**Annex 5**

**Templates for Mid-Term Evaluation Report**

**(Individual and Consensus)**

**Water Joint Programming Initiative**

**2018 Joint Call**

*Closing the water cycle gap - Sustainable management of water resources*

These Project Management Guidelines will be effective from the date of the National funding decisions and shall remain in force until the last final project report is approved in 2022.

**The Mid-Term Consensus Report will be made available to the Consortium as well as CSC and JPI Water GB.**

**MID-TERM INDIVIDUAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**PROJECT TITLE AND ACRONYM**

Name of Coordinator: Herman Hellness

Project code: WaterWorks2017-Eviban

Duration of project: 36 months

Start date:  **Apr 19** End date: **Mar 22**

**DETAILS OF THE EVALUATOR**

Name: Jessica Budds

Organisation: University of East Anglia

Date of review: 10 April 2021

### **Scientific and technological progress** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please describe the work performed and the results obtained during the lifetime of the project, and the conformity of work progress within the initial schedule. Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Has progress been achieved towards reaching the project objectives according to the original description and milestones?* * *Detailed update on methodology & results* * *How has the progress of the project promoted a multi-disciplinary work?* * *Dissemination of the results (publications, patents, other)*   As work package 1 comprises project coordination, most of the work during this period has been on work package 2, relating to toolbox development. However, it is not always very clear from the report what work has been done, and to what extent this has matched the original proposal, during this first half. The report has a tendency to reiterate the aims of different aspects of the work, and describe the work done very vaguely, producing a lack of clarity over exactly what has been achieved and its significance, even if it is stated that all deliverables and milestones have been attained. For example, the governance assessment tool text just states that data for the case studies have been mapped, and an initial version of the tool developed, giving little indication of the methods and data involved, or the nature and purchase of the tool. The report makes several statements that aspects of the work are “in progress”, without providing any explanatory detail. Conversely, the case studies report actual data, without really explaining the significance of those data to the project or beyond.  My sense from the report is that the different tools and case studies are still quite disconnected and fragmented so far, and that a priority for the second half will be integration.  Stakeholder engagement and communication is very vague, with statements about “local stakeholders” being interested in and/or supportive of the project, with no illustration or explanation.  Outputs so far (1 chapter, 1 poster) are modest. |

### **Collaboration, coordination and mobility within the Consortium** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the collaboration, coordination and mobility within the Consortium*  *Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Efficiency on the coordination and organization of the projects* * *Collaboration effective between the partners* * *Mobility of the research between the consortia* * *Does the project meet the transnational nature and its added value?*   As expected, coordination and mobility have been affected to some extent by the Covid-19 situation, with activities moving online from March 2020. The report validly notes that this has led to instances whereby the depth of discussions could not be achieved in the envisaged timeframe, and that a number of events over a longer period is needed to replace a single planned face-to-face event.  The project held a face-to-face kick-off workshop in May 2019, before the pandemic, and a second annual meeting online in May 2020. The number of consortium-wide meetings is perhaps rather low, and could be enhanced in the second half. There have been other meetings, around case studies and management issues.  Mobility in particular has been limited, with one PhD student having to cut short a visit to a partner institution in March 2020, and some stakeholder engagement meetings moving to online format. However, while the team has run events via MS Teams etc, it does not seem to have given as much thought to how to maintain contact under the new conditions as it perhaps could have done. In particular, there does not seem to be as much communication across case study sites as I would have expected to see from this project, and especially in light of the pandemic. Given that the situation may continue to persist for some time, I would also have expected a stronger sense of mitigation measures from this report. |

### **Coordination with other international project funded by WaterWorks2017, or other instruments** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the external collaboration of the Consortium,*  *Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Collaboration effective with other projects funded by WaterWorks2017* * *Collaboration effective with other projects or consortia*   As I read it, the report does not mention any contact with other funded projects on this programme, which is perhaps surprising given that I understand that there are others also examining nature-based solutions. Reference is made to other projects that are being carried out by members of the team with other sources of funding, which is acceptable, although it seems that in one place in the report (p. 17) it is suggested that a project proposal under review would be crucial to complete aspects of collaboration and dissemination of this project.  Interconnections between Eviban and other projects could also be fostered by joint events promoted by Water JPI. |

