- 90%: professional & personal improvement
- 85%: networking
Motives to Participate in Knowledge Programme’s Activities are Diverse

Events

- 95%: interest in topic
- 85%: personal improvement
- 70%: building professional competencies
- 100%: interest in topic
- 100%: reputational benefits
- 90%: professional & personal improvement
- 70%: networking

n=287
External EIBURS Participants are Satisfied with Programme Administration & Collaboration with the EIB

Among non-EIB Group Participants to EIBURS:

✓ 95% find duration of projects adequate
✓ 90% find EIB Group staff approachable
✓ 80% state EIBURS is administered well
✓ 75% appreciate valuable input from EIB Group staff

n=22
Stakeholders See High Academic Quality of Grants’ Research Outputs

Among those (n=146) who have heard of grant programmes:

- EIBURS: 85%
- STAREBEI: 85%
Stakeholders Appreciate Openness to Topic Proposals from the EIB Group Staff and Innovative Grant Topics

70% of EIB Group respondents:

“KP is open for topic proposals from EIB Group Staff.”

(n=100)

>90% of non-EIB Group and >80% of EIB Group respondents:

“Grant projects deal with innovative topics.”

(n=179)

*Among those who have heard of the grant programmes.
EIB Group Staff Confirm Added Value of the Knowledge Programme

- 90% see positive effect of grants on EIB’s reputation (n=145)
- 75% state grants lead to further cooperation and knowledge spillover
- 65% agree grants help capacity building
- 60% are willing to work overtime to participate in KP grants

Among EIB Group respondents who have heard of the KP.
Less Agreement From More Experienced EIB Group Staff

- 90% see positive effect of grants on EIB’s reputation (n=145)
- 75% state grants lead to further cooperation and knowledge spillover
- 65% agree grants help capacity building
- 60% are willing to work overtime to participate in KP grants

Among EIB Group respondents who have heard of the KP.
Strengths and Weaknesses

Overall, participants are satisfied with the Knowledge Programme.

Visibility of grants is low.

Main challenges for EIB staff participation: Low relevance to their work, lack of time and information.

Mismatch between expectations of EIB and Non-EIB Stakeholders.
Lack of Awareness and Dissemination

“The events organised are very interesting but the rest of EIB Institute's activities are not very well known to me.”

Survey Respondent

“They [EIB Institute] should make the output of the research they sponsor more visible to the public in general but also to the researcher.”

Survey Respondent
Knowledge Programme’s Activities are not Widely Known, Except for Events

Awareness of Activities of the Knowledge Programme
(EIB & Non-EIB Respondents, n=604)

- Events at EIB: 77%
- Events Outside: 42%
- EIB Prize: 40%
- EIBURS: 32%
- University Cooperation: 25%
- STAREBEI: 20%
- None: 13%
- EIB-ERSA Prize: 6%
Managerial Staff Respondents have Higher Awareness of Knowledge Programme Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Professional Staff</th>
<th>Managerial Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events at EIB</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Outside</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIB Prize</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIBURS</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Cooperation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAREBEI</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIB-ERSA Prize</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness of Activities of the Knowledge Programme, by Staff Category (EIB & Non-EIB Respondents, n=604)
Grant Research Outputs are Regarded as Being Not Easily Accessible

• 46% of EIB Group respondents
• 42% of non-EIB Group respondents
do **not** find research outputs from grants being easily accessible.
Strengths and Weaknesses

Overall, participants are satisfied with the Knowledge Programme.

Visibility of grants is low.

Main challenges for EIB staff participation: Low relevance to their work, lack of time and information.

Mismatch between expectations of EIB and Non-EIB Stakeholders.
Grants: “Too Little Information” and “Lack of Time” Main Reasons for Non-Participation of EIB Group Staff

**EIB Group Respondents: Reasons for not having participated in grants**
(multiple answers possible, n=219)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too little information</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of relevance to my work</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of adequate information</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of personal interest in the topics</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time clashes</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too late information</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar results for reasons for not participating in events.
About 45% of EIB Group Respondents Claim Grant Topics Lack Relevance to Their Work

45% Disagree

“I disagree that grant topics are relevant to my daily work.”

EIB Group Respondents

External Respondents

9% 19%

EIBURS STAREBEI

(n=114)
Strengths and Weaknesses

Overall, participants are satisfied with the Knowledge Programme.

Visibility of grants is low.

Main challenges for EIB staff participation: Low relevance to their work, lack of time and information.

