

Directorate for Science, Technology and Innovation
Committee on Industry, Innovation and Entrepreneurship
Committee on Consumer Policy
Committee on Digital Economy Policy
Committee for Scientific and Technological Policy

Directorate for Science, Technology and Innovation: Programme Implementation Report (PIR) 2013-14

Committees are requested to review the results of the PIR exercise relevant to the Output Area for which they are responsible, to assess whether they are of the desired quality and impact, and to take the results into account in preparing their Programme of Work submissions for 2017-18.

Comments and suggestions should be sent to the Secretariat (susan.peric@oecd.org) by 30 November 2015. All comments received will be circulated among Committee delegates for information and discussion with a view to feeding into the PWB discussion.

Contact: Susan Peric, Tel: 01 45 24 93 61, E-mail: susan.peric@oecd.org

JT03384103

Complete document available on OLIS in its original format

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION REPORTING (PIR) 2013-14

1. This document provides members with an overview of the results of the Programme Implementation Reporting (PIR) exercise for 2013-14. Since 2005-06, the PIR survey has been carried out on a two-yearly basis. The PIR is a major corporate exercise, used to monitor the Organisation's performance against the two following criteria:

- Compliance with the approved Programme of Work and Budget;
- The quality and impact/potential impact of the outputs produced.

2. All 34 member countries, as well as the European Commission, participated in the PIR survey for 2013-14, with over 2 600 individual users accessing the online survey (a 24% increase from 2011-12). This provided a strong data set for Delegations to finalise their "institutional" response based upon the feedback from end-users in their capital. For further details, refer to [C\(2015\)99](#).

3. Of the 223 final Output Results planned to be delivered during the biennium, 221 (99.1%) were fully or partially completed in 2013-14, and 180 results were included in the end-user survey. Countries were asked to rate Output Results on a scale of 1 to 5 for both quality and impact/potential impact (1= very low and 5 = very high), and to provide an indication of usage. All Output Results in all Output Areas received ratings from end-users.

4. Ratings for quality continue to exceed those for impact/potential impact, reflecting the fact that it is easier to assess quality than impact, especially in the short term. For the Organisation as a whole, out of the total 180 Output Results, 80 results achieved at least a "High" rating for both quality and impact -- 174, or 98.8% of Part I budget resources, were rated at least "High" in terms of quality, while 80, or 56.5% of Part I budget resources, were rated at least "High" in terms of impact. The impact rating has thus decreased compared with 2011-12, when it represented 76.5% of Part I budgeted resources.

5. All 23 OECD Output Results that received CPF resources achieved a High rating for quality, and all achieved at least Medium for impact. Three of the five Output Results undertaken by the Directorate for Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) that received CPF funding were rated "High" for both quality and impact, while the remaining two were rated "High" for quality and "Medium/High" for impact.

6. Three major Horizontal Projects were identified in the 2013-14 PWB: "NAEC", "Strategy on Development" and "New Sources of Growth: Knowledge-based Capital" - the latter Project was undertaken under the responsibility of the STI and was rated as "High" in terms of both quality and impact.

7. In terms of usage, countries were asked to state whether each Output Result was: used as a basis for policy change; as a reference (data or analysis) for policy discussion; has the potential for authoritative use in policy development; or was not used. This information is helpful in identifying how OECD outputs are used in capitals and in better understanding why some outputs may not be used. The number of Member responses citing Output Results as being "used as a basis for policy change" increased by 25% (from 8% of total responses in 2011-12 to 10% in 2013-14).

8. The work of the STI undertaken under the Part I budget in 2013-14 is spread across five Output Areas – Output Area 1.2.1 (Entrepreneurship, Industry and Local Development) in Output Group 1.2, and Output Areas 1.3.1 (Digital Economy), 1.3.2 (Science and Innovation Policies), 1.3.3 (Biotechnology) and 1.3.5 (Consumer Policy) in Output Group 1.3 – each of which were individually evaluated.

9. The shares of the STI Output Areas in total OECD substantive Part I Output Areas in 2013 represented 9.7% of the total and were as follows: Output Area 1.2.1: 2.7%; Output Area 1.3.1: 2.9%; Output Area 1.3.2: 2.9%; Output Area 1.3.3: 0.7%; Output Area 1.3.5: 0.5%.

10. In 2013-14, the STI was responsible for 22 (12.2%) of the 180 Output Results included in the PIR end-user survey for the Organisation as a whole (compared with 31 Output Results included in the end-user survey for the 2011-12 PWB.) The ratings for STI are presented in Annex 1.

