

# RIPEET Evaluation Questionnaire

## Territorial Experiments evaluation

### First evaluation questionnaire

### Territorial Experimentation (H&I; Is; Ex)

Date of completion: /\_\_/\_/ \_\_/\_/ \_\_/\_/ \_\_/\_/

Filled by (please specify also the RIPEET partner):

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

Names of other territorial core team members:

.....  
.....

The evaluative questionnaire (one per each RIPEET territory) should be filled by the RIPEET territorial partner at two intermediate stages and after the end of the experimentations (respectively, in Months 12, 24, and 34). It is advisable to answer all the questions relevant to the period in question. For any question not relevant to the period in question, answer "n.a." (not applicable). The present text is conceived for the first administration (M12.) In principle questionnaires administrated later (in M24 and in M34) will follow the same structure and most of the questions will be the same. However, some questions (or their items) will change according to the evolution of the project. Moreover, some questions could be change considering the results of the previous administration(s).

#### 1. Planned activities/implemented activities

Were the listed activities completed during the first 12 months of RIPEET implementation?

*This question refers to the experimentation activities foreseen during the first 12 months of RIPEET implementation, as they were planned at the regional level. In case of accomplishment of the planned activity, specify if the deadline has been met following the scheduled timeline in your plan. If the activity indicated is not applicable for you, tick the corresponding column "NA - Not applicable"*

*Please tick the answer "Yes", "Partially", or "No" with reference to the scheduled deadline*

	Yes	Partially	No	Respect of deadlines	NA
<b>A.</b> Establishment of the core (Transition Lab) team					
<b>B.</b> Stakeholders mapping for setting the scene of regional experimentation					
<b>C.</b> Mapping of regional policies and instruments for setting the scene of regional experimentation					
<b>D.</b> Science and technology mapping for setting the scene of regional experimentation					
<b>E.</b> Transition Lab Kick-Off meeting					
<b>F.</b> Meetings with stakeholders for discussing the results of mapping					
<b>G.</b> Training of key stakeholders in the RIPEET methodology (provision and study of online resources, training seminars, etc.)					
a. _____					
b. _____					
<b>H.</b> Development of a community among the Transition Lab members thanks to various communication channels					
<b>I.</b> Acquisition and embedding of materials most useful for the territorial setting for informing and managing purposes of the Transition Labs					
<b>J.</b> Cooperation in the preparation process of the RIPEET Handbook					
<b>K.</b> Creation of a “mutual learning group” (e.g. the stakeholder group participating in the Transition Lab activities) in each territory, providing the base for replication and exploitation					
a. Appointment of a RIPEET Transition Lab Ambassador					
b. Appointment of two RIPEET Mentors					
<b>L.</b> Definition of a territorial strategy of engagement of the relevant stakeholders					
<b>M.</b> Triggering of a reflection within the regional core team on possible RRI institutional change pathways at the level of a single organisation and in the regional system in relation to energy transition					
<b>N.</b> Regional focus group for the engagement of territorial stakeholders and key multipliers in a reflection on RRI potential for the improvement of the regional governance of the energy transition					
<b>O.</b> RIPEET vision of the territorial experimentation actions (including the identification of a set of prioritized change targets) / Backcasting exercise + (e.g., a series of Transition Lab workshops please specify)					
a. _____					
b. _____					

	Yes	Partially	No	Respect of deadlines	NA
<b>P.</b> Starting the selection of the regional demand/challenge					
<b>Q.</b> Governance/management of the territorial experimentation (core team meetings and other activities aimed at monitoring, foster self-reflection, plan negotiation activities, improve responsiveness toward barriers and opportunities related to the regional experiments, etc.)					
<b>R.</b> Other activities implemented during the first 12 months beyond the listed above, which deserve to be considered (please, if any, add here below)					
a. _____					
b. _____					
c. _____					
<b>S.</b> Identification of further activities relevant for the regional RRI policy mix experimentation planned after the first year ( <i>please check if some of the listed activities below are applicable or not to your regional plan of activities, end eventually add new ones</i> ). Of course for these activities the box on the respect of deadline is not applicable					
a. the establishment of an open platform for regular consultation of citizens on territorial needs and innovation priorities					
b. the creation of a regular institutional space/arena for societal engagement of relevant stakeholders of the R&I ecosystem at regional/territorial level					
c. initiatives aimed at the inclusion of RRI principles and recommendations within regional strategies/policies					
d. arrangement of supporting services and/or innovative funding initiatives for supporting bottom-up and social innovation in the energy transition					
e. establishment of new organisational structures/department within R&I energy sector organisations or within regional Governments, aimed at innovating the present business model and organisational practices					
f. specific initiatives related to the RRI policy areas of change (Gender Equality, Open Access, Science Literacy and Education, Public Engagement, Ethics, Governance)					
g. building of a territorial partnership/coalition among relevant actors of the R&I innovation system concerned with responsible Innovation in relation to energy transition					
h. _____					