### **Coverage of the themes and sub-themes of the call** (Maximum *250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the relation within the project results and the themes and the sub-themes of the call.*  *Theme 1. Enabling sustainable management of water resources.*  The overall aim for this theme is to develop new governance and knowledge management approaches.   * *Sub-theme 1.1. Promoting adaptive water management for global change:*   The aim of sub-theme 1.1 is to increase knowledge and to develop evidence-based methodologies and technologies for monitoring the cumulative impacts of human activities and climate change on the water cycle, but also to develop management options on the water cycle (considering all cycle compartments) and water / ecosystem services. This knowledge must be applicable for the adaptive management of water resources on a regional scale, while enabling downscaling to address local or catchment situations.   * *Sub-theme 1.2. Integrative management by implementing Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) such as Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR):*   The aim is to increase the knowledge and develop NWRMs such as MAR in a multidisciplinary way, to protect, prolong, sustain and augment freshwater supplies. Evidence of their effectiveness and on the multiple benefits they deliver should be demonstrated.   * *Sub-theme 1.3. Mitigating water stress in coastal zones and urbanized areas:*   The aim is to develop and demonstrate a comprehensive coastal zone management system based on monitoring and modelling to ensure the provision of freshwater security under a range of conditions including saline intrusion, sediment management, storms, floods and droughts, but also specific coastal water uses. Please, refer to H2020 calls on nature-based solutions to propose complementary actions.  *Theme 2. Strengthening socio-economic approaches to water management.*  The overall aim of this theme is envisaging education and communication initiatives to raise social awareness of consumption habits and water scarcity and to increase the levels of social acceptance and use of recycled water.   * *Sub-theme 2.1. Integrating economic and social analyses into decision-making processes:*   The aim is to increase the knowledge the effectiveness and efficiency of existing economic mechanisms and policy instruments related to water management, with a special emphasis on implementation of water policies (such as the EU Water Framework Directive) and development of a circular and green economy. The approach should aim to break boundaries between services valuation including more flexible pricing and charging mechanisms, management tools and institutions, and the employment of economic and social sciences to develop best practice management guidelines for efficient water uses, including under extreme events such as droughts and floods.   * *Sub-theme 2.2. The reuse of water:*   The aim is to develop integrative methods and cost-effective technologies for the implementation of acceptable and sustainable solutions on a large scale for different reuse cycles, spanning from irrigation, via livestock drinking water, to human consumption. Furthermore, goals include assessments of social acceptance for the use of recycled water and the development of integrated approaches combining technological solutions with social-psychological acceptability, economic viability and appropriate governance approaches. Research into the removal of emerging  contaminants must consider the cost of the technology vs yield and realistic options for reuse of the recovered water. Please refer to projects funded under previous Water JPI Joint Calls (2013, 2015, 2016 and 2017) to avoid any duplication. See Joint Calls on Water JPI website.   * *Sub-theme 2.3. Connecting science to society:*   The aim is to increase understanding of the role of socio-economic approaches to water uses in hydrological cycles. Knowledge building should address stakeholders' and public awareness of water challenges and values, and how perception of policy measures and technological solutions are formed and how stakeholders can be steered towards desirable behaviour. Local and/or regional context (attitude, social norms, cultural context, etc.) should be taken into consideration. The value of improved water stewardship overall should be considered by developing sustainable business models.   * *Sub-theme 2.4. Promoting new governance and knowledge management approaches:*   The aim is to develop innovative water management tools and approaches suitable for decision-making based on an analysis of the limitations of current practices. These approaches should involve the broad participation of stakeholders (including public monitoring, communication and education), multidisciplinary research, and short and long-term water cycle scenarios to support decision-making and the integration of water policy into other policy fields. In effect, governance capacities for implementation of water policies at the local and regional levels should be enhanced.  *Theme 3. Supporting tools for sustainable integrative management of water resources.*  This theme aims to complement the actions developed under the European Strategy Forum for Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) and other European initiatives. Emphasis should be on establishing networks and information sharing among existing research facilities/field labs, analytical methods, monitoring tools and programmes, access to databases and platforms, exploring the use of big data solutions and establishing reliable hydrological standards. Across the globe, there is a large body of knowledge, methodology and data related to hydrology and the water cycle that has the potential of being beneficial for a wide range of the world's regions. The alignment of water-related research and sharing of data and results will serve to avoid duplication of research, support progress based on previous finding, and thus facilitate the establishment of water management policies addressing rapid climatic changes.  At this stage of the project, I think that the project continues to be well aligned with the themes of the JPI programme as per the original proposal. However, as noted above, the impression I get from the report is that the development of the tools and the case studies is being conducted in a rather isolated and disconnected way across institutions and case study themes and locations. This may be because the case studies are quite different, and/or because the case studies also relate to PhD projects in some or all cases. This implies that integration, and the pursuit of findings across the project as a whole, will be a priority for the second half of the grant and for future evaluation. |