Mismatch between expectations of EIB and Non-EIB Stakeholders.
Several External Participants Unclear About EIB’s Expectations and Their Roles in Grant Programmes

• Some external EIBURS participants complained they did not exactly know what the EIB / EIB Institute expects in grant programmes.

  “We were basically shooting in the dark when we submitted a proposal”

  EIBURS Participant

• Others pointed out they were unclear about their roles in the STAREBEI programme.

  “The researcher turned out to be rather working for the EIB than doing his own research as he was integrated too much in EIB-internal work processes”

  Academic Supervisor, STAREBEI
EIBURS Selection Criteria Are Not Clear to Many External Participants

...of Non-EIB respondents who participated in EIBURS disagreed that the grant selection criteria are transparent and clear.

(n=59)
Some EIB Group Staff Also Found that Grant Projects Did not Meet Their Expectations

“The competition looks for quite specific ideas that will help us [the Bank] from a practical point of view in terms of improving the Bank’s business. (...) But actually (...) in the end the contract becomes a contract of academic freedom. (...) That causes tensions at times, I have to say.”

EIB Group Interviewee
Mismatch of Expectations is Likely to Cause EIB Group Staff’s Disagreement with Grants’ Relevance to Their Work

Mismatch of Expectations → Lack of Relevance to EIB’s Work (45% of EIB Group respondents)
Success Factors for Knowledge Sharing
### Success Factors of Knowledge Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credibility of the source with the recipient</td>
<td>Recipient: High absorptive capability and capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ High reputation of EIB</td>
<td>✓ EIB: Low absorptive capacity due to time constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Universities as source of high quality research</td>
<td>✓ High absorptive capacities of academics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge not deeply embedded in source’s organisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Universities make knowledge highly explicit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× EIB: Knowledge highly embedded in operations (confidentiality!)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relation: Organisational, geographic and knowledge proximity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× High organisational distance (objectives, logics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>× Potentially high geographic distance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Only small knowledge gaps, but possibly differing expert language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ High academic inclination of EIB Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on Cummings & Teng, 2006
International Experiences of Knowledge Sharing
### Knowledge Products and Services (KPS)

- a. Formal KPS targeted at specific stakeholders in the region
- b. Knowledge by-products of loan delivery and other activities

### Evaluation Identified Main Weaknesses

- Lack of coordination across departments and channels and insufficient use of synergies
- Lack of consideration of the region’s needs
- No high-level strategic guidance, direction, and ownership
- Lack of incentives for staff

---

The Asian Development Bank (ADB) sets the goal to become a “knowledge-based learning institution” *(ADB, 2004)*

Source: ADB, 2001; 2004; 2012
The World Bank Aims to Become a “Knowledge Bank” that Creates, Shares and Applies Knowledge for Development

Roles as Knowledge Institution

- **Producer**: Generate and disseminate knowledge
- **Customiser**: Customise knowledge for clients’ specific challenges
- **Connector**: Cooperation with multiple stakeholders

Knowledge Products

- Knowledge from operations
- **Bank-managed knowledge**
- Knowledge partnerships

... for external clients
... as public good
... for internal use

Sources: World Bank, 2011; 2010
The World Bank Encounters a “Knowledge Paradox” – Comparable to the Knowledge Programme’s Challenges

“Knowledge Paradox”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Bank Staff</th>
<th>Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Management undervalues knowledge activities compared to lending operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dissatisfied with recognition of knowledge work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Knowledge services are WB’s most valuable contribution – more important than financial resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approach to Address the Paradox:

1. **Measurement** of knowledge results
2. **Connectivity** across knowledge products
3. **Framework** for managing knowledge
4. **Openness** of creating, obtaining, sharing, adapting and applying knowledge

Source: World Bank, 2011
Recommendations:
Our Vision for the Knowledge Programme
Summary: To What Extent Have Functionality, Visibility and Value Added been Achieved?
Overall, Participants Are Satisfied with the Knowledge Programme

- High satisfaction of participants due to high functionality and high value added
Overall, Participants Are Satisfied with the Knowledge Programme

• High satisfaction of participants due to high functionality and high value added

• But: EIB Staff in total (participants & non-participants see lower value added)

100%
EIB and Non-EIB

0%
Functionality

100%
Deficit
Achievement

EIB Staff
Non-EIB

0%
Value Added
Mismatch Between Expectations of EIB and Non-EIB Stakeholders is Limiting the Value Added on Both Sides

- EIB’s expectations are unclear to external grant participants
- Leads to lower value added for both EIB and Non-EIB
Main Challenges for EIB Staff Participation: Low Relevance to their Work, Lack of Time and Information

- **Functionality**: Considerable achievement, but deficit due to lack of information and lack of time

- **Low relevance to EIB Staff’s work**: main reason for large deficit for value added
Low Visibility – Especially of Grants

• The Knowledge Programme has a low visibility among EIB Staff.