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>Partially</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Respect of deadlines</b>	<b>NA</b>
i. _____					

If some activities have not been implemented, or have undergone significant delays, please shortly explain the reasons, specifying the concerning activities

Click here to enter text.

## 2. Actual implementation of the planned work by different involved actors

Did the different involved actors (part of the regional Experimentation e.g., partners of the core team and other supporting actors part of an “extended” local team) carry out the tasks assigned to them, according to the plan of the activities foreseen for the RIPEET experimentation?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>Partially</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	------------------	--	-----------	--

If no or partially, please specify

Click here to enter text.

## 3. Expected numbers of beneficiaries/actual beneficiaries

*This question aims to find whether the expected number of beneficiaries (e.g., researchers, students, civil society agents, environmental groups, businesses, energy prosumers, social innovators, other citizens, energy sector/facilities professionals, policymakers, entrepreneurs, innovation managers, etc.) has been reached with your scheduled activities. In case of activities, which are still underway, please note the current number of beneficiaries.*

Please specify if the overall expected number of experiment beneficiaries was reached or not or if it has even been exceeded

<b>Exceeded</b>		<b>Yes</b>		<b>Partially</b>		<b>No</b>	
-----------------	--	------------	--	------------------	--	-----------	--

(If your answer is different from yes) for each of the main implementation action listed in question 1 please specify the mismatch between the planned and the actual number of beneficiaries concerning the main implementation actions. Please, if possible, indicate (in brackets) also the estimated gender ratio for each activity.

<b>Please specify in each row of this column the main activities including a target of beneficiaries under the main action</b>	<b>Expected Number (+ <u>gender ratio</u>)</b>	<b>Actual Number (+ <u>gender ratio</u>)</b>	<b>In case of a mismatch between the planned and the actual number, please specify the reasons</b>


**4. Type of intended beneficiaries/type of actual beneficiaries**

*Some of your actions targeted specific types of beneficiaries (e.g., researchers, students, civil society agents, environmental groups, businesses, energy prosumers, social innovators, other citizens, energy sector/facilities professionals, policymakers, entrepreneurs, innovation managers, etc.). Did the beneficiaries you reached correspond to your plans? If not, why?*

Targeted actions	The type of beneficiaries corresponded to the plans		
	Yes	Partially	No
<b>A.</b>			
If "partially" or "no", please specify the beneficiaries and the reasons for not reaching them			
<b>B.</b>			
If "partially" or "no", please specify the beneficiaries and the reasons for not reaching them			
<b>C.</b>			
If "partially" or "no", please specify the beneficiaries and the reasons for not reaching them			
<b>D.</b>			
If "partially" or "no", please specify the beneficiaries and the reasons for not reaching them			

**5. Presence/absence of financial and administrative management problems**

*Here you are requested to point out whatever difficulties or problems (main possible problems are listed, but others can be added) you met in the financial and administrative domain.*

During the first period of activity, did you meet any difficulty concerning:

	Yes
Payments transfer	
Decrease in available financial resources / lack of foreseen funding	
Money expenditures	
Costs reporting	
Use of human resources reporting	

Cash flow management	
Other aspects pertaining to financial and administrative management issues	

If you met problems, please describe them briefly and the solutions you adopted

Click here to enter text.
---------------------------

## 6. Adequacy of the available funds

To implement the experimentation activities in the concerned period, the available funds have been:

	Yes	Please specify in %
Excessive		
Adequate		-----
Inadequate		

## 7. Management of the territorial experimentation

During the concerned period, did you meet any difficulty concerning:

	Yes
Monitoring of the process	
Assuring continuity in actors involvement in tasks implementation	
Make decisions regarding resource allocation, governance and communication, work planning, etc.	
Exercising control over deadlines (e.g., On-time submission of deliverables and documents, and compliance with other formal duties)	
Other aspects pertaining to the management of the experimentation (e.g., lack of human resources in the core team; lack of competences in the core team; lack or insufficient technical resources/tools for the implementation of the planned activities; unexpected internal or external factors impacting on the regional experimental activities and on the full operation of the territorial team; etc.)	