11. Overall, and consistent with previous PIR exercises, the ratings for STI for 2013-14 illustrate strong performance in terms of both quality and impact/potential impact, as shown in the overview of the ratings presented below and in Annex 1. The vast majority of STI Output Results are funded from a mix of Part I budget and voluntary contributions. The most highly rated results generally represent fairly large shares of the Part I budget, but interesting outliers include Output Result 1.2.1.2 Fostering Entrepreneurship for Growth and Job Creation, which has a very small share (14%) of Part I funding and which was nonetheless rated as “High” for both quality and impact, providing an indication of the value accorded by members to work aiming to: strengthen the evidence base; raise understanding of the role of entrepreneurship and SMEs for growth and job creation; and identify good policy practices that can be implemented by policy makers. Similarly, at 94% and 92% respectively, Output Results 1.3.2.4 Fostering STI to Address Global and Social Challenges, and 1.3.1.3 Fostering the Internet Economy as a Platform for Creativity and Innovation were supported by a significant share of voluntary contributions, and scored “High” for quality and “Medium/High” for impact.

12. In terms of quality, at the OECD level, only three results were rated “High/Very High”, and none “Very High”. While in 2013-14 no STI results received a “High/Very High” rating (compared to 11 in 2011-12), all 22 STI results received a “High” rating.

13. In terms of impact/potential impact, at the OECD level, no results were rated “High/Very High” or “Very High”. Ten out of 22 STI results received a “High” rating (compared to 21 out of 31 in 2011-12). Seven results were rated as “Medium/High”. It is noteworthy that in the case of STI all of the Output Results carried out under Output Areas 1.2.1 and 1.3.2 received “High” or “Medium/High” impact ratings. Five STI results received a “Medium” rating for impact, while none of the STI results received a “Low/Medium”, “Low” or “Very Low” rating.

14. As shown in the table below, ten STI Output Results were rated as being “High” for both quality and impact.

15. As has been the case in previous exercises, the Directorate’s flagship publications received consistently “High” ratings for both quality and impact. Examples include:

- STI Scoreboard 2013: Output Result 1.2.1.1;
- STI Outlook 2014: Output Result 1.3.2.2
- Communications Outlook 2013 and Digital Economy Outlook 2015: Output Result 1.3.1.5.

16. Again, consistent with the results of previous exercises, work relating to Data/models/indicators and statistical reports generally received "High" ratings for both quality and impact. Noteworthy examples include:

- The OECD Project on Employment Dynamics (DynEmp): Output Result 1.2.1.2.
- Measuring Trade in Value Added: Output Result 1.2.1.4.
- Knowledge-based Assets and Big Data: Output Result 1.3.1.1
- Indicators and Methodologies for the Internet Economy: Output Result 1.3.1.
- Science, Technology and Innovation Indicators: Output Results 1.3.2.1 and 1.3.2.2.

Output Result	TEC (KEUR)	Of which Part I (KEUR)	% Part I/TEC	Quality	Impact
1.2.1.1 Benchmarking and Evaluating Performance	2,224	1,411	63%	High	High
1.2.1.2 Fostering Entrepreneurship for Growth and Job Creation	2,031	898	44%	High	High
1.2.1.4 Enhancing the Benefits from the Globalisation of Industry	2,645	1,495	57%	High	High
1.3.1.1 Knowledge-based Assets and a Data-driven Economy	2,422	1,221	50%	High	High
1.3.1.2 Strengthening the Policy Framework for the Internet Economy	1,247	647	52%	High	High
1.3.1.5 Measuring the Internet Economy	2,383	2,148	90%	High	High
1.3.2.1 Impact of Science on Economic Growth	3,978	2,208	56%	High	High
1.3.2.2 Underpinning Elements	4,845	1,945	40%	High	High
1.3.3.3 Fostering STI to Address Global and Social Challenges	720	370	51%	High	High
1.3.5.3 Promoting Consumer Product Safety	637	237	37%	High	High

17. As was the case for the 2011-12 PIR exercise, members were asked to state whether each Output Result was: used as a basis for policy change; used as a reference (data or analysis) for policy discussion; has the potential for authoritative use in policy development; or was not used.

18. At the OECD level, 21 Output Results were rated "as a basis for policy change" by five or more Members. Among these figured two STI Output Results: 1.3.1.5 Measuring the Internet Economy within Output Area 1.3.1 (Digital Economy), and 1.3.5.1 Strengthening e-Commerce Frameworks within Output Area 1.3.5 (Consumer Policy). In the latter case, it should be noted that this Output Result was rated as only "Medium/High" for Impact, which raises the question of a possible misalignment between impact ratings and usage statements.

19. Ten Output Results OECD-wide were rated as "not used" by more than five Members. For the STI, the only Output Result to elicit a high share of member responses indicating that the output was "not used" was 1.3.1.6 "Country/Region Analysis and Reviews" (7 Members). This rating confirms the utility of using voluntary contributions rather than Part I funds to support this type of activity involving mainly non-members.

20. Within Output Area 1.2.1 (Entrepreneurship, Industry and Local Development), the Output Results where the highest number of Members reported that the output was "a basis for policy change" /

"used as a reference" were Output Result 1.2.1.1 Fostering New Sources of Growth" (25 Members) and Output Result 1.2.1.2 Fostering Entrepreneurship for Growth and Job Creation (23 Members). Output Result 1.2.1.5 Green Growth: Driving the Green Transformation had the highest number of "not used" ratings (4 Members). This latter Output Result was largely voluntary contribution funded, with a very small share of Part I resources.