1. **Stakeholder/industry engagement** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the participation of stakeholder/industry on the project and the added value of this participation.*  From the report, it seems that stakeholders have been consulted in all four case study countries, and that they have contributed to the project, presumably at least by way of interviews to inform the governance tool. However, without exception, these stakeholders are not identified in any of the cases, and the report only refers to vague and reported expressions of interest and support, without any detail or illustration to support these assertions. It is therefore very difficult to evaluate whether the stakeholders consulted are sufficiently broad and representative enough in terms of type, sector and scale, and, therefore, to what extent communication and impact are likely to be effective.  In the second half of the project, the team could perhaps seek to engage with higher-level stakeholder and governance institutions. |

### **Recommendations for improvements/amendments of the report** (Please complete Table below)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Modification** | **Rationale for change** |
| 4 | Provide more detail on how the governance tool was informed and constructed, and how it will work in practice. | Too vague. |
| 4 | Provide more precise information on the state of development of the optimisation tool. | Too vague. |
| 5 | Provide a clearer state of development of the stormwater tool. | Too vague. |
| 5/6 | Clarify whether there have been any changes to the development of the MAR tool, and the MAR-SAT tool, and at what stage of development the creation of the map layers is. | Not precise enough. |
| 7 | Provide a clearer state of development of the ISA tool, explaining how it is envisaged that the different inputs will be defined and integrated, given that the input from stakeholders is not yet collected. | Too vague. |
| 8 | In the section regarding linkages to the SDGs, provide more detail on the assessments being undertaken, and how these have been informed by the development of the different tools and the data coming from the case studies. | Not precise enough. |
| 12 | Provide a brief analysis of the data in the French case and their significance, and also more detail on the information collection workshop and the field visit for monitoring. | Too vague. |
| 13 | As above, provide more details on the stakeholders and the data collection workshop. | Not precise enough. |
| 14 | Provide a clearer update on data collection in the Norwegian case. | Information missing. |
| 16 | Climate change data are mentioned in the Finnish case, but not in the other cases; clarify what these data are, and whether they are only relevant to this case study. | Not precise enough. |
| 17 | Specify how the partners’ contributions have been identifiable in the case studies. | Not precise enough. |
| 17 | Clarify whether the new funding proposal is essential to undertake the collaboration and communication mentioned. | Ambiguous. |
| 23 | How will the team mitigate the potential ongoing effects of the Covid-19 situation on data integration across case studies? | Information missing. |

1. **Recommendations/ problems and risks** (Maximum *250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please include problems identified or specific risks to the projects, deviations in relation to the planned work or budget, as well specific recommendations/feedback with could be relevant to the Consortium.*  The project seems to have made adequate progress on work package 2, although much of this report is too vague to properly judge. I had expected to see a clearer description of the specific activities undertaken as well as the emerging findings, as well as stronger indications of stakeholder engagement and the integration of the work across the different case study sites.  Aspects of the project, in particular team and stakeholder meetings and planned mobility, have been disrupted by the Covid-19 situation, and I would imagine also that a number of team members have had to cope with challenging working conditions during this time, all of which is legitimate. While these conditions are clearly outside the control of the researchers, the report could have contained a clearer idea and plan of how the impacts will be mitigated as the project continues into its second half, especially as the coming months continue to be uncertain in regard to the pandemic. |

**MID-TERM EVALUATION CONSENSUS REPORT**

**This Consensus Report will be made available to the Consortium as well as CSC and JPI Water GB.**

**PROJECT TITLE AND ACRONYM**

Name of Coordinator:

Project code: WaterWorks2017-CONSORTIUM ACRONYM

Duration of project:

Start date: End date:

**FOLLOW-UP GROUP**

Please include the data of the FG members reviewing the report

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Organisation |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### **Scientific and technological progress** (Maximum *250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please describe the work performed and the results obtained during the lifetime of the project, and the conformity of work progress within the initial schedule. Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Has progress been achieved towards reaching the project objectives according to the original description and milestones?* * *Detailed update on methodology & results* * *How has the progress of the project promoted a multi-disciplinary work?* * *Dissemination of the results (publications, patents, other)* |

### **Collaboration, coordination and mobility within the Consortium** (Maximum *250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the collaboration, coordination and mobility within the Consortium*  *Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Efficiency on the coordination and organization of the projects* * *Collaboration effective between the partners* * *Mobility of the research between the consortia* * *Does the project meet the transnational nature and its added value?* |

### **Coordination with other international project funded by WaterWorks2017, or other instruments** (Maximum 250 *words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the external collaboration of the Consortium*  *Take into account the following aspects:*   * *Collaboration effective with other projects funded under the 2018 Joint Call:* * *Collaboration effective with other projects or consortia.* |