If you met problems, please describe them briefly and the solutions you adopted for overcoming those problems

Click here to enter text.
---------------------------

## 8. Level of agreement on the aims and activities of the experiment

*This question seeks to find to what degree the involved parties (regional core team included) agree on the aims and the activities of the Experimentation as a whole. Please specify for each (applicable) category to whom you are referring:*

Please assess the degree of **agreement** on the aims and activities undertaken in the framework of your Experimentation among the actors listed below (1: complete disagreement – 5: complete agreement, or not applicable).

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Policymakers (national level) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Policymakers (intermediate – e.g., regional – level) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Policymakers (local level) (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Policymakers (local level) (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for territorial programmes in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Energy facility (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Energy facility (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Large enterprise/business working in the energy sector (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Large enterprise/business working in the energy sector (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
SMEs working in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Start-ups working in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for diversity issues/equal opportunities in the territorial area (within organisations and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible of open access / open data / open Science / open innovation departments/initiatives/centres (within organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Ethics and Research Integrity bodies (within the organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for Public engagement units or programs (within the organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Education Community (University/RPOs; Research centres in the energy sector; key actors in informal science education and literacy like science centre/museums, citizen science organisations involved in research and Innovation in energy/climate change issues, etc.)						

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
(specify who _____)						
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc. (1) (specify who _____)						
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc. (2) (specify who _____)						
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc. (3) (specify who _____)						
Environmentalist groups (e.g., ecological protection and conservation) (specify who _____)						
Research Funding Organisations (working on climate change/energy) (specify who _____)						
Other key innovation actors and multipliers (business organisations; network of social innovation; smart specialisation community; incubators; etc.) (specify who _____)						
Experimentation staff (core persons or other)						
Top management/leadership of regional partner organisations						
Other involved actors/direct beneficiaries of experimentation actions (please specify below, see points 1 and 2)						
1. _____						
2. _____						

## 9. Level of satisfaction

*This question aims to assess, according to the RIPEET territorial partners, the degree of satisfaction of various players, involved at different levels in the Experiment, regional core team included.*

Please assess the general degree of **satisfaction** with the activities included in the regional Experimentation of the actors listed below (1: complete dissatisfaction – 5: complete satisfaction, or not applicable).

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Policymakers (national level) (specify who _____)						



	1	2	3	4	5	NA
Policymakers (intermediate – e.g., regional – level) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Policymakers (local level) (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Policymakers (local level) (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for territorial programmes in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Energy facility (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Energy facility (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Large enterprise/business working in the energy sector (1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Large enterprise/business working in the energy sector (2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
SMEs working in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Start-ups working in the energy sector <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for diversity issues/equal opportunities in the territorial area (within organisations and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible of open access / open data / open Science / open innovation departments/initiatives/centres (within organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Ethics and Research Integrity bodies (within the organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Responsible for Public engagement units or programs (within the organisation and/or in the territory) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Education Community (University/RPOs; Research centres in the energy sector; key actors in informal science education and literacy like science centre/museums, citizen science organisations involved in research and Innovation in energy/climate change issues, etc.) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						

	1	2	3	4	5	NA
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc.(1) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc.(2) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
CSOs/NGOs working on energy/climate change issues, local development, ethical, legal, societal, environmental issues, gender equality, social innovation, etc.(3) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Environmentalist groups (e.g., ecological protection and conservation) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Research Funding Organisations (working on climate change/energy) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Other key innovation actors and multipliers (funding agencies, business organisations; network of social innovation; smart specialisation community; incubators; etc.) <i>(specify who _____)</i>						
Experimentation staff (core persons or other)						
Top management/leadership of regional partner organisations						
Other involved actors/direct beneficiaries of experimentation actions <i>(please specify below, see points 1 and 2)</i>						
1. _____						
2. _____						

### 10. Changes occurred until M12 the regional experiment

*Describe if during the first period of implementation of the regional experimentation the following changes occurred (please mention, whenever possible the activity/activities, what contributed to the changes, and the way changes were achieved, possibly reporting examples of negotiation activities. Add extra lines if needed).*