21. Within 1.3.1 (Digital Economy), the Output Results most cited as a "basis for policy change" / "used as a reference" were 1.3.1.1 "Knowledge-based Assets and a Data-driven Economy" (24 Members) and 1.3.1.5 Measuring the Internet Economy (23 Members).

22. For Output Area 1.3.2 (Science and Innovation), the Output Results most cited as a "basis for policy change" / "used as a reference" were 1.3.2.2 Underpinning Elements (29 Members), and 1.3.2.1 Impact of Science on Economic Growth (26 Members). The work on Biotechnology (Output Area 1.3.3) had relatively low shares of respondents who reported that they used the Output Results as a "basis for policy change" / "used as a reference". This result reinforces the decision taken by the CSTP Committee to merge these two working parties from the beginning of the 2015-16 biennium, and reorient the work towards the issue of "converging" technologies and their implications for policy.

23. Lastly, for 1.3.5 (Consumer Policy), Output Result 1.3.5.1 Strengthening e-Commerce Frameworks had the largest share of respondents who reported that the work was "a basis for policy change" / "used as a reference" (17 Members). This impact reflects the unique position this Committee commands as the only international forum of this type, and belies the small Part I budget allocated to this work. The Output Result that elicited the highest share of member responses indicating that the output was "not used" was Output Result 1.3.5.4 Contributions to Horizontal Projects. This once again confirms the utility of using voluntary contributions rather than Part I funds to support this type of activity.

Action required

24. Committees are requested to review the results of the PIR exercise relevant to the Output Area for which they are responsible, to assess whether they are of the desired quality and impact, and to take the results into account in preparing their Programme of Work submissions for 2017-18.

25. Delegates may wish to take into account the following key features of the PIR results:

- Those Outputs that were rated as having a less than "High" impact compared to those Outputs that were considered to be of "High" impact;
- The share of Outputs receiving at least a "High" rating relative to their share of the Part I budget;
- Whether there are improvements to the PWB that can be made in the structure and content of Outputs.

26. Comments and suggestions should be sent to the Secretariat by 30 November 2015. All comments received will be circulated among Committee delegates for information and discussion with a view to feeding into the PWB discussions.

Annex 1. Ratings for Quality and Impact - PIR 2013-14

Output Result	% of Part I resources	Response rate	Quality	Impact	Usage	
					Policy change/Used as a reference	Not used
OG 1.2						
1.2.1 1. Fostering News Sources of Growth throughout the Economy	28%	94%	High	High	25	1
1.2.1 2. Fostering Entrepreneurship for Growth and Job Creation	14%	94%	High	High	23	3
1.2.1 3. Beyond Industrial Policy: New Approaches to Structural Change	25%	69%	High	Medium/High	13	3
1.2.1 4. Enhancing the Benefits from the Globalisation of Industry	26%	86%	High	High	19	0
1.2.1 5. Green Growth: Driving the Green Transformation	7%	69%	High	Medium/High	14	4
1.2.1 Output Results with at least a "High" rating (share of Part I budget)			100%	69%		
OG 1.3						
1.3.1 1. Knowledge-based Assets and a Data-driven Economy	22%	83%	High	High	24	0
1.3.1 2. Strengthening the Policy Framework for the Internet Economy	12%	69%	High	High	16	0
1.3.1 3. Fostering the Internet Economy as a Platform for Creativity and Innovation	8%	63%	High	Medium/High	10	3
1.3.1 4. Measuring Increasing Internet Demand	14%	74%	High	Medium	20	0
1.3.1 5. Measuring the Internet Economy	44%	91%	High	High	23	0
1.3.1 6. Country/Region Analysis and Reviews	0%	57%	High	Medium	10	7
1.3.1 Output Results with at least a "High" rating (share of Part I budget)			100%	80%		
1.3.2 1. Impact of Science on Economic Growth	41%	89%	High	High	26	0
1.3.2 2. Underpinning Elements	36%	100%	High	High	29	1
1.3.2 3. Enhancing STI Interactions	16%	60%	High	Medium/High	15	1
1.3.2 4. Fostering STI to Address Global and Social Challenges	6%	63%	High	Medium/High	12	1
1.3.2 Output Results with at least a "High" rating (share of Part I budget)			100%	78%		
1.3.3 1. Impact of Science on Economic Growth	46%	49%	High	Medium/High	11	1
1.3.3 2. Enhancing STI Interactions	27%	31%	High	Medium	5	2
1.3.3 3. Fostering STI to Address Global and Social Challenges	27%	40%	High	High	9	0
1.3.3 Output Results with at least a "High" rating (share of Part I budget)			100%	27%		
1.3.5 1. Strengthening e-Commerce Frameworks	50%	77%	High	Medium/High	17	1
1.3.5 2. Developing More Effective Consumer Policies	21%	71%	High	Medium	14	2
1.3.5 3. Promoting Consumer Product Safety	29%	54%	High	High	9	3
1.3.5 4. Contributions to Horizontal Projects	0%	54%	High	Medium	11	5
1.3.5 Output Results with at least a "High" rating (share of Part I budget)			100%	23%		