• Visibility among Non-EIB stakeholders also not high.

• Lack of evidence for Non-EIB persons due to research design: Participants and interested persons overrepresented (*)
Overall Picture: High Functionality, Low Visibility and Large Deficit in Value Added for EIB Group Staff
Increasing Visibility and Value Added for EIB Group Staff: Largest Levers for Improving the Knowledge Programme

- **Functionality**: EIB and Non-EIB
- **Visibility**: EIB Staff, Non-EIB*
- **Value Added**: EIB Staff, Non-EIB

*Note: The diagram indicates increasing difficulty from left to right, with the highest potential for Value Added.
### Three Immediate Responses, Two Medium-Term Projects, and Two Medium-Term Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Immediate</th>
<th>R1.</th>
<th>Undertake targeted visibility actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R2.</td>
<td>Clear communication of EIB’s expectations in grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R3.</td>
<td>Increase accessibility and dissemination of information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>R4.</td>
<td>Initiate a “Data Usability Project”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R5.</td>
<td>Assign “Knowledge Programme Ambassadors” within the EIB Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Term</td>
<td>R6.</td>
<td>Allow EIB staff to spend more time on KP participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R7.</td>
<td>Develop a strategic framework for the KP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
R1. Undertake Targeted Visibility Actions

Increased visibility among promising target groups

- “Coffee Stall” to inform staff about KP
- Success stories of former KP grant participants
- Synergies with new staff training

- Multiplier effect
- Academic associations to increase impact
- Tap EIB staff’s personal networks
Before Project Starts

In the Call for Proposal
- Contact person: formulating EIB’s interest in the output
- EIB Institute: defining participants’ roles

Feedback loop
- Clarifying and publishing applicants’ FAQ

During the Project

Progress evaluation meetings
- EIB Institute, contact person and grant participants conduct annual progress evaluation meetings
- Explicitly addressing both parties’ expectations
- Monitoring contract obligations

Goals
- Aligned expectations
- Increased relevance of outputs
R3. Increase Accessibility and Dissemination of Information

- Enhancing the accessibility of existing information
- Broadening the scope of available contents
- Better linking EIB & EIB Institute websites

Improved Research Outputs Dissemination

Increased Participation

Transparent & Clear Grant Selection Criteria
R4. Initiate a “Data Usability Project”

Goals:
- Better access to EIB’s knowledge and data for academia.
- Larger value added for EIB through improved academic analyses.
R5. Assign “Knowledge Programme Ambassadors” within the EIB Group

“I felt it [Knowledge Programme] was reserved to a happy few colleagues with strong hierarchy support to propose a subject and get the opportunity to follow the research done.”

EIB Staff Survey Respondent
R5. Assign “Knowledge Programme Ambassadors” within the EIB Group

**Tasks** Included in Annual Performance Criteria

1. Disseminate information
2. Channel staff’s opinions about the KP
3. Help to identify EIB Group staff who can act as contact persons

**Goals**
- Awareness of the KP ➔ Raised
- Participation rates ➔ Increased

**Tasks**

- Appointed by Dean of EIB Institute
- Regular KPA-Meetings

**Diagram:**

- EIB
- EIBI
- Division A
- Division B
- Division C
- Division D

- Disseminate information
- Channel staff’s opinions about the KP
- Help to identify EIB Group staff who can act as contact persons
R6. Allow EIB Group Staff to Spend More Time on Participation in the Knowledge Programme

Discounting time spent on KP from working hours

Recognising KP participation in performance assessments

Management level support for subordinates’ KP participation

Increased integration and participation of EIB Group staff
R7. Develop a Strategic Framework for the Knowledge Programme and Use Synergies

“The objectives of the EIBI have always seemed quite vague to me.”

“I find it difficult to understand the goals of the Knowledge Programme.”

Two Survey Respondents
R7. Develop a Strategic Framework for the Knowledge Programme and Use Synergies

- Explicitly define objectives for the Knowledge Programme
- Identify stakeholder groups and means of targeting them
- Streamline EIB Group’s knowledge activities and use synergies better
R7. Develop a Strategic Framework for the Knowledge Programme and Use Synergies