Changes	Yes
<p>Change in the partners' business model thanks to the incorporation of RRI principles and/or the RIPEET approach</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Introduction of organisational, regulatory or procedural changes (including human resources management) in the involved services, institutions, or territorial organisations related to the RIPEET RRI/demand-driven innovation approach in the energy sector (and their specific programs)</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Identification/activation of new programmes, actions, policies in the involved organisations following the implementation of the RIPEET actions (e.g., validation and adoption of the RIPEET methodology at regional level; adoption of RRI principles and tools at the territorial level; establishment of demand/challenge-driven innovation funding initiatives; etc.)</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Opening of permanent (virtual or physical) spaces for interactions with society/citizens of your region on needs and innovation priorities in energy/climate change (blogs, surveys, and other two-way feedback collection mechanisms, territorial workshops, etc.)</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Increased access of territorial and societal stakeholders to the R&amp;I systems (overall and according to the gender) and citizens' engagements in decision-making processes in energy/climate change issues (priority setting, need articulation, selection of the solution, etc.)</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Increased involvement of relevant stakeholders to R&amp;I systems (overall and according to gender) and ensured ownership toward the regional RRI policy experimentation</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Increased responsibility/engagement of the territorial stakeholders' systems (overall and according to the gender) in the adoption of RRI-based approaches in energy/climate change issues</p> <hr/> <hr/>	
<p>Increased raising awareness about RRI and building of a common understanding/vision about "territorial RRI" in relation to the energy transition/climate change issues by citizens and relevant stakeholders in the region (overall and according the gender)</p> <hr/> <hr/>	

Changes	Yes
Establishment of RRI-related governance mechanisms for the allocation of funding within research-funding and performing organisations _____ _____	
Incorporation of RRI principles, requirements and recommendations within Innovation regional policies and strategies _____ _____	
<i>Other</i> (Please specify) _____ _____	

**11. Positive/negative effects concerning the involved actors**

*Please describe if, during the implementation of the experiment, effects concerning the involved actors occurred (see the list of actors in questions 9 and 10), their nature (positive or negative) and the way the effects were achieved.*

Positive effects on the involved partners (e.g.; changes in the understanding of - or dealing with - gender issues and/or ethics, open access, and public engagement initiated by the leadership, willingness to establish/be part of a territorial coalition/partnership for responsible innovation in energy/climate change, commitment for institutional change in their organisation, etc.)

Click here to enter text.

Negative effects (e.g., conflicts among stakeholders and/or beneficiaries, unprecedented forms of opposition of individuals/groups towards the measures envisaged by the experiment)

Click here to enter text.

**12. External relations and outreach<sup>1</sup>**

Did the activities of your experimentation involved other territorial actors in addition to those already foreseen and mapped during the first stage of the project? (e.g., universities and/or research centres, professional associations, civil society organisations, representatives of local or national governments, start-up/companies, etc., environmental groups, funding agencies, etc.)?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	-----------	--

If yes, please specify the type of the organisation involved, its territorial belonging, the type of activities in question, and the nature of the participation of the external actors

---

<sup>1</sup> This question could be likely too premature in M12 and then deleted

Click here to enter text.

### 13. RRI added value<sup>2</sup>

Can you report any benefits observed at this stage of the implementation of the regional Experimentation, as a result of the inclusion of the RRI/Demand-driven and co-creation approach (*Please mention, whenever possible: what kind of benefit you observed, and the way changes were achieved*).

Benefits	Yes
<p>SCIENTIFIC BENEFITS (e.g., Higher relevance of scientific or innovation outputs; identification and inclusion of unmet needs and new research topics; improvement of research integrity/decrease in scientific and innovation misconduct; development of gendered innovation; better understanding of the societal challenges in energy/climate change issues; social innovation through co-creation; etc.)</p> <p>Observed benefits and the way changes were achieved :</p>	
<p>ECONOMIC BENEFITS (e.g., decreased costs of introducing innovation and increased adoption; improved products and services aligned with citizens' demands; etc.)</p> <p>Observed benefits and the way changes were achieved:</p>	
<p>DEMOCRATIC BENEFITS (e.g., inclusion of local knowledge and societal perspectives in the process of design, development, and deployment of R&amp;I; better governance of ethical dilemmas and societal controversies in R&amp;I; increasing of collective responsibility, citizen engagement and social trust to R&amp;I; etc.)</p> <p>Observed benefits and the way changes were achieved:</p>	
<p>SOCIAL BENEFITS (e.g., increasing trust and interest in science in the local communities; alignment of R&amp;I in energy/climate change societal needs and local development challenges; establishment of new relationship with the territory; development of frugal and inclusive innovation solutions accessible to all the citizens; etc.)</p> <p>Observed benefits and the way changes were achieved:</p>	
<p>OTHER KIND OF BENEFITS (expected/observed)</p> <p>Please specify</p>	

<sup>2</sup> This question could be likely too premature in M12 and then deleted

**14. Difficulties met in the application of the RIPEET methodology**

Did you meet any difficulties or problems in the application of the RRI/demand-driven innovation approach for the regional Experimentation?