### **Coverage of the themes and sub-themes of the call** (Maximum 250 words*)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate relation within the project results and the themes and the sub-themes of the call.*  *Theme 1. Enabling sustainable management of water resources.*  The overall aim for this theme is to develop new governance and knowledge management approaches.   * *Sub-theme 1.1. Promoting adaptive water management for global change:*   The aim of sub-theme 1.1 is to increase knowledge and to develop evidence-based methodologies and technologies for monitoring the cumulative impacts of human activities and climate change on the water cycle, but also to develop management options on the water cycle (considering all cycle compartments) and water / ecosystem services. This knowledge must be applicable for the adaptive management of water resources on a regional scale, while enabling downscaling to address local or catchment situations.   * *Sub-theme 1.2. Integrative management by implementing Natural Water Retention Measures (NWRM) such as Managed Aquifer Recharge (MAR):*   The aim is to increase the knowledge and develop NWRMs such as MAR in a multidisciplinary way, to protect, prolong, sustain and augment freshwater supplies. Evidence of their effectiveness and on the multiple benefits they deliver should be demonstrated.   * *Sub-theme 1.3. Mitigating water stress in coastal zones and urbanized areas:*   The aim is to develop and demonstrate a comprehensive coastal zone management system based on monitoring and modelling to ensure the provision of freshwater security under a range of conditions including saline intrusion, sediment management, storms, floods and droughts, but also specific coastal water uses. Please, refer to H2020 calls on nature-based solutions to propose complementary actions.  *Theme 2. Strengthening socio-economic approaches to water management.*  The overall aim of this theme is envisaging education and communication initiatives to raise social awareness of consumption habits and water scarcity and to increase the levels of social acceptance and use of recycled water.   * *Sub-theme 2.1. Integrating economic and social analyses into decision-making processes:*   The aim is to increase the knowledge the effectiveness and efficiency of existing economic mechanisms and policy instruments related to water management, with a special emphasis on implementation of water policies (such as the EU Water Framework Directive) and development of a circular and green economy. The approach should aim to break boundaries between services valuation including more flexible pricing and charging mechanisms, management tools and institutions, and the employment of economic and social sciences to develop best practice management guidelines for efficient water uses, including under extreme events such as droughts and floods.   * *Sub-theme 2.2. The reuse of water:*   The aim is to develop integrative methods and cost-effective technologies for the implementation of acceptable and sustainable solutions on a large scale for different reuse cycles, spanning from irrigation, via livestock drinking water, to human consumption. Furthermore, goals include assessments of social acceptance for the use of recycled water and the development of integrated approaches combining technological solutions with social-psychological acceptability, economic viability and appropriate governance approaches. Research into the removal of emerging contaminants must consider the cost of the technology vs yield and realistic options for reuse of the recovered water. Please refer to projects funded under previous Water JPI Joint Calls (2013, 2015 and 2016) to avoid any duplication. See Joint Calls on Water JPI website.   * *Sub-theme 2.3. Connecting science to society:*   The aim is to increase understanding of the role of socio-economic approaches to water uses in hydrological cycles. Knowledge building should address stakeholders' and public awareness of water challenges and values, and how perception of policy measures and technological solutions are formed and how stakeholders can be steered towards desirable behaviour. Local and/or regional context (attitude, social norms, cultural context, etc.) should be taken into consideration. The value of improved water stewardship overall should be considered by developing sustainable business models.   * *Sub-theme 2.4. Promoting new governance and knowledge management approaches:*   The aim is to develop innovative water management tools and approaches suitable for decision-making based on an analysis of the limitations of current practices. These approaches should involve the broad participation of stakeholders (including public monitoring, communication and education), multidisciplinary research, and short and long-term water cycle scenarios to support decision-making and the integration of water policy into other policy fields. In effect, governance capacities for implementation of water policies at the local and regional levels should be enhanced.  *Theme 3. Supporting tools for sustainable integrative management of water resources.*  This theme aims to complement the actions developed under the European Strategy Forum for Research Infrastructures (ESFRI) and other European initiatives. Emphasis should be on establishing networks and information sharing among existing research facilities/field labs, analytical methods, monitoring tools and programmes, access to databases and platforms, exploring the use of big data solutions and establishing reliable hydrological standards. Across the globe, there is a large body of knowledge, methodology and data related to hydrology and the water cycle that has the potential of being beneficial for a wide range of the world's regions. The alignment of water-related research and sharing of data and results will serve to avoid duplication of research, support progress based on previous finding, and thus facilitate the establishment of water management policies addressing rapid climatic changes. |

1. **Stakeholder/industry engagement** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please evaluate the participation of stakeholders/industry on the project and the added value of this participation.* |

### **Recommendations for improvements/amendments of the report** (Please complete Table below)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Page** | **Modification** | **Rationale for change** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

1. **General Assessment Comments** (*Maximum 250 words)*

|  |
| --- |
| *Please include a summary of the key points of this evaluation.*  *Problems identified or specific risks to the projects. As well recommendations/feedback, which could be relevant to the Consortium.* |