Yes		No	
-----	--	----	--

If yes, please specify what kind of problem you met and how did you overcome it

Click here to enter text.
---------------------------

**15. Please specify if in the concerned period the following events, indicative of sustainability, occurred**

	Yes	No	N.A
Identification/acquisition of new material or human resources to continue the activities or parts of them			
(If yes, please specify quantity and number of sources by type: material, human)			
Use of symbols and visions referring to the territory, which can contribute to attracting the interest of local actors, aggregating and mobilising them to pursue common goals (considering also the RIPEET energy transition visions)			
(If yes, please describe)			
Occurrence of unexpected effects on policies/services provision/innovative measures not envisaged in the design phase			
(If yes, please describe)			
Identification/acquisition of new financial resources to continue the activities or parts of them			
(If yes, please specify quantity and number by type of sources)			
Creation of links with key players not previously engaged in the planned activities in the experiment territories			
(If yes, please specify)			
Creation of links with networks to access additional resources to continue the activities or parts of them			
(If yes, please specify)			
Establishment of permanent programs of policies aimed at supporting and funding RRI/demand-driven innovation in			

	Yes	No	N.A
energy/climate change (within single institutions or at regional level)			
(If yes, please specify)			
Creation of stable links with further bodies (beyond the expected ones) involved in the implementation of Transition Labs			
(If yes, please specify)			
Creation and maintenance (after the life span of the project) of a regional knowledge repository of the main output and results from the regional experimentation			
(If yes, please specify)			
Materials, outputs and resources produced in the framework of RIPEET been used by other organizations (external to the experiment) on your territorial area			
(If yes, please specify)			
Other (specify any other event/circumstance able to increase the sustainability of the outcomes of the regional experimentation and the durability of the process of transformative change activated during the RIPEET project, after its end)			
(If yes, please specify)			

**16. Please, describe the consistency of the territorial experimentation with its challenges**

	Yes	No	NA
The activities and objectives of the regional experimentation are consistent with what envisaged in the DoA			
(Please specify why)			
Project actions and objectives address the emergent challenges for responsible innovation in energy/climate change for the territorial areas			
(Please specify why)			
Project actions and objectives address the wider social, environmental and economic problems and needs in the target area			
(Please specify why)			

Project actions and objectives are consistent with the stakeholders mapped in the related territory			
(Please specify why)			
Project actions and objectives are consistent with the policies mapped in the related territory			
(Please specify why)			

**17. Please specify if the following events occurred<sup>3</sup>**

Are there any contacts established with regional, national or international networks, units, or organisations to entirely or partially replicate the implementation of the Experimentation elsewhere (e.g., “Mirror” regions)?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	-----------	--

If yes, please specify (as far as possible) where and how this should happen

Click here to enter text.
---------------------------

Have new financial or human resources (both internal and external to your institution) been identified or achieved to entirely or partially replicate the activities of the Experimentation elsewhere?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	-----------	--

If yes, please specify

Click here to enter text.
---------------------------

**18. Please specify if the following activities, which are likely to facilitate transferability, occurred<sup>4</sup>**

Were the Experiment's website and online resources disseminated information on the presence of the experimental activities to the public at large?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	-----------	--

Have you written and published (or are you planning to publish) articles or other study papers on RIPEET 'RRI policy experiments?

<b>Yes</b>		<b>No</b>	
------------	--	-----------	--

**19. Can you report (if any) the main “lessons learned” from the test/application of the RIPEET methodology in the regional experimentation, in view of its possible reproducibility/transferability (within and/or outside your regional context?)**

<sup>3</sup> This question could be likely too premature in M12 and then deleted

<sup>4</sup> This question could be likely too premature in M12 and then deleted



a. \_\_\_\_\_

b. \_\_\_\_\_

## Final Observations

*This space is dedicated to adding further observations essential to the assessment of the Experiment, which were not addressed by the previous questions.*

Please report possible further assessment observations not already provided

Click here to enter text.